Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES

OF THE

FIRST SESSION OF THE SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

OF

THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA

VOLUME LVIII—PART 1

MAY 19 TO JUNE 12, 1919

(Pages 1–1068)





48030

WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1919

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

NATIONAL YEARLY MEETING
COLLEGE * LATHER

Congressional Record.

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS FIRST SESSION.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *May 19, 1919.*

THOMAS R. MARSHALL, of Indiana, Vice President of the United States, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we have lived through days that have seen the most signal manifestations of Thy gracious favor. Peace has come to us once more and with it abounding prosperity. The proud Nation is welcoming home its victorious Army. Homes are gladdened with the faces of the boys who have come bearing with them the emblems of victory. There are saddened hearts over the boys that have paid the price of the world's prosperity and liberty and peace. May they have the consolation to know that the sacrifice their boys have made has enriched the world and will enrich it for all generations, that men shall ever arise to call them blessed.

We pray Thee to look with Thy continued gracious favor upon Thy servants whom Thou hast called to this place of honorable service. Give them far-sighted vision. Give them stout hearts to contend for the right as they see the right. Give them unity of counsel and spirit. May our flag still float as the emblem of liberty and victory and peace and ever be God's own evangel of good will among the nations of the earth. For Christ's sake. Amen.

PROCLAMATION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour having arrived of the day on which, in accordance with the proclamation of the President of the United States, an extraordinary session of the Congress of the United States is to be convened, the Secretary of the Senate will read the proclamation.

The Secretary (James M. Baker) read the proclamation, as follows:

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION.

Whereas public interests require that the Congress of the United States should be convened in extra session at 12 o'clock noon on the 19th day of May, 1919, to receive such communication as may be made by the Executive: Now, therefore,

I, Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim and declare that an extraordinary occasion requires the Congress of the United States to convene in extra session at the Capitol, in the District of Columbia, on the 19th day of May, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon, of which all persons who shall at that time be entitled to act as Members thereof are hereby required to take notice.

Given under my hand and the seal of the United States of America the 7th day of May, in the year of our Lord 1919, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.] WOODROW WILSON.

By the President:

ROBERT LANSING,
Secretary of State.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE OATH TO SENATORS ELECT.

The VICE PRESIDENT, The newly elected Senators whose credentials are on file with the Secretary of the Senate, and to whose taking of the oath of office there is no objection, will now present themselves at the desk of the Secretary for that purpose. The Secretary will call the names of those who will take the oath.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. BALL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. BORAH, and Mr. CAPPER.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. CURTIS, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. COLT, Mr. DIAL, Mr. EDGE, and Mr. ELKINS.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. MCLEAN, Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. SUTHERLAND, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath was administered to them.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. FALL, Mr. FERNALD, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. HARRISON.

These Senators (with the exception of Mr. HARRIS), escorted by Mr. JONES of New Mexico, Mr. HALE, and Mr. WILLIAMS, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath was administered to them.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. KENYON, Mr. KEYES, Mr. MCCORMICK, and Mr. MCNARY.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. CUMMINS, Mr. MOSES, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath was administered to them.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. MARTIN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. NEWBERRY, and Mr. NORRIS.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. SWANSON, Mr. KELLOGG, Mr. TOWNSEND, and Mr. HITCHCOCK, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath was administered to them.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. OWEN, Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. RANSDELL, and Mr. ROBINSON.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. GORE, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. GAY, and Mr. KIRBY, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath was administered to them.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. SHIELDS, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. STANLEY.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. OVERMAN, and Mr. BECKHAM, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath was administered to them.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. STERLING, Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, Mr. WALSH of Montana, and Mr. WARREN.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. WATSON, Mr. LODGE, Mr. MYERS, and Mr. KENDRICK, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath was administered to them.

LIST OF SENATORS.

The list of Senators by States is as follows:

Alabama—John H. Bankhead and Oscar W. Underwood.
Arizona—Henry F. Ashurst and Marcus A. Smith.
Arkansas—Joseph T. Robinson and William F. Kirby.
California—James D. Phelan and Hiram W. Johnson.
Colorado—Charles S. Thomas and Lawrence C. Phipps.
Connecticut—Frank B. Brandegee and George P. McLean.
Delaware—Josiah O. Wolcott and L. Heisler Ball.
Florida—Duncan U. Fletcher and Park Trammell.
Georgia—Hoke Smith and William J. Harris.
Idaho—William E. Borah and John F. Nugent.
Illinois—Lawrence Y. Sherman and Medill McCormick.
Indiana—James E. Watson and Harry S. New.
Iowa—Albert B. Cummins and William S. Kenyon.
Kansas—Charles Curtis and Arthur Capper.
Kentucky—J. C. W. Beckham and Augustus O. Stanley.
Louisiana—Joseph E. Ransdell and Edward James Gay.
Maine—Bert M. Fernald and Frederick Hale.
Maryland—John Walter Smith and Joseph I. France.
Massachusetts—Henry Cabot Lodge and David I. Walsh.
Michigan—Charles E. Townsend and Truman H. Newberry.
Minnesota—Knute Nelson and Frank B. Kellogg.
Mississippi—John Sharp Williams and Pat Harrison.
Missouri—James A. Reed and Selden P. Spencer.
Montana—Henry L. Myers and Thomas J. Walsh.
Nebraska—Gilbert M. Hitchcock and George W. Norris.
Nevada—Key Pittman and Charles B. Henderson.
New Hampshire—George H. Moses and Henry W. Keyes.
New Jersey—Joseph S. Frelinghuysen and Walter E. Edge.
New Mexico—Albert B. Fall and Andrieus A. Jones.
New York—James W. Wadsworth, jr., and William M. Calder.
North Carolina—F. M. Simmons and Lee S. Overman.
North Dakota—Porter J. McCumber and Asle J. Gronna.
Ohio—Atlee Pomerene and Warren G. Harding.

Oklahoma—Thomas P. Gore and Robert L. Owen.
Oregon—George E. Chamberlain and Charles L. McNary.
Pennsylvania—Boies Penrose and Philander C. Knox.
Rhode Island—LeBaron B. Colt and Peter G. Gerry.
South Carolina—Ellison D. Smith and Nathaniel B. Dial.
South Dakota—Thomas Sterling and Edwin S. Johnson.
Tennessee—John K. Shields and Kenneth McKellar.
Texas—Charles A. Culberson and Morris Sheppard.
Utah—Reed Smoot and William H. King.
Vermont—William P. Dillingham and Carroll S. Page.
Virginia—Thomas S. Martin and Claude A. Swanson.
Washington—Wesley L. Jones and Miles Poindexter.
West Virginia—Howard Sutherland and Davis Elkins.
Wisconsin—Robert M. La Follette and Irvine L. Lenroot.
Wyoming—Francis E. Warren and John B. Kendrick.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll of the Senate to ascertain whether there is a constitutional number of Senators present for the transaction of business.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gore	McLean	Shields
Ball	Gronna	McNary	Simmons
Bankhead	Hale	Martin	Smith, Ariz.
Beckham	Harding	Moses	Smith, Ga.
Borah	Harrison	Myers	Smith, Md.
Brandegee	Henderson	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Calder	Hitchcock	New	Smoot
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Newberry	Spencer
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Stanley
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Sterling
Culberson	Kellogg	Overman	Sutherland
Cummins	Kendrick	Owen	Swanson
Curtis	Kenyon	Page	Thomas
Dial	Keyes	Penrose	Townsend
Dillingham	King	Phipps	Trammell
Edge	Kirby	Pittman	Underwood
Elkins	Knox	Poindexter	Wadsworth
Fall	La Follette	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
Fernald	Lenroot	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Lodge	Reed	Warren
France	McCormick	Robinson	Watson
Frelinghuysen	McCumber	Sheppard	Williams
Gay	McKellar	Sherman	Wolcott

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a telegram from the senior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] stating that prior to the announcement of the calling of Congress he had undertaken an engagement on Government business in the Imperial Valley, Calif., at a convention or meeting being held there; that he is now en route, and will be here within the next two or three days.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-two Senators having answered to the roll call, a constitutional number of Senators is present for the transaction of business.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, for which I ask immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 1) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 2), which was read and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House is assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERMAN in the chair) appointed Mr. LODGE and Mr. MARTIN as the committee on the part of the Senate.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE AND OFFICERS OF THE SENATE.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the election of President pro tempore of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERMAN in the chair). If there is no objection, nominations to that office are now in order. The Chair hears none.

Mr. LODGE. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 3), as follows:

Resolved, That Hon. ALBERT B. CUMMINS, a Senator from the State of Iowa, be, and he hereby is, elected President of the Senate pro tempore, to hold office during the pleasure of the Senate and in accordance with the resolution of the Senate adopted on the 12th day of March, 1890, on the subject.

Mr. MARTIN. I send to the desk an amendment to the resolution which has just been offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia to the resolution offered by the Senator from Massachusetts will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is moved to strike out the words "ALBERT B. CUMMINS, a Senator from the State of Iowa," and to insert in lieu thereof the words "KEY PITTMAN, a Senator from the State of Nevada."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment to the resolution of the Senator from Massachusetts proposed by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. MARTIN. I ask that the vote on the amendment be taken by yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CALDER (when his name was called). During the Sixty-fifth Congress I had a general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY]. I believe it terminated at the end of that Congress. I inquired on Thursday at his office if he were in the city, and I was informed that he was in Europe. This morning several Senators on the other side approached me and insisted that the pair should be effective, and that the Senator from Rhode Island left the country with that idea in mind. Although I myself feel it should be disregarded, I propose, because of the attitude of these Senators, to recognize it for to-day on all questions that may come up, and therefore will not vote on this question.

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 42, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—42.

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Pomerene	Stanley
Bankhead	Jones, N. Mex.	Ransdell	Swanson
Beckham	Kendrick	Reed	Thomas
Chamberlain	King	Robinson	Trammell
Culberson	Kirby	Sheppard	Underwood
Dial	McKellar	Shields	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Martin	Simmons	Walsh, Mont.
Gay	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Gore	Nugent	Smith, Ga.	Wolcott
Harrison	Overman	Smith, Md.	
Henderson	Owen	Smith, S. C.	

NAYS—47.

Ball	Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Phipps
Borah	Gronna	McCormick	Poindexter
Brandegee	Hale	McCumber	Sherman
Capper	Harding	McLean	Smoot
Colt	Johnson, Calif.	McNary	Spencer
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Moses	Sterling
Dillingham	Kellogg	Nelson	Sutherland
Edge	Kenyon	New	Townsend
Elkins	Keyes	Newberry	Wadsworth
Fall	Knox	Norris	Warren
Fernald	La Follette	Page	Watson
France	Lenroot	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—6.

Calder	Gerry	Phelan	Pittman
Cummins	Johnson, S. Dak.		

So Mr. MARTIN's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is upon the original resolution submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The resolution was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President pro tempore elect will present himself at the desk and take the oath of office.

Mr. CUMMINS was escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. LODGE, and the oath of office was administered to him by the Presiding Officer.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 4), which was read and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Senate do now proceed to the election of the following officers in the order named: Secretary of the Senate, Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, Assistant Doorkeeper of the Senate, and Acting Assistant Doorkeeper of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Under the order of the Senate just adopted, I offer the resolution which I send to the desk.

The resolution (S. Res. 5) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That George A. Sanderson, of Illinois, be, and he is hereby, elected Secretary of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolution offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to that resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the resolution by striking out the words "George A. Sanderson, of Illinois," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "James M. Baker, of South Carolina."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the original resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

George A. Sanderson, escorted by James M. Baker, appeared at the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office was administered to him by the Vice President.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, acting under the same order, I offer the resolution which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution (S. Res. 6) was read as follows:

Resolved, That David S. Barry, of Rhode Island, be, and he is hereby, elected Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to that resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed as an amendment to strike out the words "David S. Barry, of Rhode Island," and to insert in lieu thereof the words "Charles P. Higgins, of Missouri."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the original resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. I offer, under the same order, the resolution which I send to the desk.

The resolution (S. Res. 7) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Carl A. Loeffler, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected Assistant Doorkeeper of the Senate, and that Thomas W. Keller, of West Virginia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Acting Assistant Doorkeeper of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk and for which I ask immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 8) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Hon. ALBERT B. CUMMINS, a Senator from the State of Iowa, as President of the Senate pro tempore, and George A. Sanderson, of Illinois, as Secretary of the Senate.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 9), which was read, considered, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the hour of the daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian until otherwise ordered.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN LAWSON BURNETT.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I send to the desk resolutions for which I ask immediate consideration. I give notice that at some future date I shall ask the Senate to set apart a time for the purpose of paying tribute to the memory of the deceased Representative.

The resolutions (S. Res. 10) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep sensibility the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN LAWSON BURNETT, late a Representative from the State of Alabama.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

Mr. BANKHEAD. As a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 20, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *May 19, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

This being the day fixed in the proclamation of the President for the assembling of the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, the Clerk of the last House, Mr. South Trimble, called the House to order.

The Chaplain of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth Congress, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father in Heaven, once more in the swift flight of time Thou hast brought us to a new Congress, now convened in extraordinary session by the President of the United States of America.

Under the changed conditions in human events the call is imperative and will tax the ingenuity and statesmanship of its Members. Great are the problems confronting it. Questions of moment wait upon it for solution. Hence we pray for Thy wisdom to guide it, Thy strength to sustain it, Thy courage to inspire it to deliberate yet speedy action.

Let Thy blessing descend upon the Speaker of this House and the Representatives of the people that he may guide with a firm and strong hand its Members to the highest and best solution of the great questions at home and abroad; that its acts may be to the best interests of all concerned and redound to the glory of the living God, our Heavenly Father.

Since the Sixty-fifth Congress passed into history two of its Members who had been elected to serve in this Congress have been called to the larger life. Their work well done, strong friendships formed, their going brings sadness to many hearts. We pray for those who knew and loved them, especially their respective families, that they may be comforted by the eternal hope of the immortality of the soul. This we ask in the name of Him who died and rose again. Amen.

PROCLAMATION OF THE PRESIDENT.

The CLERK. The Clerk will read the proclamation of the President.

The Clerk read as follows:

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION.

Whereas public interests require that the Congress of the United States should be convened in extra session at 12 o'clock noon on the 19th day of May, 1919, to receive such communication as may be made by the Executive: Now, therefore,

I, Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim and declare that an extraordinary occasion requires the Congress of the United States to convene in extra session at the Capitol, in the District of Columbia, on the 19th day of May, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon, of which all persons who shall at that time be entitled to act as Members thereof are hereby required to take notice.

Given under my hand and the seal of the United States of America the 7th day of May, in the year of our Lord 1919 and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.] WOODROW WILSON.

By the President:

ROBERT LANSING,
Secretary of State.

CALL OF THE ROLL BY STATES.

The CLERK. The Clerk will call the roll of the House by States to ascertain if there is a quorum present.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members elect answered to their names:

ALABAMA.

John McDuffie.
S. Hubert Dent, jr.
Henry B. Steagall.
Fred L. Blackmon.
J. Thomas Heflin.
William B. Oliver.
William B. Bankhead.

ARIZONA.

Carl Hayden.

ARKANSAS.

William A. Oldfield.
John N. Tillman.
Otis Wingo.
Samuel M. Taylor.
William S. Goodwin.

CALIFORNIA.

Clarence F. Lea.
John E. Raker.
Charles F. Curry.
John I. Nolan.
John A. Elston.
H. E. Barbour.
Hugh S. Hersman.
Charles H. Randall.
Henry Z. Osborne.
William Kettner.

COLORADO.

William N. Vaile.
Charles B. Timberlake.
Guy W. Hardy.
Edward T. Taylor.

CONNECTICUT.

Augustine Lonergan.
Richard P. Freeman.
John Q. Tilson.
Schuyler Merritt.
James P. Glynn.

DELAWARE.

Caleb R. Layton.

FLORIDA.

Herbert J. Drane.
Frank Clark.
John H. Smithwick.
William J. Sears.

GEORGIA.

James W. Overstreet.
Frank Parks.
Charles R. Crisp.
W. C. Wright.
William D. Upshaw.
James W. Wise.
Charles H. Brand.
Thomas M. Bell.
Carl Vinson.
William C. Lankford.

IDAHO.

Burton L. French.

ILLINOIS.

Martin B. Madden.
James R. Mann.
William W. Wilson.
John W. Rainey
Adolph J. Sabath.
James McAndrews.
Niels Juul.
Thomas Gallagher.
Fred A. Britten.
Carl R. Chindblom.
Ira C. Copley.
Charles E. Fuller.
John C. McKenzie.
William J. Graham.
Edward J. King.
Clifford Ireland.
Frank L. Smith.
Joseph G. Cannon.

William B. McKinley.
Henry T. Rainey.
Loren E. Wheeler.
William A. Rodenberg.
E. B. Brooks.

O. R. Luhring.
Oscar E. Bland.
J. W. Dunbar.
J. S. Benham.
Everett Sanders.
Richard N. Elliott.
Merrill Moores.

Charles A. Kennedy.
Harry E. Hull.
Burton E. Sweet.
Gilbert N. Haugen.
James W. Good.
C. William Ramseyer.

Daniel R. Anthony, jr.
Edward C. Little.
Philip P. Campbell.
Homer Hoch.

Alben W. Barkley.
David H. Kincheloe.
Robert Y. Thomas, jr.
Ben Johnson.
Charles F. Ogden.

Whitmell P. Martin.
John T. Watkins.
Riley J. Wilson.

Louis B. Goodall.
Wallace H. White, jr.

William N. Andrews.
Carville D. Benson.
Charles P. Coady.

Allen T. Treadway.
Frederick H. Gillett.
Calvin D. Paige.
Samuel E. Winslow.
John Jacob Rogers.
Willfred W. Lufkin.
Michael F. Phelan.

Frank E. Doremus.
Earl C. Michener.
John M. C. Smith.
Edward L. Hamilton.
Carl E. Mapes.
Patrick H. Kelley.

Sydney Anderson.
Franklin F. Ellsworth.
Charles R. Davis.
W. H. Newton.
Harold Knutson.

Ezekiel S. Candler.
Hubert D. Stephens.
Thomas U. Sisson.
William W. Venable.

Milton A. Romjue.
William W. Rucker.
Joshua W. Alexander.
Charles F. Booher.
William T. Bland.
Clement C. Dickinson.
Sam C. Major.
William L. Nelson.

John M. Evans.

Charles F. Reavis.
Albert W. Jefferis.
Robert E. Evans.

Sherman E. Burroughs.

William J. Browning.
Isaac Bacharach.
Thomas J. Scully.
Elijah C. Hutchinson.
Ernest R. Ackerman.
John R. Ramsey.

Frederick C. Hicks.
John McCrate.
Thomas H. Cullen.
John B. Johnston.
Frederick W. Rowe.
James P. Maher.
Thomas S. Williams.
Edward E. Denison.
William E. Mason.
Richard Yates.

INDIANA.

Albert H. Vestal.
Fred S. Purnell.
William R. Wood.
Milton Kraus.
Louis W. Fairfield.
A. J. Hickey.

IOWA.

Cassius C. Dowell.
Horace M. Towner.
William R. Green.
L. J. Dickinson.
W. D. Boies.

KANSAS.

James G. Strong.
Hayes B. White.
J. N. Tincher.
William A. Ayres.

KENTUCKY.

Arthur B. Rouse.
James C. Cantrill.
William J. Fields.
John W. Langley.
J. M. Robsion.

LOUISIANA.

Jared Y. Sanders.
Ladislas Lazaro.
James B. Aswell.

MAINE.

John A. Peters.
Ira G. Hersey.

MARYLAND.

J. Charles Linthicum.
Sydney E. Mudd.
Frederick N. Zihlman.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Frederick W. Dallinger.
Alvan T. Fuller.
John F. Fitzgerald.
George Holden Tinkham.
Robert Luce.
William S. Greene.
Joseph Walsh.

MICHIGAN.

Louis C. Cramton.
Joseph W. Fordney.
James C. McLaughlin.
Gilbert A. Currie.
Frank D. Scott.
Charles A. Nichols.

MINNESOTA.

Andrew J. Volstead.
W. L. Carss.
Halvor Steenerson.
Thomas D. Schall.

MISSISSIPPI.

P. B. Johnson.
Percy E. Quin.
James W. Collier.

MISSOURI.

Champ Clark.
Cleveland Newton.
William L. Igoe.
Leonidas C. Dyer.
Marion E. Rhodes.
Ed. D. Hays.
Isaac V. McPherson.
Thomas L. Rubey.

MONTANA.

Carl W. Riddick.

NEBRASKA.

M. O. McLaughlin.
William E. Andrews.
Moses P. Kinkaid.

NEVADA.

Charles R. Evans.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Edward H. Wason.

NEW JERSEY.

Amos H. Radcliffe.
Cornelius J. McGlennon.
Daniel F. Minahan.
Frederick R. Lehlbach.
John J. Eagan.

NEW MEXICO.

Benigno C. Hernandez.

NEW YORK.

William E. Cleary.
David J. O'Connell.
Reuben L. Haskell.
Daniel J. Riordan.
Henry M. Goldfogle.
Christopher D. Sullivan.
Fiorello H. LaGuardia.
Peter J. Hooling.
Thomas F. Smith.
Herbert C. Pell.
John F. Carew.
Joseph Rowan.
Isaac Siegel.
Jerome F. Donovan.
Anthony J. Griffin.
Richard F. McKiniry.
James V. Ganly.
James W. Husted.
Edmund Platt.
Charles B. Ward.
Rollin B. Sanford.

John H. Small.
Claude Kitchin.
S. M. Brinson.
Edward W. Pou.
Charles M. Stedman.

John M. Baer.
George M. Young.

Nicholas Longworth.
A. E. B. Stephens.
Warren Gard.
Benjamin F. Welty.
Charles J. Thompson.
Charles C. Kearns.
Simeon D. Fess.
R. Clint Cole.
Isaac R. Sherwood.
Israel M. Foster.
Edwin D. Ricketts.

E. B. Howard.
William W. Hastings.
Charles D. Carter.
Tom D. McKeown.

Willis C. Hawley.
Nicholas J. Sinnott.

William S. Vare.
George S. Graham.
J. Hampton Moore.
George W. Edmonds.
Peter E. Costello.
George P. Darrow.
Thomas S. Butler.
Henry W. Watson.
William W. Griest.
Patrick McLane.
John J. Casey.
John Reber.
Arthur G. Dewalt.
Edgar R. Kiess.
John V. Lesher.

Thomas S. Crago.
Mahlon M. Garland.

Clark Burdick.
Walter R. Stiness.

Richard S. Whaley.
James F. Byrnes.
Fred H. Dominick.
Samuel J. Nicholls.

Carl A. Christopherson.
Royal C. Johnson.

Sam R. Sells.
J. Will Taylor.
John A. Moon.
Cordell Hull.
Ewin L. Davis.

Eugene Black.
John C. Box.
James Young.
Sam Rayburn.
Rufus Hardy.
Clay S. Briggs.
Joe H. Eagle.
Joseph J. Mansfield.

Milton H. Welling.

Schuyler Otis Bland.
Edward E. Holland.
Andrew J. Montague.
Walter A. Watson.
Edward W. Saunders.

John F. Miller.
Lindley H. Hadley.
Albert Johnson.
James S. Parker.
Frank Crowther.
Bertrand H. Snell.
Luther W. Mott.
Homer P. Snyder.
William H. Hill.
Walter W. Magee.
Norman J. Gould.
Alanson B. Houghton.
Thomas B. Dunn.
Archie D. Sanders.
S. Wallace Dempsey.
Clarence MacGregor.
James M. Mead.
Daniel Reed.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Hannibal L. Godwin.
Leonidas D. Robinson.
Robert L. Doughton.
Edwin Y. Webb.
Zeb Weaver.

NORTH DAKOTA.

J. H. Sinclair.

OHIO.

J. T. Begg.
Martin L. Davey.
C. Ellis Moore.
Roscoe C. McCulloch.
William A. Ashbrook.
B. Frank Murphy.
John G. Cooper.
Charles A. Mooney.
John J. Babka.
Henry I. Emerson.

OKLAHOMA.

Joseph B. Thompson.
Scott Ferris.
James V. McClintic.
Dick T. Morgan.

OREGON.

Clifton N. McArthur.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Benjamin K. Focht.
Aaron S. Kreider.
John M. Rose.
Edward S. Brooks.
Evan J. Jones.
J. H. Wilson.
S. A. Kendall.
Henry W. Temple.
Milton M. Shreve.
Henry J. Steele.
Nathan L. Strong.
Willis J. Hulings.
Stephen G. Porter.
Guy. E. Campbell.

AT LARGE.

William J. Burke.
Anderson H. Walters.

RHODE ISLAND.

Ambrose Kennedy.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

William F. Stevenson.
J. Willard Ragsdale.
Asbury F. Lever.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Harry L. Gandy.

TENNESSEE.

Joseph W. Byrns.
Lemuel P. Padgett.
Thetus W. Sims.
Finis J. Garrett.
Hubert F. Fisher.

TEXAS.

James P. Buchanan.
Fritz G. Lanham.
Lucien W. Parrish.
Carlos Bee.
John N. Garner.
Claude Hudspeth.
Thomas L. Blanton.

UTAH.

James H. Mays.

VERMONT.

Frank L. Greene.

VIRGINIA.

James P. Woods.
Thomas W. Harrison.
C. Bascom Slemp.
Henry D. Flood.

WASHINGTON.

J. W. Summers.
J. S. Webster.

WEST VIRGINIA.

M. M. Neely.
George M. Bowers.
Stuart F. Reed.
Harry C. Woodyard.
Wells Goodykoontz.
L. B. Echols.

WISCONSIN.

C. E. Randall.
Edward Voigt.
J. G. Monahan.
John C. Kleczka.
Victor Berger.
Florian Lampert.
John J. Esch.
Edward E. Browne.
David G. Classon.
James A. Frear.
Adolphus P. Nelson.

WYOMING.

Frank W. Mondell.

The CLERK. Four hundred and two Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present. For the information of the House I present a statement of the changes that have taken place by death and resignation since the close of the Sixty-fifth Congress.

The Clerk read as follows:

District.	Name.	Date of vacancy.
Sixth Virginia	Carter Glass, resigned	Dec. 16, 1918
Twenty-second Pennsylvania	Edward E. Robbins, died	Jan. 25, 1919
Eighth Virginia	Charles C. Carlin, resigned	Mar. 3, 1919
Eighth Kentucky	Harvey Helm, died	Do.
Twelfth Texas	James C. Wilson, resigned	Apr. 3, 1919
Alaska	Charles A. Sulzer, died	Apr. 15, 1919
First Louisiana	Albert Estopinal, died	Apr. 28, 1919
Seventh Alabama	John L. Burnett, died	May 13, 1919

ELECTION OF SPEAKER.

The CLERK. The next business in order is the election of the Speaker. Nominations for Speaker are in order.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Clerk, I am authorized by the unanimous action of the Republican conference to place in nomination for Speaker of the House of Representatives for the Sixty-sixth Congress Mr. FREDERICK HUNTINGTON GILLETT, of Massachusetts. [Applause.]

The CLERK. Are there any further nominations?

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Clerk, I have always been frank with the House, and I am going to be frank with it now. If it were possible, I would like to postpone the election of Speaker for about two years, to give time and opportunity to some of our boys who have remained at home to get here. [Applause and laughter.] I see many new faces over there on the Republican side, and I fear they, like the lean and hungry Cassius, are dangerous to Democratic success in this contest.

Mr. Clerk, this is an important function we are called upon to perform—the election of a Speaker for the Sixty-sixth Congress. The office of Speaker is a high, important, and responsible position. I have inquired diligently among the gentlemen sitting on this side of the aisle, and I learn that the distinguished gentleman whose name was just presented by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] is a man of unimpeachable character, of great learning, long experience, a man who has proven good and true in every capacity in which he has been tried. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which I have read recites his splendid achievements and fully justifies the high esteem in which his friends on this side of the House hold him. [Applause on Republican side.] I am very glad to hear that applause. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD also shows that the distinguished gentleman whose name I shall present has time and time again received the unqualified approval of every man upon the Republican side. [Applause.] You have said that he is a brave man, a learned man, an impartial man, just such a man as should preside over this House in this day of harmony and good will, and now I am going to put to the test my good friends on that side, and, notwithstanding the unavoidable absence for two years of many gentlemen who sincerely desired to be here, I am going to ask this House to reelect to the office which he has so well filled so long, and in which he has served his country with such distinguished ability, that great American citizen, CHAMP CLARK, of Missouri. [Applause.]

The CLERK. Are there any further nominations? If not, the nominations will be closed. The Clerk will appoint as tellers to count the votes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANFORD], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON], the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. GANDY], and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], who will please take their places at the desk. The Clerk will call the roll and the Members will designate by name whom they desire to elect as Speaker.

The tellers having taken their places, the House proceeded to vote viva voce for Speaker. The following is the vote in detail:

FOR MR. FREDERICK H. GILLETT—228.

Ackerman	Fordney	Lehlbach	Rodenberg
Anderson	Foster	Little	Rogers
Andrews, Md.	Frear	Longworth	Rose
Andrews, Nebr.	Freeman	Luce	Rowe
Anthony	French	Lufkin	Sanders, Ind.
Bacharach	Fuller, Ill.	Luhring	Sanders, N. Y.
Baer	Fuller, Mass.	McArthur	Sanford
Barbour	Garland	McCulloch	Schall
Begg	Good	McKenzie	Scott
Benham	Goodall	McKinley	Sells
Bland, Ind.	Goodykoontz	McLaughlin, Mich.	Shreve
Boies	Gould	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Siegel
Bowers	Graham, Pa.	McPherson	Sinclair
Britten	Graham, Ill.	MacCrate	Sinnott
Brooks, Ill.	Green, Iowa	MacGregor	Slemp
Brooks, Pa.	Greene, Mass.	Madden	Smith, Ill.
Browne	Greene, Vt.	Magee	Smith, Mich.
Browning	Griest	Mann	Snell
Burdick	Hadley	Mapes	Snyder
Burke	Hamilton	Mason	Steenerson
Burroughs	Hardy, Colo.	Merritt	Stephens, Ohio
Butler	Haskell	Michener	Stiness
Campbell, Kans.	Haugen	Miller	Strong, Kans.
Cannon	Hawley	Monahan	Strong, Pa.
Chindblom	Hays	Mondell	Summers, Wash.
Christopherson	Hernandez	Moore, Ohio	Sweet
Classon	Hersey	Moore, Pa.	Taylor, Tenn.
Cole	Hickey	Moores, Ind.	Temple
Cooper	Hicks	Morgan	Thompson, Ohio
Copley	Hill	Mott	Tilson
Costello	Hoch	Mudd	Timberlake
Crago	Houghton	Murphy	Tincher
Cramton	Hulings	Nelson, Wis.	Tinkham
Crowther	Hull, Iowa	Newton, Minn.	Towner
Currie, Mich.	Husted	Newton, Mo.	Treadway
Curry, Calif.	Hutchinson	Nichols, Mich.	Vaile
Dallinger	Ireland	Nolan	Vare
Darrow	Jefferis	Ogden	Vestal
Davis, Minn	Johnson, S. Dak.	Osborne	Voigt
Dempsey	Johnson, Wash.	Paige	Volstead
Denison	Jones, Pa.	Parker	Walsh
Dickinson, Iowa	Juul	Peters	Walters
Dowell	Kearns	Platt	Ward
Dunbar	Kelley, Mich.	Porter	Wason
Dunn	Kendall	Purnell	Watson, Pa.
Dyer	Kennedy, Iowa	Radcliffe	Webster
Echols	Kennedy, R. I.	Ramsey	Wheeler
Edmonds	Kiess	Ramseyer	White, Kans.
Elliott	King	Randall, Wis.	White, Me.
Ellsworth	Kinkaid	Reavis	Williams
Elston	Kleczka	Reber	Wilson, Ill.
Emerson	Knutson	Reed, N. Y.	Winslow
Esch	Kraus	Reed, W. Va.	Wood, Ind.
Evans, Nebr.	LaGuardia	Rhodes	Woodyard
Fairfield	Lampert	Ricketts	Yates
Fess	Langley	Riddick	Young, N. Dak.
Focht	Layton	Robsion, Ky.	Zihlman

FOR MR. CHAMP CLARK—172.

Alexander	Dooling	Lea, Calif.	Rouse, Ky.
Ashbrook	Doremus	Lesher	Rowan, N. Y.
Aswell	Doughton	Lever	Rubey
Ayres	Drane	Linthicum	Rucker
Babka	Eagan	Lonergan	Sabath
Bankhead	Eagle	McAndrews	Sanders, La.
Barkley	Evans, Mont.	McClintic	Saunders, Va.
Bee	Evans, Nev.	McDuffie	Scully
Bell	Ferris	McGlennon	Sears
Benson	Fields	McKeown	Sherwood
Black	Fisher	McKinley	Sims
Blackmon	Fitzgerald	McLane	Sisson
Bland, Mo	Flood	Maher	Small
Bland, Va.	Gallagher	Major	Smith, N. Y.
Blanton	Gandy, S. Dak.	Mansfield	Smithwick
Booher	Ganly, N. Y.	Martin	Steagall
Box	Gard	Mays	Stedman
Brand	Garner	Mead	Steele
Briggs	Garrett	Minahan, N. J.	Stephens, Miss.
Brinson	Godwin	Montague	Stevenson
Buchanan	Goldfogle	Moon, Tenn.	Sullivan
Byrnes, S. C.	Goodwin	Mooney, Ohio	Taylor, Ark.
Byrns, Tenn.	Griffin	Nelson, Mo.	Taylor, Colo.
Campbell, Pa.	Hardy, Tex.	Nicholls, S. C.	Thomas
Candler	Harrison	O'Connell	Thompson, Okla.
Cantrill	Hastings	Oldfield	Tillman
Carew	Hayden	Oliver	Upshaw
Carss	Heflin	Overstreet	Venable
Carter	Hersman	Padgett	Vinson
Casey	Holland	Park	Watkins
Clark, Fla.	Howard	Parrish	Watson, Va.
Cleary	Hudspeth	Pell	Weaver
Coady	Hull, Tenn.	Phelan	Webb
Collier	Igoe	Pou	Welling
Crisp	Johnson, Ky.	Ragsdale	Welty
Cullen	Johnson, Miss.	Rainey, H. T.	Whaley
Davey	Johnston, N. Y.	Rainey, J. W.	Wilson, La.
Davis, Tenn.	Kettner	Raker	Wilson, Pa.
Dent	Kincheloe	Randall, Calif.	Wingo
Dewalt	Kitchin	Rayburn	Wise
Dickinson, Mo.	Lanham	Riordan	Woods, Va.
Dominick	Lankford	Robinson, N. C.	Wright
Donovan	Lazaro	Romjue	Young, Tex.

At the conclusion of the roll,

The CLERK said: The result of the ballot as agreed to by the tellers is as follows:

Total number of votes cast, 400. Mr. GILLETT received 228 and Mr. CLARK of Missouri received 172. Mr. GILLETT, having received a majority of all the votes cast, a quorum being present

and voting, is declared duly elected Speaker of the Sixty-sixth Congress. [Applause.] The Clerk appoints as a committee to notify Mr. GILLETT of his election and to escort him to the chair Mr. CLARK of Missouri, Mr. MANN, of Illinois, and Mr. MONDELL, of Wyoming.

The committee appointed to conduct the Speaker elect to the chair having returned with him,

Mr. CLARK of Missouri said:

Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, out of 37 Speakers Massachusetts has had 5. This is the first time that the fatherhood of the House and the Speakership of the House have merged in one man. The gentleman you have elected has served 26 years. He has scholarship, experience, high character, and I hope that he will write his name among the very scanty list of great Speakers. [Applause and laughter.]

I have the pleasure and the honor of introducing to you the next Speaker of the House, Hon. FREDERICK H. GILLETT. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF THE SPEAKER.

The SPEAKER elect, on taking the chair, said:

Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I thank you for this cordial demonstration. I wish I could hope that this gavel will never be needed to check any less friendly and good-tempered disturbance. But I recognize this momentous session must bring periods of stress and excitement when it will be hard for us all to preserve that moderation and decorum befitting the dignity of this body.

I hope that the good feeling and mutual respect which exists to-day, although it may at times be clouded and dimmed, will, at the end of this Congress, be no less general and genuine. [Applause.]

To you who have conferred upon me this high office I feel the deepest gratitude. Both my training and my taste have made it attractive to me. There is no other in the world for which I would exchange it. Perhaps I ought to throw a ring into the sea to propitiate the gods. I have served under five Speakers, Crisp, Reed, Henderson, Cannon, and Clark, all men of high character and great ability, some of them men of extraordinary ability, and I have now no ambition except by an honorable and acceptable performance of my duty to prove myself not unworthy of that exalted company and of your partiality. To achieve that I ask your aid and cooperation. [Applause.]

There are facing this Congress problems so grave and so difficult as to demand our most industrious application and combined wisdom. Upon our success in solving them hangs the immediate prosperity and the future development of the Nation. They are so momentous that they may well sober partisanship and disarm prejudice. I am sure you will enter upon your task with high purpose, and I pledge you it will be my aim to exercise the power you have conferred upon me fairly, impartially, judicially, and with scrupulous regard for the rights and for the feelings of every Member of the House. [Applause.]

I am now ready to take the oath of office, and I ask that it be administered by Mr. CANNON, of Illinois. [Applause.]

The oath of office was administered by Mr. CANNON.

SWEARING IN OF CERTAIN MEMBERS ELECT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to send to the Clerk's desk a list of Members elect whose certificates have not been received but with regard to whose election there is no question. After the list has been read I shall ask unanimous consent that they may be allowed to take the oath.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read the list.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McDuffie, first Alabama.
Mr. Lea, first California.
Mr. Hersman, eighth California.
Mr. Kettner, eleventh California.
Mr. Wilson, third Illinois.
Mr. Fuller, twelfth Illinois.
Mr. Rainey, twentieth Illinois.
Mr. Rodenberg, twenty-second Illinois.
Mr. Bland, second Indiana.
Mr. Towner, eighth Iowa.
Mr. Hersey, fourth Maine.
Mr. Nichols, thirteenth Michigan.
Mr. Reavis, first Nebraska.
Mr. McClintic, seventh Oklahoma.
Mr. Bee, fourteenth Texas.
Mr. Welling, first Utah.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Members whose names have been read who are now present and with regard to whose election there is no question be allowed to take the oath.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will call the list of Members by States, to take the oath of office, and Members will come forward as called.

The Members presented themselves as their States were called and took the oath of office provided by law.

Mr. GRIEST, Mr. HICKS, and Mr. BUTLER affirmed.

During the swearing in of Members, when the State of Wisconsin was called, the following occurred:

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the swearing in at this time of VICTOR BERGER, a Representative elect from the State of Wisconsin [applause], for the reason that he is now under conviction and sentence by a United States court for a violation of the law of the United States. I wish to state for the information of the House that at the proper time I shall offer a resolution providing that the question of the eligibility of Mr. BERGER to a seat in this House be referred to a special committee in accordance with the precedents established by the House of Representatives in similar cases. [Applause.]

Mr. BERGER. Mr. Speaker, I understand this is a question of the highest personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. This is not the time to recognize the gentleman for that. Until the swearing in of the Members is completed the Chair can not recognize the gentleman.

The swearing in of the Members was completed.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a resolution which I will send to the Clerk's desk, ask that it be read, and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That William Tyler Page, of the State of Maryland, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Joseph G. Rodgers, of the State of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That Bert W. Kennedy, of the State of Michigan, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That Frank W. Collier, of the State of Wisconsin, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives; and

That Rev. Henry N. Couden, of the State of Michigan, be, and he is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit a unanimous-consent request that the gentleman who is nominated for Chaplain be elected by acclamation, and then, as to the balance of the names included in the resolution offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] I wish to offer a substitute.

Mr. TOWNER. I think there will be no objection to that on this side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the election of Chaplain.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman to suggest offering a substitute resolution.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. As soon as disposition is made of the election of Chaplain.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the election of Chaplain.

The question was taken, and Mr. Couden was unanimously elected.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I now send to the desk a resolution in the nature of a substitute.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That South Trimble, of the State of Kentucky, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Robert B. Gordon, of the State of Ohio, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That Joseph J. Sinnott, of the State of Virginia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives; and

That William M. Dunbar, of the State of Georgia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the substitute.

The question was taken, and the substitute was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts will be recognized. First the officers who have just been elected will come forward and be sworn.

Messrs. Page, Rodgers, Kennedy, Collier, and Couden appeared at the bar of the House, and the Speaker administered to them the oath of office.

MINORITY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a resolution, which it will take but a minute to dispose of. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered, Joseph J. Sinnott be authorized to act as special employee of the House of Representatives and receive compensation at the rate of $1,800 per annum; that H. W. Hetron be authorized to act as special chief page and pair clerk and receive compensation at the rate of $1,800 per annum; that Kenneth Romney be authorized to act as special messenger and assistant pair clerk and receive compensation at the rate of $1,800 per annum; that John O. Snyder and Lawrence Overstreet be authorized to act as special messengers and receive compensation at the rate of $1,800 per annum; and that J. J. Kenah be authorized to act as minority telephone messenger and receive compensation at the rate of $1,800 per annum; such employees to be at all times under the control of the Speaker of the House and subject to change at any time by the House as provided by law.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

Also:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House is assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

Also:

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Hon. ALBERT B. CUMMINS, of Iowa, as President of the Senate pro tempore, and George A. Sanderson as Secretary of the Senate.

Also:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep sensibility the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN LAWSON BURNETT, late a Representative from the State of Alabama.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected FREDERICK H. GILLETT, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, as Speaker, and William Tyler Page, a citizen of the State of Maryland, as Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-sixth Congress.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

NOTIFICATION TO THE SENATE.

Resolved, That a message be sent to the Senate to inform that body that a quorum of the House of Representatives is assembled; that FREDERICK H. GILLETT, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, has been elected Speaker; that William Tyler Page, a citizen of the State of Maryland, has been elected Clerk; and that the House is ready for business.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

REPRESENTATIVE ELECT BERGER.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it is charged that VICTOR BERGER, a Representative elect to the Sixty-sixth Congress from the State of Wisconsin, is ineligible to a seat in the House of Representatives; and

Whereas such charge is made through a Member of the House, and on his responsibility as such Member, and on the basis, as he asserts, of public records and papers evidencing such an ineligibility:

Resolved, That the question of the prima facie right of VICTOR BERGER to be sworn in as a Representative of the State of Wisconsin of the Sixty-sixth Congress, as well as of his final right to a seat therein as such Representative, be referred to a special committee of nine Members of the House, to be appointed by the Speaker; and until such committee shall report upon and the House decide such question and right, the said VICTOR BERGER shall not be sworn in nor be permitted to occupy a seat in this House; and said committee shall have power to send for persons and papers and examine witnesses on oath relative to the subject matter of this resolution.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state, for the information of the House, that this resolution follows the precedent established by the House in the first session of the Fifty-sixth Congress, in the case of Mr. Roberts, a Representative elect from the State of Utah. Inasmuch as the only question now before the House is the adoption of this resolution for the appointment of a committee to consider the question of eligibility, and inasmuch as Mr. BERGER will have full opportunity to appear and present his case before that committee, and also at a later date before the House, in case the House so decides, when the report of the committee comes up for discussion and action, in order to expedite the public business I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BERGER rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BERGER. I rise to a question of the highest privilege.

Mr. MONDELL rose.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. BERGER. I say I would like to make a short statement at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has the floor at present.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, out of due and proper deference to the action of the Senate, I submit the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House is assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints Messrs. MONDELL, MANN, and CLARK of Missouri as members of the committee.

THE RULES.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I send a resolution to the Clerk's desk and ask for its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the rules of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth Congress, with an amendment increasing the membership of the Committee on Ways and Means to 25, be adopted as the rules of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-sixth Congress.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committees of the House and the joint standing committees, as follows——

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the list of members of committees be dispensed with, and that the list be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the reading of the list of members of the committees be dispensed with, and that the list be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is this just a list of the majority Members?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes. It is a list of the majority Members.

Mr. GARRETT. There are no minority Members on the list?

Mr. MONDELL. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Following is the list referred to:

ASSIGNMENTS OF MAJORITY MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES.

Accounts: Clifford Ireland, chairman, of Illinois; Carl H. Mapes, of Michigan; Adolphus P. Nelson, of Wisconsin; Anderson H. Walters, of Pennsylvania; Edward D. Hays, of Missouri; Clarence MacGregor, of New York; William H. Hill, of New York.

Agriculture: Gilbert N. Haugen, chairman, of Iowa; James C. McLaughlin, of Michigan; Sydney Anderson, of Minnesota; William W. Wilson, of Illinois; Charles B. Ward, of New York; William B. McKinley, of Illinois; Elijah C. Hutchinson, of New Jersey; Fred S. Purnell, of Indiana; Edward Voigt, of Wisconsin; Melvin Orlando McLaughlin, of Nebraska; Evan J. Jones, of Pennsylvania; Carl W. Riddick, of Montana; J. N. Tincher, of Kansas.

Alcoholic Liquor Traffic: Addison T. Smith, chairman, of Idaho; John M. C. Smith, of Michigan; Thomas D. Schall, of Minnesota; J. H. Sinclair, of North Dakota; James G. Strong, of Kansas.

Appropriations: James W. Good, chairman, of Iowa; Charles R. Davis, of Minnesota; William S. Vare, of Pennsylvania; Joseph G. Cannon, of Illinois; Campbell Bascom Slemp, of Virginia; William R. Wood, of Indiana; Louis C. Cramton, of Michigan; Edward H. Wason, of New Hampshire; Walter W. Magee, of New York; George Holden Tinkham, of Massachusetts; Burton L. French, of Idaho; Milton W. Shreve, of Pennsylvania; Charles F. Ogden, of Kentucky.

Banking and Currency: Edmund Platt, chairman, of New York; Louis T. McFadden, of Pennsylvania; Porter H. Dale, of Vermont; Roscoe C. McCulloch, of Ohio; Edward J. King, of Illinois; Frank D. Scott, of Michigan; Adolphus P. Nelson, of Wisconsin; James G. Strong, of Kansas; L. S. Echols, of West Virginia; Edward S. Brooks, of Pennsylvania; William H. Hill, of New York; Robert Luce, of Massachusetts; Clark Burdick, of Rhode Island.

Census: Charles A. Nichols, chairman, of Michigan; Isaac Siegel, of New York; Louis W. Fairfield, of Indiana; Ira G. Hersey, of Maine; John W. Langley, of Kentucky; Horace M. Towner, of Iowa; Loren E. Wheeler, of Illinois; James P. Glynn, of Connecticut; Willis J. Hulings, of Pennsylvania; Henry E. Barbour, of California.

Claims: George W. Edmonds, chairman, of Pennsylvania; Edward C. Little, of Kansas; Clifford Ireland, of Illinois; James P. Glynn, of Connecticut; John M. Rose, of Pennsylvania; Clarence MacGregor, of New York; John C. MacCrate, of New York; Charles J. Thompson, of Ohio; M. Clyde Kelly, of Pennsylvania.

Coinage, Weights, and Measures: Albert H. Vestal, chairman, of Indiana; John M. Rose, of Pennsylvania; Louis B. Goodall, of Maine; John W. Langley, of Kentucky; Reuben L. Haskell, of New York; Clifford Ireland, of Illinois; Florian Lampert, of Wisconsin; John Reber, of Pennsylvania; William N. Andrews, of Maryland; R. Clint Cole, of Ohio.

District of Columbia: Carl E. Mapes, chairman, of Michigan; Benjamin K. Focht, of Pennsylvania; Loren E. Wheeler, of Illinois; Norman J. Gould, of New York; Stuart F. Reed, of West Virginia; Frederick W. Rowe, of New York; Frederick N. Zihlman, of Maryland; Florian Lampert, of Wisconsin; Anderson H. Walters, of Pennsylvania; Frank Murphy, of Ohio; Edward D. Hays, of Missouri; Clark Burdick, of Rhode Island.

Education: Simeon D. Fess, chairman, of Ohio; Horace M. Towner, of Iowa; Edmund Platt, of New York; Frederick W. Dallinger, of Massachusetts; Albert H. Vestal, of Indiana; Sherman E. Burroughs, of New Hampshire; Edward J. King, of Illinois; Daniel Reed, of New York; John M. Robsion, of Kentucky.

Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress: Florian Lampert, chairman, of Wisconsin; Carl E. Mapes, of Michigan; Simeon D. Fess, of Ohio; Mahlon M. Garland, of Pennsylvania; William E. Andrews, of Nebraska; Edwin B. Brooks, of Illinois; Hayes B. White, of Kansas; Daniel Reed, of New York.

Elections No. 1: Frederick W. Dallinger, chairman, of Massachusetts; John M. Rose, of Pennsylvania; William A. Rodenberg, of Illinois; R. Clint Cole, of Ohio; Clifford E. Randall, of Wisconsin; Oscar R. Luhring, of Indiana.

Elections No. 2: Louis B. Goodall, chairman, of Maine; Frederick R. Lehlbach, of New Jersey; John A. Elston, of California; Marion E. Rhodes, of Missouri; Robert Luce, of Massachusetts; Albert W. Jefferies, of Nebraska.

Elections No. 3: Cassius C. Dowell, chairman, of Iowa; Roscoe C. McCulloch, of Ohio; Frank D. Scott, of Michigan; Richard N. Elliott, of Indiana; Edward D. Hays, of Missouri; Carl R. Chindblom, of Illinois.

Enrolled Bills: John R. Ramsey, chairman, of New Jersey; Edmund Platt, of New York; Marion E. Rhodes, of Missouri; Edwin D. Ricketts, of Ohio.

Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture: John M. Baer, chairman, of North Dakota; Albert H. Vestal, of Indiana; Edward J. King, of Illinois.

Expenditures in the Department of Commerce: Thomas S. Williams, chairman, of Illinois; Norman J. Gould, of New York; Willis J. Hulings, of Pennsylvania; Frank Murphy, of Ohio.

Expenditures in the Department of Interior: Aaron S. Kreider, chairman, of Pennsylvania; Albert Johnson, of Washington; Roscoe C. McCulloch, of Ohio; Henry E. Barbour, of California.

Expenditures in the Department of Justice: Wallace H. White, jr., chairman, of Maine; Stuart F. Reed, of West Virginia; Robert Luce, of Massachusetts.

Expenditures in the Department of Labor: Anderson H. Walters, chairman, of Pennsylvania; Bertrand H. Snell, of New York; James H. Sinclair, of North Dakota.

Expenditures in the Navy Department: Reuben L. Haskell, chairman, of New York; L. S. Echols, of West Virginia; Clark Burdick, of Rhode Island.

Expenditures in the Post Office Department: Frederick N. Zihlman, chairman, of Maryland; Sam R. Sells, of Tennessee; Frederick W. Rowe, of New York; James P. Glynn, of Connecticut.

Expenditures in the Department of State: Richard N. Elliott, chairman, of Indiana; Louis T. McFadden, of Pennsylvania; Isaac Siegel, of New York; J. Will Taylor, of Tennessee.

Expenditures in the Treasury Department: Porter H. Dale, chairman, of Vermont; Mahlon M. Garland of Pennsylvania; William E. Andrews, of Nebraska; William N. Vaile, of Colorado.

Expenditures in the War Department: William J. Graham, chairman, of Illinois; Royal C. Johnson, of South Dakota; Albert W. Jefferies, of Nebraska; Clarence MacGregor, of New York.

Expenditures on Public Buildings: Ira G. Hersey, chairman, of Maine; George W. Edmonds, of Pennsylvania; John S. Benham, of Indiana; William H. Hill, of New York.

Flood Control: William A. Rodenberg, chairman, of Illinois; Charles F. Curry, of California; William J. Graham, of Illinois; Thomas D. Schall, of Minnesota; Stuart F. Reed, of West Virginia; Oscar R. Luhring, of Indiana; Frank Crowther, of New York; Frank Murphy, of Ohio.

Foreign Affairs: Stephen G. Porter, chairman, of Pennsylvania; John Jacob Rogers, of Massachusetts; Henry W. Temple, of Pennsylvania; Ambrose Kennedy, of Rhode Island; Edward E. Browne, of Wisconsin; Merrill Moores, of Indiana; William E. Mason, of Illinois; William H. Newton, of Minnesota; L. J. Dickinson, of Iowa; Ernest R. Ackerman, of New Jersey; Frank L. Smith, of Illinois; James T. Begg, of Ohio; Alanson B. Houghton, of New York.

Immigration and Naturalization: Albert Johnson, chairman, of Washington; Isaac Siegel, of New York; Harold Knutson, of Minnesota; Roscoe C. McCulloch, of Ohio; J. Will Taylor, of Tennessee; John C. Kleczka, of Wisconsin; William N. Vaile, of Colorado; Hayes B. White, of Kansas.

Indian Affairs: Homer P. Snyder, chairman, of New York; Philip P. Campbell, of Kansas; Royal C. Johnson, of South Dakota; John A. Elston, of California; Frederick W. Dallinger, of Massachusetts; Benigno C. Hernandez, of New Mexico; Marion E. Rhodes, of Missouri; James H. Sinclair, of North Dakota; Clifford E. Randall, of Wisconsin; Albert W. Jefferies, of Nebraska; R. Clint Cole, of Ohio; John Reber, of Pennsylvania; M. Clyde Kelly, of Pennsylvania.

Industrial Arts and Expositions: Oscar E. Bland, chairman, of Indiana; Charles A. Nichols, of Michigan; Louis W. Fairfield, of Indiana; Moses P. Kinkaid, of Nebraska; Sam R. Sells, of Tennessee; Edgar R. Kiess, of Pennsylvania; Clifford Ireland, of Illinois; Clark Burdick, of Rhode Island; William J. Burke, of Pennsylvania.

Insular Affairs: Horace M. Towner, chairman, of Iowa; Charles E. Fuller, of Illinois; James P. Glynn, of Connecticut; Benjamin K. Focht, of Pennsylvania; John I. Nolan, of California; Charles A. Nichols, of Michigan; Ira G. Hersey, of Maine; Frederick N. Zihlman, of Maryland; Harold Knutson, of Minnesota; Louis W. Fairfield, of Indiana; Willis J. Hulings, of Pennsylvania; Clarence MacGregor, of New York; John C. Kleczka, of Wisconsin.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce: John J. Esch, chairman, of Wisconsin; Edward L. Hamilton, of Michigan; Samuel E. Winslow, of Massachusetts; James S. Parker, of New York; Burton E. Sweet, of Iowa; Walter R. Stiness, of Rhode Island; John G. Cooper, of Ohio; Henry W. Watson, of Pennsylvania; Franklin F. Ellsworth, of Minnesota; Edward E. Denison, of Illinois; Everett Sanders, of Indiana; Schuyler Merritt, of Connecticut; J. Stanley Webster, of Washington.

Invalid Pensions: Charles E. Fuller, chairman, of Illinois; John W. Langley, of Kentucky; Moses P. Kinkaid, of Nebraska; Reuben L. Haskell, of New York; Oscar E. Bland, of Indiana; Thomas S. Williams, of Illinois; Edwin D. Ricketts, of Ohio; Willis J. Hulings, of Pennsylvania; Edward D. Hays, of Missouri.

Irrigation of Arid Lands: Moses P. Kinkaid, chairman, Nebraska; Nicholas J. Sinnott, Oregon; Edward C. Little, Kansas; Addison T. Smith, of Idaho; John M. Baer, of North Dakota; Benigno C. Hernandez, of New Mexico; John W. Summers, of Washington; Henry E. Barbour, of California; Charles J. Thompson, of Ohio.

Judiciary: Andrew J. Volstead, chairman, of Minnesota; Dick T. Morgan, of Oklahoma; George S. Graham, of Pennsylvania; Leonidas C. Dyer, of Missouri; Joseph Walsh, of Massachusetts; C. Frank Reavis, of Nebraska; James W. Husted, of New York; Gilbert A. Currie of Michigan; David G. Classon, of Wisconsin; William D. Boies, of Iowa; Charles A. Christophersen, of South Dakota; Richard Yates, of Illinois; Wells Goodykoontz, of West Virginia.

Labor: John M. C. Smith, chairman, of Michigan; John I. Nolan, of California; Ira G. Hersey, of Maine; Frederick N. Zihlman, of Maryland; Norman J. Gould, of New York; Oscar E. Bland, of Indiana; John C. MacCrate, of New York; Frank Murphy, of Ohio.

Library: Norman J. Gould, chairman, of New York; Simeon D. Fess, of Ohio; Robert Luce, of Massachusetts.

Merchant Marine and Fisheries: William S. Greene, chairman, of Massachusetts; George W. Edmonds, of Pennsylvania; Frederick W. Rowe, of New York; Frank D. Scott, of Michigan; Wallace H. White, jr., of Maine; Frederick R. Lehlbach, of New Jersey; Sherman E. Burroughs, of New Hampshire; Charles F. Curry, of California; Edwin D. Ricketts, of Ohio; Carl R. Chindbloom, of Illinois; Frank Crowther, of New York; Clifford E. Randall, of Wisconsin; William N. Andrews, of Maryland.

Mileage: John A. Elston, chairman, of California; Royal C. Johnson, of South Dakota; John Reber, of Pennsylvania.

Military Affairs: Julius, Kahn, chairman, of California; Daniel R. Anthony, jr., of Kansas; John C. McKenzie, of Illinois; Frank L. Greene, of Vermont; John M. Morin, of Pennsylvania; Thomas S. Crago, of Pennsylvania; Harry E. Hull, of Iowa; Rollin B. Sanford, of New York; W. Frank James, of Michigan; Charles C. Kearns, of Ohio; Alvan T. Fuller, of Massachusetts; Fiorello H. LaGuardia, of New York; John F. Miller, of Washington.

Mines and Mining: Mahlon M. Garland, chairman, of Pennsylvania; Moses P. Kinkaid, of Nebraska; Marion E. Rhodes, of Missouri; J. G. Monahan, of Wisconsin; L. S. Echols, of West Virginia; John M. Robsion, of Kentucky; Edwin B. Brooks, of Illinois; William J. Burke, of Pennsylvania; Oscar R. Luhring, of Indiana.

Naval Affairs: Thomas S. Butler, chairman, of Pennsylvania; William J. Browning, of New Jersey; Fred A. Britten, of Illinois; Patrick H. Kelley, of Michigan; Sydney E. Mudd, of Maryland; John A. Peters, of Maine; Frederick C. Hicks, of New York; Clifton N. McArthur, of Oregon; George P. Darrow, of Pennsylvania; Milton Kraus, of Indiana; Willfred W. Lufkin, of Massachusetts; Ambrose E. B. Stephens, of Ohio; Isaac V. McPherson, of Missouri.

Patents: John I. Nolan, chairman, of California; Florian Lampert, of Wisconsin; Loren E. Wheeler, of Illinois; Albert H. Vestal, of Indiana; William J. Burke, of Pennsylvania; Albert W. Jefferies, of Nebraska; John C. MacCrate, of New York.

Pensions: Sam R. Sells, chairman, of Tennessee; Edgar R. Kiess, of Pennsylvania; Harold Knutson, of Minnesota; Anderson H. Walters, of Pennsylvania; Wallace H. White, jr., of Maine; John M. Robsion, of Kentucky; R. Clint Cole, of Ohio; John C. Kleczka, of Wisconsin.

Post Offices and Post Roads: Halvor Steenerson, chairman, of Minnesota; Martin B. Madden, of Illinois; William W. Griest, of Pennsylvania; Calvin DeWitt Paige, of Massachusetts; Harry C. Woodyard, of West Virginia; C. William Ramseyer, of Iowa; Archie D. Sanders, of New York; Samuel A. Kendall, of Pennsylvania; James W. Dunbar, of Indiana; Cleveland Newton, of Missouri; Guy W. Hardy, of Colorado; Homer Hoch, of Kansas; C. Ellis Moore, of Ohio; Charles H. Randall, of California, to be assigned as a minority member.

Printing: Edgar R. Kiess, chairman, of Pennsylvania; Albert Johnson, of Washington.

Public Buildings and Grounds: John W. Langley, chairman, of Kentucky; John M. C. Smith, of Michigan; Thomas B. Dunn, of New York; Aaron S. Kreider, of Pennsylvania; Richard N. Elliott, of Indiana; William E. Andrews, of Nebraska; Charles J. Thompson, of Ohio; Edwin B. Brooks, of Illinois; J. Will Taylor, of Tennessee; Daniel Reed, of New York; Carl R. Chindblom, of Illinois.

Public Lands: Nicholas J. Sinnott, chairman, of Oregon; Addison T. Smith, of Idaho; John A. Elston, of California; Bertrand H. Snell, of New York; Charles A. Nichols, of Michigan; William J. Graham, of Illinois; John M. Baer, of North Dakota; Benigno C. Hernandez, of New Mexico; Hayes B. White, of Kansas; William N. Vaile, of Colorado; Henry E. Barbour, of California; John S. Benham, of Indiana; John W. Summers, of Washington.

Railways and Canals: Loren E. Wheeler, chairman, of Illinois; Louis B. Goodall, of Maine; Frederick R. Lehlbach, of New Jersey; John S. Benham, of Indiana; J. G. Monahan, of Wisconsin; Edward S. Brooks, of Pennsylvania; Charles J. Thompson, of Ohio.

Reform in the Civil Service: Frederick R. Lehlbach, chairman, of New Jersey; Louis W. Fairfield, of Indiana; Adolphus P. Nelson, of Wisconsin; John M. C. Smith, of Michigan; Addison T. Smith, of Idaho; William J. Graham, of Illinois; Frank Crowther, of New York; William H. Hill, of New York.

Revision of the Laws: Edward C. Little, chairman, of Kansas; Charles E. Fuller, of Illinois; Reuben L. Haskell, of New York; Isaac Siegel, of New York; Wallace H. White, jr., of Maine; Sherman E. Burroughs, of New Hampshire; Oscar R. Luhring, of Indiana; Clifford E. Randall, of Wisconsin.

Rivers and Harbors: Charles A. Kennedy, chairman, of Iowa; Peter E. Costello, of Pennsylvania; S. Wallace Dempsey, of New York; Henry I. Emerson, of Ohio; Henry Z. Osborne, of California; Richard P. Freeman, of Connecticut; Nathan L. Strong, of Pennsylvania; Niels Juul, of Illinois; Amos H. Radcliffe, of New Jersey; Andrew J. Hickey, of Indiana; Caleb R. Layton, of Delaware; Israel M. Foster, of Ohio; Earl C. Michener, of Michigan.

Roads: Thomas B. Dunn, chairman, of New York; Sam R. Sells, of Tennessee; Thomas S. Williams, of Illinois; John R. Ramsey, of New Jersey; Cassius C. Dowell, of Iowa; John M. Rose, of Pennsylvania; Edwin D. Ricketts, of Ohio; John S. Benham, of Indiana; John M. Robsion, of Kentucky; Robert E. Evans, of Nebraska; John W. Summers, of Washington; William N. Andrews, of Maryland; J. G. Monahan, of Wisconsin.

Rules: Philip P. Campbell, chairman, of Kansas; Bertrand H. Snell, of New York; William A. Rodenberg, of Illinois; Simeon D. Fess, of Ohio; Aaron S. Kreider, of Pennsylvania; Porter H. Dale, of Vermont; Royal C. Johnson, of South Dakota; Thomas D. Schall, of Minnesota.

Territories: Charles F. Curry, chairman, of California; Albert Johnson, of Washington; Cassius C. Dowell, of Iowa; Nicholas J. Sinnott, of Oregon; Louis T. McFadden, of Pennsylvania; John M. Baer, of North Dakota; John R. Ramsey, of New Jersey; John C. Kleczka, of Wisconsin; Edward S. Brooks, of Pennsylvania; James G. Strong, of Kansas.

War Claims: Benjamin K. Focht, chairman, of Pennsylvania; Bertrand H. Snell, of New York; Frederick N. Zihlman, of Maryland; Stuart F. Reed, of West Virginia; John R. Ramsey, of New Jersey; James G. Strong, of Kansas; J. G. Monahan, of Wisconsin; Robert E. Evans, of Nebraska; Daniel Reed, of New York.

Ways and Means: Joseph W. Fordney, chairman, of Michigan; J. Hampton Moore, of Pennsylvania; William R. Green, of Iowa; Nicholas Longworth, of Ohio; Willis C. Hawley, of Oregon; Allen T. Treadway, of Massachusetts; Ira C. Copley, of Illinois; Luther W. Mott, of New York; George M. Young, of North Dakota; James A. Frear, of Wisconsin; John Q. Tilson, of Connecticut; Isaac Bacharach, of New Jersey; Lindley H. Hadley, of Washington; Charles B. Timberlake, of Colorado; George M. Bowers, of West Virginia.

Woman Suffrage: James R. Mann, chairman, of Illinois; Edward C. Little, of Kansas; Richard N. Elliott, of Indiana; John I. Nolan, of California; George W. Edmonds, of Pennsylvania; Sherman E. Burroughs, of New Hampshire; Adolphus P. Nelson, of Wisconsin; John C. MacCrate, of New York.

DAILY HOUR OF MEETING.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered, the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be 12 o'clock meridian.

The resolution was agreed to.

ELECTION OF ADDITIONAL MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the election of the following additional Members to committees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KITCHIN moves the election of the following additional named Members to the following-named committees:

Accounts: Frank Park, of Georgia; Ben Johnson, of Kentucky; William W. Hastings, of Oklahoma; Lucien W. Parrish, of Texas.

Appropriations: Joseph W. Byrns, of Tennessee; Thomas U. Sisson, of Mississippi; James McAndrews, of Illinois; John M. Evans, of Montana; John J. Eagan, of New Jersey; James P. Buchanan, of Texas; James A. Gallivan, of Massachusetts; James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina.

Mileage: James P. Maher, of New York; Charles R. Evans, of Nevada.

Rules: Edward W. Pou, of North Carolina; Finis J. Garrett, of Tennessee; James C. Cantrill, of Kentucky; Daniel J. Riordan, of New York.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the election of the following additional Members to the Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. KITCHIN, of North Carolina; Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY, of Illinois; Mr. HULL, of Tennessee; Mr. GARNER, of Texas; Mr. COLLIER, of Mississippi; Mr. DICKINSON, of Missouri; Mr. OLDFIELD, of Arkansas; Mr. CRISP, of Georgia; Mr. CAREW, of New York; and Mr. MARTIN, of Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE ESTOPINAL.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ALBERT ESTOPINAL, a Representative from the State of Louisiana.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate a copy of these resolutions to the Senate.

The resolutions were agreed to.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE BURNETT.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JOHN LAWSON BURNETT, a Representative from the State of Alabama.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate a copy of these resolutions to the Senate.

The resolutions were agreed to.

DEATH OF DELEGATE SULZER, OF ALASKA.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. CHARLES AUGUST SULZER, a Delegate from the Territory of Alaska.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate a copy of these resolutions to the Senate.

The resolutions were agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representatives, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 20, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations required by the Treasury Department for the fiscal years 1919 and 1920 (H. Doc. No. 4); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Bureau of Pensions to pay Army and Navy pensions for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 5); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Postmaster General submitting deficiency estimates of appropriations required by the Post Office Department for the Postal Service, fiscal year 1919 and prior years, including certain reductions in estimates heretofore submitted (H. Doc. No. 6); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the institution for heating, lighting, etc., for the Freer Building, fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 7); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, submitting supplemental estimates of appropriation required by the Department of Labor (H. Doc. No. 8); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the civil government of the Panama Canal, relating to the salary of the district judge for the Canal Zone (H. Doc. No. 9); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Geological Survey for topographic surveys in various portions of the United States for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 10); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War, submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation required by the Panama Canal for censorship of mails and regulating commerce, Panama Canal, for the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 11); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, submitting deficiency estimates of appropriation required by the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1919 and prior years (H. Doc. No. 12); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, inviting attention to the revised estimate of appropriations for defraying the expenses of collecting the customs revenue for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 13); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

11. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of Commerce, submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation required by the Department of Commerce to cover the increased cost of envelopes for the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 14); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

12. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Superintendent of the State, War, and Navy buildings, submitting supplemental estimates of appropriations required for salaries and expenses of buildings under his charge for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 15); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

13. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of Commerce, submitting supplemental estimates of appropriations required by the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 16); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

14. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Attorney General, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations required by the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 17); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

15. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of Commerce, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the expenses of vessels and launches assigned to the survey by Executive order (H. Doc. No. 18); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

16. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of Commerce submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Lighthouse Service for completing the Conneaut Light Station, Ohio (H. Doc. No. 19); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LUFKIN: A bill (H. R. 1) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Salem, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 2) to pension soldiers of the War with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, and the China relief expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 3) to provide for a public building at Ilion, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4) to provide for a public building at Herkimer, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 5) to create in the War Department and the Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as the "Civil War volunteer officers' retired list," to authorize placing thereon with retired pay certain surviving officers who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the Civil War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 6) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Seaside, Clatsop County, State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 7) to create a department of education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 8) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Marshfield, Coos County, State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hillsboro, Washington County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Medford, Jackson County, State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Albany, Linn County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Coquille, Coos County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Gold Beach, Curry County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Astoria, Clatsop County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Oregon City, Clackamas County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Grants Pass, Josephine County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of St. Helens, Columbia County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ashland, Jackson County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Corvallis, Benton County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Salem, Marion County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of McMinnville, Yamhill County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Roseburg, Douglas County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Toledo, Lincoln County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Eugene, Lane County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Dallas, Polk County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Jacksonville, Jackson County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Tillamook, Tillamook County, in the State of Oregon, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 28) requiring The Adjutant General of the United States Army and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain data to the adjutants general of the several States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 29) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Dracut, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Reading, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 31) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Tewksbury, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Bolton, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 33) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Berlin, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 34) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Shirley, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 35) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Westford, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 36) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Concord, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 37) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Littleton, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 38) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Pepperell, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 39) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Carlisle, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 40) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wilmington, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 41) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Methuen, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 42) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Acton, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 43) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Ayer, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 44) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Billerica, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 45) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Chelmsford, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 46) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Woburn, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 47) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Bedford, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 48) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Harvard, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 49) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Tyngsboro, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 50) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Maynard, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 51) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Northboro, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 52) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Groton, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 53) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Burlington, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 54) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Boxboro, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 55) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lincoln, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 56) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hudson, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 57) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Andover, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 58) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lowell, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 59) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Dunstable, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 60) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Stow, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUFKIN: A bill (H. R. 61) to prohibit immigration for a period of four years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 62) to provide surgical or medical treatment for the men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard who have been honorably discharged from the service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 63) authorizing and providing for the purchase of land abroad for military cemeteries, and for their preservation and maintenance, in which to inter the remains of officers and enlisted men of the American Expeditionary Forces killed in battle or who have died abroad; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 64) to authorize the Chief of Ordnance to enter into agreements relative to repairs to public highways and the cost thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 65) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the boards of county commissioners of Orange, Clay, St. Johns, Putnam, Volusia, Flagler, Seminole, Broward, St. Lucie, Dade, Palm Beach, Brevard, Monroe, Okeechobee, Osceola, and Duval Counties each one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 66) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Huntington, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 67) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Milton, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 68) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Barboursville, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 69) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ripley, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 70) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ravenswood, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 71) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Point Pleasant, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 72) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of St. Marys, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 73) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Winfield, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 74) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Spencer, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 75) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Middlebourne, W. Va., one cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 76) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sistersville, W. Va., one cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 77) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Elizabeth, W. Va., one cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 78) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Parkersburg, W. Va., one cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 79) donating a captured cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Crown Point, Lake County, Ind.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 80) donating a captured cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Monticello, White County, Ind.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 81) donating a captured cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Battle Ground, Tippecanoe County, Ind.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 82) donating a captured cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of West Lebanon, Ind.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 83) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the cities and towns of Selmer, Henderson, Jackson, Lexington, Decaturville, Linden, Camden, Huntingdon, Paris, and Savannah, Tenn., each one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 84) making an appropriation to establish a national park at the Oriskany (N. Y.) battle field; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 85) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Lyons, N. Y., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 86) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Cato, N. Y., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 87) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Port Byron, N. Y., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 88) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Guyanoga, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 89) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of East Bloomfield, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 90) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Auburn, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 91) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Newark, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 92) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Sodus, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 93) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Geneva, N. Y., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 94) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Aurora, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 95) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Canandaigua, N. Y., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 96) authorizing and empowering the President of the United States, within his discretion, to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, any officer of the Regular Army, either on the active or retired list, who entered the volunteer service in April, 1861, and so continued until November, 1865, and attained the grade of major of Volunteers, to the grade of brigadier general on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 97) to permit members of the National Soldiers' Home to purchase food supplies from the commissary department of such home for wives and other members of their families dependent on them for support at prices not to exceed 10 per cent above actual cost of such food supplies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 98) making appropriation for the construction and equipment of a sanitary fireproof hospital on the grounds of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, Pacific Branch, in the county of Los Angeles, State of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 99) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of ordnance and cannon to designated cities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 100) to provide for the payment of mileage to officers on joining their first stations when commissioned in the National Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 101) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the public park at Eaton, Weld County, Colo., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 102) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the town of Limon, Lincoln County, Colo., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 103) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Yuma, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 104) donating a captured German cannon or field gun to the city of Manitou, county of El Paso, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 105) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Douglas, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 106) donating a captured German cannon or field gun to the county of Sedgwick, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 107) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Adams, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 108) donating a captured German cannon or field gun to the county of Arapahoe, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 109) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Kit Carson, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 110) donating a captured German cannon or field gun to the county of Weld, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 111) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Elbert, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 112) donating a captured German cannon and field gun to the county of Boulder, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 113) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Phillips, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 114) donating a captured German cannon and field gun to the county of Larimer, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 115) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Lincoln, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 116) donating a captured German cannon and field gun to the county of Morgan, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 117) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of El Paso, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 118) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Washington, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 119) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Cheyenne, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 120) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the park board of Longmont, at Longmont, Boulder County, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 121) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Logan, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 122) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Englewood, Arapahoe County, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes and to commemorate the participation of the boys there in the Battle of Chateau-Thierry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 123) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Saranac Lake, in the State of New York, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 124) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the city of Plattsburg, in the State of New York, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 125) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Massena, in the State of New York, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 126) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Elizabethtown, in the State of New York, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 127) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Canton, in the State of New York, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 128) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Chateaugay, in the State of New York, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 129) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Malone, in the State of New York, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 130) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the city of Ogdensburg, in the State of New York, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 131) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Port Henry, for use at old Fort St. Frederick, in the State of New York, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 132) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Ticonderoga, for use at old Fort Ticonderoga, in the State of New York, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 133) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Lake Placid, in the State of New York, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 134) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish two condemned cannon to the village of Port Henry, N. Y., for use at old Fort St. Frederick; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 135) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Carmi, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 136) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Albion, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 137) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Harrisburg, Ill., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 138) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Golconda, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 139) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of McLeansboro, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 140) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Vienna, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 141) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to Old Fort Massac National Park two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 142) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Shawneetown, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 143) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Flora, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 144) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fairfield, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 145) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Elizabethtown, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 146) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Louisville, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: A bill (H. R. 147) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Barnstead, N. H., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 148) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Sandwich, N. H., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 149) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Meredith, N. H., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 150) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Goffstown, N. H., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 151) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Manchester, N. H., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCHALL: A bill (H. R. 152) to donate one captured machine gun to each of the villages of Ogilvie and Milaca, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 153) to donate one captured cannon or gun to the village of Anoka, Minn., to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 154) to donate one captured cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Lindstrom, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 155) to donate one captured cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Annandale, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 156) to donate one captured cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Annandale, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 157) to donate one captured cannon or gun to the village of Monticello, Minn.; to the Committee on Miliary Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 158) to donate one captured gun each to various Minnesota villages; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 159) to donate eight captured cannons or fieldpieces to the city of Minneapolis, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ACKERMAN: A bill (H. R. 160) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Elizabeth, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpieee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 161) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Rahway, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 162) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Summit, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 163) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Plainfield, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 164) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Madison, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 165) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Westfield, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 166) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Dover, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 167) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Rockaway, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 168) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wharton, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 169) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Morristown, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 170) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Boonton, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 171) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Roselle Park, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 172) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Roselle, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 173) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cranford, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 174) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Butler, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 175) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of ordnance and cannons to designated cities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 176) to provide for a homestead entry on water-power sites; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 177) granting 50,000 acres of land to the State of Colorado for the use of the State Normal School at Gunnison, Colo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 178) authorizing an exchange of lands by A. A. Bruce, of La Veta, Colo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 179) permitting minors of the age of 18 years or over to make homestead entry or other entry of the public lands of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 180) granting certain coal lands to the city of Grand Junction, Colo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 181) to authorize the exchange of lands within the Montezuma National Forest in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 182) to authorize the exploration for and disposition of coal on the public domain; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 183) to authorize the exploration for and disposition of coal, phosphate, sodium, oil, oil shale, or gas on the public domain; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 184) to add certain lands to the national forests in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 185) conveying Trappers Lake to the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 186) granting cities and incorporated towns coal lands for municipal purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 187) to authorize leasing deposits of oil shale, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 188) to provide for furnishing information with respect to shares of stock offered to the public, and prescribing penalties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 189) to make The Star-Spangled Banner the national anthem of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 190) granting to the State of Oklahoma 210,000 acres of unappropriated nonmineral land for the benefit of its agricultural and mechanical colleges according to the provisions of the acts of July 2, 1862, and July 23, 1862, and authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the Secretary of the Interior certifying the number of acres available and that there are not sufficient lands in the State of Oklahoma to comply with the provisions of this act, to pay to the State of Oklahoma in lieu thereof the sum of $1.25 per acre for the number of acres due said State; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 191) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Custer, Okla., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 192) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Washita, Okla., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 193) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Dewey, Okla., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 194) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Greer, Okla., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 195) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Beckham, Okla., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 196) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Roger Mills, Okla., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 197) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Jackson, Okla., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 198) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Ellis, Okla., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 199) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Harmon, Okla., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 200) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Tillman, Okla., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 201) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Kiowa, Okla., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 202) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent in fee simple to the county of Huron, in the State of Michigan, for a certain described tract of land for public park purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 203) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Sebewaing, Mich., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 204) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Sandusky, Mich., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 205) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Port Austin, Mich., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 206) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Owendale, Mich., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 207) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Mount Clemens, Mich., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 208) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Lapeer, Mich., two German cannons or fieldpieces to mark the Victory Highway; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 209) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Imlay City, Mich., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 210) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Elkton, Mich., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 211) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Dryden, Mich., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 212) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Croswell, Mich., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 213) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Capac, Mich., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 214) to amend an act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1915; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 215) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 216) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the liability of common carriers by railroad to their employees in certain cases," approved April 22, 1908, and amended April 5, 1910; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 217) to amend sections 24 and 256 of the Judicial Code relating to the jurisdiction of the district courts so as to save claimants the rights and remedies under the workmen's compensation law of any State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 218) to amend section 35 of the Criminal Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 219) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Atlantic City, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 220) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mount Holly, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 221) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Moorestown, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 222) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Burlington, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 223) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Vineland, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 224) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Millville, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 225) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bridgeton, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 226) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cape May Court House, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 227) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cape May, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 228) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wildwood, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 229) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ocean City, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 230) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Tuckahoe, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 231) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Riverside, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 232) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Florence, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 233) to repeal the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 234) to amend an act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 235) authorizing certain papers to the executed outside the Visalia, Independence, and Imperial (California) land districts; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 236) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to grant to the Los Angeles County flood control district the use of certain public lands in California, and granting rights in, over, and through the Angeles and Santa Barbara Forest Reserves to the Los Angeles County flood control district; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 237) making the fraudulent sale of war materials a felony punishable by imprisonment in time of peace and by death in time of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 238) to repeal an act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," and the act amendatory thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 239) providing for parents to visit graves in Europe of sons killed in action; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY: A bill (H. R. 240) to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the East Branch of the Susquehanna River from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, Pa., to the borough of Shickshinny, county of Luzerne, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 241) to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the East Branch of the Susquehanna River from the city of Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the borough of West Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 242) to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the East Branch of the Susquehanna River from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the township of Salem, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 243) to enlarge the boundaries of the Oregon National Forest; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 244) to repeal the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: A bill (H. R. 245) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Smithfield, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 246) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Gloucester, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 247) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Burrillville, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 248) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Harrisville, in the county of Providence, State of Rhode Island, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 249) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of North Smithfield, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 250) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Manville, in the State of Rhode Island, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 251) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lincoln, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 252) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Valley Falls, in the town of Cumberland, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 253) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Cumberland, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 254) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Woonsocket, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 255) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Central Falls, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 256) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Pawtucket, R. I., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 257) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Providence, R. I., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 258) to amend sections 10 and 37 of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 259) to protect citizens of the United States against lynching in default of protection by the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 260) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 261) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 262) to prevent the nullification of State antigambling laws by international or interstate transmission of race-gambling bets or racing odds; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 263) to further protect interstate and foreign commerce against bribery and other corrupt trade practices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 264) to authorize the adoption, registration, and protection of a national trade-mark to distinguish merchandise manufactured or produced in the United States of America and used in commerce with foreign nations or among the several States, or with Indian tribes, and to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to license the use of same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 265) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 266) to give effect to certain provisions of the convention for the protection of trade-marks and commercial names, made and signed in the city of Buenos Aires, in the Argentine Republic, August 20, 1910, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 267) to erect a post-office building in the city of Lexington, State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 268) to erect a post-office building in the city of McKenzie, State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 269) to provide for the appointment of postmasters of all classes by the Postmaster General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 270) to provide that the United States shall construct rural post roads between the county seats of the several States; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 271) to extend the franking privilege to such officials of the several States as are charged with the administration of the State Confederate pension laws; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 272) declaring the selling, exchanging, or giving away any pistol, bowie knife, dirk or dirk knife, blackjack, dagger, sword cane, slung shot, brass or other metal knuckle in the District of Columbia a misdemeanor; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 273) declaring the carrying, openly or concealed, about the person any pistol, bowie knife, dirk or dirk knife, blackjack, dagger, sword cane, slung shot, brass or other metal knuckle in the District of Columbia a felony; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 274) in the promotion of the general welfare to provide capital for the development by land colonization of the agricultural resources of the Nation, providing certain privileges to soldier settlers, and creating a national colonization board; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 275) for the relief of the State of Vermont; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: A bill (H. R. 276) to repeal section 630 of the revenue act of 1919, which provides a tax of 1 cent for each 10 cents or fraction paid for drinks known as soft drinks, on ice cream sodas, sundaes, etc., and to provide a method of supplying any possible shortage in revenue resulting from such repeal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 277) to repeal that part of paragraph 4 of Public Act No. 243 of the Sixty-fifth Congress, approved November 21, 1918, which makes it unlawful to sell for beverage purposes any distilled spirits, and which prohibits the use of grain, etc., in the manufacture of beer, wine, or other intoxicating malt or vinous liquors for beverage purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 278) providing for a site and public building for post office and other Federal purposes at Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 279) further extending the time for the repayment of certain Spanish War revenue taxes erroneously collected; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 280) granting an increase of pension to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War and the War with Mexico, and to the widows of such soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 281) granting pensions to certain soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 282) to repeal the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 283) to repeal section 3 of an act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 284) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian Wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War," approved April 19, 1908, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAZARO: A bill (H. R. 285) to establish a fish-cultural station at some point in the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 286) to repeal the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOCH: A bill (H. R. 287) to repeal the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 288) for the purposes of conferring citizenship upon Indians, segregation of Indian tribal property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 289) providing for an additional session of Congress on the 5th day of March following the election of such Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 290) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a post-office building at Petaluma, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 291) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Marysville, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HULINGS: A bill (H. R. 292) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a post-office building at Greenville, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 293) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a post-office building at Warren, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 294) to increase the productive agricultural area of the United States by the reclamation of arid and swamp lands therein; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 295) to return to the South certain of the "cotton tax" collected from 1863 to 1868 by paying to each living Confederate soldier and each living widow of a Confederate soldier, as proper representatives of the South, the sum of $1,000 and a further sum of $25 per month during the remainder of their lives, and authorizing the appropriation of money therefor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 296) to promtly demobilize all men in every branch of the service whose purpose was to serve only for the duration of the war and who have made application for discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 297) providing for an increase of salary of the United States district attorney for the western district of Louisiana; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 298) to limit mileage to actual expenses; to the Committee on Mileage.

Also, a bill (H. R. 299) for the erection of a public building in the city of Cisco, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 300) for the erection of a public building in the city of Ballinger, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 301) for the erection of a public building in the city of Eastland, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 302) for the erection of a public building in the city of Sweetwater, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 303) for the erection of a public building in the city of Coleman, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 304) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building in Comanche, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 305) for the erection of a public building in the city of Ranger, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 306) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Burnet, in the State of Texas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 307) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Brown, in the State of Texas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 308) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Callahan, in the State of Texas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 309) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Comanche, in the State of Texas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 310) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Coleman, in the State of Texas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 311) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Taylor, in the State of Texas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 312) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Stephens, in the State of Texas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 313) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Shackelford, in the State of Texas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 314) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of San Saba, in the State of Texas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 315) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Runnels, in the State of Texas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 316) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Palo Pinto, in the State of Texas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 317) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Mills, in the State of Texas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 318) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of McCulloch, in the State of Texas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 319) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Lampasas, in the State of Texas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 320) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Llano, in the State of Texas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 321) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Nolan, in the State of Texas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 322) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Jones, in the State of Texas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 323) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Eastland, in the State of Texas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 324) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Concho, in the State of Texas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 325) to amend section 5197, Revised Statutes of the United States, regulating the rate of interest which may be charged by national banking associations and providing a penalty for violation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 326) to provide for the erection of an addition to the post-office building at Baltimore, Md., for alterations to the present building, and changes to the railroad entering same; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 327) to repeal the law known as the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 328) to provide for a canal and reservoirs in the counties of Dawson and Lincoln, in the State of Nebraska, for the purpose of diverting flood waters from the Platte River, conserving and utilizing same for irrigation and other beneficial uses; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 329) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building in the city of Lexington, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 330) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building in the city of Broken Bow, State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 331) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building in the city of Scottsbluff, State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 332) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building in the city of O'Neill, State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 333) providing for the disinterment and removal of the remains of the infant child, Norman Lee Molzahn, from the temporary burial site in the District of Columbia to permanent burial place; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COADY: A bill (H. R. 334) to enlarge, remodel, and improve the United States post-office and courthouse building located at Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 335) to amend an act with reference to the improvement of the public building at Utica, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 336) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Schenectady, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 337) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Fonda, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 338) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Gloversville, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 339) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Amsterdam, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIEGEL: A bill (H. R. 340) for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 341) to amend an act to parole United States prisoners, and for other purposes, approved June 25, 1910, as amended in section 1 by the act of Congress approved January 23, 1913; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 342) making a crime the disclosure of the finding of an indictment previous to the accused person being taken into custody; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 343) making the 12th day of October in each year a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 344) to declare Lincoln's birthday a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 345) making a crime the disclosure of grand jury proceeding by a grand juror; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 346) to further amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 347) granting pensions to certain members of the former Life-Saving Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 348) to add certain lands to the Ochoco National Forest, Oreg.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CARTER (by request): A bill (H. R. 349) providing for the validation of certain lands of the Cherokee, Creek, Seminole, Choctaw, or Chickasaw Tribes of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 350) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Lowville, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 351) to provide for the erection of a post-office building at Oneida, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 352) directing The Adjutant General of the United States Army and the Secretary of the Navy to allow the adjutant general of each State or his representative to examine and make transcripts of records; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 353) tendering the thanks of Congress to Gen. John J. Pershing, United States Army, and the officers and men under his command; and to Maj. Gen. Enoch H. Crowder, Provost Marshal General, and the Members of the local and district boards throughout the United States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 354) for the purchase of a post-office site at Phoenix, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 355) to repeal and annul certain parts of the charter and lease granted and made to the Washington Market Co. by act of Congress entitled "An act to incorporate the Washington Market Co.," approved May 20, 1870; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 356) to repeal the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 357) for the erection of a public building at Carlinville, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 358) providing for the remodeling and improvement of the post office at Springfield, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 359) providing for the purchase of a site for a post office and public building at Hillsboro, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 360) authorizing the erection of a public building at Provincetown, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 361) providing a penalty for those who wear or display medals of honor, decorations, etc., unless such medals or decorations were duly awarded them by military procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 362) making October 27 a national holiday, to be known as Roosevelt's birthday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 363) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chicago, County of Cook, State of Illinois, one German cannon or fieldpiece, to be placed in West Pullman Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 364) providing for the discharge of sailors and marines who enlisted since April 7, 1917, and before November 11, 1918; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REAVIS: A bill (H. R. 365) to repeal the law known as the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 366) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Johnstown, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 367) to establish military justice; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 368) to provide for the erection of a public building at Sparta, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 369) to provide for the erection of a public building at McMinnville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 370) to provide for the erection of a public building at Sweetwater, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 371) to provide for the erection of a public building at South Pittsburg, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 372) to provide for the erection of a public building at Tracy City, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 373) to provide for the erection of a public building at Madisonville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 374) to repeal the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 375) for the further relief of soldiers of the Civil War pensioned for wounds or injuries received in line of duty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 376) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, by providing for equal and identical rights, accommodations, and privileges for all persons applying for interstate transportation, and prohibiting discrimination on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 377) to reclassify the salaries of employees above the clerical grades in post offices of the first and second class; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 378) to provide for a preliminary survey of Eel River, Calif., with a view to the control of floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 379) granting a pension to widows of soldiers, sailors, or marines who served in the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HERSEY: A bill (H. R. 380) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Caribou, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 381) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Houlton, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 382) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Milo, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 383) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Dexter, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 384) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Presque Isle, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 385) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Island Falls, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 386) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Dover, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 387) providing for a resurvey of certain lands in Oregon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 388) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Honolulu and the towns of Hilo, Wailuku, Maui, and Lihue, Kauai, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 389) to establish a fund for public works in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 390) to appropriate $50,000 for the erection of a fish hatchery and laboratory at Honolulu, Hawaii; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 391) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to amend section 4131 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, to improve the Merchant Marine Service, and thereby also to increase the efficiency of the naval reserve, and for other purposes," as amended by act approved October 22, 1914; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 392) to prevent the shipment and sale in interstate commerce of nursery stock not true to name; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 393) granting to all members of the military or naval service in the present war six months' pay, subject to deduction for bonuses heretofore received; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 394) amending an act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes, approved July 11, 1916, and an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 395) repealing an act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 396) to authorize the payment of certain amounts for damages sustained by prairie fire on the Rosebud Indian Reservation in South Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 397) to authorize a lieu selection by the State of South Dakota for 160 acres on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 398) to prohibit the traffic in peyote, including its sale to Indians, introduction into the Indian country, importation, and transportation and providing penalties therefor; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 399) providing that Indians and other persons on Indian reservations and superintendencies shall be subject to certain State or Territorial laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 400) authorizing the Sioux Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 401) to protect owners of trademarks, labels, and similar property; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 402) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the

United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended by an act approved February 5, 1903, and as further amended by an act approved June 15, 1906, and an act approved June 25, 1910; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 403) to regulate the sale of stocks, bonds, and other securities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 404) providing that the United States flag shall be displayed in all United States courts while in session; that the attention of foreign-born applicants for naturalization shall be directed to the national flag, and that they shall be instructed as to its meaning and their duties in relation thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 405) to prohibit the public or private display within the United States of America and its Territories and possessions of certain flags and emblems, and prescribing penalties for the violation thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 406) amending an act entitled "An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., certain public lands in California, and granting rights in, over, and through the Sierra Forest Reserve, the Santa Barbara Forest Reserve, and the San Gabriel Timberland Reserve, Calif., to the city of Los Angeles, Calif.," approved June 30, 1906; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 407) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at San Pedro, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 408) to erect a post-office building in the city of Huntingdon, State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 409) to provide for a road to the Shiloh National Military Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 410) for the extension and completion of the United States Capitol; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 411) for the erection of a public building at West Point, Commonwealth of Virginia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 412) to incorporate Near East Relief; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 413) to regulate the interstate commerce of articles produced in the Territories, districts, and other political subdivisions of the United States in violation of the land laws of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 414) to provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of free zones in the ports of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 415) providing for cooperation between the United States and State governments in the rural settlement of soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to promote the reclamation of lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 416) to restore to the public domain certain lands heretofore reserved for a bird reservation in Siskiyou and Modoc Counties, Calif., and Klamath County, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 417) providing certain preferences to appointment in civil-service positions to soldiers and sailors who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the war with Germany and Austria; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 418) for the retirement of employees of the United States; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 419) providing for the reemployment to former positions of civil-service employees who left positions to enter the military service of the United States during the war with Germany and Austria; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 420) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Camp Douglas, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 421) to repeal chapter 154 of the acts of the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, being the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLIVER: A bill (H. R. 422) to provide a preliminary survey of the Sipsey River, Ala., with a view of the control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 423) to provide a preliminary survey of the Cahaba River, Ala., with a view to the control of floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 424) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Elk City, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 425) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Hobart, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 426) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Clinton, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 427) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Mangum, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 428) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Frederick, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 429) to amend an act approved September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIEGEL: A bill (H. R. 430) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to audit and adjust certain claims of the city of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 431) to promote the administration of military justice by amending existing laws regulating trial by courts-martial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 432) providing for the repair, improvement, and construction of ice piers in the harbor of Maysville, Ky., on the Ohio River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 433) providing for the construction of ice piers in the harbor of Louisa, Ky., on the Big Sandy River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 434) granting an increase of pension to certain soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 435) granting an increase of pension to certain soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 436) repealing an act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 437) granting a pension to deputy United States marshals of the United States court, western district of Arkansas, for the Indian Territory, prior to March 1, 1895; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 438) to amend the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 439) to exclude from the Arkansas National Forest all lands within the fourth congressional district and restore same to the public domain; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 440) to fix Christmas Day a legal holiday for rural letter carriers of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 441) to provide for the erection of a public building at De Queen, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 442) to provide for the erection of a public building at Nashville, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 443) to provide for the erection of a public building at Van Buren, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 444) to amend an act entitled "An act to pension the survivors of certain Indian wars from January 1, 1859, to January, 1891, inclusive, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 445) to authorize the establishment of auxiliary or field fish-cultural stations on the Columbia River of Oregon; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 446) authorizing the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to transfer fractional block 6 of Naylor's Addition,

Forest Grove, Oreg., to the United States of America for the use of the Bureau of Entomology, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 447) to provide for the construction of a dredge for use in improving the harbors on the Oregon coast; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 448) for the construction of a seagoing dredge for use in improving the harbors on the coast of Oregon; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 449) authorizing and directing the Postmaster General to prepare cancellation stamps for certain post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 450) granting an honorable discharge to certain members of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 451) granting an honorable discharge to certain enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 452) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Vinita, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 453) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Bartlesville, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 454) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act providing for patents on reclamation entries, and for other purposes," approved August 9, 1912; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 455) providing for the establishment of a weather bureau station at Delta, Colo.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 456) to establish an agricultural experiment station on the western slope of Colorado; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 457) providing for cooperation between the United States and State governments in the rural settlement of soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to promote the reclamation of lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 458) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Montrose, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 459) to increase the cost of the public building at Durango, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 460) authorizing a preliminary examination to be made of the Colorado River with a view to controlling the flood waters thereof; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 461) to extend to Indians the State laws governing in the matter of marriage and divorce and the social crimes herein enumerated; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 462) to authorize a report upon the necessity for the construction of a bridge across the Salt River on the Salt River Indian Reservation, Ariz.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 463) to authorize the advancement of funds to survey, construct, and maintain roads, trails, and bridges within Indian reservations; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 464) providing for the payment of pensions monthly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 465) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 466) providing for an additional judge for the district of Arizona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 467) to provide for the erection of a public building at Grand Canyon, Ariz.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 468) to increase the cost of the public building at Globe, Ariz.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 469) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Kingman, Ariz.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 470) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Yuma, Ariz.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 471) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate a captured German cannon to the city of Nogales, Ariz.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 472) to amend the war-risk insurance act as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 473) to provide for the enforcement of prohibition during the war and the period of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 474) to permit women otherwise qualified under the laws of the State wherein they reside to vote for Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States of America; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, a bill (H. R. 475) to establish an additional fish-cultural station in the State of Texas; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 476) providing for the local commemoration in his home county of the supreme sacrifice made by each soldier, sailor, marine, and aviator who lost his life while in the service of the United States during the present war; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 477) requiring all pensioners to reside within the territorial limits of the United States; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 478) to regulate commerce in adulterated and misbranded seed and to prevent the sale and transportation thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 479) providing for cooperation between the United States and State governments in the rural settlement of soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to promote the reclamation of lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 480) to revise the right of action under the act of March 12, 1863 (12 Stat. L., p. 820); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 481) to relieve Congress from the adjudication of private claims against the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 482) to reorganize the Dental Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 483) to regulate pawnbrokers and their business in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 484) to provide for the erection of a Federal office building on the site acquired for the Subtreasury in St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 485) to increase the rates of pay of certain grades of officers; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 486) to provide a commission to secure plans and designs for a monument or memorial to the memory of the Negro soldiers and sailors who fought in the wars of our country; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 487) to provide employment and rural homes for those who have served with military and naval forces, through the reclamation of lands, to be known as the "National soldier settlement act"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 488) for the erection of a public building at Lyons, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 489) to increase the limit of cost for the Federal post-office building at Waterloo, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 490) for the relief of certain officers and members of the crew of the U. S. S. *San Diego;* to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 491) to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion, and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto; and to promote safety at sea," approved March 4, 1915; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 492) providing for cooperation between the United States and State governments in the rural settlement of soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to promote the reclamation of lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 493) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Waurika, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 494) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Duncan, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 495) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Anadarko, State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 496) to authorize exploration for and disposition of coal, phosphate, sodium, oil, oil shale, or gas on the public domain; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 497) to fix the rate of pensions of mothers, fathers, and widows of deceased soldiers and sailors of the War of 1812, the War with Mexico, the Civil War, the various Indian wars, the War with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, and the Regular Establishment; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 498) to amend section 3 of public act 106 of the Sixty-fifth Congress entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 499) to amend section 314 of an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as added to said act by an act approved October 6, 1917; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 500) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Boston, Mass., three German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 501) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Boston, Mass., three German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 502) for the relief of the owner of the steamer *Mayflower* and for the relief of passengers on board said steamer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 503) to establish a game sanctuary in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 504) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 73 of an act entitled 'An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary,' approved June 12, 1916," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 505) to limit the area of land which may be acquired by any person under all the agricultural public-land laws; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 506) to provide for an authorization of money to be used in the construction of a public building at Sterling, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 507) to provide for the purchase of additional land and for the erection thereon of an addition to the post-office building at Boulder, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 508) to amend article 3 of the war-risk insurance act, compensation for death or disability, to conform with the highest rates allowed under the pension laws for permanent specific disabilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 509) granting gratuity to members of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, Army or Navy Nurse Corps, Army field clerks, Coast Guard, and Naval Reservists; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 510) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Borough of Brooklyn, city of New York, for Irving Square Park, cannons or fieldpieces, with carriages and suitable complements of projectiles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 511) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Borough of Brooklyn, city of New York, for Bushwick Playground, cannons or fieldpieces, with carriages and suitable complement of projectiles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 512) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Borough of Queens, city of New York, for Forest Park and Richmond Hill Library Square, cannons or fieldpieces, with carriages and suitable complement of projectiles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 513) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Borough of Brooklyn, city of New York, for Highland Park, cannons or fieldpieces, with carriages and suitable complement of projectiles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 514) to purchase a site for the erection of a post-office building in the section of the Borough of Queens, city of New York, N. Y., known and designated as Woodhaven; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 515) to purchase a site for the erection of a post-office building in the section of the Borough of Queens, city of New York, N. Y., known and designated as Richmond Hill; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 516) to provide for the construction of roads adjoining Indian allotments in the State of Oklahoma and the Five Civilized Tribes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 517) to amend an act to provide for drainage of Indian allotments of the Five Civilized Tribes, approved March 27, 1914; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. OLIVER: A bill (H. R. 518) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Marion, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 519) authorizing the acquisition of a site for a public building at Greensboro, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 520) granting pensions to the officers and soldiers who served in the West Virginia State troops in the late Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 521) for the relief of West Virginia State troops; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 522) granting a pension to teamsters, bridge builders, and railroad repairers who were in the service of the United States during the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 523) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Spencer, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HERSEY: A bill (H. R. 524) for the establishment of a national park and acquiring national forest in the Mount Katahdin region of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 525) to provide for the erection of a public building at Presque Isle, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 526) to provide for the erection of a public building at Dover, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 527) to increase the limit of cost of the public building to be erected at Fort Fairfield, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 528) to provide for enlarging the United States building at Houlton, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 529) to increase the limit of cost of the public building to be erected at Caribou, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 530) for the construction of a bridge across the St. John River between Madawaska, Me., and Edmunston, Province of New Brunswick, Canada; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 531) designating the columbine the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 532) to establish and maintain a fish-hatching and fish-culture station in La Plata County, Colo.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 533) to establish and maintain a fish-hatching and fish-culture station in Garfield County, State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 534) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Drumright, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 535) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Shawnee, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 536) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Sapulpa, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 537) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Ada, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 538) to define, regulate, and punish using the telephone or telegraph to defraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 539) to carry into effect the finding of the Court of Claims in favor of Elizabeth White, administratrix of estate of Samuel N. White, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 540) to regulate the interstate use of automobiles and all self-propelled vehicles which use the public highways in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: A bill (H. R. 541) to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, additional land for the Federal building at Manchester, N. H., and to construct an addi-

tion thereon; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 542) to secure and protect the rights of women citizens of the United States to vote for Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States of America; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: A bill (H. R. 543) to increase the limit of cost for the new public-building site for the west side, Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 544) to provide for the establishment of a national employment bureau in the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 545) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved May 11, 1912; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 546) to authorize the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii to ratify the agreements of certain persons made with the commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii and to issue land patents to those eligible under the terms of said agreements; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 547) to increase the pension of those who have lost limbs in the military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 548) amending an act to pension the survivors of certain Indian wars from January 1, 1859, to January, 1891, inclusive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 549) to refund the cotton tax realized to the Government under the various acts of Congress; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 550) authorizing preliminary examination and survey for ice breakers on the Ohio River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 551) to transfer the accounting offices from the jurisdiction and control of the Treasury Department to the jurisdiction and control of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. HAMILL: A bill (H. R. 552) to provide for the retirement of employees in the civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 553) to promote military training by providing scholarships for students enrolled in public institutions of higher learning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 554) to amend the copyright law passed March 4, 1909; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: A bill (H. R. 555) to provide for flood control on the Colorado River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 556) to repeal section 3 of the act to save daylight, approved March 19, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 557) to provide that the heads of the executive departments may occupy seats on the floor of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 558) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 559) providing for an increase of salary of the United States marshal for the western district of Louisiana; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 560) to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, and sodium on the public domain; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 561) to reimburse the city of Richmond, Va., for expenditures incurred in the preparation and equipment of grounds for the mobilization and encampment of certain organizations of the National Guard of Virginia in pursuance of the order of the Secretary of War, and for the housing and caring for certain soldiers or troops of the United States; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 562) authorizing the Treasurer of the United States to pay to Catherine C. Schilling $599; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 563) to provide for the [illegible] of the citizens of the United States by the temporary suspension of immigration, for the deportation of additional classes of aliens, for the registration of aliens, to promote the assimilation of aliens, to further regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States, to amend provisions of the immigration act relating to alien seamen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 1036) to repeal the sections of the war-revenue act, approved October 3, 1917, relating to and providing for a zone system for second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A resolution (H. Res. 1) for the establishment of a bureau of information in the main corridor of the House wing of the Capitol; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. GOULD: A resolution (H. Res. 14) calling upon the President for information regarding the expenditure of the $100,000,000 and $50,000,000 appropriations for national security and defense; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 15) as to the creation of a committee on aeronautics; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 16) calling upon the President for certain information regarding food-price fixing; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 17) directing the Secretary of War to furnish the House of Representatives with certain information regarding court-martial cases since April 6, 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 18) directing the Secretary of War to furnish the House of Representatives with certain information regarding the confinement of military prisoners; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 19) directing the Secretary of War to furnish the House of Representatives with certain information concerning prisoners confined at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.; also information regarding the discharge of conscientious war objectors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: A resolution (H. Res. 20) providing for investigation and report by the Interstate Commerce Commission as to what the present methods are that are now being used in the purchase of railroad ties, switch ties, car material, and crossing plank; whether said methods are efficient; and as to whether there are any satisfactory substitutes on the market for taking the place of the railroad ties, and so forth, now generally used, and made of timber; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A resolution (H. Res. 21) asking the State Department to submit to the House of Representatives a copy of the American proposal for a League of Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOULD: A resolution (H. Res. 22) directing the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives to investigate and report to the House of Representatives certain information with reference to the Government of Costa Rica; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EMERSON: A resolution (H. Res. 23) asking the Secretary of War for definite information of the return of the Three hundred and eighth Engineer Motor Supply Train; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MASON: A resolution (H. Res. 24) authorizing various committees of the House of Representatives to investigate with a view to providing work for the unemployed; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SIMS: A resolution (H. Res. 25) amending the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A resolution (H. Res. 26) providing for investigation of charges of Dr. Spillman concerning the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A resolution (H. Res. 27) authorizing the codification of the laws relating to Indian affairs; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GOULD: A resolution (H. Res. 28) requesting full information relative to the situation in the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MANN: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 2) terminating Government supervision, possession, control, and operation of the telephone and telegraph systems of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 3) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 4) directing the President to appoint Rear Admiral William S. Sims, United States Navy (now holding the rank of admiral), an admiral with pay and allowances of that grade; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BLANTON: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 5) directing additional questionnaires for employees of the United States Government; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 6) directing the Food Administration to make a survey of foodstuffs in storage and release for immediate sale that not required for public protection; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HASKELL: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 7) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 8) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 9) directing the Secretary of War to investigate the claims of American citizens for damages suffered within American territory and growing out of the insurrection in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 10) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 11) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States giving to Congress the power to extend the right of suffrage to residents of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 12) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by amending Article V of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 13) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 14) extending the thanks of Congress to all members of the American Protective League for services rendered the Government during the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 15) extending to members of local and district boards, Government appeal agents, and members of medical and legal advisory boards the thanks of Congress for their services rendered in the administration of the selective-service law; also authorizing the President to appoint by brevet commissions the members of such local and district boards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 16) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 17) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLANTON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 18) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. CARTER (by request): Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 19) extending to all persons commissioned as civilian aids to the Adjutant General of the Army and to branch chairmen Military Training Camps Association the thanks of Congress for their services rendered in the administration of the selective-service law; the securing of enlistments for the several branches of the Army; the securing of candidates for officers' training camps and the commissioned personnel of the Army, under direction of the War Department; for their loyal and devoted services; also authorizing the President to appoint by brevet commissions all such persons; also authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to cause to be struck and presented to each of such officials in the name of Congress an appropriate medal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FERRIS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 20) giving to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines a preferred right of homestead entry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 21) authorizing and directing the Postmaster General to return to their owners the telegraph and telephone lines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SABATH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 22) to repeal that part of paragraph 4 of public act 243 of the Sixty-fifth Congress, approved November 21, 1918, making it unlawful to sell for beverage purposes any distilled spirits, and which prohibits the use of grain, etc., in the manufacture of beer, wine, or other intoxicating malt or vinous liquors for beverage purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 23) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay each honorably discharged soldier, sailor, and marine the additional sum of $300; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 24) to repeal section 630 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 25) to repeal section 904 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 26) to repeal section 904 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALSH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 27) directing the United States Coast Guard to resume its operations under the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 28) admitting into the United States 560 barrels of Spanish wine ordered by Luigi Bick, of New York City, before the passage of the food-control act prohibiting the importation of distilled spirits, the delivery of which was delayed on account of war conditions until after that act went into effect; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 29) to create a joint commission of Congress on estimates and appropriations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MONDELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 30) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. WALSH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 31) appointing a joint commission to confer with officials of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and others relative to celebration of landing of Pilgrims at Plymouth, Mass.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. OLNEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 32) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States giving to Congress the power to extend the right of suffrage to residents of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOULD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 33) directing the Postmaster General to suspend the operation of orders issued by him, effective May 1, 1919, and June 1, 1919, changing or altering rural-delivery routes, and to restore to their former status routes changed or altered by orders effective May 1, 1919; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 34) calling upon the Commission of Fine Arts to submit to the Congress certain suggestions; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 35) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that all amendments thereto shall be ratified by the people of three-fourths of the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEGEL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 36) providing for amendment to the Constitution of the United States that all amendments be ratified direct by the people of each State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 37) extending to the Territory of Hawaii the same right that is given to the States of the Union to participate in the Federal funds for good roads development; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 38) extending to the Territory of Hawaii the same right that is given to the States of the Union to participate in the Federal funds for vocational education; to the Committee on Territories.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) recognizing the great sacrifices made by the soldiers of the United States and favoring the immediate return of the soldiers who are still in Europe, and also the discharge of soldiers now in camps in the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GANDY: Concurrent resolution (H. Con Res. 2) authorizing the printing of 2,000 copies of the soil survey of western South Dakota; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 3) authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies of Handbook of American Indians; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. KIESS: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 4) to compile an edition of the Congressional Directory for the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress and authorizing payment therefor; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Wisconsin relating to cheese, butter, and feed industry,

and to the supply of and prices for cheese, butter, and feed at the present time; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin urging the Congress of the United States to enact legislation relating to the conservation of fish and clams in the Mississippi River and its branches in the States of Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin asking Congress to prohibit the purchase of liberty bonds by scalpers, and providing a penalty therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin relating to the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HERSEY: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Maine urging Congress to pass such laws as will prevent all Germans or Austrians who were engaged in any manner in opposition to the United States and its allies returning to the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Maine urging the Congress of the United States to pay soldiers and sailors discharged from the service six months' additional salary; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial relating to the labor controversy in the city of Madison; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial memorializing Congress to continue appropriations for United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial relating to a deep waterway from Oshkosh to Green Bay; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial memorializing Congress for the speedy withdrawal of the American forces from Russia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial memorializing Congress in behalf of the farmers to repeal the law advancing the time one hour; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress to refund insurance premiums paid by soldiers, sailors, and marines under the soldiers' and sailors' insurance act during the war, and to permit such soldiers, sailors, and marines to continue such insurance after discharge; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 564) granting a pension to Rosa Fitzpatrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 565) granting a pension to M. S. Wyman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 566) for the relief of Eugene Frazzi; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: A bill (H. R. 567) for the relief of John Chick; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 568) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John A. Douglas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 569) granting an increase of pension to John Paul; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 570) granting a pension to Margaret Tennant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 571) granting an increase of pension to James Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 572) granting an increase of pension to Albert Raymond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 573) granting an increase of pension to George B. Crain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 574) granting an increase of pension to Hannah J. Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 575) granting a pension to Frank Carney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 576) granting a pension to Jane H. Larkin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 577) granting an increase of pension to Ira N. Haney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLEN: A bill (H. R. 578) for the relief of Swend A. Swendson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 579) for the relief of Anna Carroll; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 580) for the relief of G. L. Aldendifer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 581) for the relief of John Flaherty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 582) granting a pension to Robert S. Hansbury; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 583) granting a pension to Mary Ann McMaihn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 584) granting an increase of pension to William H. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 585) granting a pension to Fred D. Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 586) to place the name of Thomas W. Purcell upon the Army and Navy medal-of-honor roll; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 587) for the relief of the estate of Simon Ludwig; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 588) for the relief of George W. Stinebaker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 589) for the relief of Henry Schulz as branch postmaster at his drug store, at southeast corner of Vandeventer and Laclede Avenues, city of St. Louis, Mo., for war-tax stamps, war-savings stamps, postage stamps, cash, and money orders stolen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 590) for the relief of John H. Rheinlander; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 591) for the relief of C. M. Perkins; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 592) for the relief of George W. Flynn; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 593) granting a pension to Mary F. Kraus; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 594) granting a pension to Joseph Glass; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 595) granting an increase of pension to David Tipton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 596) granting an increase of pension to John T. Vanlandingham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 597) granting an increase of pension to James Watson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 598) granting a pension to Hattie Sylvia; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 599) granting an increase of pension to William J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 600) granting an increase of pension to Oscar Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 601) granting a pension to David S. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 602) granting an increase of pension to William K. White; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 603) granting a pension to Jacob Stone; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 604) granting an increase of pension to John Whitington; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 605) for the relief of Lizzie Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 606) for the relief of W. T. Doorley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 607) for the relief of Ivy L. Merrill; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 608) granting a pension to James L. Stidham; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 609) granting an increase of pension to Pleasant Timberlake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 610) granting a pension to Jason Adkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 611) granting a pension to James L. Buckler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 612) granting an increase of pension to Mathew Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 613) for the relief of Otho Adams; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 614) granting an increase of pension to Presley Sexton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 615) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 616) granting a pension to Claude L. Salmons; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 617) granting an increase of pension to James F. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 618) granting an increase of pension to Gussie Rash; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 619) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Ridinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 620) granting an increase of pension to Asa C. Pieratt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 621) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Puckett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 622) granting a pension to Pauline Saunders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 623) granting an increase of pension to R. T. Parsons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 624) granting an increase of pension to William M. Nourse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 625) granting a pension to John Orsborn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 626) granting a pension to Matilda Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 627) granting an increase of pension to Louis G. Murray; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 628) granting an increase of pension to Joseph McClure; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 629) granting a pension to Richard Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 630) granting a pension to Burns Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 631) granting a pension to George W. Lambert; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 632) granting an increase of pension to John M. Ison; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 633) granting a pension to Henry J. Kegley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 634) granting a pension to David J. Holbrook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 635) granting a pension to John R. Hold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 636) granting an increase of pension to Ransom Forrest; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 637) granting a pension to Gabriel S. Henderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 638) granting an increase of pension to John S. Conley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 639) granting an increase of pension to Henry Drake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 640) granting an increase of pension to Wilder Branum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 641) granting an increase of pension to John F. Campbell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 642) granting an increase of pension to L. C. Bohannon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 643) granting a pension to U. S. G. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 644) for the relief of Oscar Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 645) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Allen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 646) for the relief of Perry E. Borchers because of losses suffered, due to destruction of property and termination of contract for services because of smallpox, while in the employ of the Navy Department in Cuba; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 647) for the relief of Henry L. Biddle; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 648) granting a pension to William Bogen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 649) for the relief of Louis Cupp; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 650) granting a pension to Frank Clemson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 651) for the relief of John M. V. Dutton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 652) granting a pension to James F. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 653) for the relief of Samuel B. Faulkner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 654) granting a pension to John C. Fernending; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 655) for the relief of James A. Flory; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 656) granting a pension to Jesse A. R. Forbes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 657) for the relief of James Green; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 658) granting a pension to John A. Gaut; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 659) granting a pension to William H. Heller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 660) granting a pension to Peter J. Huber; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 661) for the relief of Sylvester Haus; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 662) granting a pension to Anna Kelley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 663) granting a pension to John Lambertson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 664) granting a pension to Julia M. Little; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 665) for the relief of Dock Leach; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 666) for the relief of Garrett M. Martin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 667) for the relief of Allen Moore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 668) granting a pension to Patrick H. Madigan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 669) granting a pension to Francis P. McCue; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 670) granting a pension to Joseph B. Ohr; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 671) for the relief of William L. Spivey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 672) granting a pension to Frank Shaw; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 673) for the relief of Jacob Shoup; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 674) granting a pension to James Sweeney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 675) granting a pension to Charles W. Van Scoyk; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 676) granting a pension to Elizabeth Gouldrick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 677) granting a pension to Charlotte Tena Segoine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 678) granting a pension to John Finnerty; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 679) granting a pension to Susan M. Gregory; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 680) granting a pension to Aura V. Slocum; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 681) granting a pension to Hiram T. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 682) granting a pension to Cruz Rubi; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 683) for the relief of William E. Johnson; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 684) for the relief of the heirs of Patrick White and Annie E. White; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 685) for the relief of Frank S. Ingalls; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 686) for the relief of William Wooster; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 687) for the relief of Frank Pinkley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 688) for the relief of W. M. G. Mackechney; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 689) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. McKee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 690) granting a pension to William M. Metzger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 691) granting a pension to Miley Fitzgerald; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 692) granting a pension to Mary A. Abbott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 693) granting an increase of pension to George W. Doney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 694) granting a pension to John Hobbs; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 695) granting a pension to John E. Coleman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 696) granting a pension to James P. Merrifield; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 697) granting a pension to James O. Singleton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 698) granting a pension to William Bell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 699) granting a pension to Thirza M. Dolph; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 700) granting a pension to Abbie M. Kelley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 701) granting a pension to Charles Francis Gilroy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 702) granting a pension to Harold Sailsbury; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 703) granting a pension to Mary F. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 704) granting a pension to Jennie C. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 705) granting a pension to K. Shannon Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 706) granting a pension to Mary E. Hazelrigg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 707) granting a pension to Ione J. Stroud; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 708) granting a pension to Joseph B. Doan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 709) granting a pension to Mary S. Runion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 710) granting a pension to Victoria Wheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 711) granting a pension to Joseph Bauer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 712) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 713) granting an increase of pension to Charity Isabelle Beeson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 714) granting an increase of pension to Emily A. De Forest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 715) granting an increase of pension to Melville C. Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 716) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Hathaway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 717) granting an increase of pension to George W. Justice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 718) granting an increase of pension to James H. Layne, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 719) granting an increase of pension to William J. R. Beach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 720) granting an increase of pension to Richard J. Stoops; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 721) granting an increase of pension to John Linquist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 722) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin M. Donaca; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 723) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 724) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Blake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 725) granting an increase of pension to Francis C. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, A bill (H. R. 726) granting an increase of pension to John W. Woods; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 727) granting an increase of pension to John T. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 728) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Fiske Bassett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 729) for the relief of Amy E. Hall; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 730) for the relief of Preston B. C. Lucas; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 731) for the relief of Orville T. Perkins; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 732) for the relief of W. R. Wells, administrator of the estate of James S. Wells, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 733) for the relief of William A. Frater; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 734) for the relief of the estate of Andrew Rader, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 735) for the relief of the legal representatives of Sydney W. Moss; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 736) for the relief of Willis Alden; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 737) for the relief of the legal representative of Joseph R. Payne; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 738) for the relief of Jonathan J. Totten; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 739) for the relief of George W. Peters; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 740) for the relief of John W. Baggott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 741) for the relief of Francis M. Myers, or Francis Meyer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 742) for the relief of J. W. La Bare; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 743) for the relief of Amos Dahuff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 744) for the relief of Henry N. Penfield; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 745) for the relief of Louis Southworth; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 746) to reimburse Simon Caro; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 747) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in the claim of Albert Wood arising out of a contract for carrying the mails on star route No. 73195; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 748) to reimburse United Engineering & Contracting Co. of Astoria, Oreg., for extras furnished and moneys withheld in the construction of bachelor officers' quarters at Fort Stevens, Oreg.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 749) authorizing the Coos Bay, Umpqua, and Siuslaw Tribes of Indians in the State of Oregon to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 750) to reimburse Mary E. Myers, widow of Joseph Myers, deceased, for loss of personal property sustained in depredations of Indians on the Snake River, Idaho; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HERSEY: A bill (H. R. 751) granting an increase of pension to Frank Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 752) granting an increase of pension to Henry Quint; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 753) for the relief of Susie Currier; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 754) for the relief of W. A. Brown Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 755) granting a pension to Mary E. Reed; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 756) granting a pension to Olive M. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 757) granting a pension to Mary Jane Boughton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 758) granting a pension to Pamela Goodell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 759) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Egbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 760) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph F. Mitchell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 761) for the relief of Elizabeth Marsh Watkins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 762) to correct the military title of Fred R. Nugent; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 763) granting a pension to Julius A. Fuhrman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: A bill (H. R. 764) granting an increase of pension to Arthur E. Gilligan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 765) granting an increase of pension to Charles O. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 766) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Spence; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 767) granting a pension to Pearl G. Hunsaker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 768) granting an increase of pension to Georgia H. Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 769) granting an increase of pension to Mordecai F. Riley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 770) granting a pension to James W. Hendrickson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 771) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Henry Harding; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 772) granting an increase of pension to John Hobart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 773) granting a pension to Simon P. Parrish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 774) granting a pension to James W. Eller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 775) granting a pension to Elizabeth Moses; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 776) granting a pension to Anna Wilcox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 777) granting a pension to Frank Swartz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 778) granting a pension to Florence F. Hubbard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 779) granting a pension to Otto M. Payton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 780) granting an increase of pension to Robert Leitch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 781) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Totten; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 782) granting an increase of pension to George Ware; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 783) granting an increase of pension to Absalom A. Lusk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 784) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius S. Munhall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 785) granting an increase of pension to Robert M. Dickson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 786) for the relief of Noah Cox; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 787) for the relief of Jacob Byers, alias Jacob Myers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 788) for the relief of John Minahan, alias John Bagley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 789) for the relief of Thomas J. O'Mara; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 790) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Kingsley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 791) granting an increase of pension to John T. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 792) for the relief of Martin C. Rucker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 793) for the relief of Cornelia M. A. Tower; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 794) authorizing the payment of salary due J. A. McCreary, of Forestville, Calif.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 795) for the relief of Arthur Wendle Englert; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUFKIN: A bill (H. R. 796) granting a pension to Mary A. G. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 797) granting a pension to Mary E. Hiller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 798) granting a pension to William H. Brooks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 799) granting a pension to Charles W. Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 800) granting a pension to Hannah D. Jellison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 801) granting a pension to Michael W. Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 802) granting an increase of pension to Emma A. Hobbs; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 803) for the relief of Mrs. Herbert W. Bean; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 804) for the relief of Edith P. Friend; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 805) granting an increase of pension to James Cunningham; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 806) granting a pension to Rose Ettie Sheppard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 807) granting a pension to Benjamin L. Greer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 808) granting a pension to Luvina Avery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 809) granting a pension to Sarah E. Farrall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 810) granting a pension to John Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 811) granting a pension to John Fitzgerald; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 812) granting a pension to Mary A. Barber; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 813) granting a pension to John Fitzgerald; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 814) to correct the military record of Cuthbert W. Laing; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 815) granting a pension to Clara A. Rice; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 816) for the relief of the United Breweries Co., of Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 817) granting an increase of pension to Edward Nathan Marx; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 818) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Susan A. Nicholas; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 819) granting a pension to Dr. Ezekiel P. Murdock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 820) granting a pension to George W. McDonald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 821) granting a pension to James J. Healy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 822) granting a pension to Sarah J. Casler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 823) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Moody; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 824) for the relief of the estate of Isabella H. Silvey; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 825) granting a pension to Sophie Reimuller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 826) granting an increase of pension to Anna Schmidt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 827) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Barney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 828) granting an increase of pension to Alban E. Bentley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 829) granting an increase of pension to Paleman S. Castle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 830) granting an increase of pension to Robert G. Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 831) granting an increase of pension to Llewellyn A. Cole, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 832) granting a pension to Henry H. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 833) granting a pension to William G. Bryce; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 834) granting a pension to Ida Helene Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 835) granting a pension to Anna Greer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 836) granting a pension to Hannah C. Hayes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 837) granting a pension to James Honan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 838) granting a pension to Elizabeth Hooton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 839) granting a pension to Anna M. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 840) granting a pension to Charles Peters; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 841) granting a pension to Delos M. Porter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 842) granting a pension to Rebecca F. Rush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 843) granting a pension to Helen A. Seeker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 844) granting a pension to Carl Schoppe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 845) granting a pension to Claude W. Smyth; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 846) granting a pension to Henry H. Snow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 847) granting a pension to Louisana Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 848) granting a pension to Alice H. Von Pinnon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 849) granting a pension to Sarah J. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 850) for the relief of Andrew J. Bell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 851) for the relief of Lewis W. Crain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 852) for the relief of Seth J. Simmonds; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 853) for the relief of Miles Swift; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 854) granting a certificate of merit or distinguished-service medal to John Faraday James; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 855) for the relief of Mary J. McGlothlen; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 856) to correct the military record of John W. Terry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REAVIS: A bill (H. R. 857) granting an increase of pension to Jerome Shamp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 858) granting an increase of pension to William Newell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 859) granting an increase of pension to William S. Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 860) granting a pension to Martin W. Morganson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 861) granting a pension to John F. Herold; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 862) granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Bullitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 863) granting an increase of pension to William R. Sheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 864) granting an increase of pension to William M. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 865) granting an increase of pension to Charles Mangon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 866) to correct the military record of Lauritz S. Rasmusson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 867) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the record of Stephen McKenzie; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 868) for the relief of James W. Kingon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 869) for the relief of Bruce J. Syarse; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 870) for the relief of Sarah Shelton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 871) for the relief of William J. Rosselot; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 872) for the relief of Charles B. Carroll; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 873) granting a pension to Eby A. Tillery; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 874) granting a pension to Orley E. Laird; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 875) granting a pension to Jacob Herpin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 876) granting an increase of pension to Levi S. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 877) granting a pension to Sarah L. Truck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 878) granting an increase of pension to William J. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 879) granting a pension to Michael F. Noonan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 880) granting a pension to Kate Orba Larrabee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 881) granting a pension to Barney Hammel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 882) granting an increase of pension to George W. Grigg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 883) granting a pension to Henry Flachmeyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 884) granting an increase of pension to James J. Ferguson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 885) granting a pension to Ben H. Coursey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 886) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Burrows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 887) granting an increase of pension to Robert G. Ardrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHALL: A bill (H. R. 888) for the relief of the Atlas Lumber Co., Babcock & Willcox, Johnson, Jackson & Corning Co., and the C. H. Klein Brick Co., each of which companies furnished to Silas N. Opdahl, a failing Government contractor, certain building materials which were used in the construction of Burke Hall at the Pierre Indian School, in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 889) granting an increase of pension to Martin L. Kee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 890) granting an increase of pension to John W. Scott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 891) for the relief of Francis M. Kirby; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 892) granting a pension to Harold W. Burch; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 893) granting an increase of pension to John B. Hays; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 894) for the relief of Jefferson Franks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 895) granting an increase of pension to Joseph I. Mahar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 896) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Melvinia C. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 897) for the relief of Mildred J. Bray; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 898) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 899) granting a pension to George Watson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 900) granting a pension to Louisa Smith, widow of Richard Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 901) granting a pension to Helen F. Wade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 902) granting a pension to Julia Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 903) granting an increase of pension to James Boshane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 904) granting an increase of pension to Henry Conger, alias Henry Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 905) granting an increase of pension to Newell B. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 906) granting an increase of pension to Francis Dunery; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 907) for the relief of Rufus L. Cole; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 908) for the relief of Leo Balsam; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 909) for the relief of Ellen Agnes Monogue; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 910) granting a pension to Belle S. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 911) granting a pension to Abbie H. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 912) granting a pension to Hannah R. Grant; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 913) granting a pension to Frances Watches; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 914) granting a pension to Mary A. Powers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 915) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 916) granting a pension to Thomas M. Hoover; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 917) granting a pension to Charles Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 918) granting a pension to Margaret Yohe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 919) granting a pension to Charles Francis Schaeffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 920) granting a pension to Carson Rummel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 921) granting a pension to John Bohntinsky; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 922) granting an increase of pension to Julia Ann Fyock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 923) to correct the military record of Harrison H. Hollowell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 924) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. Shaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 925) granting an increase of pension to John N. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 926) granting an increase of pension to John Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 927) granting an increase of pension to George Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 928) to correct the military record of Solomon Beck; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 929) to correct the military record of Nathan Cunningham; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 930) for the relief of Allen Greenlief; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 931) granting an honorable discharge to Isaiah R. Lockhart; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 932) to correct the military record of J. H. McGrew; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 933) to correct the military record of Stephen A. West; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 934) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Ayers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 935) granting a pension to Ida D. Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 936) granting an increase of pension to Nelson D. Madden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 937) granting a pension to William Coonrod; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 938) granting an increase of pension to Oscar N. Greer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 939) granting an increase of pension to Charity Ann Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 940) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 941) granting an increase of pension to James Hamilton Rose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 942) granting an increase of pension to William A. Byus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 943) granting an increase of pension to John A. Burns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 944) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Westbrook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 945) granting an increase of pension to William Thornton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 946) for the relief of James A. Showen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 947) granting a pension to Della Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 948) granting an increase of pension to Peter Jennings; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 949) granting a pension to Rebecca Strouther; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 950) to correct the military record of Charles R. Pennybacker; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 951) granting a pension to John J. McGinley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 952) granting a pension to Martha E. Waldsmith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 953) granting a pension to Julia A. Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 954) granting a pension to Merrill Martin Chenoweth; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 955) granting an increase of pension to William F. Rodenberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 956) granting an increase of pension to James W. Beasley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 957) granting an increase of pension to Jourdan B. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 958) granting an increase of pension to Peter A. Ruble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 959) granting an increase of pension to James B. Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 960) granting an increase of pension to Mary Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 961) granting an increase of pension to John N. Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 962) granting an increase of pension to Addison Holmes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 963) granting a pension to Nancy M. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 964) granting an increase of pension to Belle P. Wolfe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 965) granting an increase of pension to Martha R. Been; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 966) granting an increase of pension to Elvira Hunter; to the Committe on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 967) granting a pension to John Sawicki; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 968) granting a pension to Mose Attaway; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 969) granting a pension to Zachariah Kizer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 970) granting a pension to George W. Turner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 971) granting a pension to George W. Oblisk; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 972) to correct the military record of Jesse L. Meeks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 973) to correct the military record of Thomas Lee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 974) for the relief of W. T. Dingler; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 975) for the relief of John Davis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 976) for the relief of James M. Wright; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 977) for the relief of Wesley Maynor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 978) for the relief of James M. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 979) for the relief of Silas Shepherd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 980) for the relief of Benjamin F. Reams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 981) for the relief of the legal representatives of Thomas H. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 982) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Pack; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 983) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Guill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 984) granting an increase of pension to John Weatherington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 985) granting an increase of pension to Jesse M. Reed; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 986) granting a pension to David M. Allen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 987) granting an increase of pension to Johnathan J. Boyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 988) granting a pension to Delilah Hunley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 989) granting a pension to Sylvester O. Phinney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 990) granting a pension to Annie Casey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 991) granting a pension to William H. LeBaron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 992) granting a pension to Susan M. Wilcox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 993) granting a pension to Hodges W. Drayton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 994) granting a pension to Luther F. Thayer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 995) granting an increase of pension to William Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 996) granting an increase of pension to John K. Freeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 997) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 998) granting an increase of pension to Cora Fannie Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 999) granting an increase of pension to Peter Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1000) granting an increase of pension to Carrie C. Washburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1001) granting an increase of pension to George C. Peterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1002) granting an increase of pension to Albert Damon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1003) for the relief of Jose Lopez y Castelo; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1004) for the relief of E. W. Rohmeling; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1005) for the relief of William Befuhs, alias Charles Cameron, Company B, Twenty-eighth Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 1006) granting a pension to James F. Connell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1007) granting a pension to John H. Cunningham, alias John H. Curley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1008) granting a pension to Richard R. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1009) granting an increase of pension to Leverett C. Felch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1010) for the relief of the trustees and parties who now or who may hereafter become interested in the estate of James A. Chamberlain under the terms of his will; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1011) for the relief of the owner of the steam lighter *Cornelia;* to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1012) for the relief of the owner of the steamship *Matoa;* to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1013) for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Horatio G. Foss*; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1014) authorizing the Treasurer of the United States to pay to Rosamond Linnette the sum of $763.20; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1015) to pay to Bernice L. Blair the sum of $12,470, with interest; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1016) for the relief of Jeremiah McCraith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 1017) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. McGrew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1018) granting a pension to Addie L. Barr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1019) for the relief of Michael Curran; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1020) for the relief of the estate of Jarib L. Sanderson, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1021) for the relief of Frank Ferrin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1022) granting a pension to Chester E. Green; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1023) for the relief of Elmer Howe; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1024) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to John Zimmerman for certain lands in the Colorado National Forest upon the surrender of other lands of equal acreage also located in the Colorado National Forest, Colo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1025) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Matthew Thomas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 1026) granting a pension to Emerson E. Paden; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1027) granting a pension to Richard G. Trotter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1028) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1029) granting an increase of pension to John J. Kraft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1030) to correct the military record of John R. Smith, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1031) for the reimbursement of James Caviness for the loss of his residence while occupied as camp headquarters by the United States Geological Survey; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1032) for the relief of Jacob Holman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1033) for the reimbursement of James E. Murphy for the loss of a horse while hired by the United States Reclamation Service; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1034) for the relief of Jose Ramon Cordova; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1035) for the relief of the widow of Joseph C. Akin; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of Private Soldiers and Sailors' Legion of United States of America, asking Congress to pass at the earliest possible date legislation giving measure of justice to private soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of Ladies' Auxiliary of the Three hundred and eighth Regiment of Engineers, asking that a resolution be introduced inquiring about the return of the regiment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Wisconsin Daily League of Newspapers, protesting against the free publicity bureaus of the Government in the interest of economy; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, petition of National Committee of the Fur Industry, protesting against the tax of 10 per cent imposed on articles made of fur; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of subscribers to the Southern Pine Association at New Orleans, La., February 25, 1919, insisting that foreign nations requiring food for their citizens send their ships for it and American ships be used for the exporting of American commerce; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition for the appointment by the United States Government of an unprejudiced nonmedical commission to investigate the claims and outworking of various schools of healing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING: Resolutions signed by Mrs. Mary Giles, of Wataga, Ill., president, and other officials of the Knox County W. C. T. U., indorsing the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions passed by the board of supervisors, Fulton County, Ill., urging repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions adopted at a meeting of four churches at Liberty, Ill., Mrs. C. W. Linn, chairman, advocating acceptance of eighteenth amendment and protesting against any evasion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Private Soldiers' and Sailors' Legion of the United States of America, for the enactment of legislation to do justice to private soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKEOWN: Petition of Veterans of the Southern Confederacy, for the immediate refund of the $68,000,000 cotton-tax fund in the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Petition relating to the extension and development of the merchant marine of the United States until it shall become the greatest of any nation in the world; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Woodhaven Democratic Club (Inc.), unanimously approving of the Hearst six months' pay plan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Women's Regular Democratic Club and James Braschart Regular Dramatic Club, favoring referendum vote on subject of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of William P. Kelly Benevolent Society, against the prohibition amendment and asking defeat of same; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Twentieth Assembly District Republican Club, Brooklyn, N. Y., asking support for six months' pay for soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Cypress Hills Board of Trade, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring six months' pay to discharged soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Community Council for Good Government of Richmond Hill, N. Y., favoring the plans for a league of nations as outlined by the President of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the National Committee of Fur Industry, against the tax of 10 per cent on fur articles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and the President of the United States Independent Telephone Association, relating to control and operations of telephones; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York against Government control of public utilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Typographical Union No. 6, of New York City, indorsing training and teaching foreign-born unnaturalized citizens; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of National Garment Retailers' Association, protesting against the continuance of tax and urging immediate repeal of section 904; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAKER: Letter from the Schow Batcher Co., 211 J Street, Sacramento, Calif., opposing the zone system and urging its repeal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Fay Fruit Co., Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against efforts of Publishers' Advisory Board in zone rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Tillman & Bender, wholesale grocers, San Francisco, Calif., opposing efforts of publishers in zone rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, letter from L. C. Scheller, treasurer, Union Hardware & Metal Co., Los Angeles, Calif., relating to repeal of zone system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rosenthal's (Inc.), San Francisco, Calif., asking the repeal of the luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of executive committee of Northern California Counties Association, favoring the passage of good roads legislation; also urging passage of Lane Reclamation Act; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, petition of Redlands (Calif.) Grade Teachers' Club, indorsing Senate bill 4987; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Fellows Local, No. 13, urging Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution by the Mariposa (Calif.) Local, No. 18, Oil Workers' Union, protesting against the return of the railroads to private ownership; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution by the Woman's Improvement Association of South Pasadena and by the faculty and students of the State Normal School, San Diego, Calif., favoring the entrance of the United States into the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution by the Maywood Woman's Club, of Corning, Calif., indorsing the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution by the California Federation of Women's Clubs, indorsing the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of the National Association of Manufacturers, favoring the return of the railroads to private ownership; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the First Congregational Church, Loomis, Calif.; Ladies' Aid Society, Loomis, Calif.; and of the First Congregational Church, Rocklin, Calif., favoring a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of California Almond Growers' Exchange, asking for an appropriation for the investigation of the culture of almonds, walnuts, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RODENBERG: Letter and copy of resolutions adopted by Alton (Ill.) Board of Trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of the retail merchants' council of the Rochester (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, for the repeal of the luxury-tax section in the war-revenue law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 61 farmers living on Lewiston Road, Batavia, N. Y., urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Oatka Falls Grange, No. 394, Le Roy, N. Y., urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of W. F. Rockow and 19 other residents of Hamlin, Morton, and Walker, N. Y., urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of 260 petitioners of the Livingston County (N. Y.) Sunday School Association, urging that the preamble of the National Constitution be amended so as to recognize the authority and law of Jesus Christ; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Automobile Club of Rochester, N. Y., urging the passage of a bill providing for the laying out, planning, and estimating of cost of construction of a military road across the State of New York to be named the "Roosevelt National Military Road"; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, petition of 30 petitioners of the Tuscarora Presbyterian Church, Tuscarora, N. Y., urging that the preamble of the National Constitution be amended so as to recognize the authority and law of Jesus Christ; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHALL: Petition of sundry citizens of Minnesota, for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Minnesota, urging Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Minnesota Garden Flower Society, protesting order No. 37 of the Federal Horticultural Board; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of Utica (N. Y.) section of the Council of Jewish Women, favoring a league of nations and civil and religious liberty in all countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *May 20, 1919.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, day unto day uttereth speech and night unto night showeth knowledge. So with the return of every day we come and stand before Thee to catch the inspiration of the new light that falls on all our duties and see with clearer vision that ever-increasing purpose which runs through all Thy creation. Endue us plenteously this day with Thy grace that we may follow the divine commandments, know the will of God, and gladly do that which is pleasing in Thy sight. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. LODGE and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE (S. DOC. NO. 3).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the report of the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, in compliance with law, an account of all property, including stationery, belonging to the United States in his possession on the 19th day of May, 1919, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

ABROGATION OF TREATIES (S. DOC. NO. 2).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, in response to resolutions of December 5, 1918, and February 3, 1919, certain information relative to the abrogation of treaties, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS AGAINST MEXICO (S. DOC. NO. 1).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, in response to a resolution of February 7, 1919, certain information relative to the claims of American citizens against the Government of Mexico, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the number of documents received and distributed by the Treasury Department during the year ended December 31, 1918, together with the number remaining on hand January 1, 1919, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Printing and ordered to be printed.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Food Administrator, the Fuel Administrator, and the Director of the War Trade Board, transmitting, pursuant to a resolution of December 15, 1918, a list showing the number of employees in their respective departments at specified dates, and the number discharged during the two weeks previous to that date, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AUTOMATIC STRAIGHT AIR BRAKES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a report of the Chief of the Bureau of Safety relative to tests of the brake system of the Automatic Straight Air Brake Co., etc., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PRODUCTION OF MINERALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Director of the Bureau of Mines, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of all expenditures and disbursements under the act to encourage the production of minerals, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining and ordered to be printed.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting a list of useless papers on the files of the Department of Labor having no historic value and requesting action looking to their disposition. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] the committee on the part of the Senate. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives thereof.

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Boy Scouts of America for the year ended December 31, 1918, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

Mr. Hempstead, the enrolling clerk of the House of Representatives, appeared and delivered the following message:

"Mr. President, I am directed by the House of Representatives to inform the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives has appeared and that the House is ready to proceed to business.

"Also, that a committee of three members were appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House to join the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of the two Houses has assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make, and that Mr. MONDELL, Mr. MANN, and Mr. CLARK of Missouri were appointed as a committee on the part of the House.

"Also, that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that FREDERICK H. GILLETT, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, had been elected Speaker; and that William Tyler Page, a citizen of the State Maryland, had been elected Clerk.

"Also, that the House communicates to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. JOHN LAWSON BURNETT, late a Representative from the State of Alabama, and transmits resolutions of the House thereon.

"Also, that the House communicates to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. CHARLES AUGUST SULZER, late a Delegate from the Territory of Alaska, and transmits resolutions of the House thereon."

SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair presents the petition of Henry Ford contesting the election of Senator TRUMAN H. NEW-

BERRY, which will be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The petition is as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
OF THE SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS.

Petition of Mr. Henry Ford, contesting the election of Mr. Truman H. Newberry as Senator from Michigan, for the term beginning March 4, 1919, for a recount of ballots for the office of United States Senator cast at the election held in Michigan November 5, 1918, and for other relief.

DETROIT, MICH., *May 17, 1919.*

To Mr. TRUMAN H. NEWBERRY:

You are hereby notified that I intend to contest, and hereby do contest, your election as Senator from Michigan in the Congress of the United States for the term beginning March 4, 1919, to succeed the Honorable William Alden Smith, and that I shall ask a recount of the ballots cast at the election for such office held in Michigan November 5, 1918, and also for an investigation of the unlawful uses by you and your supporters, agents, and representatives of large sums of money to influence the primaries therefor and the said election, and also of the alleged intimidation of voters by your supporters and agents.

I beg to advise you that the grounds for such contest are, among others, those which were specifically enumerated by me in my previous notice to you thereof dated December 31, 1918, and as are also enumerated in subdivision six of the enclosed petition to the Senate of the United States of America of the Sixty-sixth Congress.

Respectfully, HENRY FORD.

—

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
District of Columbia, ss:

Howell Van Auken, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he resides in the city of Detroit, State of Michigan, and that he is upwards of twenty-one years of age; that on, to wit, May 17th, 1919, he endeavored to serve personally upon Mr. Truman H. Newberry a notice of the contest of his election as Senator from Michigan for the term beginning March 4, 1919, by Henry Ford, etc., and likewise the petition for a contest and recount of the votes cast at said election in Michigan, referred to in said notice, of which the attached notice is a duplicate original copy; that upon investigation and inquiry deponent, on said date, ascertained that the said Truman H. Newberry was not then present in Detroit, in said county and State nor the vicinity thereof, but that he was then in the city of Washingon, District of Columbia, where he then received his mail at the Senate Office Building of the United States Senate, in said last-named city; that deponent thereupon mailed to said Truman H. Newberry the said notice of contest so served and the petition therein mentioned, being a duplicate original petition of Henry Ford to the United States Senate of the Sixty-sixth Congress for contest of the election of Truman H. Newberry as Senator from Michigan, the other duplicate original of which petition is filed herewith, by enclosing said notice and petition in an envelope securely sealed addressed to said Truman H. Newberry, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., his present address, with postage thereon, including the usual registration fee prepaid in full, and handing said envelope and contents for registration and mailing to the registry clerk of the United States post office at Detroit, Michigan, and at the same time demanding a return registry receipt.

HOWELL VAN AUKEN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 19th day of May, A. D. 1919.

CHARLES L. HUTCHINSON,
Notary Public, Washington, District of Columbia.

My commission expires May 1, 1924.

—

PETITION OF MR. HENRY FORD CONTESTING THE ELECTION OF MR. TRUMAN H. NEWBERRY AS SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN FOR THE TERM BEGINNING MARCH 4, 1919, FOR A RECOUNT OF THE BALLOTS FOR THE OFFICE OF UNITED STATES SENATOR CAST AT THE ELECTION IN MICHIGAN HELD NOVEMBER 5, 1918, AND FOR OTHER RELIEF.

To the Senate of the United States of America of the Sixty-sixth Congress:

I, Henry Ford, of Dearborn, Michigan, the petitioner, do hereby give notice of my intention to contest and do hereby enter and file a contest of the election of Mr. Truman H. Newberry as Senator from Michigan to succeed the Honorable William Alden Smith; and I request and petition for a recount of the ballots cast at the election held in Michigan November 5, 1918, and an investigation of the unlawful uses by said Truman H. Newberry, and in his behalf by his agents and representatives, of large sums of money to influence the primary and election, and also of cases of undue influence and intimidation of voters at the election.

I beg to represent to your honorable body:

(1) That an election was held by the voters of Michigan on the 5th day of November, 1918, to elect a United States Senator from Michigan for the term beginning March 4, 1919. That Truman H. Newberry was the candidate on the Republican ticket, Henry Ford on the Democratic ticket, Edward O. Foss on the Socialist ticket, and William J. Faull on the Prohibition ticket.

(2) That the official canvass made by the State canvassing board showed 220,054 votes cast for said Newberry, 212,487 votes cast for said Henry Ford, 4,763 votes cast for said Foss, and 1,133 votes cast for said Faull, and that in pursuance of such canvass said board announced the result of the election to be that the above-mentioned number of votes were cast for each of the said candidates as stated above.

(3) That a certificate of election as such Senator has heretofore been issued to said Truman H. Newberry and he claims to have been duly elected such Senator, and he has heretofore caused his credentials as such to be offered to the United States Senate, namely, on or about the 14th day of December, 1918.

(4) That the primary election to select candidates by the respective parties for the office of such United States Senator was held on August 27, 1918; that in the primaries Mr. Truman H. Newberry was a candidate for the Republican nomination, your petitioner was candidate for the Republican nomination, also for the Democratic nomination, and he was nominated on the Democratic ticket, and said Truman H. Newberry was nominated on the Republican ticket. That large sums of money were unlawfully used and expended by and on behalf of said Newberry at said primary election and previous thereto to effect such election and to bring about his nomination and to purchase and procure the support and efforts of divers large numbers of persons and newspapers and periodicals. It was admitted by the committee, composed of a large number of men who acted in behalf of the nomination of Mr. Newberry, that said committee expended $176,568.08 and a sworn report to that effect was made under the State law by Mr. Frank W. Blair, the treasurer of said committee, and said report was filed with the county clerk of Wayne County, Michigan, where said Blair resided. And petitioner states upon information and belief that it can and will be proved that said Truman H. Newberry procured the appointment and selection of said committee and its members and was directly responsible for all its acts and that he was in constant communication with said committee and its members and knew of and approved its large expenditures of moneys and participated in its work. Upon information and belief petitioner says that large sums of money, aggregating many thousands of dollars, were expended by or on behalf of said Newberry's nomination, entirely outside of said $176,568.08 above mentioned as having been admitted, in the hiring of workers and other legitimate expenses and contrary to the laws of the United States and the State of Michigan in that behalf. That a memorial with respect to the above matters was filed with the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections in the month of November last by Mr. Elbert H. Fowler, a lawyer and reputable citizen of the city of Detroit, Michigan, who had acted as secretary of the nonpartisan Ford-for-Senator Club, in connection with the election, a copy of which memorial or statement is hereto attached and made a part hereof, and upon information and belief petitioner avers the statements thereof to be true.

(5) He further shows that the large sums of money expended by and in behalf of the nomination of Mr. Truman H. Newberry as hereinbefore stated, unlawfully enlisted the aid and support of large numbers of persons, papers, and periodicals throughout the State, and the results and influence of which extended down to and affected the election materially in favor of the said Truman H. Newberry, and that said great sums of money were expended in violation of the statutes of the United States and of the State of Michigan in such cases provided.

(6) The petitioner shows on information and belief that said Truman H. Newberry was not truly or lawfully elected to said office of the United States Senator and is not entitled to said office, and that your petitioner was elected and is entitled to said seat, and he specifies:

(a) That there are about 2,200 election precincts or districts in Michigan, and that nearly all of the election boards were composed wholly of Republicans, and great numbers of them were wholly composed of intense partisans of Mr. Newberry, and that only in a comparatively few of them were there at the said election any challengers or others acting in behalf of the Democratic candidates, and that every opportunity existed for election

officials who were so inclined to miscount the ballots in favor of Mr. Newberry.

(b) That a large number of ballots were unlawfully counted for said Newberry, which, in fact and in truth, were cast for Henry Ford, namely, at least ten thousand.

(c) That large numbers of ballots lawfully cast for petitioner were not counted for him, but were unlawfully rejected by the various precinct election boards when making the counts, and they were not returned for petitioner as in truth they ought to have been, namely, at least ten thousand.

(d) That in many election precincts or districts the count by the election officers and boards was illegal, in favor of Newberry, false and fraudulent, and in violation of the election laws governing the count.

(e) Many of the ballots marked and cast for petitioner were counted and returned for the said Truman H. Newberry.

(f) In many precincts (particularly in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan) the provisions of law enacted to protect the sanctity and secrecy of the ballots and to promote a true and honest vote and count were flagrantly violated and many important and vital irregularities and departures from such provision occurred, thus vitiating under the law the vote of such precincts. As, for instance, the marking of ballots for voters by unauthorized third person, the exposure of ballots by the voters, the overseeing of the voting by mine bosses and superintendents and the like; all of which were conducted in the interests of said Truman H. Newberry, and the votes of such precincts should be rejected and thrown out.

(g) That many ballots in many precincts duly marked and cast for petitioner were rejected by the respective election boards and not counted at all.

(h) That many ballots bearing unlawful distinguishing marks were illegally and unlawfully counted for the said Truman H. Newberry.

(i) Many ballots duly marked and cast for your petitioner were wholly rejected and thrown out by many election boards on the unlawful and fraudulent pretext that they were not duly and properly marked for the petitioner, whereas in fact they were so marked and cast.

(j) Many ballots duly and properly marked and cast for the petitioner were rejected and thrown out by many election boards on the unlawful and fraudulent pretext that they bore distinguishing marks, whereas in fact they did not bear any unlawful distinguishing marks and ought to have been counted for your petitioner.

(k) Many ballots duly and lawfully marked and cast for petitioner were erroneously thrown out and not counted for petitioner by many of the said election boards under erroneous interpretations of their duties.

(l) Many ballots for said Truman H. Newberry were corruptly and unlawfully procured to be cast and counted for him by the unlawful use of money on his behalf.

(m) Large sums of money were unlawfully expended by and in behalf of said Truman H. Newberry to influence said election and cause votes to be cast for him that otherwise would not have been so cast.

(n) Large numbers of lawful voters were intimidated and prevented from voting at the said election by partisans and supporters of said Newberry who otherwise would have voted at the election and cast their votes for the petitioner, to wit, five thousand of such votes.

(o) Large numbers of lawful voters, employees of certain large corporations, were intimidated and unlawfully coerced by employers and their representatives into voting for said Newberry against their wills and preferences who otherwise would have cast their ballots for the petitioner.

(p) In a number of the counties the respective boards of county canvassers made and reported their canvasses without having or examining the poll books and tally sheets nor in any way verifying the number of original votes as cast or the number of voters voting at the respective precincts.

(q) That careful investigation by petitioner's directions have been made by reliable men since the election to ascertain as far as may be the detailed facts pertaining to the above statements and as to the conduct of counting in said election and from such investigations and from other information reaching the petitioner and his representatives he avers the foregoing statements to be true and he particularly specifies the following counties and election districts therein as the counties and districts where such irregularities, miscounting, and frauds were more flagrantly committed, namely: Kent, Bay, Kalamazoo, Wayne, Saginaw, Allegan, Antrim, Baraga, Barry, Benzie, Berrien, Calhoun, Cass, Charlevoix, Chippewa, Clare, Dickinson, Eaton, Emmet, Genesee, Gladwin, Gogebic, Gratiot, Hillsdale, Houghton, Huron, Ingham, Ionia, Iosco, Iron, Isabella, Jackson, Kalkaska, Keweenaw, Lapeer, Lenawee, Macomb, Marquette, Mason, Mecosta, Midland, Monroe, Montcalm, Montmorency, Muskegon, Newaygo, Oakland, Oceana, Osceola, Ottawa, Sanilac, St. Clair, St. Joseph, Tuscola, Van Buren, Washtenaw, Wexford; and that such irregularities and miscounts occurred in a more modified degree in nearly all the other counties of the State and that mistakes unfavorable to petitioner and in favor of the said Truman H. Newberry occurred in all of the counties.

(r) That upon a fair and lawful recount of the ballots cast at said election your petitioner would be decided to be duly and lawfully elected Senator from Michigan.

(s) That upon such a fair and lawful recount, and due allowances being made for such frauds, intimidations, and prevention of votes, petitioner would be decided and declared by your honorable body to have been duly and lawfully elected Senator from Michigan.

(7) Your petitioner shows that the ballots cast for the said office of United States Senator at said election have generally been preserved intact, with the exception of those cast in the cities of Saginaw, Marquette, and possibly one or two smaller localities, together with the poll books and tally sheets relating thereto, under the provisions of the several orders of court in that behalf in the two suits in equity brought by your petitioner for that purpose in the United States district court for each the eastern and western districts of Michigan, comprising the whole of said State; that as your petitioner is advised the ballots, poll books, and tally sheets, with the exceptions mentioned, are now generally held in the custody and possession of the officers designated by the law of the State of Michigan for such purposes awaiting action hereon by this Senate.

(8) And the petitioner further shows that he is advised that under the laws of Michigan there is no body or tribunal which has control of a recount except the United States Senate, and that his only adequate relief to preserve and recount the ballots lies in suitable action to that end by your honorable body.

(9) That petitioner has caused notice of his intention to contest the alleged election of said Truman H. Newberry to the United States Senate to be duly served upon the said Truman H. Newberry, viz, on the 2d day of January, 1919, and May 17, 1919.

(10) The petitioner hereby prays and requests the Senate to entertain his said contest; to provide for a recount of the said ballots and the due preservation of said ballots for the purpose of the recount and of evidence in the contest; and for a prompt investigation of said election and primary and of the matters hereinbefore set forth, and that said Truman H. Newberry be declared not elected, and also disqualified and not entitled to a seat because of the aforesaid violations of law; and that petitioner may be declared elected and entitled to said seat, and that he may have such further action of the Senate and its duly appointed committees and agents and such other relief as shall be conformable to justice, and as the premises shall warrant; and he will ever petition, etc.

HENRY FORD.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
County of Wayne, ss:

Henry Ford being duly sworn, deposes and says that he has read the foregoing petition and notice, and that the same is true to the best of his knowledge, information, and belief.

HENRY FORD.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 17th day of May, A. D. 1919.

HOWELL VAN AUKEN,
Notary Public, Wayne County, Mich.

My commission expires October 3, 1921.

—

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
County of Wayne, ss:

Robert E. Walter, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is a citizen of Michigan and a resident of the county of Wayne, Michigan; that he has read the foregoing petition and notice of contest and knows the contents thereof, and that paragraphs one, two, three, five, seven, eight, and ten are true; and deponent further says that he was a member of the Legislature of Michigan, viz, a senator for three successive terms, namely, from 1911 to 1917, and that he was one of a committee of three members of the legislature who conducted a recount of the votes cast in the 22nd senatorial district, comprising the whole of the county of Saginaw (which is one of the three or four largest counties in Michigan) in the year 1913. He further says that since the election of November 5, 1918, he has devoted considerable time to the investigation of the said election in the various parts of the State, and that he has traveled personally to various

parts of the State in that work, and has received reports from a considerable number of other careful and reliable men who have devoted their time to the said work of investigation, and that every precaution has been taken to make such investigation thorough, reliable, and strictly according to the truth. And he further says that from such experiences above described and from his said investigations and the said reports he states that he has good reasons to believe, and does believe, that the allegations of the fourth, sixth, and ninth paragraphs of said petition and notice of contest are true. And he further says that the representatives of Mr. Ford have now a great abundance of evidence to establish Mr. Truman H. Newberry's personal connection with his said campaign committee described in the foregoing petition and notice and with the activities of said committee in his behalf, and that said campaign was conducted with his full knowledge, consent, and active cooperation. And he further says that said Ford's representatives have reliable proofs of large numbers of unlawful expenditures of money in said Truman H. Newberry's campaign involving large amounts in a great many portions of the State not set out or included in said report of Frank W. Blair, treasurer of said committee; and the said contestant's representatives are ready to produce such proofs and the witnesses to sustain the charges in the petition, but deponent deems it advisable and safest not to give the names of said additional witnesses for very obvious reasons.

He further says that contestant's representatives have reliable evidence of great activities on the part of the supporters of Mr. Newberry and his committee to suppress the evidence of said unlawful expenditures and of attempts to prevent disclosures by those having knowledge of the facts; and these proofs contestant's representatives are prepared to present to any committee authorized by the Senate to investigate the election.

ROBERT E. WALTER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 17th day of May, 1919.

JAMES W. THOMAS,
Notary Public, Wayne County, Mich.

My commission expires April 9, 1923.

LUCKING, MURPHY, HELFMAN, LUCKING & HANLON,
Attorneys for Henry Ford.

—

NOVEMBER 15, 1918.

Hon. ATLEE POMERENE,
Chairman Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I am a Republican who was inclined to support Mr. Truman Newberry for Senator in the Michigan primary election until I personally saw evidence of the extravagant use of large sums of money, in which I felt to be unlawful amounts, to advance his candidacy. I then decided I could not support him in the primaries. Some weeks after the primaries I joined the Nonpartisan Ford-for-Senator Club, an organization composed largely of prominent Republicans who looked with disfavor upon the method used by Mr. Newberry and his committee to obtain the Republican nomination. I acted as secretary of this organization. Our membership was over 20,000 before the election of Nov. 5th.

As secretary of this organization I was in constant communication with prominent Republicans throughout the State of Michigan who saw the lavish expenditures of the Newberry committee and protested against them. From them and in other ways I have collected a large amount of information and reports, sufficient, I think, to convince your committee that an investigation of the campaign is necessary and ample, I hope, to form the basis for a complete investigation of the campaign.

It would seem that an investigation is absolutely necessary. In the words of Senator KENYON (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 1918, page 11275): "If this enormous expenditure of money in senatorial campaigns is to go on without any challenge by Congress, then the poor man has no chance ever to secure a seat in this body and simply the rich can purchase a seat here."

There should be no objection to an investigation at this time. I feel that Senator TOWNSEND expressed the sentiment admirably when he said (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 1918, page 11274): "I would be glad to have a full and complete investigation, and if Mr. Newberry shall receive a certificate of election in November and charges are preferred against his title, I will not only vote to investigate, but I will vote to unseat him if corruption which secured his nomination is proven."

The information to form the basis of an investigation is sent you under separate cover.

Yours, very truly,

EHF ELBERT H. FOWLER.

In the matter of Michigan primary senatorial election of 1918.

DETROIT, MICHIGAN.

To the COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIRS: The following statement of evidence pertaining to the Newberry senatorial campaign is sent you in compliance with my telegram of November 14th and letter of November 15, 1918, and it is hoped that it will be of assistance to you as a basis for the proposed investigation.

The United States statute governing the matter is contained in First United States Compiled Statutes of 1916, pages 65 to 72, section 198, page 72, providing: "Every person wilfully violating any of the foregoing provisions shall upon conviction be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisonment not more than one year or both." Section 195 defines who shall be considered a candidate, which clearly includes a candidate for the nomination or election to the office of United States Senator. Subdivision 3 of section 195, which is printed on page 69, states that the candidate shall file with the Secretary of the Senate "a full, correct, and itemized statement of all moneys and things of value received by him or by anyone for him with his knowledge and consent from any source in aid or support of his candidacy, together with the names of all those who have furnished the same in whole or in part, and such statement shall contain a true and itemized account of all moneys and things of value given, contributed, expended, used, or promised by such candidate or by his agent, representative, or other person for and in his behalf with his knowledge and consent, together with the names of all those to whom money and all such gifts, contributions, payments, or promises were made for the purpose of procuring his nomination or election."

Subdivision 4 also contains the requirement for a similar statement to be filed within fifteen days after the primary. Subdivision 7, printed on pages 70 and 71, provides: "No candidate for Senator shall give, contribute, expend, use, or promise or cause to be given, contributed, expended, used, or promised, in procuring his nomination and election any sum in the aggregate in excess of the amount which he may lawfully give, contribute, expend, or promise under the laws of the State in which he resides: *Provided*, That no candidate for Senator of the United States shall give, contribute, expend, use, or promise any sum in the aggregate exceeding ten thousand dollars in any campaign for his nomination and election," etc.

The Michigan State statute is act No. 109 of the laws of 1913 on pages 189 et seq. entitled "An act to regulate and limit nomination expenses." Section 1 provides: "No sums of money shall be paid and no expenses authorized or incurred by or on behalf of any candidate to be paid by him, in order to secure or aid in securing his nomination to any public office in excess of 25 per cent of one year's compensation of the office." Further down in the same section it provides that no sum for election shall be expended beyond 25 per cent of one year's salary, etc. Section 2 provides that "every political committee should appoint a treasurer and that no money shall be expended except through him. Section 3 defines what are lawful expenditures. Section 4 provides that every candidate and every treasurer shall file full and complete statements within ten days after primary or election. Section 11 provides that no person shall pay any expenses or make any payments except to a candidate or a political committee, and section 12 provides that there shall be no receipts except in the true name of the donor. Section 13 provides that no moneys shall be expended from any anonymous source. Section 18 provides for fine and imprisonment for any wilful violation of the act.

From the various advertisements appearing in the Detroit and Michigan newspapers generally and from other sources it appears that a committee known as the Newberry-for-Senator committee ostensibly had charge of the management and conduct of Mr. Newberry's campaign. This committee for a period of several months, commencing in March of 1918 and continuing until after the primaries in August, maintained elaborate offices at rooms 308-310 Ford Building, Detroit.

Mr. A. A. Templeton, president of the Detroit Seamless Steel Tubes Company, acted as general chairman; Mr. Newberry is a large stockholder of this company, having originally financed Templeton in its organization; Mr. Paul H. King, an attorney and former receiver of the Pere Marquette Railroad, acted as executive chairman; Mr. Frank W. Blair, president of the Union Trust Company of Detroit, as treasurer; Charles A. Floyd as secretary; B. F. Emery, Harry O. Turner, James R. Davis, Terry T. Corliss, James F. McGregor, A. K. Moore, E. V. Chilson, James B. Haskins, B. F. Reed, assistant secretaries; director of publicity, H. A. Hopkins; publicity representatives,

Thomas Phillips, B. C. Wilson, H. W. Rose, A. G. MacEachron, E. E. Smith, and F. O. McLean; attorney, Paul R. Dailey.

The report just mentioned was filed by the committee in the office of Milton Oakman, county clerk of Wayne County, where Mr. Newberry resides, on September 6, 1918, in compliance with act 109 of the Michigan Public Acts of 1913. It is signed and verified by Mr. Frank W. Blair, treasurer, and appears set forth in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, issue of September 17, 1918, on pages 11267 and following. Mr. Newberry did not personally make any report under this act. Instead there appears in the miscellaneous files of the county clerk's office, attached to the committee report, a letter from Mr. Fred P. Smith, on the stationery of the executors of the Newberry estate, wherein the writer advises the county clerk that Mr. Truman H. Newberry states that he did not receive or disburse any money in connection with his campaign and that the writer, Mr. Smith, therefore assumes that no personal report is required of Mr. Newberry. In this letter it is also said that should Mr. Oakman, the county clerk, place a different interpretation on the act, upon information accordingly to the writer, Mr. Newberry will report the facts as theretofore reported to the Secretary of the United States Senate.

I am informed that Mr. Newberry, in compliance with the Federal act, made personal reports of his campaign expenditures both before and after the primary. The prior statement is contained on one of the regular blank forms prepared for the purpose by the Secretary of the Senate. On page two (2) thereof Mr. Newberry states: "The campaign for my nomination for United States Senator has been voluntarily conducted by friends in Michigan. I have taken no part in it whatever and no contributions or expenditures have been made with my knowledge or consent." On the third page he states "no promise or pledge has been made by me or by anyone on my behalf with my knowledge or consent relative to the appointment of any person to a position of trust, honor, or profit either in the county, State, or Nation, or in any political subdivision thereof, or in any private or corporate employment for the purpose of procuring the support of such person or of any person in my candidacy." Mr. Newberry signs the statement "Truman H. Newberry, 123 Lake Shore Road, Grosse Pointe Farms, Michigan." It was sworn to in the State of New York, county of New York, before Charles C. Schneider, notary public, August 14, 1918.

The primary was held on the 27th day of August. After the primaries Mr. Newberry filed another statement with the Secretary of the Senate, sworn to on the 29th day of August, 1918, in New York, before Louis B. Wolf, notary, etc. This was on the regular blank furnished by the Secretary of the Senate for statements to be made after the primary. In the blank space on the second page relative to contributions there is written in ink the following: "None with my knowledge and consent." With reference to expenditures, in the blank space therefor, is written the following: "None with my knowledge and consent. I have read a general public statement of Paul H. King concerning expenditures made by a voluntary committee of my friends, but these were made without my knowledge or consent."

The first public outcry against the unlawful use of money, as stated, in Mr. Newberry's campaign was made by the Honorable Luren D. Dickinson, a prominent candidate for governor, reelected lieutenant governor of Michigan on the Republican ticket in the recent election. His public protest was published in all the prominent newspapers in Michigan on or about August 22, 1918, and is as follows:

AUGUST 22nd, 1918.
Detroit News.

[Lieut. Gov. Dickinson's letter.]

Hon. TRUMAN H. NEWBERRY,
Brooklyn Navy Yard, New York.

DEAR SIR: Men of all walks of life who have the best interest of our State at heart believe the men who are conducting your campaign for United States Senator are conducting one that will bring one of the greatest scandals on our State that Michigan politics ever saw, and have asked me to take the lead in attempting to rid our State of this blight.

I note by your statement that you say you do not know of these things.

In giving you the information, I will give you the terms that I hear everywhere in the 62 counties in which I have been recently. I have always had the highest regard for you and must believe you will relieve the Republican Party and the State of a campaign that is now being likened to the notorious Lorimer campaign of Illinois a few years ago. The terms "boodle" and "rotten" seem to be general terms that I hear.

Every section of the State shows evidence of an expensive newspaper campaign, costing thousands and thousands of dollars. Thousands of men are liberally paid for work at many more thousands of dollars, an expensive suite of offices with a large force sending out hundreds of thousands of letters to influential voters at more thousands of dollars, thousands of autos already engaged for use on primary day at many more thousands, that practically every opponent of the primary system is backing your campaign, and that hundreds of the experts who have figured in or conducted for money the wet campaigns of the past are among the most active of your supporters.

Conservative estimates say everywhere from $250,000 to $500,000 is being used. The good people of the State are apparently powerless to give the voters these matters on short notice. In case you get the most votes you must expect to have the placing of your name on the election ballot contested. If by technical reasons you succeed, then you must expect every church and moral organization to work until election night to keep our fair State from the baneful influence that success following such methods would leave for years to come.

Should you be successful at the polls, you must expect a legislative investigation that would be demanded by an indignant populace. And if by technicalities you could overcome this you will probably have to face a Democratic Senate, which will unseat you, as it justly unseated Wm. Lorimer, jr., because of flagrant disregard in your behalf of Michigan's primary laws. The effect on the Republican Party with the people demanding cleaner things can not be estimated. Already we hear the Democrats will make the corrupting use of money in your campaign one of their great campaign arguments.

I can not believe you understand the situation, and if you did you would come to the rescue. I am, therefore, asking you, in behalf of the old Republican Party, clean politics, preservation of the primaries, social and business interest, to withdraw from this campaign and save the everlasting disgrace to the party and the State from a pollution that would stay for years. Hoping you may act favorably and retain the high esteem in which you have been held in the State, I am, sincerely, yours,

L. D. DICKINSON,
Lieutenant Governor of Michigan.

The other candidates on the Republican ticket in the late primary for the office of United States Senator from Michigan were: Honorable Chase S. Osborn, of Sault Ste. Marie, who had been twice governor of Michigan, Mr. Henry Ford, and Mr. William G. Simpson.

Representative Merlin Wiley, of Sault Ste. Marie, a member of the State Legislature of Michigan and Mr. Osborn's manager in the senatorial campaign, also made a public protest on the subject, which was published in the Detroit News on August 22, 1918, and probably in several other newspapers. It read as follows:

[Rep. Merlin Wiley's letter, of Sault Ste. Marie (Detroit News, Aug. 22nd, 1918).]

To the EDITOR: The campaign conducted on behalf of Mr. Newberry's candidacy for the United States Senate is a disgrace to the State of Michigan. Some one or some persons are incurring bills of tremendous size. They are incurred in behalf of Mr. Newberry's candidacy, and they must be paid by some one. Facts that can not be denied, because the knowledge of them is common property, attest the following:

First. A large and pretentious headquarters has been conducted for months in the Ford Building in Detroit with a clerical force of from 30 to 40. Office rent and competent clerks cost money in Detroit.

Second. A force of Newberry workers of the class who seldom work without pay have been scouring the State for months doing organization work for Mr. Newberry's candidacy. They cost money.

Third. Banquets in county after county have been held, sometimes under the guise of patriotic meetings and sometimes plainly and boldly for Newberry organization work, as was the case of the banquet at Lansing, when the local Newberry organization was perfected, and the banquet of the Newberry workers of St. Clair at Marine City last Friday night. These things cost money, and these are war times and not time for political banquets.

Fourth. A superexpensive advertising campaign is being carried on, handled by a Detroit advertising company and carrying almost continuous advertising in nearly every one of the 700 papers in the State, both secular and religious. This costs money and lots of it.

Fifth. It has been stated that a letter enclosing a return postal card, together with printed matter, has been sent to every voter in the State. This costs money.

Sixth. It is stated that the Newberry organization plans to have autos in every voting precinct to bring out the Newberry vote on election day. This will cost still more money.

Seventh. The old-time politicians, the opponents of the primary systems, and the "wets" are almost to a man supporting Mr. Newberry.

Eighth. Not a word, not a statement, not a single announcement of what he stands for has Mr. Newberry made. Even his campaign expense statement states that his campaign is being conducted by his friends without his knowledge or participation, and that no expenses have been incurred with his consent or authority.

These items cost money; more money than has ever been spent in a Michigan campaign; certainly in this generation. They are, in the amount expended, in plain and open violation of the letter and spirit of both the State and Federal laws. If Mr. Newberry should be elected, Michigan will have an election scandal worse than the Lorimer scandal in Illinois or the Stephenson scandal in Wisconsin. If this is to be the policy permitted in Michigan, then none but millionaires or men with millionaire friends who will pay the bills need apply for the office of governor or United States Senator, for only they can pay the price.

It is variously estimated that the entire cost of the Newberry organization and the conduct of Mr. Newberry's candidacy will have cost from one hundred thousand to one-half million of dollars. Certainly it will cost enough to down the fair name of Michigan for a generation to come, and if Mr. Newberry should be nominated he can never hope to take his seat. A United States Senate that, as Republican, would not permit William Lorimer to retain his seat, and would seriously challenge the right of Senator Stephenson to a seat therein, will never, when Democratic, permit Mr. Newberry, if elected, to be seated after such campaign expenditures.

It is time for Michigan to wake up and shield her honor by administering a defeat that will forever make impossible the repetition of such methods.

MERLIN WILEY.

LANSING, MICH., *Aug. 20th, 1918.*

Mr. Simpson, one of the Republican candidates for Senator, mentioned above, likewise made public charges directed against

the expenditures of the Newberry committee. One of his statements published October 6, 1918, is as follows:

MR. SIMPSON ON THE SITUATION.

[From the Detroit News, Oct. 6, 1918.]

TO THE EDITOR: Now that the Michigan Republican and Democratic conventions have been held, the stage seems to be all set for November when the people can come forth and select their public servants. (?)

The army of 50,000 Republican joperatics in Michigan will be on the job as usual to do the bidding of the leaders who employ them, as will also as many of the Democrats who are equally fortunate in holding a political job.

And the plain citizen voter—the man with whom lies the balance of power for good or evil—the man who is interested in politics only as a means of self-government, what will he do?

The main contests, of course, will be the senatorship and the governorship.

At present mud is flying in all directions without apparently any desire for sensible reasoning, and the situation takes the phase of being grotesquely funny were it not a serious menace to our form of government.

Ford says he is obeying the commands of the President.

Newberry swears that he didn't know—that not even his wife told him that she spent $25,000 of his money to nominate him.

Osborn charges Newberry with being an ass, but says that he will support him to show he's a good sport, even though he lost and Newberry flagrantly violated the law.

Paul King—a lawyer, mind you—says he did it all for nothing, just as if he expected people to believe him.

Gov. Sleeper (and his name seems quite appropriate in view of the facts) says he is neutral.

The governor is doing the State a real service without cost by removing himself from office in the coming election. The people will do the rest.

And Attorney General Groesbeck—

On the 24th of June I saw Mr. Groesbeck in his office, where I had called to protest the large expenditure of money by the Newberry people.

"You are familiar with the corrupt-practices act, are you not?" I asked.

"Well," replied Mr. Groesbeck, "I ought to be; I am the attorney general of the State."

"I am well aware of that fact, Mr. Groesbeck," I replied. "As this effort is for a Federal office, I'm quite sure that if you won't act Mr. Kinnane will." He replied:

"Oh! You get me the facts, Simpson, and I'll act."

Mr. Groesbeck has had the facts for some time in the admission of Paul King, but has he acted?

On July 20 I wrote regarding the matter to Mr. Kinnane and Secretary Lansing at Washington.

Did they act? Not yet.

After the primary and on September 7 I again wrote to the governor and Secretary of State Vaughan, asking them to withhold Newberry's nomination certificate. Did they do so? The substance of the law which Newberry violated has been repeated so frequently in these columns it is unnecessary to do so again.

I think that every voter who has any conscience at all will admit that Newberry has violated the law, in spirit if not in fact, although it pleases the interests with which he is connected to provide all manner of excuses, among which they say it was to save the country from Ford.

The facts will show that they laid their expensive plans to deliberately violate the law long before Ford announced his candidacy, and there is no doubt in my mind but what they intended with premeditation to violate the law.

Only a few days ago the State board of canvassers met to determine the ballot, and said, as reported, that I should have gone to Prosecutor Jasnowski.

Always "passing the buck" to others. This seems to be the feature of joperatic's job when he is called upon to earn his salary—at least in Michigan.

Anyone who knows conditions, and who has gone to see Jasnowski on matters of this kind, knows what a fat chance I'd stand of having him do anything against the "combine," even if I could find the prosecutor.

Here is a letter from Will Hays, which contains nothing that he could object to having printed:

"MY DEAR MR. SIMPSON: Returning to-day after an absence, etc.

"The unlawful use of money in an election can not be too strongly condemned. There is no penalty too severe or excoriation too vigorous for anyone guilty of such practices.

"However, I am quite sure that there must be some mistake in the information which you have received regarding the unlawful use of money by Mr. Newberry. While I have known Mr. Newberry only a short time, I have known him by reputation a great many years, and, while, as I understand, he is quite 'well to do,' as you say, I am very sure he would not, under any circumstances indulge or condone nor permit the unlawful use of money in connection with his candidacy for the nomination or election to any office.

"I am glad, etc.

"Sincerely, yours, WILL H. HAYS."

As to Mr. Hays's complacent belief in the virtue of others, I have nothing to say.

How satisfying out of this mess of recriminations, senseless explanations and excuses stand forth, like living words of fire, that every youth in Michigan would do well to remember, these words of our lieutenant governor, the man who knew, felt in his heart his duty, and dared:

"I did what my conscience dictated; I have made enemies; but if I have opened the way for the correction of one of our greatest evils, I am abundantly repaid."

Personally, I refuse to believe other than in the old-fashioned goodness and honesty of the common people of Michigan.

If the evils of which Newberry and his friends are charged are allowed to continue it means that we, the common people, must submit to rule by a class, and that class the rich class. We therefore lose our much-vaunted democracy.

We read every day of current political difference, where matters of the war are brought into argument, which are not appeals to reason but appeals to prejudice and self-interest.

This line of argument gets us nowhere. Prominent business men are interviewed regarding Newberry and their replies printed. The major part of them, being of his class of self and social interest, say, in effect: "To hell with the law; we want Newberry elected." Those too cowardly to voice an opinion say nothing.

The attitude of Thursday's conventions shows that the reactionary element of the Republican Party is still in the saddle.

After two sad presidential defeats under their rule they have yet to learn their lesson, and the idea does not seem to percolate through their thick craniums that the voting Republican citizens will not have that type of politics.

It is not a question of loyalty between parties. It is a question of common honesty, decency, and principles among men.

If we can look ahead to the sure defeat of Newberry, we can see the just release of impending dishonor to the State—a dishonor invited by the leaders in power, and, as much as I would like to support Republican national principles, I can't vote a member of that party into an important office who has "hit below the belt" to get there.

Nor can I assist, by my vote, in the humiliation of the State which I love. If Newberry is selected, this will surely be forced upon us by the body of men whose privilege it is to refuse to accept questionable associates.

I hope to see every cowardly official connected with this disgraceful affair defeated at the coming election, and I shall vote for Bailey for governor, Dickinson for lieutenant governor, Masselink for secretary of state, and Baker for attorney general, and I know a few thousand others who will do the same.

As for the Senatorship, I won't vote for Newberry, and I can't vote for Ford. I opine, however, that Ford will be elected by at least 20,000 majority.

I'd rather be a prophet with a good vision than a forgetful historian that I might, perhaps, install a ray of hope in the minds and hearts of the common people of Michigan.

WM. G. SIMPSON.

I am informed that Mr. Simpson, as he states in his communication, did in fact file specific charges as to the unlawful use of money by Mr. Newberry, both with the attorney general of Michigan and the United States attorney for the eastern district of Michigan.

After the primaries, at which Mr. Newberry received the Republican nomination, Mr. Newberry wrote Mr. Osborn, in answer to a telegram, as follows:

NEWBERRY'S LETTER.

NEW YORK CITY,
Sunday, September 1, 1918.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: Your cordial telegram assuring me of your earnest support is all that was needed to insure the defeat of Ford in November. I fully realize that my personality is submerged in the issues that confront our party in our State. Many times in the past few months I have envied your ability and privilege to talk, and when your voice rang clear and strong throughout State and Nation on the menace of Ford I wanted to wire you godspeed in your patriotic work.

Your deeply appreciated telegram of support helps me to visualize the statesman, the sportsman (hunter), and gentleman that I have always known you to be.

Cordially, yours, TRUMAN H. NEWBERRY.

In reply to this Mr. Osborn wrote him an open letter which was published generally throughout Michigan, and which reads as follows:

SEPTEMBER 17, 1918.

MY DEAR COMMANDER: I have read your letter. Thank you for your sentiments. I shall support you. Already I have straightened out entanglements that would have been hurtful to your success. I am not interested in you personally a particle. The entire matter is so far beyond personal consideration and transcends individual proportions to an extent that only public welfare may be thought of. You can be elected; no doubt you will be. My idea is that the thing for you to do is to honestly confess that you broke the law and that you knew all about the campaign, but that you did not realize the enormity of your offense. In such a position you would be intrenched in honesty, I fully believe. And an indulgent people would forgive you, and fight for you, because of the past services they think you have given and what they have been told you are giving now. In addition this action would make for your name an honorable place in the history of Michigan. Otherwise the future will curse you.

The plea can not be honestly made that you spent money in excess because you were fighting Ford, because you had begun your reckless campaign long before Ford was mentioned and had already transgressed the law. Nor can you plead "you did not know." That would prove you to be both an ass and a liar, which I choose to think you are not. I am for you only to save the Nation and the State from the curse of Fordism. A vote for Ford is a vote for the Kaiser right now, as I view the case.

Yours, truly, CHAS. S. OSBORN.

Coming now to the facts as to Mr. Newberry's connection with the work of the committee, I am informed and believe that he was personally active in organizing his own campaign, and that he conducted the same through the Newberry committee. This connection is shown by many facts and witnesses, as I am informed and believe, and among other evidence of witnesses, as follows:

Chief manager and intimate friend of Mr. Newberry was Mr. Fred Cody, who has an office in the down-town section of New York, and who ostensibly is an insurance man, but who is principally a lobbyist for the American Telegraph and Telephone Company, the American Book Company, Standard Oil Company, and other large and important Wall Street interests.

Mr. Cody was active, as I am informed and believe, from before the beginning of the organizing until after the election, and was constantly in communication with and in the office of the committee and in and out the apartment and office of Mr. Newberry, conferring and giving directions with respect to the campaign.

Mr. Cody at the outset of the campaign went to Washington and, at the direction of Mr. Newberry, tendered the appointment of manager of the campaign to Mr. Jay G. Hayden, Washington correspondent of the Detroit News. Mr. Cody took Mr. Hayden to New York to see Mr. Newberry, where the appointment was tendered to Mr. Hayden by Mr. Newberry personally. The whole subject was gone into at great length between Mr. Newberry, Mr. Hayden, and Mr. Cody, with prospect of his making a success of the campaign. Mr. Hayden finally declined the position.

Subsequently, in February of 1918, Mr. Cody, as I am informed and believe, arranged an interview between Mr. Milton Oakman, Mr. Robert Oakman, and others of Detroit with Mr. Newberry at the Biltmore. The parties all met there and discussed fully the prospects for a successful campaign of Mr. Newberry, the amounts of money that would be required, and the place of manager was tendered to Milton Oakman, as I am informed and believe.

Mr. Milton Oakman acted as manager for a time, as I am informed, but subsequently a more elaborate organization was organized and conducted under Mr. Templeton and Mr. Paul King. Mr. Milton Oakman continued to act for Mr. Newberry in Wayne County (Detroit) until after the primary election. Mr. Oakman had been sheriff of Wayne County twice, and also then, and is still, clerk of Wayne County, and the leader of the dominant Republican faction in Wayne County. Very scandalous stories have been in circulation as to the large amounts of money expended by Mr. Oakman on behalf of Mr. Newberry. If such were expended, they are not set forth in the accounts of the committee.

Mrs. Louisa Delamater, a stenographer, now employed at 316 Moffat Block, Detroit, Michigan, states she was employed in the Newberry campaign headquarters at the Ford Building from about the 5th of March until April 20, 1918; that during her employment therein Mr. Newberry at least twice to her personal knowledge was in the Detroit campaign office, and that on the first visit she saw Mr. Emery show Mr. Newberry through the entire suite of about eight offices, pointing out to him things of interest as Mr. Newberry was shown through. She also says that she knows that railroad reservations to New York and hotel accommodations were made for persons in the Detroit office who went to New York for the purpose of consulting Newberry about campaign methods.

Mrs. Delamater also states that Miss Margaret Nevin was the private secretary at campaign headquarters for Paul King, and that she must also have seen Newberry in that office. After Mrs. Delamater ceased working for the campaign committee a Miss Chappell was employed there. When Mrs. Delamater was there Mr. Emery was the office manager. She believes he had something to do with one of the Detroit draft boards. Another of the stenographers who was there while Mrs. Delamater was employed is Ruth Goldstein, of 111 Edmund Street, Detroit, Michigan; also a Florence Shepiro.

According to Mrs. Delamater, Miss Nevin wrote letters on Mr. Newberry's private stationery, which she sent by parcel post to New York, for Mr. Newberry's signature. Mrs. Delamater herself wrote letters to railroads to make reservations to New York for Mr. Templeton and Mr. King; also letters to New York making appointments for Mr. King with Mr. Newberry.

I am informed that Thomas G. Smythe, of Detroit, Michigan, before the primaries saw Mr. Newberry in the offices of the committee from a window in the Moffat Block, which is directly opposite the office of the committee in the Ford Building and not over thirty feet therefrom.

I am also informed and believe that Mr. Thomas Phillips, who was formerly employed on the staff of the Detroit News, was induced to take a position with the Newberry committee at a salary that is nearly twice the sum that he received from the Detroit News; that he went to New York and consulted with Mr. Newberry with reference to the preparation of advertisements to appear in Michigan newspapers; that he was in constant communication with Mr. Newberry while writing these intimate advertisements, and that Mr. Newberry cooperated with him in their preparation.

Mr. Clarence L. Sibbens, 1224 Ford Building, Detroit, Michigan, was Paul King's personal secretary during the campaign; he traveled all over the State with King before the primaries, and also went with him to New York at different times. He is a stenographer and is now employed in the office of Mr. Fred P. Smith, in charge of the offices of the executors of the Newberry estate. Sibbens has probably been taken into the regular employ of the Newberry family. These offices were used for private dictation of King, Emery, and others of the committee, I am informed and believe.

It can be shown without question that Mr. Newberry was in constant touch with the committee almost daily by telephone, telegraph, and written communications, receiving practically continuous reports of the work of the committee and communicating with its various members both in Detroit and at New York, entertaining them at the Biltmore in New York, and communicating with them verbally, by writing and by telegraph, and also through Mr. Frederick Cody. This can be shown by examination of the following witnesses, as I am informed and believe: Templeton, King, Blair, and the various assistant secretaries above mentioned.

I have been apprised through the press that a Federal grand jury investigation on this subject was held in New York City preceding the Michigan primary. In this connection it was stated in the dispatches that the following persons most closely and directly associated with Mr. Newberry in the campaign refused to testify, and were thereafter ordered to testify by two different Federal judges; that they persisted in their refusal; namely: A. A. Templeton, general chairman; Frank W. Blair, treasurer; and Thomas P. Phillips, publicity agent. It was also stated in the newspapers that the following persons, called as witnesses before the same grand jury, indicated that they would likewise refuse to testify, following the course of the three witnesses mentioned. These others, who were not committed, include the following: John S. Newberry, a brother of the candidate, who furnished upwards of ninety-nine thousand dollars ($99,000.00) of the committee moneys; Paul H. King, the Michigan manager of the campaign; Milton Oakman, campaign manager for Wayne County; and H. A. Hopkins, director of publicity.

Besides the upwards of one hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars ($175,000.00) expended and admitted by the committee to have been expended, I have been informed through a number of persons throughout Michigan that other large amounts of money were expended, which moneys are not shown or accounted for by the committee, and I am informed and believe that these facts can be substantiated by a large number of witnesses, among whom are the following:

William Moore, of Wayne, Michigan.
Mr. Jameson, attorney, Wayne, Michigan.
Mr. Harrison (whose full name can be obtained), Wayne, Mich.
Frank Schumaker, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
Frank Newton (late candidate for Congress from the 2nd district), Ypsilanti, Mich.
Mr. Owen, ex-postmaster, Ypsilanti, Michigan.
Thomas M. Ward, 1202 Houseman Building, Grand Rapids, Mich.
George Welsh, Grand Rapids, Michigan.
G. A. (Tennie) Daniels, George Rodgers, James Quinlan, Oscar Kilstron (of the Bolo Club), William J. Mickels, Robert G. Bell (county clerk), George Reed (clerk of police court), Dan Kennedy, William Grove, James Healy, all of Grand Rapids, Michigan.
Neal McMillan, of Rockford, Kent County, Michigan.
Chas. H. Bender, Grand Rapids, Michigan.
S. F. Bernard, Battle Creek, Michigan.
Charles Biggers, Marshall, Mich.
John La Rue, of Lakeview, Montcalm County, Mich.
Mr. Kennedy, postmaster at Lakeview, Mich.
F. M. Lothrop, probably of Lakeview, but whose exact address can be obtained.
E. J. Bowman, Greenville, Mich.
J. W. Hoskins, of Howard City, Mich.
William T. Hosner, of Romeo, Mich.
Judge James G. Tucker, of Mount Clemens.
Thomas Barkworth and John Miner, both of Jackson, Mich.
C. J. De Land, Jackson, Mich.
Emery Mills, Monroe, Mich.
Lee Wilbur, Ypsilanti, Mich.
Mr. Hawthorn, Wayne, Mich.
Ira Wilson, Plymouth, Mich.
Phillip Cottrell, Jackson, Mich.
Ivan George English, publisher of Daily Mirror, Escanaba, Mich.
Albert J. Young, Escanaba, Mich.
Judd Yelland, Escanaba, Mich.
Sherman Olmstead, Midland, Mich.
Rogers Andrews, Menominee, Mich.
Mr. Rice, attorney, Battle Creek, Mich.
Ike Bloom, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Bill Yearnb, Cadillac, Mich.

Many other names of men can be obtained if an investigation finds it necessary.

I have reason to believe that witnesses may be obtained in nearly every county of the State showing that large sums of

money were expended in them before the primaries which are not set forth or included in the committee report.

I am forwarding to the committee a copy of the Saginaw Valley Farmer, a prominent farm newspaper, for August, 1918. In it you will see a sample of the lavish expenditures of money on behalf of Mr. Newberry. You will find advertisements and reading articles on ten pages of this issue, which contains only twenty-four pages in all.

Newberry's campaign was advertised in practically all of the newspapers of the State of Michigan in the most lavish manner.

I am also informed and believe that several speakers were engaged for the primary campaign whose names do not appear in the committee report under their list of expenditures. One of these speakers, whom I have been informed was engaged to travel in the western part of the State of Michigan, was Mr. Horatio Earle, of Detroit. I have been unable to find his name in the committee report.

A great deal of evidence in addition to the suggestions above made could be obtained by a more thorough investigation.

Respectfully submitted.

ELBERT H. FOWLER.

—

The following is taken from the inaugural address of Lieut. Governor Dickinson, of Michigan, which was delivered in the senate of Michigan on Wednesday, January 1, 1919. The senate of Michigan is composed entirely of Republicans, and Lieut. Governor Dickinson is himself a Republican, who announced in the public press just before election that he would vote for Mr. Newberry. The following clipping contains all that Lieut. Governor Dickinson said in his inaugural upon the subject.

Lieut. Gov. Dickinson in his inaugural covers a number of subjects with a few words each. With reference to the Newberry campaign he said:

PRIMARY CHANGES ASKED.

Primary elections will call for action on your part. From what has occurred during the past political campaign it would afford me relief if I could pass by this question, but experience teaches that the disagreeable acts of an office are the ones people demand the most strenuously. More communications on this line asking for legislative action have come to me by far than all others combined, and almost without exception Republicans not only from all parts of Michigan but from other States.

This you know is the outgrowth of a candidacy that doubtless cost more money than ever before was paid for a nomination for office in all the world's history.

CLAIMS G. O. P. NEAR DEFEAT.

You also know this candidacy from one of the best known families of the State, of a man of high standing, unquestioned integrity, and acknowledged ability, in the face of an abnormally large party majority, came near an ignominious defeat through the resentment from nearly every voting precinct in the State, of the farmer, the laborer, the business and professional voter, because of the enormous amount of money acknowledged to have been used in his behalf and generally believed to have been used contrary to laws, several sections of which were enacted for the stipulated purpose of restricting the use of large sums of money in campaigns.

The case is now agitating Congress, the Federal and Michigan courts, with a strong suspicion by many that for political purposes it will be there suspended as long as possible before the country at large as an unsavory act of Republican primary in Michigan, hoping by such course to produce an effect that will deprive the party of the majority secured at the November elections.

SHOULD AMEND PRIMARY ACT.

If the courts had given a decision as to who is to blame for this undesirable condition, it would have cleared the way for your action. If, however, there is any question as to violation of the primary statute, it should be so amended that the interpretation relative to restrictions in the use of money and who to blame for violation shall be made plain and simple.

In legislative action I believe the utmost caution should be used to eliminate the name of any candidate and avoid all appearance of politics in considering this subject. The individual or even party interests are of but little note when the sanctity of the ballot and safety of democracy are at stake.

REPORTS MANY COMPLAINTS.

From almost every part of the State have come to me pleas that this legislature make it impossible in the future to witness the sale of a public office on the auction block, but rather that the laborer, the farmer, the business or professional voter, however humble, but able and respectable, may have a chance with the man of millions.

The war's end has been termed a victory for safe democracy. No democracy is safe with a polluted primary or election, made so by money or otherwise. And no great amount of money will be used except for the purpose of making votes, and to make votes by the use of money is polluting, corrupting, and the user should be treated as a baser criminal than the laborer who steals a sack of flour for his family.

* * * * * * *

—

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
District of Columbia, ss:

Howell Van Auken, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is of full age; that on, to wit, Tuesday, May 20, 1919, at, to wit, office number 411, Senate Office Building, city of Washington, said District of Columbia, he served upon Mr. Truman H. Newberry a true copy of each the following papers: (1) Notice of Mr. Henry Ford, dated May 17, 1919, as to the contest of the election of Mr. Truman H. Newberry as Senator from Michigan, and (2) petition of Mr. Henry Ford, dated May 17, 1919, to the Senate of the United States, for a contest of said election of Mr. Newberry, for a recount of the ballots for such election cast in Michigan at the election of November 5, 1918, and for other relief, the originals of which said notice and petition were filed in the Senate of the United States on, to wit, May 20, 1919, by handing said true copies so served to the aforesaid Mr. Newberry personally.

Deponent further says that upon said occasion Mr. Newberry acknowledged to deponent that he, Mr. Newberry, had received the duplicate originals of said notice and petition, being those sent to him by registered mail from Detroit, Michigan, as set forth in the proof of mailing filed in the Senate of the United States along with the other original of said notice and petition filed in said Senate, as first aforesaid.

HOWELL VAN AUKEN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 20th day of May, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.] F. GWYNN GARDINER,
Notary Public, District of Columbia.

My commission expires March 15, 1923.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, out of order, I ask leave to introduce a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for woman suffrage.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States conferring upon women the right of suffrage was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. Sharkey, one of the secretaries of the President of the United States, appeared and said:

Mr. President, the President of the United States directs me to deliver to the Senate a message in writing.

The message was received by the Secretary of the Senate and handed to the Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States.

The Assistant Secretary (Henry M. Rose) read the message, as follows:

GENTLEMEN OF THE CONGRESS: I deeply regret my inability to be present at the opening of the extraordinary session of the Congress. It still seems to be my duty to take part in the counsels of the peace conference and contribute what I can to the solution of the innumerable questions to whose settlement it has had to address itself: for they are questions which affect the peace of the whole world and from them, therefore, the United States can not stand apart. I deemed it my duty to call the Congress together at this time because it was not wise to postpone longer the provisions which must be made for the support of the Government. Many of the appropriations which are absolutely necessary for the maintenance of the Government and the fulfillment of its varied obligations for the fiscal year 1919–20 have not yet been made; the end of the present fiscal year is at hand; and action upon these appropriations can no longer be prudently delayed. It is necessary, therefore, that I should immediately call your attention to this critical need. It is hardly necessary for me to urge that it may receive your prompt attention.

I shall take the liberty of addressing you on my return on the subjects which have most engrossed our attention and the attention of the world during these last anxious months, since the armistice of last November was signed, the international settlements which must form the subject matter of the present treaties of peace and of our national action in the immediate future. It would be premature to discuss them or to express a judgment about them before they are brought to their complete formulation by the agreements which are now being sought at the table of the conference. I shall hope to lay them before you in their many aspects so soon as arrangements have been reached.

I hesitate to venture any opinion or press any recommendation with regard to domestic legislation while absent from the United States and out of daily touch with intimate sources of information and counsel. I am conscious that I need, after so long an absence from Washington, to seek the advice of those who have remained in constant contact with domestic problems and who have known them close at hand from day to day; and I trust that it will very soon be possible for me to do so. But there are several questions pressing for consideration to which I feel that I may, and indeed must, even now direct your attention, if only in general terms. In speaking of them I shall, I

dare say, be doing little more than speak your own thoughts. I hope that I shall speak your own judgment also.

The question which stands at the front of all others in every country amidst the present great awakening is the question of labour; and perhaps I can speak of it with as great advantage while engrossed in the consideration of interests which affect all countries alike as I could at home and amidst the interests which naturally most affect my thought, because they are the interests of our own people.

By the question of labour I do not mean the question of efficient industrial production, the question of how labour is to be obtained and made effective in the great process of sustaining populations and winning success amidst commercial and industrial rivalries. I mean that much greater and more vital question, how are the men and women who do the daily labour of the world to obtain progressive improvement in the conditions of their labour, to be made happier, and to be served better by the communities and the industries which their labour sustains and advances? How are they to be given their right advantage as citizens and human beings?

We cannot go any further in our present direction. We have already gone too far. We cannot live our right life as a nation or achieve our proper success as an industrial community if capital and labour are to continue to be antagonistic instead of being partners. If they are to continue to distrust one another and contrive how they can get the better of one another. Or, what perhaps amounts to the same thing, calculate by what form and degree of coercion they can manage to extort on the one hand work enough to make enterprise profitable, on the other justice and fair treatment enough to make life tolerable. That bad road has turned out a blind alley. It is no thoroughfare to real prosperity. We must find another, leading in another direction and to a very different destination. It must lead not merely to accommodation but also to a genuine cooperation and partnership based upon a real community of interest and participation in control.

There is now in fact a real community of interest between capital and labour, but it has never been made evident in action. It can be made operative and manifest only in a new organization of industry. The genius of our business men and the sound practical sense of our workers can certainly work such a partnership out when once they realize exactly what it is that they seek and sincerely adopt a common purpose with regard to it.

Labour legislation lies, of course, chiefly with the states; but the new spirit and method of organization which must be effected are not to be brought about by legislation so much as by the common counsel and voluntary cooperation of capitalist, manager, and workman. Legislation can go only a very little way in commanding what shall be done. The organization of industry is a matter of corporate and individual initiative and of practical business arrangement. Those who really desire a new relationship between capital and labour can readily find a way to bring it about; and perhaps Federal legislation can help more than state legislation could.

The object of all reform in this essential matter must be the genuine democratization of industry, based upon a full recognition of the right of those who work, in whatever rank, to participate in some organic way in every decision which directly affects their welfare or the part they are to play in industry. Some positive legislation is practicable. The Congress has already shown the way to one reform which should be worldwide, by establishing the eight-hour day as the standard day in every field of labour over which it can exercise control. It has sought to find the way to prevent child labour, and will, I hope and believe, presently find it. It has served the whole country by leading the way in developing the means of preserving and safeguarding life and health in dangerous industries. It can now help in the difficult task of giving a new form and spirit to industrial organization by coordinating the several agencies of conciliation and adjustment which have been brought into existence by the difficulties and mistaken policies of the present management of industry, and by setting up and developing new Federal agencies of advice and information which may serve as a clearing house for the best experiments and the best thought on this great matter, upon which every thinking man must be aware that the future development of society directly depends. Agencies of international counsel and suggestion are presently to be created in connection with the league of nations in this very field; but it is national action and the lightened policy of individuals, corporations, and societies within each nation that must bring about the actual reforms. The members of the committees on labour in the two houses will hardly need suggestions from me as to what means they shall seek to make the Federal Government the agent of the whole nation in pointing out and, if need be, guiding the process of reorganization and reform.

I am sure that it is not necessary for me to remind you that there is one immediate and very practical question of labour that we should meet in the most liberal spirit. We must see to it that our returning soldiers are assisted in every practicable way to find the places for which they are fitted in the daily work of the country. This can be done by developing and maintaining upon an adequate scale the admirable organization created by the Department of Labor for placing men seeking work; and it can also be done, in at least one very great field, by creating new opportunities for individual enterprise. The Secretary of the Interior has pointed out the way by which returning soldiers may be helped to find and take up land in the hitherto undeveloped regions of the country which the Federal Government has already prepared or can readily prepare for cultivation and also on many of the cutover or neglected areas which lie within the limits of the older states; and I once more take the liberty of recommending very urgently that his plans shall receive the immediate and substantial support of the Congress.

Peculiar and very stimulating conditions await our commerce and industrial enterprise in the immediate future. Unusual opportunities will presently present themselves to our merchants and producers in foreign markets, and large fields for profitable investment will be opened to our free capital. But it is not only of that that I am thinking; it is not chiefly of that that I am thinking. Many great industries prostrated by the war wait to be rehabilitated, in many parts of the world where what will be lacking is not brains or willing hands or organizing capacity or experienced skill, but machinery and raw materials and capital. I believe that our business men, our merchants, our manufacturers, and our capitalists, will have the vision to see that prosperity in one part of the world ministers to prosperity everywhere: that there is in a very true sense a solidarity of interest throughout the world of enterprise, and that our dealings with the countries that have need of our products and our money will teach them to deem us more than ever friends whose necessities we seek in the right way to serve.

Our new merchant ships, which have in some quarters been feared as destructive rivals, may prove helpful rivals, rather, and common servants, very much needed and very welcome. Our great shipyards, new and old, will be so opened to the use of the world that they will prove immensely serviceable to every maritime people in restoring, much more rapidly than would otherwise have been possible, the tonnage wantonly destroyed in the war. I have only to suggest that there are many points at which we can facilitate American enterprise in foreign trade by opportune legislation and make it easy for American merchants to go where they will be welcomed as friends rather than as dreaded antagonists. America has a great and honorable service to perform in bringing the commercial and industrial undertakings of the world back to their old scope and swing again, and putting a solid structure of credit under them. All our legislation should be friendly to such plans and purposes.

And credit and enterprise alike will be quickened by timely and helpful legislation with regard to taxation. I hope that the Congress will find it possible to undertake an early reconsideration of Federal taxes, in order to make our system of taxation more simple and easy of administration and the taxes themselves as little burdensome as they can be made and yet suffice to support the Government and meet all its obligations. The figures to which those obligations have arisen are very great indeed, but they are not so great as to make it difficult for the nation to meet them, and meet them, perhaps, in a single generation, by taxes which will neither crush nor discourage. These are not so great as they seem, not so great as the immense sums we have had to borrow, added to the immense sums we have had to raise by taxation, would seem to indicate; for a very large proportion of those sums were raised in order that they might be loaned to the governments with which we were associated in the war, and those loans will, of course, constitute assets, not liabilities, and will not have to be taken care of by our taxpayers.

The main thing we shall have to care for is that our taxation shall rest as lightly as possible on the productive resources of the country, that its rates shall be stable, and that it shall be constant in its revenue-yielding power. We have found the main sources from which it must be drawn. I take it for granted that its mainstays will henceforth be the income tax, the excess-profits tax, and the estate tax. All these can so be adjusted to yield constant and adequate returns and yet not constitute a too grievous burden on the taxpayer. A revision of the income tax has already been provided for by the act of 1918, but I think you will find that further changes can be made to advantage both in the rates of the tax and in the method of its collection. The excess-profits tax need not long be maintained at the rates which were necessary while the enormous expenses of the war had to be borne, but it should be made the basis of a permanent system which will reach undue profits without dis-

couraging the enterprise and activity of our business men. The tax on inheritances ought, no doubt, to be reconsidered in its relation to the fiscal systems of the several States, but it certainly ought to remain a permanent part of the fiscal system of the Federal Government also.

Many of the minor taxes provided for in the revenue legislation of 1917 and 1918, though no doubt made necessary by the pressing necessities of the war time, can hardly find sufficient justification under the easier circumstances of peace and can now happily be got rid of. Among these, I hope you will agree, are the excises upon various manufacturers and the taxes upon retail sales. They are unequal in the incidence on different industries and on different individuals. Their collection is difficult and expensive. Those which are levied upon articles sold at retail are largely evaded by the readjustment of retail prices. On the other hand, I should assume that it is expedient to maintain a considerable range of indirect taxes, and the fact that alcoholic liquors will presently no longer afford a source of revenue by taxation makes it the more necessary that the field should be carefully restudied in order that equivalent sources of revenue may be found which it will be legitimate and not burdensome to draw upon. But you have at hand in the Treasury Department many experts who can advise you upon the matters much better than I can. I can only suggest the lines of a permanent and workable system, and the placing of the taxes where they will least hamper the life of the people.

There is, fortunately, no occasion for undertaking in the immediate future any general revision of our system of import duties. No serious danger of foreign competition now threatens American industries. Our country has emerged from the war less disturbed and less weakened than any of the European countries which are our competitors in manufacture. Their industrial establishments have been subjected to greater strain than ours, their labour force to a more serious disorganization, and this is clearly not the time to seek an organized advantage. The work of mere reconstruction will, I am afraid, tax the capacity and the resources of their people for years to come. So far from there being any danger or need of accentuated foreign competition, it is likely that the conditions of the next few years will greatly facilitate the marketing of American manufactures abroad. Least of all should we depart from the policy adopted in the Tariff Act of 1913, of permitting the free entry into the United States of the raw materials needed to supplement and enrich our own abundant supplies.

Nevertheless, there are parts of our tariff system which need prompt attention. The experiences of the war have made it plain that in some cases too great reliance on foreign supply is dangerous, and that in determining certain parts of our tariff policy domestic considerations must be borne in mind which are political as well as economic. Among the industries to which special consideration should be given is that of the manufacture of dyestuffs and related chemicals. Our complete dependence upon German supplies before the war made the interruption of trade a cause of exceptional economic disturbance. The close relation between the manufacturer of dyestuffs, on the one hand, and of explosives and poisonous gases, on the other, moreover, has given the industry an exceptional significance and value. Although the United States will gladly and unhesitatingly join in the programme of international disarmament, it will, nevertheless, be a policy of obvious prudence to make certain of the successful maintenance of many strong and well-equipped chemical plants. The German chemical industry, with which we will be brought into competition, was and may well be again, a thoroughly knit monopoly capable of exercising a competition of a peculiarly insidious and dangerous kind.

The United States should, moreover, have the means of properly protecting itself whenever our trade is discriminated against by foreign nations, in order that we may be assured of that equality of treatment which we hope to accord and to promote the world over. Our tariff laws as they now stand provide no weapon of retaliation in case other governments should enact legislation unequal in its bearing on our products as compared with the products of other countries. Though we are as far as possible from desiring to enter upon any course of retaliation, we must frankly face the fact that hostile legislation by other nations is not beyond the range of possibility, and that it may have to be met by counter legislation. This subject has, fortunately, been exhaustively investigated by the United States Tariff Commission. A recent report of that commission has shown very clearly that we lack and that we ought to have the instruments necessary for the assurance of equal and equitable treatment. The attention of the Congress has been called to this matter on past occasions, and the past measures which are now recommended by the Tariff Commission are substantially the same that have been suggested by previous administrations. I recommend that this phase of the tariff question receive the early attention of the Congress.

Will you not permit me, turning from these matters, to speak once more and very earnestly of the proposed amendment to the Constitution which would extend the suffrage to women and which passed the House of Representatives at the last session of the Congress? It seems to me that every consideration of justice and of public advantage calls for the immediate adoption of that amendment and its submission forthwith to the legislatures of the several States. Throughout all the world this long delayed extension of the suffrage is looked for; in the United States, longer, I believe, than anywhere else, the necessity for it, and the immense advantage of it to the national life, has been urged and debated, by women and men who saw the need for it and urged the policy of it when it required steadfast courage to be so much beforehand with the common conviction; and I, for one, covet for our country the distinction of being among the first to act in a great reform.

The telegraph and telephone lines will of course be returned to their owners so soon as the retransfer can be effected without administrative confusion, so soon, that is, as the change can be made with least possible inconvenience to the public and to the owners themselves. The railroads will be handed over to their owners at the end of the calendar year; if I were in immediate contact with the administrative questions which must govern the retransfer of the telegraph and telephone lines, I could name the exact date for their return also. Until I am in direct contact with the practical questions involved I can only suggest that in the case of the telegraphs and telephones, as in the case of the railways, it is clearly desirable in the public interest that some legislation should be considered which may tend to make of these indispensable instrumentalities of our modern life a uniform and coordinated system which will afford those who use them as complete and certain means of communication with all parts of the country as has so long been afforded by the postal system of the Government, and at rates as uniform and intelligible. Expert advice is, of course, available in this very practical matter, and the public interest is manifest. Neither the telegraph nor the telephone service of the country can be said to be in any sense a national system. There are many confusions and inconsistencies of rates. The scientific means by which communication by such instrumentalities could be rendered more thorough and satisfactory has not been made full use of. An exhaustive study of the whole question of electrical communication and of the means by which the central authority of the nation can be used to unify and improve it, if undertaken, by the appropriate committees of the Congress, would certainly result, indirectly even if not directly, in a great public benefit.

The demobilization of the military forces of the country has progressed to such a point that it seems to me entirely safe now to remove the ban upon the manufacture and sale of wines and beers, but I am advised that without further legislation I have not the legal authority to remove the present restrictions. I therefore recommend that the act approved November 21, 1918, entitled, "An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the purposes of the act entitled 'An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products,' and for other purposes," be amended or repealed in so far as it applies to wines and beers.

I sincerely trust that I shall very soon be at my post in Washington again to report upon the matters which made my presence at the peace table apparently imperative, and to put myself at the service of the Congress in every matter of administration or counsel that may seem to demand executive action or advice.

WOODROW WILSON.

20 MAY, 1919.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Private Soldiers and Sailors' Legion of the United States of America, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the employment on public works of all soldiers, sailors, marines, and war workers who are unable to secure employment in private business, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 2.

To his excellency the President of the United States and to the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Whereas the successful termination of the present World War was largely brought about by the timely participation in the struggle of the land and naval forces of the United States; and

Whereas the United States, in taking up arms against the Central Powers, sought no selfish dominion or indemnities, but waged war in defense of the smaller nationalities, and to further the abolition of future international wars; and

Whereas the President of the United States, in conducting the negotiations leading to an armistice and consequent cessation of bloodshed, laid down certain 14 propositions, some of particular and others of general application, which 14 propositions, having been accepted by the Allied Governments and the Central Powers, constituted, and do still constitute, a solemn and binding contract and agreement between the former belligerents and by reason of their general acceptance have now risen to the dignity of international law; and

Whereas one of the 14 propositions of general application acquiesced in and agreed to as a condition of averting further carnage, and now generally accepted by all enlightened and liberty-loving nations, is the right of self-determination of subject peoples involving the vindication of the American principle that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the Senate and House concurring), That the President of the United States and the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled be, and by these presents are, memorialized and requested to instruct America's delegates to the peace conference to advocate at said conference the application of the principle of self-determination and self-government to Ireland and the Irish people, according to the liberal rules applied to other nationalities and national aspirations. In our judgment nothing will be more conducive to the continuance of cordial relations between ourselves and our international neighbors than a settlement of the centuries-old Irish question according to the principles now dominant everywhere in the civilized world and in keeping with the natural rights of man; be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house be instructed to forward forthwith a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States and to Montana's Representatives in the lower House at Washington, and that the secretary of the senate be likewise instructed to forward a copy of the same to Montana's representatives in the United States Senate.

O. W. BELDEN,
Speaker of the House.
W. W. McDOWELL,
President of the Senate.

Approved February 11, 1919.

S. V. STEWART,
Governor.

Filed February 11, 1919, at 3.50 p. m.

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of house joint memorial No. 2, "Relating to self-government and self-determination for Ireland and Irish people," enacted by the sixteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 11th day of February, 1919.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Montana at Helena, the capital, this 11th day of February, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 6.

To the honorable Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, Washington, D. C.:

Whereas the Department of Agriculture of the Government of the United States had adopted and promulgated various specifications for the grading and inspection of grain under the authority of an act of Congress known as the Federal grain standards act; and

Whereas under the specifications of the grain-grading inspection as provided the amount of moisture allowance and deduction is greater than is warranted from the facts, and thus results in the deduction of greater value being taken from the grower of grain than is equitable and just; and

Whereas the variation of moisture allowed in the specification of grain inspection is such that it results in an unjust discrimination against the growers of winter wheat; and

Whereas the test weight of No. 1 spring wheat, compared with No. 1 hard winter wheat per bushel, is so arranged that it permits of an unfair and unjust discrimination being made by the purchaser of grain against the grain growers; and

Whereas the test weight of No. 1 spring wheat is set at 58 pounds and of No. 1 hard winter wheat is set at 60 pounds, and that the difference in test weight is unfair and unreasonable and works an injustice to the growers of No. 1 hard winter wheat, the test weight of No. 1 hard winter wheat should be reduced to the same test weight as No. 1 northern spring wheat; and

Whereas under the said grain-inspection act the vitreous contents of No. 1 hard winter wheat is set at a higher percentage than for No. 1 northern spring wheat, and thereby results in discrimination against the grower of No. 1 hard winter wheat; and

Whereas that by reason of these standards of grading and testing which result in unjust discrimination against the growers of wheat in the State of Montana to their loss and detriment of about 7 cents a bushel, which sum aggregates approximately $2,000,000 per year: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House concurring) of the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, That we petition the Department of Agriculture of the Government of the United States that, after due investigation, it make such changes in the rules and regulations of the grading and testing of wheat under the grain standards act, so that the same may be more just and equitable to the growers of grain of the State of Montana; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of Montana be directed to prepare and forward copies of the above resolution to the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Montana in Washington, D. C.

W. W. McDOWELL,
President of the Senate.
O. W. BELDEN,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 27, 1919.

S. V. STEWART,
Governor.

Filed February 27, 1919, at 4.40 o'clock p. m.

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of senate joint resolution No. 6, enacted by the sixteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 27th day of February, 1919.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Montana at Helena, the capital, this 27th day of February, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 3, introduced by Roberts.

A memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives praying for the passage of such legislation as may be necessary for the continuance of the United States Employment Service.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress of the United States assembled:

Whereas the United States Government has established offices of the United States Employment Service throughout the State of Montana, serving the people of the entire State; and

Whereas the United States Employment Service, which was created and extended as a solution to the labor employment problems growing out of war-time conditions, has proven its worth to the people of the State of Montana, and has been and is of material value and assistance both to employers in securing labor when workers are wanted and to labor when employment is sought; and

Whereas the people of Montana believe that the usefulness of the United States Employment Service will not cease with the termination of the war, but rather that its fields of service will constantly become broader and more beneficial to the public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana that we do hereby petition and earnestly pray the honorable Congress of the United States for the passage of such legislation as may be necessary for the continuance of the United States Employment Service; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Senate of the United States, and that copies of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the House of Representatives of the United States, and that copies thereof be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the State of Montana with the request that they use every effort within their power to bring about an accomplishment of the ends and purposes herein indicated.

O. W. BELDEN,
Speaker of the House.
W. W. McDOWELL,
President of the Senate.

Approved February 18, 1919.

S. V. STEWART,
Governor.

Filed February 18, 1919, at 4.10 o'clock p. m.

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of house joint memorial No. 3, being "A memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives praying for the passage of such legislation as may be necessary for the continuance of the United States Employment Service," enacted by the sixteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 18th day of February, 1919.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Montana at Helena, the capital, this 18th day of February, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 7, introduced by Gullidge.

A memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives praying for the passage of the educational bill known as Senate bill No. 4987.

Whereas this bill (S. 4987) is designed to remedy in a constructive way existing defects in our public school system, defects which have existed for years but of which our participation in the world war has made us keenly conscious; and

Whereas this bill, by its provisions for the removal of illiteracy, the Americanization of immigrants, the equalization of educational opportunities, the establishment of physical and health education, and the preparation of teachers, recognizes the cooperative responsibility, and provides for the cooperative system of communities, States, and the Nation in carrying on with greater effectiveness than ever before those types of education that are fundamental for individual, community, State, and national welfare; and

Whereas this bill also provides for the creation of an executive department of Government to be known as the Department of Education,

with a Secretary who is to be a member of the President's Cabinet, thus furnishing a proper national agency for carrying out the provisions of the bill and for the unifying of all the education activities, which the Nation is now carrying on, and thus giving the education a new sanction, a sanction which it ought to have because of its service to our Nation; and

Whereas, and finally, the bill will translate into social reality and thus assure to the future the idealism with which and for which our country went in war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, That we do hereby petition and earnestly pray the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States for the passage of Senate bill No. 4987, now pending before it; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of the State of Montana to the Senate of the United States, and that copies of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the House of Representatives of the United States, and that copies thereof be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the State of Montana with the request that they use every effort within their power to bring about the passage of Senate bill No. 4987.

O. W. BELDEN,
Speaker of the House.
J. E. EDWARDS,
President pro tempore of the Senate.

Approved February 21, 1919.

S. V. STEWART,
Governor.

Filed February 21, 1919, at 4.25 o'clock p. m.

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of house joint memorial No. 7, being "A memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives praying for the passage of the educational bill, known as Senate bill No. 4987," enacted by the sixteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State on the 21st day of February, 1919.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Montana at Helena, the capital, this 21st day of February, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 14, introduced by Hathaway.

Memoralizing Congress of the United States to pass the Smith-Bankhead Americanization bill.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas there are 8,000,000 of illiterates and non-English-speaking people in the United States; and

Whereas the war has demonstrated some of our dangers from the large numbers of our foreign-born citizens who have not been definitely assimilated or Americanized, and has brought forth thousands upon thousands of men, native-born Americans for many generations, who can not read or write; and

Whereas these 8,000,000 people must be educated at least sufficiently to read an American newspaper and to know something of what it means to be an American; and

Whereas there is now pending in Congress the Smith-Bankhead Americanization bill, which directs the Bureau of Education to cooperate with the several States in the education of the above-mentioned peoples and in the preparation of teachers for the work: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana do earnestly petition the Congress of the United States to pass Senate bill No. 5464 and House bill 15402; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and is hereby, instructed to transmit copies of this memorial to the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor in the United States Senate and to the chairman of the Committee on Education in the House of Representatives, and to our Senators and Representatives in the United States Congress.

O. W. BELDEN,
Speaker of the House.
W. W. MCDOWELL,
President of the Senate.

Approved March 1, 1919.

S. V. STEWART,
Governor.

Filed March 1, 1919, at 9.55 o'clock a. m.

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of house joint memorial No. 14, being "memorializing Congress of the United States to pass the Smith-Bankhead Americanization bill," enacted by the sixteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 1st day of March, 1919.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Montana at Helena, the capital, this 1st day of March, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 10, introduced by Rasmusson.

A resolution memorializing Congress for the passage of necessary legislation providing for the deportation of undesirable foreigners who claimed exemption from military service on the ground of being a citizen or subject of a neutral country.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas during the recent World War many registrants under the selective service regulations of the United States Government claimed deferred classification upon the ground that they were citizens or subjects of a neutral country, and in many instances such registrants became relieved from liability to military service by withdrawing their intention to become citizens of the United States; and

Whereas practically all of such aliens came to this country for the purpose of securing the protection of the American flag and enjoying the fruits of liberty and the benefits of a constitutional government, and by their conduct have shown that they are unworthy of becoming citizens of the United States of America; and

Whereas many of such aliens are now conspiring or are members of organizations whose underlying, if not their ostensible, purpose is to overthrow our present form of government and to destroy every tradition and right that is sacred to the American people, either peaceably or by bloodshed if necessary, and to substitute for a government of law and order, with individual rights of citizens guaranteed by the Constitution and by the courts, a condition of anarchy and revolution; and

Whereas all of such aliens are dangerous and undesirable residents in this country and are totally unfit to associate with law-abiding persons or to live in a peace-loving nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, That we do hereby petition the Congress of the United States for the passage of necessary legislation prohibiting all such dangerous and undesirable aliens from ever becoming citizens of the United States of America and authorizing their immediate deportation to the country of which they are citizens or subjects; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to both Houses of the National Congress and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana, with the request that they use every effort within their power to bring about the enactment of such legislation.

RONALD HIGGINS,
Speaker pro tempore of the House.
W. W. MCDOWELL,
President of the Senate.

Approved March 4, 1919.

S. V. STEWART,
Governor.

Filed March 5, 1919, at 9.35 a. m.

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of House joint memorial No. 10, "A resolution memorializing Congress for the passage of necessary legislation providing for the deportation of undesirable foreigners who claimed exemption from military service on the ground of being a citizen or subject of a neutral country," enacted by the sixteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 4th day of March, 1919.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Montana at Helena, the capital, this 5th day of March, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 12, in behalf of the Shafter bill in Congress.

To the honorable the Senators and Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana that there has heretofore been introduced in Congress a measure providing, among other things, that all discharged soldiers shall receive a bonus of pay from the date of discharge, and which said measure is styled the Shafter bill; and

Whereas the legislative assembly is of the belief that some effort should be made to provide assistance to the returning soldiers, so that they may, as quickly as possible, be able to adjust themselves to the economic and industrial conditions of civil life; and

Whereas the legislative assembly is of the belief that the Shafter bill presents legislation toward effecting that object: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, your memorialists of the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, do respectfully petition the Congress of the United States that said Shafter bill be enacted; that the secretary of state be instructed to transmit notice of this memorial, properly authenticated, to our Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana.

W. W. MCDOWELL,
President of the Senate.
O. W. BELDEN,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 27, 1919.

S. V. STEWART,
Governor.

Filed February 27, 1919, at 4.40 o'clock p. m.

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of senate joint memorial No. 12, being "a memorial in behalf of the Shafter bill in Congress," enacted by the sixteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 27th day of February, 1919.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Montana at Helena, the capital, this 27th day of February, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint resolution 2, introduced by Edwards.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas Congressman GANDY, of South Dakota, has introduced a bill in Congress providing for the transfer of the Battle Mountain Home, at Hot Springs, S. Dak., to the War Department for use as a hospital for the soldiers of the present war; and also providing for the transfer of the veterans of the Civil and Spanish-American Wars to other homes, principally to the home at Danville, Ill.; and

Whereas the sanitarium at Battle Mountain is for the treatment of all diseases to which the old soldiers are subject, and if they were removed to Danville, Ill., or any of the other homes, the old soldiers would be deprived of this treatment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (the house of representatives concurring), That we, the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, do hereby petition the Congress of the United States that whatever disposition may be made of the Battle Mountain Home, that the old soldiers of the Civil and Spanish-American Wars be not deprived of the benefits of the said sanitarium.

Resolved further, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded to our Senators and Representatives in Congress by the secretary of state, with the request that they use every effort within their power to protect the old soldiers in their right to the benefits of the said sanitarium.

W. W. MCDOWELL,
President of the Senate.
O. W. BELDEN,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 4, 1919.

S. V. STEWART,
Governor.

Filed February 4, 1919, at 1.45 p. m.

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of Senate joint resolution No. 2, "A memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, relating to the transfer of Battle Mountain Home at Hot Springs, S. Dak.," enacted by the sixteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State on the 4th day of February, 1919.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Montana at Helena, the capital, this 4th day of February, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 11, introduced by Mr. Page.

A memorial asking for reduction of home-seeker rates to Montana from eastern points.

To Hon. CARTER GLASS,
Secretary of the Treasury and Director General of Railroads:

Whereas in the past it has been customary for the railroads to give home seekers round-trip tickets from Chicago and other eastern points for about $40; and

Whereas at the present time the said round trip costs in excess of $80; and

Whereas it is expected that many home seekers would like to visit Montana during the coming spring, summer, and fall in quest of homes, but that if this rate continues many of them will be discouraged from making the trip: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, of the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, do earnestly petition your careful consideration of this matter, with the idea, if possible, of affording Montana some relief and by reducing this home seekers' round-trip rate; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and is hereby, instructed to have this memorial prepared authentically and presented to the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana.

W. W. MCDOWELL,
President of the Senate.
O. W. BELDEN,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 27, 1919.

S. V. STEWART,
Governor.

Filed February 27, 1919, at 4.40 o'clock p. m.

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of senate joint memorial No. 11, being "A memorial asking for reduction of home-seeker rates to Montana from eastern points," enacted by the sixteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 27th day of February, 1919.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Montana at Helena, the capital, this 27th day of February, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Substitute for Senate joint memorial 5, introduced by Donlan.

A memorial petitioning Congress to make restoration of railroads to their owners.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas during the period of the recent European war it was deemed by the Government of the United States necessary and expedient that the several railroad systems and telegraph lines of the United States be operated under and by the direct control of the Federal Government, to the end that means of transportation of troops and munitions of war, and the conveyance of information by the telegraph lines, be brought to a state of control necessary to carry and conduct the war to a successful conclusion; and

Whereas the several systems of railroads and telegraph lines of the United States were taken over by the United States Government under the authority of laws passed by the Congress of the United States providing that said railroads and telegraph lines should be returned to the owners of said railroad systems and telegraph lines within a period of 22 months after the conclusion of the war; and

Whereas during the period within which the Government has been in control of the railroad systems and telegraph lines freight and passenger rates of the railroad systems were increased and the rates charged by telegraph lines increased; and

Whereas it is a matter of common repute that during the time said railroad systems and telegraph lines have been under the control and operation of the Federal Government the service rendered by said public utilities has become less efficient, notwithstanding the fact that the public has been charged increased rates for the use of said public utilities; and

Whereas during said period of operation the cost of operation has increased to such an extent that the Federal Government is now and has been during the course of operation paying large sums of money in excess of revenues received; and

Whereas the people of the United States, whether individually or in communities, who must of necessity use the several railroad systems and telegraph lines, have suffered inconveniences by reason of less efficient service; and

Whereas it is apparent that the continued operation of the railroad systems and telegraph lines in the United States by the Federal Government will result in a continued drain upon the people of the United States without any corresponding benefit; and

Whereas it is apparent that longer delay in returning railroad property and telegraph property to its owners will carry with it financial burdens of so great a character as to be almost beyond conception, and that a continuation of the present system of Government control will add to and increase the burden already imposed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, do earnestly petition the Congress of the United States to enact with all possible dispatch and expedition suitable laws and legislation making provision for the early restoration of railroad and telegraph lines of the country to their legitimate owners and that the present Government control of railroad and telegraph lines be terminated at as early a date as possible; and be it further

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, do petition the Congress of the United States that said railroads and railroad property and telegraph property be returned to its rightful and legitimate owners, to be operated under the direct supervision of the Federal Government; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, instructed to transmit copies of this memorial, properly authenticated, to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Montana in the Congress of the United States.

W. W. MCDOWELL,
President of the Senate.
RONALD HIGGINS,
Speaker pro tempore of the House.

Filed March 6, 1919, at 9.15 a. m.

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of substitute for joint memorial No. 5, "A memorial petitioning Congress to make restoration of railroads to their owners," enacted by the sixteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Montana at Helena, the capital, this 6th day of March, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 3, introduced by Craig and Heren.

A memorial to the Congress of the United States and to the Director General of Railroads of the United States.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Director General of the Railroads of the United States:

Your memorialists, the members of the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, the senate and house concurring, respectfully represent:

Whereas the county of Carter, of the State of Montana, at the present time has no railroad facilities by reason of there being no railroad constructed in, across, or through said county; and

Whereas a large portion of the county of Custer, of the State of Montana, adjoining the county of Carter on the western side thereof, is similarly situated; and

Whereas there have settled in the county of Carter and the south half of the county of Custer in the last several years a large number of actual bona fide settlers, who are at the present time cultivating the lands of said district; and

Whereas the said territory embraced in the county of Carter and the south half of the county of Custer contains approximately 10,000 square miles in area; and

Whereas the settlers of said extensive area are growing, cultivating, and producing a large amount of grain, which said grain, at the nearest point, is more than 50 miles distant from any railroad point, and some of the settlers being over 100 miles from the nearest point on any railroad; and

Whereas the settlers within said area are unable to continue to raise grain and have a market therefor at a reasonable profit, and that unless relief is granted to the settlers of this area they will be compelled to abandon the producing and growing of grain; and

Whereas if adequate facilities were accorded to the peoples living within this area the amount of land which would come under cultivation and become productive and produce a large amount of grain would increase at least one hundredfold: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate of the sixteenth legislative assembly (the house concurring), That we, the members of the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, hereby petition and earnestly pray the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and the Director General of Railroads of the United States that they do cause inquiry to be made into the advisability and practicability of the authorization of the construction of a line of railroads across the aforesaid area, and that such relief be granted as speedily as possible to the settlers of said area as may be necessary, to the end that they may continue their farming operations with profit to themselves and benefit to the entire State of Montana.

Resolved further, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded to the Secretary of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Director General of Railroads of the United States, and that copies thereof be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

W. W. MCDOWELL,
President of the Senate.
O. W. BELDEN,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 10, 1919.

S. V. STEWART,
Governor.

Filed February 10, 1919, at 4.20 p. m.

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of senate joint memorial No. 3, "A memorial to the Congress of the United States and to the Director General of Railroads of the United States," enacted by the Sixteenth Session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 10th day of February, 1919.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Montana at Helena, the capital, this 10th day of February, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 8, introduced by Burlingame.

A resolution memorializing Congress for passage of legislation recognizing governmental obligations to producers of essential war minerals.

Whereas upon the entry of the United States Government in the European war certain minerals essential to the manufacture of war material became vital to the successful prosecution of the war; and

Whereas such essential war minerals were in times of peace obtainable from foreign sources and our domestic sources of supply were undeveloped and unknown; and

Whereas when the entry of the United States into the world conflict created conditions which prevented the importation of ores of chrome, tungsten, and manganese, vital to munition requirements, this Government, through various governmental agencies, appealed to American miners to produce such ores from domestic sources, representing the dire distress to follow the shortage of those minerals necessary in the manufacture of war material; and

Whereas Montana's loyal response to this appeal materially increased the national resources in vital war minerals at a time of urgent need; and

Whereas the production of such vital war minerals in this State was due to the individual energy and efforts of Montana prospectors and miners in a field of endeavor involving such uncertain financial reward as to be unattractive to capital as an investment; and

Whereas repeated urgent requests by governmental agencies for increased production in essential war minerals, and particularly for an increase of manganese ore, induced many small operators to undertake more extensive development of such ores, in the belief that the manner in which requests for greater production were made by governmental officials guaranteed a market for the ore; and

Whereas summary refusal by governmental agencies to purchase the ore developed at their request has deprived the producers of manganese ore in this State of a market and of means of retrieving outlays made in developing such ore: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the House of Representatives concurring), That in the sense of this assembly a moral obligation exists between the United States Government and the producers of manganese ore in this State, who through governmental action are facing serious financial loss, as herein recited; and be it further

Resolved, That we hereby petition the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as will result in reimbursing those who have in good faith made outlays to develop war minerals in time of need; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy hereof be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Montana in Congress, with the request for their utmost efforts in obtaining the congressional action herein indicated.

W. W. MCDOWELL,
President of the Senate.
O. W. BELDEN,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 27, 1919.

S. V. STEWART,
Governor.

Filed February 27, 1919, at 4.40 o'clock p. m.

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of senate joint memorial No. 8, being "A resolution memorializing Congress for passage of legislation recognizing governmental obligations to producers of essential war minerals," enacted by the sixteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 27th day of February, 1919.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Montana at Helena, the capital, this 27th day of February, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of the Legislature of Montanan which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 4, introduced by Page.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas upon the declaration of war between the United States of America and Germany and Austria, an increased production of manganese and other minerals in the United States became, and was, vitally essential to the prosecution of said war upon the part of the United States and associated nations; and

Whereas prior to the European war, on account of the heavy production of manganese, especially, by Brazil, Russia, and other countries of the world, by means of cheap and underpaid labor, the producers of manganese in the United States could not produce the same with profit, and little development and exploration for said metal had been undertaken or accomplished; and

Whereas upon the outbreak of said war, and upon the most urgent solicitation upon the part of the United States of America, through its properly constituted and organized boards and officers, and actuated thereunto by patriotic motives, many people in the United States, and particularly in the State of Montana, invested very large sums of money in the acquisition of properties producing manganese and in the exploration and development of said properties; and

Whereas immediately upon the signing of the articles of armistice between the United States, and its associated nations, and said Germany and Austria, all market for manganese in the United States was suspended and cut off, and the same has not been since ther, neither can the same now be, produced with any profit whatever, and only at great loss, and for these reasons many investors in manganese properties have suffered, and are suffering, great loss on account of said investments, and on account of stocks of manganese on hand which can not be sold or disposed of, and unless relief is granted many of said investors will suffer irreparable loss and financial ruin; and

Whereas the situation of said manganese producers and other producers of metals for the prosecution of the war has been considered by the American Mining Congress, when the same convened in the city of Washington on December 16 and 17, 1918, and an appeal to Congress, through and by said American Mining Congress, has heretofore been made for relief in this behalf; and

Whereas there has been introduced in the Senate of the United States, by Senator HENDERSON of the State of Nevada, Senate bill No. 5234, entitled "A bill to supplement an act of Congress approved October 5, 1918 (public, No. 220), and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, from the funds appropriated by said act, to determine, adjust, and pay losses sustained by investments preparatory to production of war minerals mentioned in said act" (manganese being one of the war minerals mentioned in said act), and said bill is now pending before the Congress of the United States for consideration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, do earnestly petition the Congress of the United States to enact said bill into law, to the end that relief may be granted to the manganese miners and producers of the State of Montana and the United States; and we do further earnestly petition the Congress of the United States to enact such further laws and regulations, either by the levying of import duties upon manganese produced in and by the cheap labor of other countries, or otherwise, as will enable the people of the United States to produce and market manganese ores at a reasonable profit, and give suitable and proper encouragement to the manganese industry in the mineral-producing States of the Union; and, be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, instructed to transmit copies of this memorial, properly authenticated, to the Senators and Representatives from the State of Montana in the Congress of the United States.

W. W. MCDOWELL,
President of the Senate.
O. W. BELDEN,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 4, 1919.

S. V. STEWART,
Governor.

Filed February 4, 1919, at 1.45 p. m.

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of senate joint memorial No. 4, "Memorializing Congress to enact Senate bill 5234 into law for

the relief of manganese producers," enacted by the sixteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 4th day of February, 1919.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Montana at Helena, the capital, this fourth day of February, A. D., 1919.

[SEAL.]

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 15, introduced by Gibson.

A memorial to Congress asking Congress to appropriate a sum of money for the building of a hard-surfaced road through the northern portion of the Yellowstone Park, leading from Gardiner, Mont., to Cooke City, Mont., or to dedicate a strip of ground through the Yellowstone Park for such road.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

Whereas Congress did set aside and reserve land from the Territories of Montana and Wyoming, in the year 1872 for the purpose of preserving to the people of the United States the wonderful scenic and unusual natural phenomena therein contained, which said reservation of land constitutes the Yellowstone National Park; and

Whereas the act dedicating this land as the said park was so worded as to prevent the use of said park for commercial use or purpose of private gain, it being under the direction of the Interior Department of our Government, and maintained in large part by annual appropriations for the Yellowstone National Park, made by the Congress of the United States, which said appropriations are never in excess of the minimum needs of the administration of said park as at present operated for the enjoyment of tourists visiting the locations of greatest interest and scenic beauty; and

Whereas there was discovered in 1871 a mineral area situated a few miles northeast of the northeast corner of said park, of most promising prospect, which said mineral area is known as the New World Unorganized Mining District, Park County, Mont., and is approximately an area 10 miles east and west by 15 miles north and south and situated entirely within the boundary of the said county of Park, of the State of Montana; and

Whereas since the year of this discovery there have been great labor and money expenditures in said district in prospecting and developing the same, there having been made as many as 6,000 mineral locations in said district, and there having been expended in attempts to develop the same approximately $3,000,000; and as a result of said attempts to develop said district there has been proved the existence of valuable deposits of gold, silver, lead, copper, and many other minerals of slightly greater value than the average of such minerals as are mined and exported at a profit from other mining districts closer to transportation; and

Whereas it has been impossible for the owners of said claims to make a profit from their mining operations in said district, owing to the bad road conditions existing between the said mining district and its nearest shipping point, viz, Gardiner, Mont., a distance of 56 miles, of which distance 50 miles lies within the boundaries of the Yellowstone National Park, and therefore all traffic over said portion of said route being under the rules of the Department of the Interior, and half of said road being the tourist route, with many long and heavy grades thereon, rendering its use by ore trucks, during the tourist season in particular, very difficult; and

Whereas after a careful investigation and inspection by competent mining men and engineers from all over the United States of the said mining district and of the means and directions of ingress and egress from said district, it is the unanimous opinion that said district will become a large and prosperous one if afforded adequate transportation facilities which would enable it to more cheaply develop the many promising mining prospects situated within the said district, and known to contain large deposits of most valuable minerals; and further, that the most feasible, practical, and only present method of improving said transportation facilities is the building of a hard-surface motor road on water grade through the Yellowstone National Park from Gardiner, Mont., to the commercial center of the said New World Mining District, Cooke, Mont., which said water-grade road should follow in general the north bank of the Yellowstone River from Gardiner, Mont., to a point opposite the Tower Falls Station in the Yellowstone National Park, a distance of about 20 miles; from which point it would proceed up the Lamar River on its north bank, a distance of 16 miles to the mouth of Soda Butte Creek; from which point it would proceed up the Soda Butte Creek to the northeast boundaries of the said Yellowstone National Park, a distance of 14 miles and approximately 3 miles from Cooke, Mont., from which point it would proceed up the Soda Butte Creek to Cooke, a distance of approximately 3 miles, which said 3 miles lies wholly within the boundaries of Park County, Mont.; and

Whereas it further appears that the portion of this route lying within the boundary of the Yellowstone National Park can be cheaply and quickly built at a moderate cost per mile, and laid on a grade not exceeding 3 per cent in any place; and that motor trucks operated on such a hard surface road could haul supplies and ore to and from the said mining district at such a reasonable cost as would enable the said mining district to quickly and economically develop its vast resources, adding the same to the mineral wealth of our great State; and

Whereas it further appears that this district is so situated as to make the only practical route by which adequate transportation facilities can be afforded at this time, that through the Yellowstone National Park hereinbefore mentioned and described; that all other possible routes, two in number, one being from Columbus, Mont., up the Stillwater River, a distance of 98 miles, the upper 20 miles being over 8,500 feet above sea level; the other being from Belfry, Mont., up the Clarks Fork River to Cooke, a distance of 115 miles, through extremely mountainous country on its upper 50 miles, have been most carefully investigated, and that construction costs on same are so enormous as to render the same prohibitive at this time, and prohibitive at any time until there shall have been developed and proven within this district such vast reserves of ore as would cost many years of work and millions of dollars to develop, all of which would of necessity be done at a tremendous loss, unless more adequate transportation facilities were afforded the district while the same was being done; and

Whereas in the past many thousands of dollars have been expended by the property owners of the district in endeavoring to secure from Congress rights to build railroads, etc., to the said district through the Yellowstone National Park, along the route heretofore described in this memorial, all of which said efforts have served only to prove that it is impossible for private individuals to so obtain the relief prayed for, and to further convince those owning property in the district that it would be impossible to finance the building of such a road through the boundaries of the Yellowstone National Park on any permit which is now within the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to grant, owing to the fact that such permit must of necessity, under the laws of Congress dedicating this park, be subject to revocation by the said Secretary of the Interior at his will and pleasure, making it a matter of such extreme jeopardy, to anyone who might invest his money in such an enterprise, as to make it impossible to obtain sufficient funds for such purpose from the investing public or from any business person or corporation; and

Whereas it further appears that the building and operation of such motor route as hereinbefore described in the memorial would in no way or sense interfere with or destroy any of the scenic beauties of the said Yellowstone National Park, or do any damage to the said park, or to the many species of wild game, which so abundantly live and flourish within its boundaries, but would, on the contrary, make the administration of the said park and its enjoyment by the visitors touring the same more pleasurable and profitable; and that the Government of the United States, in the building and maintaining of such a road and charging a reasonable toll per ton for the transportation of ore and supplies thereon, would in a few years have such a large income from the road alone as would probably make the Yellowstone National Park self-sustaining: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, That Congress be requested to appropriate as soon as possible a sufficient sum not in excess of $1,500,000 with which to build that part of this road which lies within the boundaries of the said Yellowstone National Park, as hereinbefore described; that the road be built with a hard surface, adapted to withstand the destruction of heavy motor trucks operating thereon, and that it be built with such surface at least 20 feet wide;

Or, that Congress dedicate a strip of ground 200 feet wide along the route hereinbefore described, within the boundaries of the Yellowstone National Park, which said strip shall be available for the permanent use of the New World Unorganized Mining District, for the purpose of building a motor road thereon, subject to such rules for the use of the same as shall be equitably suited to its needs and established by the Secretary of the Interior, but not subject to revocation for such permanent use by the Secretary of the Interior; and it is further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and is hereby, instructed to transmit copies of this memorial, properly authenticated, to the honorable Secretary of the Interior and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana.

RONALD HIGGINS,
Speaker pro tempore of the House.
W. W. MCDOWELL,
President of the Senate.

Approved March 4, 1919.

S. V. STEWART,
Governor.

Filed March 5, 1919, at 9.35 a. m.

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of house joint memorial No. 15, "A memorial to Congress asking Congress to appropriate a sum of money for the building of a hard-surfaced road through the northern portion of the Yellowstone Park, leading from Gardiner, Mont., to Cooke City, Mont., or to dedicate a strip of ground through the Yellowstone Park for such road," enacted by the sixteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 4th day of March, 1919.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Montana at Helena, the capital, this 5th day of March, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 6, introduced by Brandjord.

Praying that the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, enact into law Senate bill No. 940, now pending in that honorable body.

To the honorable House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States assembled:

Whereas there is now pending before you Senate bill No. 940, introduced by the Hon. H. L. MYERS, Senator from Montana, providing for the payment for certain lands within the former Flathead Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana; and

Whereas this bill provides a just and fair solution of the controversy over the appraisal of more than 1,100 acres of land on the former Flathead Indian Reservation in the State of Montana, now occupied by approximately 200 actual and bona fide settlers and home builders, which land has been appraised at approximately $65,000 more than the settlers and home builders had good and sufficient reason to believe would be the appraisal of these lands; and

Whereas the settlement embodied in the said Senate bill No. 940 would be entirely just and fair not only to the settlers on the lands in question, but also to the Indians whose funds and rights are affected; and

Whereas the bill is recommended by the Hon. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, and by the Hon. William H. Ketcham, member of the Board of Indian Commissioners, which board made a special investigation of the appraisal sought to be corrected by the said Senate bill No. 940, and the approvals of these high officials have been set forth in the report of the Senate Committee on Public Lands dated March 20, 1916, and accompanying Senate bill No. 1059; and

Whereas we, the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, feel satisfied that the settlers on the former Flathead Indian Reservation are fairly and justly entitled to relief afforded by Senate bill No. 940, now before you: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, That we do hereby petition and earnestly pray you, the honorable House of Representatives of the United States, to enact into law the said Senate bill No. 940, to the end that justice may prevail; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the House of Representatives of the United States and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

O. W. BELDEN,
Speaker of the House.
W. W. MCDOWELL,
President of the Senate.

Approved March 1, 1919.

S. V. STEWART,
Governor.

Filed March 1, 1919, at 9.55 o'clock a. m.

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of house joint memorial No. 6, being "praying that the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, enact into law Senate bill No. 940, now pending in that honorable body," enacted by the sixteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 1st day of March, 1919.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Montana at Helena, the capital, this 1st day of March, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 11, introduced by Brandjord.

Petition to the Congress of the United States, asking for a $3,000,000 appropriation for the Flathead irrigation project, in the State of Montana, for the years 1919 and 1920, to the end that the said project may be speedily completed and that a considerable amount of work may be provided for returning soldiers and sailors.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States assembled:

SECTION 1. We, the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, the house and the senate concurring, do hereby most respectfully set forth:

That the Flathead irrigation project, in the State of Montana, has made slow progress on account of the uncertainty and insufficiency of the congressional appropriations, and that this slowness of progress has brought about a heavy increase in the construction cost and has resulted in financial loss, hardships, and suffering to numerous settlers and home makers waiting for the water to become available; that

This project is in the hands of highly efficient management, capable of conducting the prosecution of this work on a large scale, both economically and scientifically; that

The problem of furnishing useful employment for returning soldiers and sailors is both National and a State problem, highly patriotic in character, and stupendous in its magnitude and importance, and that the vigorous prosecution of this irrigation project would furnish a considerable amount of work for our returning soldiers and sailors:

SEC. 2. In consideration of the fact set forth in section 1 hereof, We, the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, the house and the senate concurring, do hereby respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to appropriate the sum of $3,000,000 for the prosecution of the Flathead irrigation project during the years 1919 and 1920.

SEC. 3. It is hereby directed that the secretary of state of the State of Montana transmit copies of this memorial to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

O. W. BELDEN,
Speaker of the House.
W. W. MCDOWELL,
President of the Senate.

Approved March 1, 1919.

S. V. STEWART,
Governor.

Filed March 1, 1919, at 9.55 o'clock a. m

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of house joint memorial No. 11, being "Petition to the Congress of the United States asking for a $3,000,000 appropriation for the Flathead irrigation project, in the State of Montana, for the years 1919 and 1920, to the end that the said project may be speedily completed and that a considerable amount of work may be provided for returning soldiers and sailors," enacted by the sixteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 1st day of March, 1919.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Montana at Helena, the capital, this 1st day of March, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 2, introduced by Slayton.

A resolution memorializing Congress to pass legislation for the purpose of issuing patents to all homesteaders who have served in any branch of the Army or Navy in the present world war, providing settlement and certain improvements were made prior to enlistment.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas under the present laws of the United States it is necessary that anyone taking up a homestead on public lands live thereon a certain minimum prescribed time and conform to certain laws relative to improvements thereon and pay certain fees in connection therewith before patent to the same can be issued, irrespective of whether or not such homesteader has served his country in any of the numerous branches of the Army or Navy in the present world war; and

Whereas there have been thousands of cases throughout the western part of the United States where bona fide homesteaders were forced to sell their stock and ranching equipment at a great sacrifice, in some instances practically giving it away, when called upon to enter our country's service; and

Whereas in such cases, by reason of the fact that such homesteaders were compelled to sell their property at such a low price they will be unable on their return from the service to resume their ranching or farming operations by reason of the fact that they are without sufficient funds to do so, and they will be unable to borrow money without difficulty, or have any credit extended to them, by reason of the fact that they do not have title to the land they were living on prior to their enlistment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana and House of Representatives concurring therein, That we do hereby petition Congress of the United States for the passage of legislation relieving all bona fide homesteaders who were engaged in some branch of the Army or Navy in the present war, and who had made some improvements of a substantial nature on their land and established their residence thereon prior to their enlistment from any further residence or the making of any additional improvements thereon before patent can be issued to them, and that patent be issued to them on their request upon proof being made that such residence was established and improvements made prior to their enlistment, and without the payment of any fees whatsoever; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of the State of Montana to the honorable Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives from the State of Montana, requesting them to exert every possible effort within their power to enact such legislation.

W. W. MCDOWELL,
President of the Senate.
O. W. BELDEN,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 6, 1919.

S. V. STEWART,
Governor.

Filed February 6, 1919, at 2.45 p. m.

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss.

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of senate joint memorial No. 2, "A resolution memorializing Congress to pass legislation for the purpose of issuing patents to all homesteaders who served in any branch of the Army or Navy in the present world war, providing settlement and certain improvements were made prior to enlistment," enacted by the sixteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 4th day of February, 1919.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Montana at Helena, the capital, this 4th day of February, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

Mr. LODGE presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, 1919.

Resolutions in favor of Armenian independence.

Resolved, That it is the opinion of the General Court of Massachusetts that the people of Armenia, by their resolute and faithful maintenance of Christianity and civilization through long centuries of unspeakable oppression by the barbarous Turk; by their capacity for business and administration, well proven and demonstrated in their own land and in many other lands; and by their heroic conduct and great sacrifices in the present war have shown that they are worthy to be restored as an independent nation; and that we do therefore earnestly request and urge that prompt and favorable action be taken on the resolution introduced in the Senate of the United States by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE on December 10, 1918, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, declaring that in the opinion of the Senate of the United States Armenia ought to be independent, and expressing the hope of the Senate that the peace conference will make arrangements for helping Armenia to establish an independent republic; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the commonwealth to the President and to the Vice President of the United States and to the Senators in Congress from Massachusetts.

In senate, adopted March 4, 1919.

In house of representatives, adopted, in concurrence, March 7, 1919.

A true copy. Attest:

ALBERT P. LANGTRY,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. LODGE presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, 1919.

Resolutions in favor of Irish independence.

Whereas the General Court of Massachusetts reaffirms as the fundamental doctrine of our institutions that all governments "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," a great truth which, expressed under the designation of the "self-determination of

peoples," the President of the United States and the other great leaders of progressive ideas among the allied nations are proposing to put into practical execution in the interest of oppressed nationalities, like Belgium, Servia, Montenegro, and other States whose interests and aspirations have been set at naught because of the dominance of the opposing principle that might makes right; and

Whereas no people better deserves the blessings of the right of self-determination than the people of Ireland, the service of whose sons in the colonization of America, in the winning of its independence, in the founding of its institutions and the creation of its wealth and prosperity, has placed America and democratic government everywhere in its everlasting debt: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges upon the President of the United States and his associates in framing the final terms of peace, as a matter of simple justice and as one of the guaranties of the continuance of peace and contentment in Ireland, the granting of complete independence to the Irish people; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the representatives of the United States at the peace conference, to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, and to the Senators in Congress from this Commonwealth.

In senate, adopted February 14, 1919.

In house of representatives, adopted, in concurrence, February 25, 1919.

A true copy. Attest:

ALBERT P. LANGTRY,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. LODGE presented resolutions adopted by the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, 1919.

Resolutions favoring an early consummation of peace and the subsequent establishment of a league of nations.

Whereas on the 11th day of November, 1918, an armistice was signed by the representatives of the allied powers and of Germany; and

Whereas in consequence of the victory of the Allies and of the United States a peace conference convened and is now holding sessions in Paris for the purpose of settling the terms of peace; and

Whereas a conference committee thereof has proposed a constitution for a league of nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in the opinion of the General Court of Massachusetts the nations of the world should do everything in their power to bring about a prompt peace and general disarmament; and

Whereas the constitution of the league of nations, as reported in the peace conference, is not wholly acceptable to the citizens of Massachusetts: Therefore be it further

Resolved, That it is also the opinion of the General Court of Massachusetts that the negotiations on the part of the United States should immediately be directed to the business of formulating peace terms with Germany satisfactory to the nations at war with her, and that any proposal for a league of nations or any agreement intended to insure the permanent peace of the whole world should then be considered by the peace conference without further delay.

Resolved, That certified copies of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Vice President, as presiding officer of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts.

In senate, adopted March 28, 1919.

In house of representatives, adopted in concurrence April 8, 1919.

A true copy. Attest:

ALBERT P. LANGTRY,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. LODGE presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, 1919.

Resolutions favoring an early discharge from the United States Army of all soldiers, except those in the Regular Army, who desire to be discharged.

Whereas the present state of affairs in Europe permits of a great reduction in the size of the Army now maintained by the United States; and

Whereas the number of men who are willing and able to serve for the duration of the war or longer is adequate for any probable need, and a much larger number are anxious to return to their homes and to positions where they are urgently needed; and

Whereas the retention of such men in the service means in many cases a loss of positions now awaiting them, and serious hardship to themselves and their families: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges upon Congress the passage of House bill No. 13443, now pending therein, or some similar legislation, to provide for the prompt and honorable discharge from the Army, with adequate pay and mileage allowance to convey them home, of all enlisted men in the military service not included in the Regular Army, who shall file with their commanding officer a statement in writing that such is their desire; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the commonwealth to the Members of Congress from Massachusetts and to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress.

In house of representatives, adopted February 14, 1919.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, February 19, 1919.

A true copy. Attest:

ALBERT P. LANGTRY,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. LODGE presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, 1919.

Resolutions urging Congress to pass certain legislation relative to aliens who avoided military service in the present war.

Whereas certain aliens, not being alien enemies, resident in this country, claimed exemption from military service in the Army of the United States during the present war by reason of alienage, or failed to respond to the call for military or naval service from their respective countries: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges upon the Congress of the United States the passage of such legislation as will prevent the aliens aforesaid from hereafter becoming citizens, and also the passage of legislation to prevent the return to this country of any such aliens who hereafter leave the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the commonwealth to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted February 26, 1919.

In senate, adopted in concurrence March 3, 1919.

A true copy. Attest:

ALBERT P. LANGTRY,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. LODGE presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, 1919.

Resolutions in favor of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to regulate the hours of labor.

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby records its belief that the public interest will be better served and the hardships of human life ameliorated by national regulation of the hours of labor, and respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution giving to Congress power to regulate the hours of labor and to make the same uniform throughout the United States; and

Resolved, That certified copies of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the commonwealth to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Massachusetts.

In house of representatives, adopted February 18, 1919.

In senate, adopted in concurrence February 21, 1919.

A true copy. Attest:

ALBERT P. LANGTRY,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. LODGE presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, 1919.

Resolutions relative to Federal taxation of the income of manufacturers employing women or minors for excessive working hours.

Whereas the diversity of the labor laws of the several States is the cause of unfair and unequal industrial competition, and an obstacle to the passage by this Commonwealth of further humane legislation affecting hours and conditions of labor, especially in respect to women and minors; and

Whereas the only agency that can effectively overcome this diversity and insure uniformity in the hours and conditions of labor affecting women and minors is the Congress of the United States under its comprehensive powers of taxation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges upon Congress the wisdom and necessity of levying upon all manufacturers who employ minors under 16 years of age more than 8 hours daily or women more than 9 hours daily, or either more than 48 hours weekly, an income tax large enough to prohibit such employment; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the commonwealth to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of both branches of Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth.

In senate, adopted February 21, 1919.

In house of representatives, adopted in concurrence February 27, 1919.

A true copy. Attest:

ALBERT P. LANGTRY,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. LODGE presented a memorial of the Central Labor Union of Worcester, Mass., remonstrating against national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Building Trades Council of Lawrence, Mass., praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which was referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Young Men's Catholic Temperance Society, of Salem, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation granting six months' additional pay to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for the ratification of the league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted at a meeting of sundry citizens of Brighton, Mass., favoring the self-determination of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GRONNA presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, which was referred to the

Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA.

To all to whom these presents shall come:

I, Thomas Hall, secretary of state for the State of North Dakota, do hereby set forth and certify that the following is the full text and the whole thereof of a certain concurrent resolution adopted by the sixteenth legislative assembly of the State of North Dakota.

Dated at the capitol in Bismarck, N. Dak., this 3d day of March, 1919.

[SEAL.] THOMAS HALL,
Secretary of State.

Concurrent resolution favoring the establishment of a league of nations to enforce peace, and aim at promoting the liberty, progress, and orderly development of the world.

Whereas the war now brought to a victorious close by the associated power of the free nations of the world was above all else a war to end war and protect human rights: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring), That we favor the establishment of a league of nations of which the United States shall be a member. We believe that such a league should aim at promoting the liberty, progress, and orderly development of the world; that it should clinch the victory won at such terrible sacrifice by having the united potential force of all its members as a standing menace against any nation that seeks to upset the peace of the world; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the President and to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress and to each of the United States Senators and Representatives from the State of North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA.

To all to whom these presents shall come:

I, Thomas Hall, secretary of state for the State of North Dakota, do hereby set forth and certify that the following is the full text and the whole thereof of a certain concurrent resolution adopted by the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota.

Dated at the capitol in Bismarck, N. Dak., this 3d day of March, 1919.

THOMAS HALL,
Secretary of State.

Concurrent resolution favoring direct rail routes.

Whereas the Federal Government of the United States is presumably operating all railroads as a unit for the benefit of the entire people of the United States, irrespective of selfish interests of the former management of several individual lines of railroad; and

Whereas we believe the shortest and best possible routes between all points on existing lines should be utilized and reasonable train service established thereon and reasonable rates be charged for service rendered; and

Whereas there are no through passenger or through freight trains operating via Linton, N. Dak. (the northern terminal of the branch line of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad), between points on said railroad in South Dakota and Bismarck, the capital of North Dakota; and

Whereas the past and present policy of the management of the Northern Pacific Railroad Co. has been to obstruct and prevent the establishment of through freight and passenger service via Linton on the shortest line between western North Dakota and central South Dakota; and

Whereas the people of both North and South Dakota are entitled to much better, shorter, cheaper passenger and freight service than that now offered between these sections; and

Whereas at Bismarck, N. Dak., there are ample terminal facilities, roundhouses, machine shops, stock yards, side tracks, and division superintendent's headquarters on the Soo Railway and lines for the North and West, as well as for the East, diverge at Bismarck, N. Dak., where connection may be made with Missouri River boats; and

Whereas through train service may profitably be established by utilizing a short mileage on each of the three railroads; and

Whereas an emergency exists in that the immense lignite fields of North Dakota remain undeveloped and the live-stock industry of western North Dakota would be greatly stimulated were it not for the excessive rates of freight and inadequate train service provided between North Dakota and South Dakota: Therefore be it

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be urged to present to the Hon. Walker D. Hines, Director General of Railroads, the protest of the State of North Dakota against the prevailing railroad passenger and freight service between west North Dakota and South Dakota, and the excessive rates now charged for inadequate service established by the former management of the Northern Pacific Co. to the exclusion of the railroads from the capital of North Dakota; and further be it

Resolved, That the Director General of Railroads be urged to direct the immediate establishment of through passenger train service and through freight train service, using the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul tracks from South Dakota points to Linton, N. Dak., and the Northern Pacific Railway tracks from Linton, N. Dak., to Moffit, N. Dak., and the Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway tracks from Moffit, N. Dak., to Bismarck, where he may utilize the terminals of the Soo Line at Bismarck; and that the Director General of Railroads be urged to prepare reasonable joint through rates for the service to be rendered based upon the mileage of each line used.

Mr. GRONNA presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA.

To all to whom these presents shall come:

I, Thomas Hall, secretary of state for the State of North Dakota, do hereby set forth and certify that the following is the full text and the whole thereof of a certain concurrent resolution adopted by the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota.

Dated at the capitol in Bismarck, N. Dak, this 18th day of March, 1919.

THOMAS HALL,
Secretary of State.

Concurrent resolution urging Congress to pass such legislation as is necessary to authorize Government control of all the railroads in the United States for a period of five years from and after the 1st of January, 1919.

Whereas the Government of the United States has taken control of all the railroads in the United States during the great World War; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has not had control of the railroads for a sufficient period of time to fairly test the desirability of permanent Government control of railroads; and

Whereas Director General McAdoo has recommended to Congress that the railroads of the United States be under Government control for a period of five years from and after the 1st of January, 1919; and

Whereas it is the sense of this legislature that the Government should try out thoroughly the feasibility of Government control and ownership of railroads; and

Whereas five years appears to be no more than a reasonable time to give such a question a fair and thorough trial: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That they urge Congress to pass such legislation as is necessary to authorize Government control of all the railroads in the United States for a period of five years from and after the 1st of January, 1919; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state send a copy of this resolution, one to each Senator and Member of Congress for North Dakota and to the chairman of the Committee on Railroads of the National Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. WARREN presented a resolution adopted by the Delta Meta Delphian Chapter, of Rock Springs, Wyo., and a resolution adopted at a community welfare meeting at Bosler, Wyo., favoring the ratification of the league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 2700, United Mine Workers of America, of Crosby, Wyo., and a petition of Local Union No. 1074, United Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees and Railway Shop Laborers, of Sheridan, Wyo., praying for the continuance of Federal control of railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution 56, A.

Joint resolution memoralizing Congress to continue appropriations for United States employment service.

Whereas for some time the United States employment service has been rendering very great aid in securing positions for the unemployed; and

Whereas the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives has seen fit to strike from the appropriation bill all appropriations made for the continuation of such employment service, against the protest of a strong minority of said committee; and

Whereas if the action of said committee is not reversed, all the Federal employment offices in the United States will be closed on April 1, 1919, for lack of funds; and

Whereas the need of such employment service is required now as never before, due to the fact that we are demobilizing hundreds of thousands of men from military into industrial life: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That Congress be respectfully requested to appropriate such sums of money for the United States employment service as will enable the Department of Labor to continue this very efficient work; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, properly attested, be forwarded to the Senators and Representatives from the State of Wisconsin.

RILEY S. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
EDWARD F. DITTMAR,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution 68, A.

Joint resolution relating to the labor controversy in the city of Madison.

Whereas the National War Labor Board, after careful and thorough consideration made, on February 18, 1919, certain awards and determinations in the labor disputes between the machinists and other employees of nine different companies and corporations in the city of Madison and their employers; and

Whereas an agreement of submission to the arbitration of the National War Labor Board was signed by these nine corporations and companies; and

Whereas all but one of these employers have refused and now, after nearly two months, still do persistently refuse to abide by the determination and awards of the National War Labor Board: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the National War Labor Board is hereby urgently requested to take such steps as may be possible, necessary, and effective to bring about a prompt and complete enforcement of the awards and determinations of the National War Labor Board duly made in its case, docket No. 195, entitled Machinists et al. *v.* Employers of Madison, Wis.

Resolved further, That if legislation seems necessary to bring about such a prompt and effective enforcement of such awards, that the National War Labor Board is urged to present such facts to Congress with a recommendation for such necessary legislation.

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution, duly attested, be sent to the National War Labor Board, and as soon as Congress shall

be in session that duly attested copies be sent to the presiding officers and to all the Members from this State in both Houses of the Congress of the United States.

RILEY S. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
EDWARD F. DITTMAR,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution 52, S.

Joint resolution memorializing Congress in behalf of the farmers to repeal the law advancing the time one hour.

Whereas the conditions imposed by turning the clocks one hour ahead are a source of great inconvenience and annoyance to, and in many cases work a hardship on the majority of our citizens, including practically all of the farmers, and many of the other laboring men, their wives, and families, working special hardships on those women who rise early to prepare the worker's morning meal and noon lunch, who are deprived of the summer morning daylight, and have it added at the evening to keep their small children awake and deprive these mothers of much of their evening freedom, and widespread dissatisfaction prevails among them because the law, which they supposed was only a war-time measure, is still in force: Be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That Congress be memorialized to repeal the law by which the time of day was advanced one hour, so that the farmers and others may continue their avocation, so necessary and vital to the Nation, unhampered by such unnatural interference and secure from their labors the largest possible returns not only for themselves but also for the country and world at large; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, signed by the presiding officers of each house, be forwarded to the Senators and Congressmen from this State.

EDWARD F. DITTMAR,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
RILEY S. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution 76, A.

Joint resolution memorializing Congress for the speedy withdrawal of the American forces from Russia.

Whereas in the prosecution of the great war our Government has seen fit to send American forces, including Wisconsin troops, into Russia; and

Whereas by virtue of the signing of the armistice on November 11, 1918, the same reasons which pertained to the maintenance of American troops in Russia were obliterated; and

Whereas Congress has never declared war against Russia; and

Whereas in the best interest of our country's welfare it seems unnecessary under existing circumstances to imperil the lives of our troops to the desolation, dangerous and rigorous climatic conditions, and perils existing in far-distant Russia; and

Whereas the best interests of our troops demand that they be removed from the intolerable conditions to which they are now subject: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That Congress be memorialized to pass such laws and take such action therefor as it shall deem necessary for the speedy return of all American troops from Russia.

Resolved further, That a copy of these resolutions, properly attested by the presiding officer of each house, be forwarded to the President of the United States, the representatives of the United States at the peace conference, the Secretary of War, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Wisconsin in the Congress of the United States. That as soon as the Congress of the United States shall be in session duly attested copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the presiding officers of each House.

RILEY S. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
EDWARD F. DITTMAR,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. FA FOLLETTE presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution 50, A.

Joint resolution relating to the league of nations.

Resolved, That the Legislature of Wisconsin is profoundly impressed by the momentous character of the constitution of the proposed league of nations recently cabled from Paris, by its supremely just and exalted purpose, by its sound generalities and elastic quality, and desires promptly to go on record as favoring its spirit and design, relatively as presented, and as urging the Senators in Congress from Wisconsin to give to it, in treaty form, friendly consideration to the utmost degree consistent with the safeguarding and preservation of our national sovereignty, which sovereignty, we believe, can not be threatened by it in any possible measure comparable with the beneficent possibilites affecting humanity and civilization that it embraces.

Resolved further, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

RILEY S. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
EDWARD F. DITTMAR,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution 39, A.

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to refund insurance premiums paid by soldiers, sailors, and marines under the soldiers' and sailors' insurance act during the war, and to permit such soldiers, sailors, and marines to continue such insurance after discharge.

Whereas Congress has provided a plan of insurance for soldiers, sailors, and marines under "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department,'" approved October 6, 1917; and

Whereas such insurance was planned to care for the dependents of soldiers, sailors, and marines by insurance in place of by pensions; and

Whereas the cost of such insurance except the expense of administration and excess mortality and disability is borne by the enlisted men themselves; and

Whereas the entire financial burdens of every activity connected with the war, including the obligations resulting from casualities, should be borne by all the people, rather than by the soldiers, sailors, and marines alone who have already done their great share of carrying such burdens; and

Whereas such insurance was provided to take the place of pensions to care for the soldiers, sailors, and marines and their dependents, policies of insurance issued thereunder should be continued at the option of such soldiers, sailors, and marines: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, respectfully memorialized to provide for the refunding to soldiers, sailors, and marines all amounts paid by them as premiums for such war-risk insurance prior to their being mustered out and to provide or continue the policy of maintaining such insurance after being mustered out as term insurance, with the option of converting the same into any of the usual forms to be carried by the soldier, sailor, or marine; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted by the chief clerk of the assembly to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and also to the Representatives from this State in the Congress of the United States.

RILEY S. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
EDWARD F. DITTMAR,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Fisheries and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution 28, A.

Joint resolution urging the Congress of the United States to enact legislation relating to the conservation of fish and clams in the Mississippi River and its branches in the States of Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin.

Whereas the fishing and clamming industry in the Mississippi River and its branches in the States of Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin has become of vital importance in the production of food; and

Whereas this industry in the States mentioned has been greatly retarded in its proper development because of the lack of uniform laws providing definite and uniform regulations governing the industry; and

Whereas, the Legislatures of Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin heretofore have been unable to agree upon laws which would provide such uniform and definite regulations: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this legislature respectfully memorialize and urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation governing and regulating fishing and clamming in the Mississippi River and its tributaries in the States of Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin; and be it further

Resolved, That a suitable copy of this resolution, properly attested by the presiding officers and chief clerks of both houses, be forwarded to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each United States Senator and Congressman from this State.

RILEY S. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
EDWARD F. DITTMAR,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution 42.

Joint resolution relating to a deep waterway from Oshkosh to Green Bay.

Whereas the failure of the transportation companies to keep pace with the commercial requirements of the country, and especially the great Northwest, has become a question of national importance; and

Whereas the building of ship canals and the digging of deeper waterways under proper restrictions would furnish work for the unemployed and be of lasting benefit to the people of this country; and
Whereas on the Fox River, between Oshkosh and Green Bay, smaller boats now travel and the largest boats could travel if the river was widened and deepened or if a suitable ship canal was built; and
Whereas the enlarging of this river, permitting travel and transportation from this part of the State, and thence directly into Lake Michigan, would be of the greatest possible benefit to the people of the northeastern part of this State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That our Representatives in Congress are hereby requested to use their best endeavor to secure such an appropriation as will permit either the making of a deep waterway or a ship canal between the points herein suggested; and that copies of this resolution, signed by the presiding officers of both houses and attested by the chief clerks, be transmitted to each such Representative.

EDWARD F. DITTMAR,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
F. N. GRAAN,
Speaker pro tempore of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution 41, A.

Joint resolution relating to the cheese, butter, and feed industry, and to the supply of and prices for cheese, butter, and feed at the present time.

Whereas the price of American full-cream cheese was up to a rate ranging from 35 cents to 38 cents per pound during the fall of 1918 and until some recent date in January, 1919, although the central powers and most of the neutral powers were not being supplied; and
Whereas after the cessation of hostilities the price of these commodities showed a tendency to drop, and has recently dropped to about 27 cents or 28 cents per pound; and
Whereas despite the need of food in Europe it is commonly reported that the large storage warehouses are filled to their utmost capacity with this food product; and
Whereas our farmers are being charged such high prices for wheat bran, gluten, oil meal, and similar feeding stuffs that these abnormal conditions will mean a great loss of money to the farmers of this State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Federal Trade Commission is hereby respectfully requested and urged to investigate, as soon as may be, the conditions of supply of cheese and butter in storage warehouses and in other places of commercial storage, and the conditions of supply of the various mill feeding stuffs, and to report the result of such investigation to this legislature with all convenient speed in such a form as to fully advise the farmers of the true causes of the present condition of the market for cheese and butter and the prices charged for mill feeds.

That copies of this resolution duly engrossed and properly attested be transmitted to the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission and to each of the Senators and Representatives from this State in the Congress of the United States.

RILEY S. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
EDWARD F. DITTMAR,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution 73, A.

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to prohibit the purchase of liberty bonds by scalpers, and providing a penalty therefor.

Whereas in the best interests of our country's welfare our Government has found it necessary and desirable to issue, promote, and sell liberty bonds as a provision towards the cost of the great war and has found it desirable that the sale of liberty bonds should be widely distributed throughout the country, thereby insuring both the popularity of the loan and giving all persons equal opportunity to secure its benefits; and
Whereas the great success of the sale of the liberty bonds and its wide distribution among all classes of people and nationalities in this country has made it possible for swindlers and scalpers to take advantage of the times and conditions of the small investors, especially by obtaining the liberty bonds on false representations and at prices below the par value of the same, thereby enabling the scalper to obtain unfair profit, especially at the expense of the holders of the bonds of small denomination; and
Whereas such practices are contrary to the welfare of the people and the public policy of this State: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That Congress be memorialized to pass such laws and make appropriations therefor as it shall deem necessary for the protection of all holders of liberty bonds and provide a penalty for the punishment of all bond scalpers or persons who obtain bonds below the par value thereof without the full knowledge of the seller of the bond of his rights therein.

Resolved, That as soon as the Congress of the United States shall be in session duly attested copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the presiding officers of each House and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Wisconsin in the Congress of the United States.

RILEY S. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
EDWARD F. DITTMAR,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF ARIZONA,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Arizona, ss:

I, Mit Simms, secretary of state, do hereby certify that the within is a true, complete, and correct transcript of house concurrent resolution No. 1, Fourth Legislature of the State of Arizona, 1919, "favoring the establishment of a league of nations of which the United States will be a member," all of which is shown by the original on file in this department.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal. Done at Phoenix, the capital, this 4th day of February, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

MIT SIMMS,
Secretary of State.

House concurrent resolution 1, introduced by Mr. Vyne, of Yavapai.

Whereas the war, now brought to a victorious close by the associated power of the free nations of the world, was above all else a war to end war and protect human rights: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Arizona (both houses concurring), That we favor the establishment of a league of nations, of which the United States shall be a member. We believe that such a league should aim at promoting the liberty, progress, and orderly development of the world and clinch the victory won at such terrible sacrifice; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of State, to the President, and to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from Arizona.

Passed the House January 25, 1919, by the following vote: 34 ayes, no noes, no absent, 1 excused.

(Signed) A. C. PETERSON,
Speaker of the House.
(Signed) SAM B. BRADNER,
Chief Clerk of House.

Passed the senate January 28, 1919, by the following vote: 14 ayes, no nays, no absent, 5 excused.

(Signed) A. A. JOHNS,
President of the Senate.
(Signed) L. F. SWEETING,
Secretary of Senate.

Approved February 1, 1919.
(Signed) THOMAS E. CAMPBELL,
Governor of Arizona.

Filed in the office of the secretary of the State of Arizona this 1st day of February, A. D. 1919, at 1.30 p. m.

MIT SIMMS,
Secretary of State.
By R. E. MCGILLEN,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint resolution 5.

Whereas it has been recommended by the Hon. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior of the United States, that Congress immediately appropriate the sum of $100,000,000 for placing the returning soldiers of the United States upon farms, thereby inaugurating a plan whereby at least 100,000 men will be immediately employed in the creation of at least 25,000 farms within the territory of the United States; and
Whereas the plan as outlined by the honorable Secretary of the Interior proposes the reclamation of approximately 215,000,000 acres of arid and swamp land within the United States, at present unfit for cultivation because of the lack of water in the one case and drainage in the other; and
Whereas the plan suggested is not a "charity scheme," and under appropriate management will be self-funding, and will offer alluring opportunities to settlers as compared with the old land-settlement systems, inasmuch as 40 years' time is to be given the settlers within which to reimburse the United States for the money and credit loaned to them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Arizona at its fourth regular session, That the plan as outlined by Secretary of the Interior Lane meets with its heartiest and utmost approval, and that this legislature urges upon the Congress of the United States the early enactment into law of the plan proposed and the appropriation of the money needed to carry out the provisions thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be signed by the presiding officers of each branch of the legislature and the governor of the State, and that the secretary of state of the State of Arizona be, and he is hereby, directed to forward copies of these resolutions to the Hon. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of Arizona's Representatives in Congress.

(Signed) A. C. PETERSON,
Speaker of the House.
(Signed) SAM B. BRADNER,
Chief Clerk of the House.
(Signed) A. A. JOHNS,
President of Senate.
(Signed) L. F. SWEETING,
Secretary of Senate.

Approved February 6, 1919.
(Signed) THOMAS E. CAMPBELL,
Governor of Arizona.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona presented a resolution adopted by the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association favoring the continuance of Federal control of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association praying for the enactment of legislation requiring the fencing of rights of way of railroads and the early settlement of claims for damages for the killing of live stock, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association praying for the enactment of legislation restricting the importation of agricultural products into the United States in competition with such products of our own people, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association favoring the modification of the rules relative to the exportation of cattle to the State of Sonora, Mexico, for grazing purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the granting to the State of Arizona of 5,000,000 acres of the unappropriated vacant lands upon the public domain within the State of Arizona, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association favoring the regulation and control by the Federal Government of the unappropriated and unreserved lands lying on the public domain, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association favoring the plans proposed by the Secretary of the Interior for the reclamation of large areas of land in the State of Arizona for the settlement by returned soldiers, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition adopted by the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association praying that the State Department modify the passport rules and regulations as to permit cattle growers to take advantage of the grazing opportunities afforded in the State of Sonora, Mexico, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association praying for the appropriation of $50,000 for the destruction and extermination of predatory wild animals and range-destroying rodents, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association favoring the prompt enactment of the Kendrick bill, with necessary amendments, for the control of the marketing of live stock, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association praying for the enactment of legislation to provide adequate compensation to retain capable men for the Forest Service, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the Federal farm-loan banks to make loans upon live-stock securities, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. STERLING presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Certificate.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
Department of State, ss:

I, C. A. Burkhart, secretary of state of the State of South Dakota, do hereby certify that the attached copy of concurrent resolution is a true and correct copy of a concurrent resolution adopted at the sixteenth session, as appears on page 501 of the journal of the house for the forty-fifth day.

In testimony whereof I have set my hand and affixed the great seal this 22d day of March, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.] C. A. BURKHART,
Secretary of State.

Concurrent resolution introduced by the house committee of agriculture.

Whereas the practice in gambling in grain options has grown to such an extent in this country that it unsettles market conditions and is detrimental to the interest of the producers and persons engaged in the legitimate grain business; and

Whereas it has become common practice for persons to sell and buy in the market on margin large quantities of grain without regard to the supply or the existence of the commodity so bought or sold: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and the same hereby is, respectfully memorialized to forthwith enact suitable legislation forbidding the trading on margins or selling or offering for sale of any grain or farm products not in existence at the time of the trading, selling, or offering for sale of such commodities, to the end that gambling and market manipulation by the sale or offer for sale of products not owned or nonexistent in competition with actual existing products may be prevented, and compelling all persons selling or offering for sale such products to furnish bills of lading, warehouse receipts, or other evidence of ownership and existence of such commodities where the actual product is not produced for delivery on sale.

That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

Mr. STERLING presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Certificate.

OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE,
Pierre, S. Dak.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of South Dakota, Secretary's Office.

I, C. A. Burkhart, secretary of state, do hereby certify that the annexed bill, to wit, house concurrent resolution, was duly passed by the sixteenth session of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, and that the same is now in full force and effect.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota, at the city of Pierre, January 4, 1919.

[SEAL.] C. A. BURKHART,
Secretary of State.

Hon. C. A. BURKHART, *Secretary of State:*

The following concurrent resolution has been adopted by the house of representatives and concurred in by the senate:

Concurrent resolution.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring):

Whereas Congress has at various times appropriated funds for the purpose of sinking four flowing artesian wells on the border of a certain meandered lake known as Lake Andes, and located in the county of Charles Mix and State of South Dakota, for the purpose of furnishing water and fish for the Indians; and

Whereas the level of said lake has been raised several feet by the continuous flow of water discharged from the above-mentioned wells, causing the water to inundate large areas of valuable surveyed and patented agricultural land adjacent to the said lake, and that the lands so submerged are rendered worthless thereby to the owners thereof for either agricultural or grazing purposes, and that there are at least 1,500 acres of such land so submerged, and that the damage to these lands by said inundation or overflow is not less than $100 per acre, and that the owners of said lands are justly entitled to full compensation for such damage from the Government of the United States, by whose authority the said wells were sunk which caused the submerging or overflow of said lands: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring), That we earnestly, though respectfully, request the Congress of the United States at its next session to appropriate a sufficient sum to reimburse said overflowed-land owners.

For the house:

LEWIS BENSON, *Speaker.*
WRIGHT TARBELL, *Chief Clerk.*

For the senate:

C. S. AMSDEN,
President pro tempore.
A. B. BLAKE, *Secretary.*

Dated at Pierre, S. Dak., this 22d day of January, A. D. 1919.

Mr. STERLING presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of South Dakota, praying for the repeal of the daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented petitions of sundry citizens of Plattsburgh, N. Y., praying for the ratification of the league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of New York, praying for Government ownership of railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Jamestown, N. Y., praying for the repeal of the so-called "luxury" tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McLEAN presented a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
General Assembly, January Session, A. D. 1919.

Senate joint resolution 61.

Resolution in relation to the establishment of a Federal department of education.

Resolved by this assembly:

Whereas the future security and prosperity of the United States as a democracy depends upon the trained intelligence and skill of those present and future citizens, for which purpose a constructive national system and Federal support of education are necessary: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives of Connecticut be memorialized and urged to use all honorable means to secure the enactment of the educational bill S. 4987 or H. R. 15400, which provide for the removal of illiteracy, the Americanization of aliens, the improvement of the facilities for the preparation of teachers, the promotion of the health of all school children, and the establishment of a Federal department of education.

Senate, April 16, 1919: Passed.

House of representatives, April 22, 1919: Passed.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
Office of the Secretary, ss:

I, F. L. Perry, secretary of the State of Connecticut and keeper of the seal thereof and of the original record of the acts and resolutions

of the general assembly of said State, do hereby certify that I have compared the annexed copy of the resolution in relation to the establishment of a Federal department of education, with the original record of the same now remaining in this office, and have found the said copy to be a correct and complete transcript thereof.

And I further certify that the said original record is a public record of the said State of Connecticut now remaining in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said State at Hartford this 29th day of April, 1919.

[SEAL.] F. L. PERRY, *Secretary.*

Mr. MCLEAN presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Connecticut, praying for the ratification of the league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Young Men's Christian Association of Bridgeport, Conn., praying for the disposal of Government machinery not now in use to trade and technical schools and universities, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Bridgeport, Conn., praying for the stabilizing of the United States dollar as a standard of value as proposed by Prof. Irving Fisher, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Farmington, Conn., praying for the repeal of the daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HARDING. I present a joint resolution adopted by the general assembly of the State of Ohio, relative to the rights of the Jewish people. I ask that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint resolution 45.

Joint resolution relative to the rights of the Jewish people.

Whereas the future prosperity and peace of the world depends upon a just and equitable settlement of the European war whereby each and every nationality, however small, shall be granted the liberty to determine its own destiny and the opportunity of living its own life; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America is recognized as an ardent exponent of the rights of small nations: Therefore be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, That in its opinion the national aspirations and historic claims of the Jewish people with regard to Palestine should be recognized at the peace conference in accordance with the British Government's declaration of November 2, 1917, that there be established such political, administrative, and economic conditions in Palestine as will assure the development of Palestine into a Jewish commonwealth, and that the American representatives at the peace conference should use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object: Be it further

Resolved, That it is the opinion of the General Assembly of the State of Ohio that express provisions be made at the peace conference for the purpose of granting the Jewish people in every land the complete enjoyment of life, liberty, and the opportunities for national development to the end that justice may be done to one of the most suffering people on earth, the Jewish people; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, directed to send duly certified copies of this resolution to each of the Representatives of this State in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the representatives of the United States in attendance as members of the peace conference assembled at Paris.

CARL R. KIMBALL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
CLARENCE J. BROWN,
President of the Senate.

Adopted April 15, 1919.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Ohio, ss:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Harvey C. Smith, secretary of state of the State of Ohio, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a copy of house joint resolution 45 as adopted by the General Assembly of Ohio, the same being a resolution relative to the rights of the Jewish people; that the same has been carefully compared by me with the original joint resolution filed in this office May 7, 1919, and now in my official custody as secretary of state; and that the same is found to be a true and correct copy.

Witness my hand and official seal, at Columbus, this 8th day of May, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.] HARVEY C. SMITH,
Secretary of State.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PITTMAN:

A bill (S. 1) authorizing the cutting of timber for mining purposes by corporations organized in one State and conducting mining operations in another;

A bill (S. 2) for the relief of settlers and town-site occupants of certain lands in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nev.; and

A bill (S. 3) to authorize exploration for and disposition of coal, phosphate, sodium, oil, oil shale, or gas on the public domain; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 4) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of David D. Sharp; and

A bill (S. 5) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of David H. Hartson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 6) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey title to certain lands in the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 7) to regulate the interstate use of automobiles and all self-propelled vehicles which use the public highways in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 8) to provide for the application of the reclamation law to irrigation districts; and

A bill (S. 9) to encourage the reclamation of certain arid lands in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

A bill (S. 10) for the relief of J. I. Earl; and

A bill (S. 11) for the relief of John B. O'Sullivan; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 12) prohibiting the interment of the body of any person in the cemetery known as the Cemetery of the White's Tabernacle No. 39 of the Ancient Order of Sons and Daughters, Brethren and Sisters of Moses, in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 13) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Callahan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 14) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the State of Ohio the cannon, machine guns, and other military equipment captured by the Thirty-seventh Division, American Expeditionary Forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Georgia:

A bill (S. 15) to create a Department of Education, to appropriate money for the conduct of said department, to appropriate money to encourage the States in the promotion and support of education, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 16) to establish engineer experiment stations in the States and Territories in connection with institutions of higher technical education, for the promotion of engineering and industrial research as a measure of industrial, commercial, military, and naval progress and preparedness in times of peace or war;

A bill (S. 17) to promote the education of native illiterates, of persons unable to understand and use the English language, and of other resident persons of foreign birth; to provide for cooperation with the States in the education of such persons in the English language, the fundamental principles of government and citizenship, the elements of knowledge pertaining to self-support and home making, and in such other work as will assist in preparing such illiterates and foreign-born persons for successful living and intelligent American citizenship; and

A bill (S. 18) to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 19) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend sections 2291 and 2297 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to homesteads"; and

A bill (S. 20) to provide for the payment for certain lands within the former Flathead Indian Reservation in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 21) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Anaconda, in the State of Montana; and

A bill (S. 22) providing for the enlargement of the Federal building at Missoula, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds;

A bill (S. 23) for the relief of George A. Robertson;

A bill (S. 24) for the relief of F. A. Carnal and Ada Lewis;

A bill (S. 25) for the relief of Benjamine O. Kerlee;

A bill (S. 26) for the relief of G. W. Kates; and

A bill (S. 27) for the relief of Joseph C. Cosley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 28) to provide for the deportation of certain aliens from the United States; and

A bill (S. 29) to establish in the Department of Labor a bureau of citizenship and Americanization for the Americanization of naturalized citizens; amend section 4 of the act approved June 29, 1906, entitled "An act to establish a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization and to provide a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States, and for other purposes;" to the Committee on Immigration.

A bill (S. 30) to establish within the Department of the Treasury a bureau for the regulation and supervision of the

export of savings from the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 31) to repeal the act approved March 1, 1913, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, by providing for a valuation of the several classes of property of carriers subject thereto and securing information concerning their stocks, bonds, and other securities;" to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 32) for the relief of John Gray; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 33) to prohibit and punish certain characteristic acts of Bolshevism in the United States; and

A bill (S. 34) to amend the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 35) to provide for the survey of a national highway connecting certain national monuments in the States of Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico;

A bill (S. 36) to repeal the act of Congress approved February 1, 1905, and to transfer national forests from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 37) to establish a branch of the Interior Department in the Western States and to transfer to such branch certain bureaus and offices of the Interior Department; and

A bill (S. 38) to establish the Zion National Park in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 39) for the relief of H. G. Godfrey;

A bill (S. 40) for the relief of Frank Harrigan; and

A bill (S. 41) for the relief of Franklin A. Swenson; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 42) for the relief of Emma Kiener;

A bill (S. 43) to cede unreserved public lands to the several States;

A bill (S. 44) to prevent the withdrawal of mineral lands of the United States from entry and occupancy under the laws of the United States;

A bill (S. 45) providing for cooperation between the United States and State governments in the rural settlement of soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to promote the reclamation of lands, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 46) for the protection of the water supply of the town of Sunnyside, Utah;

A bill (S. 47) to amend sections 2325 and 2326 of the Revised Statutes prescribing the method of obtaining patent to mining claims;

A bill (S. 48) for the relief of purchasers from the State of Utah of lands in sections 2, 16, 32, and 36 in said State; and

A bill (S. 49) to authorize the exchange of certain lands within the Wasatch National Forest, Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 50) providing for a reclamation project on Green and Grand Rivers, in the State of Utah;

A bill (S. 51) providing for a reclamation project on Price River, Utah; and

A bill (S. 52) providing for a reclamation project on the Strawberry River, Duchesne County, Utah, to be known as the Castle Peak reclamation project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

A bill (S. 53) to pension the survivors of certain Indian wars and disturbances in Utah Territory from 1849 to 1869, inclusive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 54) to further protect interstate and foreign commerce against bribery and other corrupt trade practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 55) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to adjust disputes or claims by entrymen, selectors, grantees, and patentees of the United States against the United States and between each other arising from faulty surveys in townships 36, 37, and 38 south, ranges 29 and 30 east, Tallahassee meridian, in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 56) providing for additional compensation to persons serving in the military and naval forces of the United States during the war with the German Empire; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 57) regulating trials by jury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 58) relative to discharges of certain soldiers and sailors who served in the war with Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 59) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to navigation of vessels, bills of lading, and to certain obligations, duties, and rights in connection with the carriage of property," approved February 13, 1893; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 60) authorizing the Director General of Railroads to establish a system of mileage books; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 61) regulating shipments of freight to foreign ports and prohibiting discrimination in the receipt and shipment of such freight; and

A bill (S. 62) to prohibit interstate shipments or transportation of certain food products, to define and to prohibit transportation and sale of adulterated or misbranded food products, to regulate traffic therein, to define and regulate cold storage, to regulate dealing in cold-storage food products, and to fix penalties for violation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 63) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 64) to establish military justice; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 65) granting a pension to Lydia A. Tromblee; and

A bill (S. 66) granting a pension to Joseph B. Doan (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 67) to provide for the creation of Federal railroad companies, to establish a more effective supervision of railroads in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

(By request:) A bill (S. 68) granting an increase of pension to Albert N. Raymond (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona:

A bill (S. 69) to punish aliens in the United States for conspiracy against the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 70) providing for the construction of a dam across the Gila River, at or near San Carlos, in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 71) for the erection of a public building in the city of Tucson, Ariz.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 72) for the relief of settlers on Baca Float Grant No. 3, in the State of Arizona; and

A bill (S. 73) granting a right of way over public lands for certain purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 74) authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to deliver to the city of Nogales, in the State of Arizona, one cannon with carriage captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells;

A bill (S. 75) authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to deliver to the city of Douglas, in the State of Arizona, one cannon with carriage captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; and

A bill (S. 76) authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to deliver to the city of Tucson, in the State of Arizona, one cannon with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number or shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 77) for the relief of Mrs. W. P. Miller (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 78) granting an increase of pension to Carrier Thompson; and

A bill (S. 79) granting an increase of pension to James F. Duncan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 80) to repeal an act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States"; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 81) to repeal section 3 of Title I and Title XII of Public 24 and Public 150, Sixty-fifth Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 82) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. Bannow;

A bill (S. 83) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Hahn;

A bill (S. 84) granting a pension to Susan E. Richardson;

A bill (S. 85) granting a pension to John Daley; and

A bill (S. 86) granting a pension to Alphonso L. Armstrong; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 87) granting a pension to Emil Moellendorf;

A bill (S. 88) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Harrison;

A bill (S. 89) granting an increase of pension to Frank C. Myrick;

A bill (S. 90) granting a pension to Daniel Stahler;

A bill (S. 91) granting a pension to August Wohlgemuth;

A bill (S. 92) granting an increase of pension to Rosetta Waldref; and

A bill (S. 93) granting a pension to John M. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 94) relating to the use and occupation of lands of the United States for the development of water power, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 95) to provide for the disposal of coal and coal lands;

A bill (S. 96) granting to the State of North Dakota 50,000 acres of land to aid in the maintenance of a normal school at Dickinson, N. Dak.;

A bill (S. 97) to provide for the classification of the public lands of the United States;

A bill (S. 98) relating to additional entries on lands subject to entry under the enlarged-homestead act;

A bill (S. 99) to authorize the disposal of phosphate, oil, asphaltum, or natural gas; and

A bill (S. 100) revoking authority to lease Sibley Island, in the Missouri River, to the city of Bismarck, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 101) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Crosby, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 102) providing for the admission to the mails as second-class matter of publications issued by certain public institutions and boards; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 103) to prohibit selling of intoxicating beverages in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

A bill (S. 104) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 105) for the promotion of engineering and industrial research; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 106) to amend section 10 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization and to provide for a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States," approved June 29, 1906; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 107) making it unlawful for any Member of Congress to serve on or solicit funds for any political committee, club, or organization; and

A bill (S. 108) to limit campaign contributions and expenditures and to provide for publicity thereof; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

A bill (S. 109) to aid navigation and control floods on the boundary waters of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 110) for the relief of Rodger Caplette;

A bill (S. 111) for the relief of Bonnar Borzie and his minor children, Helen, Joseph, Rosalie, and Mary; and

A bill (S. 112) relating to the disposal of coal and mineral deposits in Indian lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 113) providing for a reduced rate for the transportation of laborers when traveling on the railroads of the United States under the direction and control of the United States Department of Labor;

A bill (S. 114) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as heretofore amended; and

A bill (S. 115) for the prevention of cruelty to animals transported in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 116) granting additional pay to officers, enlisted men, and others serving in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard;

A bill (S. 117) for the relief of Louis Blanchette, alias Lewis Blanchard, alias Louis White;

A bill (S. 118) for the relief of Wiley W. Houston; and

A bill (S. 119) to correct the military record of John M. Rock; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLOGG:

A bill (S. 120) to repeal chapter 154 of the acts of the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, being the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. HARDING:

A bill (S. 121) granting a pension to Irene Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 122) authorizing a commission to acquire and maintain a cemetery in France in the name of the United States for the reception and interment of the bodies of American officers and men who lost their lives in connection with the European war, and to appropriate $500,000 therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 123) to grant patent to certain lands to Christian Frederickson; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 124) for the relief of the estate of Israel Folsom;

A bill (S. 125) to establish an Indian boarding school at or near the city of Rolla, in the State of North Dakota; and

A bill (S. 126) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to permit the Yankton and Cuthead Bands of Sioux Indians to intervene in the action of the Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians against the United States (Docket No. 33731), and to hear, determine, and render judgment in said action in claims of Yankton and Cuthead Bands of Sioux Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 127) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Richard County, N. Dak., three brass cannon, with carriages;

A bill (S. 128) for the relief of Isaac J. Reese;

A bill (S. 129) to correct the military record of A. M. Weller; and

A bill (S. 130) for the relief of John H. Fesenmeyer, alias John Wills; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 131) to provide that petty officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men of the United States Navy and Marine Corps on the retired list who had creditable Civil War service shall receive the rank or rating and the pay of the next higher enlisted grade; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 132) for the relief of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co., the Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Co., and the St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 133) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of North Dakota;

A bill (S. 134) to establish a fish hatchery on Strawberry Lake in North Dakota;

A bill (S. 135) to establish a fish-culture station on the upper Des Lacs Lake in North Dakota; and

A bill (S. 136) to establish a fish hatchery on Spiritwood Lake in North Dakota; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 137) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Lincoln;

A bill (S. 138) granting a pension to Etta Warner;

A bill (S. 139) granting a pension to Mary Steele;

A bill (S. 140) granting a pension to Elizabeth C. Curtis;

A bill (S. 141) granting a pension to William H. Turner;

A bill (S. 142) granting a pension to William Shoemaker;

A bill (S. 143) granting a pension to James Kenyon;

A bill (S. 144) granting an increase of pension to Walter J. Shelley;

A bill (S. 145) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Porter;

A bill (S. 146) granting an increase of pension to E. G. Thompson;

A bill (S. 147) granting a pension to John R. Beebe (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 148) granting an increase of pension to Jacob B. Eakman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 149) for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 150) to admit osteopathic physicians to examinations for commissions in the medical branch of the Army of the United States, and to provide for their official status, rank, and pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 151) to create in the War Department and the Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as the "Civil

War volunteer officers' retired list," to authorize placing thereon with retired pay certain surviving officers who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the Civil War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 152) to create a Federal power commission and to define its powers and duties, to provide for the improvement of navigation, for the development of water power, for the use of lands of the United States in relation thereto, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 153) relating to the sale, charter, and operation of merchant ships owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 154) providing for the establishment of a radio station on Unga Island, Alaska; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 155) for the relief of volunteer officers and soldiers who served in the Philippine Islands beyond the period of their enlistment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 156) defining sedition and providing a punishment therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 157) authorizing the Indian tribes and individual Indians, or any of them, residing in the State of Washington and west of the summit of the Cascade Mountains, to submit to the Court of Claims certain claims growing out of treaties and otherwise; and

A bill (S. 158) authorizing the leasing of the lands embraced within the Hoh Indian Reservation in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 159) to expel and exclude from the United States aliens who, to escape military service, have withdrawn their declaration of intention to become citizens; to the Committee on Immigration.

A bill (S. 160) providing for the investigation of certain lands in the State of Washington with a view to their reclamation;

A bill (S. 161) providing for the investigation of arid and desert lands in the State of Washington with a view to their reclamation;

A bill (S. 162) providing for the investigation of certain lands in central Washington with a view to their reclamation; and

A bill (S. 163) relating to the reclamation of arid, semiarid, swamp, and overflow lands through district organizations, and authorizing Government aid therefor; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

A bill (S. 164) to authorize the establishment of a fisheries experiment station on the coast of Washington; and

A bill (S. 165) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Fisheries.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 166) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 167) to create a Federal Industrial Relations Commission; and

A bill (S. 168) to create a commission to investigate and report to Congress a plan on the questions involved in the financing of house construction and home ownership and Federal aid therefor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 169) for the retirement of certain naval officers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 170) to amend section 25 of the act of December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, as amended by the act of September 7, 1916; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 171) changing the name of the Panama Canal to the Roosevelt Canal; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

A bill (S. 172) to regulate the personnel of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 173) to repeal section 904 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 174) for the relief of Emma H. Ridley;

A bill (S. 175) for the relief of Kny-Scheerer Corporation; and

A bill (S. 176) for the relief of John M. Francis; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 177) granting an extension of patent to Ida H. Fischer, sole legatee of Max H. Fischer, deceased; to the Committee on Patents.

A bill (S. 178) granting a pension to Michael J. C. Dedeyn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 179) providing for lump-sum payments to beneficiaries under the war-risk insurance act of September 2, 1914, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 180) to incorporate Near East Relief; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALSH of Montana:

A bill (S. 181) to encourage and promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, and sodium on the public domain; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 182) to reimburse the county of Lewis and Clark, State of Montana, for expenses incurred by it for the construction of a public highway through the Helena National Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 183) providing additional time for the payment of purchase money under homestead entries of lands within the former Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.;

A bill (S. 184) to amend an act approved February 22, 1889, entitled "An act to provide for the division of Dakota into two States and to enable the people of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington to form constitutions and State governments, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and to make donations of public lands to such States;

A bill (S. 185) granting to the county of Custer, State of Montana, certain land in said county for use as a fairground;

A bill (S. 186) for the relief of Torger Olson;

A bill (S. 187) granting additional rights to settlers on reclamation projects; and

A bill (S. 188) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to permit the leasing of certain coal lands in Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 189) to increase the limit of cost for the Federal building and site therefor at Billings, Mont., and to authorize the provision of quarters for United States courts in said building;

A bill (S. 190) to provide for the erection of a public building at Glasgow, Mont.; and

A bill (S. 191) to enlarge, extend, remodel, etc., public building at Helena, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 192) authorizing the Crow Tribe of Indians residing in the State of Montana to submit claims to the Court of Claims;

A bill (S. 193) to cancel the allotment of Little Bear, deceased Indian of the Crow Reservation, Mont.;

A bill (S. 194) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prorate tribal funds of Indians; and

A bill (S. 195) for the opening and settlement of a part of the Crow Indian Reservation in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 196) for the relief of Thomas W. Williams;

A bill (S. 197) for the relief of Edward T. Moran;

A bill (S. 198) for the relief of Levi B. Rouse;

A bill (S. 199) to correct the military record of William McCormick;

A bill (S. 200) for the relief of James W. Nugent; and

A bill (S. 201) providing for the conveyance to the State of Montana of Fort William Henry Harrison Military Reservation for educational and other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 202) providing for an additional judge for the district of Montana;

A bill (S. 203) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 3 of the act of Congress of May 1, 1888, and extend the provisions of section 2301 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to certain lands in the State of Montana embraced within the provisions of said act, and for other purposes";

A bill (S. 204) amending section 140 of the act approved March 4, 1909, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States";

A bill (S. 205) to enlarge the jurisdiction of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, and to regulate appeals from the judgments of said court, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 206) concerning actions on account of death or personal injury within places under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 207) authorizing the conveyance of certain land to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, for park purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 208) for the relief of Lars T. Rykken;

A bill (S. 209) for the relief of John T. Eaton;

A bill (S. 210) for the relief of J. D. Savage;

A bill (S. 211) for the relief of John E. Woods;

A bill (S. 212) for the relief of Benjamin Musselman;
A bill (S. 213) for the relief of H. Frank Adkins;
A bill (S. 214) for the relief of Patrick Rafferty;
A bill (S. 215) to reimburse Hill County, State of Montana, for money expended for the support of the Rocky Boy Band of Chippewa Indians;
A bill (S. 216) for the relief of Grace Brewster-Arnold, administratrix of the estate of George W. Brewster, deceased;
A bill (S. 217) for the relief of John T. Eaton;
A bill (S. 218) for the relief of Harry Scott; and
A bill (S. 219) for the relief of Kate Canniff; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 220) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.
A bill (S. 221) granting a pension to Mary E. King;
A bill (S. 222) granting a pension to Justus W. King;
A bill (S. 223) granting a pension to James Farrell;
A bill (S. 224) granting a pension to Mary E. Hover;
A bill (S. 225) granting a pension to Kathryn C. Sterling;
A bill (S. 226) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Culbertson; and
A bill (S. 227) granting a pension to Thomas Ryan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 228) forbidding judges to charge juries with regard to matters of fact, but requiring judges to declare the law, and in jury trials to reduce their charge or instructions to writing on the request of either party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
A bill (S. 229) for the relief of James Shook; and
A bill (S. 230) for increasing the efficiency of Army bands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 231) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Forrest City, in the State of Arkansas; and
A bill (S. 232) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Monticello, in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
A bill (S. 233) to encourage instruction in the hygiene of maternity and infancy, and to extend proper care for maternity and infancy; to provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such instruction and care in rural districts; to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure, and for other purposes; and
A bill (S. 234) to promote the welfare of industries and wage earners of the United States, to extend the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.
A bill (S. 235) releasing the claim of the United States Government to the block or square of land in the city of Fort Smith, in the State of Arkansas, upon which is situated the old Federal jail, to the State of Arkansas for a site for an armory and training camp of the Arkansas National Guard;
A bill (S. 236) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to certain lands of James Payne, his heirs and assigns; and
A bill (S. 237) authorizing local drainage districts to drain certain public lands in the State of Arkansas, counties of Mississippi and Poinsett, and subjecting said lands to taxation; to the Committee on Public Lands.
A bill (S. 238) for the relief of the heirs of William H. Harvey, deceased;
A bill (S. 239) for the relief of the heirs of J. S. Morton, deceased;
A bill (S. 240) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to adjust the accounts of the St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co. in accordance with the decision of the Court of Claims in case No. 24409;
A bill (S. 241) for the relief of the heirs of John Kirk;
A bill (S. 242) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of W. W. Busby, administrator of the estate of Evelina V. Busby, deceased, *v.* The United States;
A bill (S. 243) for the relief of the heirs or estate of Samuel N. Pryor, deceased;
A bill (S. 244) for the relief of the heirs of the late Jennie Hunter;
A bill (S. 245) for the relief of heirs or estate of Thomas Daly, deceased;
A bill (S. 246) for the relief of heirs of James Thompson, deceased;
A bill (S. 247) for relief of Lizzie E. McCord, administratrix of Moses S. McCord, deceased;
A bill (S. 248) for the relief of Henry P. Grant, of Phillips County, Ark.;
A bill (S. 249) for the relief of William Ramsey and others;
A bill (S. 250) for the relief of John W. Fein;
A bill (S. 251) for the relief of the heirs of the late Hugh Rowen;
A bill (S. 252) for the relief of the heirs or estate of Wesley W. Wallace, deceased;
A bill (S. 253) for the payment of claims for loss of private property on account of the loss of firearms and ammunition taken by the United States troops during the labor strike in the State of Colorado in 1914;
A bill (S. 254) for the relief of Jennie Bell Cox, Robert Isaac Clegg, and Thomas Neel Clegg, children and only heirs of Thomas Watts Clegg, deceased;
A bill (S. 255) for the relief of William E. Johnson;
A bill (S. 256) to relieve Congress from the adjudication of private claims against the Government; and
A bill (S. 257) for the relief of certain officers in the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 258) granting a pension to John S. Hope;
A bill (S. 259) granting a pension to A. G. Hamilton, alias Garland Hammond;
A bill (S. 260) granting an increase of pension to John F. Spence;
A bill (S. 261) granting a pension to William H. Tucker;
A bill (S. 262) granting a pension to Ada Jernigen;
A bill (S. 263) granting a pension to Stephen Konicka;
A bill (S. 264) granting an increase of pension to B. E. Benton;
A bill (S. 265) granting a pension to Samuel M. McKinney;
A bill (S. 266) granting a pension to John A. Pryor;
A bill (S. 267) granting a pension to James E. Dickerson;
A bill (S. 268) granting a pension to Philip S. Herron;
A bill (S. 269) granting an increase of pension to Frank Plumlee;
A bill (S. 270) granting a pension to J. A. Swaim;
A bill (S. 271) granting an increase of pension to Oscar S. Pomeroy;
A bill (S. 272) granting an increase of pension to Silas W. Norris;
A bill (S. 273) granting an increase of pension to Zora W. Elder;
A bill (S. 274) granting a pension to Thomas S. Garen; and
A bill (S. 275) granting a pension to Minnie Bryant; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENDRICK:

A bill (S. 276) to amend sections 4 and 5 of an act entitled "An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes," approved December 29, 1917; and
A bill (S. 277) to authorize absence by homestead settlers and entrymen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.
A bill (S. 278) authorizing the acquirement of a site and the construction of a building for a post office at Kemmerer, Wyo.; and
A bill (S. 279) authorizing the acquirement of a site and the construction of a building for a post office at Lusk, Wyo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
A bill (S. 280) granting a pension to Nettie I. Moffatt; and
A bill (S. 281) granting a pension to Thomas Fife; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 282) providing for an additional judge for the district of Arizona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
A bill (S. 283) to provide for the erection of a public building at Prescott, in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
A bill (S. 284) to provide Federal aid in caring for indigent tuberculous persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.
A bill (S. 285) authorizing a right of way for the transportation of water for improvement of grazing and development of the live-stock industry upon public and national forest lands in Arizona; to the Committee on Public Lands.
A bill (S. 286) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Fisheries.
A bill (S. 287) to authorize mining for metalliferous minerals on Indian reservations;
A bill (S. 288) for the relief of John Flanigan;

A bill (S. 289) to authorize a report upon the necessity for the construction of a diversion dam with a bridge superstructure across the Gila River on the Gila Bend Indian Reservation, Ariz.;

A bill (S. 290) to authorize a report upon the necessity for the construction of a bridge across the Salt River on the Salt River Indian Reservation, Ariz.; and

A bill (S. 291) for the survey and allotment of lands within the Colorado River Indian Reservation in the States of Arizona and California, for the disposal of the surplus lands after allotment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 292) making an appropriation for the construction of roads within the Petrified Forest National Monument, Ariz.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (S. 293) for the relief of the widows and children of R. F. McBride, Martin R. Kempton, Thomas K. Wootan, and Mark Wildes; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 294) for the relief of Alfred Cluff, Orson Cluff, Henry E. Norton, William B. Ballard, Elijah Hancock, Mrs. Susan R. Saline, Oscar Mann, Celia Thayne, William E. Cox, Theodore Farley, Adelaide Laxton, Clara L. Tenney, George M. Adams, Charlotte Jensen, Sophia Huff, Peter H. McBride, David Edward Adams, Mrs. M. J. Ellsworth, and the heirs of J. H. Frisby;

A bill (S. 295) for the relief of Frank Pinkley; and

A bill (S. 296) for the relief of William Wooster; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 297) for the relief of Jasper Newton Gibson; and

A bill (S. 298) for the relief of Killian Delabar; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 299) to regulate the salaries of fourth-class postmasters; and

A bill (S. 300) for the relief of the heirs of Gordon H. Meek, deceased; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 301) for the relief of Solomon M. Bennett;

A bill (S. 302) for the relief of Thomas Simmons;

A bill (S. 303) for the relief of George B. Todd;

A bill (S. 304) for the relief of Theophilus Nuzum;

A bill (S. 305) for the relief of John W. Berry;

A bill (S. 306) for the relief of William M. Cheuvront;

A bill (S. 307) for the relief of John H. Galloway;

A bill (S. 308) for the relief of James Johnson;

A bill (S. 309) for the relief of John W. May; and

A bill (S. 310) for the relief of John Murphy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 311) amendatory of the act of May 11, 1912, granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico;

A bill (S. 312) granting an increase of pension to Fannie I. Cooper;

A bill (S. 313) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Harman;

A bill (S. 314) granting a pension to Edwin T. Jones;

A bill (S. 315) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Jordan;

A bill (S. 316) granting an increase of pension to Nathan C. Kelly;

A bill (S. 317) granting a pension to Arch Linthicum;

A bill (S. 318) granting an increase of pension to George A. Liston;

A bill (S. 319) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Bracey;

A bill (S. 320) granting a pension to W. H. Mallow;

A bill (S. 321) granting a pension to Kate G. Morris;

A bill (S. 322) granting a pension to Arzanna Nesbitt;

A bill (S. 323) granting a pension to George W. Parks;

A bill (S. 324) granting a pension to Harrison Pierson;

A bill (S. 325) granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Porter;

A bill (S. 326) granting an increase of pension to America Postelwait;

A bill (S. 327) granting an increase of pension to Enoch Roberts;

A bill (S. 328) granting a pension to Solomon P. Stalnaker;

A bill (S. 329) granting a pension to Joseph Stevens;

A bill (S. 330) granting a pension to Willis Gray Southerland;

A bill (S. 331) granting a pension to Edgar Travis;

A bill (S. 332) granting a pension to Cale Trippett;

A bill (S. 333) granting a pension to Henry Washington;

A bill (S. 334) granting an increase of pension to David D. Arnold;

A bill (S. 335) granting an increase of pension to Fannie R. Wells;

A bill (S. 336) granting an increase of pension to Gordon H. Williams;

A bill (S. 337) granting a pension to teamsters, bridge builders, and railroad repairers who were in the service of the United States during the Civil War;

A bill (S. 338) granting pensions to the officers and soldiers who served in the West Virginia State troops in the late Civil War;

A bill (S. 339) for the relief of West Virginia State troops;

A bill (S. 340) granting a pension to Emeline Hartley;

A bill (S. 341) granting an increase of pension to William W. Givens;

A bill (S. 342) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Beorn;

A bill (S. 343) granting an increase of pension to Ann Bates;

A bill (S. 344) granting an increase of pension to James A. Criswell;

A bill (S. 345) granting an increase of pension to General Taylor Garrison;

A bill (S. 346) granting a pension to Ida M. Goodwin;

A bill (S. 347) granting an increase of pension to Oscar N. Greer;

A bill (S. 348) granting an increase of pension to William J. Grimm;

A bill (S. 349) granting an increase of pension to Edward D. Hamrick;

A bill (S. 350) granting an increase of pension to Edward A. Hamner;

A bill (S. 351) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Cheuvront;

A bill (S. 352) granting a pension to Thomas J. Boice;

A bill (S. 353) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Cooper;

A bill (S. 354) granting a pension to Asa W. Coplin;

A bill (S. 355) granting a pension to Charles B. Cundiff;

A bill (S. 356) granting an increase of pension to Jethrow Davis; and

A bill (S. 357) granting a pension to Edward G. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 358) carrying into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of T. L. Love, surviving partner of Robert Love & Son; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 359) providing for the election of a Delegate to the House of Representatives from the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 360) to amend section 4 of the act to regulate commerce, passed February 4, 1887, and subsequent amendments thereof; and

A bill (S. 361) to amend section 20 of an act to regulate commerce, to prevent overissues of securities by carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 362) providing free passage through the Panama Canal for American ships; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

A bill (S. 363) to prohibit "cost-plus" Government contracts, and to prohibit the payment of commissions for the awarding of Government contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 364) to amend section 704 of the act of Congress approved September 8, 1916, entitled "An act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 365) authorizing the appropriation of $50,000 to reimburse the city of Renton, in the State of Washington, for damages done in the destruction of the outlet of the sewerage of that city; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (S. 366) appropriating the sum of $500 for the erection of a suitable monument over the grave of the Indian "Spokane Garry";

A bill (S. 367) providing additional time for the payment of purchase money under homestead entries within the former Colville Indian Reservation, Wash.; and

A bill (S. 368) to cancel the allotment of Davie Skootah on the Lummi Reservation, Wash., and reallot the lands included therein; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 369) for the relief of Napoleon Le Clerc;

A bill (S. 370) providing for second homestead and desert-land entries;

A bill (S. 371) to establish the Mount Baker National Park, in the State of Washington; and

A bill (S. 372) for the relief of Frederick W. Seidell; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 373) appropriating $24,000 for providing and installing in the harbor of Seattle, Wash., four mooring buoys for the use of the Government; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 374) fixing eight hours as the standard day's work for all lumber mills, logging camps, or other woodworking establishments whose products enter interstate commerce; and

A bill (S. 375) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the liability of common carriers by railroad to their employees in certain cases," approved April 22, 1908; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 376) for the relief of certain retired noncommissioned officers of the United States Army who were recalled to active service during the war with Germany and commissioned as officers;

A bill (S. 377) for the relief of John Morrow;

A bill (S. 378) authorizing the President to appoint John K. Hume a first lieutenant of Cavalry, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 379) for the relief of James Gloster;

A bill (S. 380) for the relief of Wellington F. Larabee;

A bill (S. 381) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant to John D. Sherwood, of Spokane, Wash., the right to overflow certain lands on the Fort George Wright Military Reservation at Spokane, Wash., and to accept the conveyance to the United States of other lands to be designated by the Secretary of War and suitable for a rifle range in exchange for the land so overflowed;

A bill (S. 382) authorizing the Secretary of War, upon the request of the governor of a State, to designate one or more commissioned officers of the United States Army to cooperate with the school authorities of the State in the establishment and proper conduct in any of the public schools of the State of the so-called Wyoming plan of military and physical training according to the system prepared by Lieut. E. Z. Steever, United States Army, and recommended by the War College Division of the General Staff Corps, United States Army;

A bill (S. 383) authorizing the President to appoint Frank B. Lawson a first lieutenant in the Regular Army; and

A bill (S. 384) authorizing the President to appoint J. Benjamin Hayes a first lieutenant in the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 385) for the purchase of land and water rights on the Okanogan irrigation project, to relieve settlers, and to insure an adequate water supply; and

A bill (S. 386) providing for the survey and reclamation of arid, swamp, and logged-off lands within the continental limits of the United States and the sale of same upon a system of deferred payments to soldiers and other citizens; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

A bill (S. 387) for the relief of Albert J. Weber;

A bill (S. 388) for the relief of L. H. Phipps;

A bill (S. 389) for the relief of C. P. Zent; and

A bill (S. 390) for the relief of Peter McKay; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 391) granting a pension to Rolla King;

A bill (S. 392) granting a pension to John Leonard;

A bill (S. 393) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Mullen;

A bill (S. 394) granting a pension to Jack Sommer;

A bill (S. 395) granting an increase of pension to John Barker;

A bill (S. 396) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Wilcox;

A bill (S. 397) granting an increase of pension to George C. Bonney;

A bill (S. 398) granting a pension to Catherin Arminty Holmes;

A bill (S. 399) granting an increase of pension to John Reiman;

A bill (S. 400) granting an increase of pension to Susie M. Gilbert;

A bill (S. 401) granting an increase of pension to James M. King;

A bill (S. 402) to pension widows and minor children of officers and enlisted men who served in the War with Spain, Philippine insurrection, or in China;

A bill (S. 403) granting an increase of pension to Chase Cummins;

A bill (S. 404) granting an increase of pension to Hugh L. Eyler;

A bill (S. 405) granting an increase of pension to Simeon L. Coen;

A bill (S. 406) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Higby;

A bill (S. 407) granting a pension to Mary A. Shaffer; and

A bill (S. 408) granting an increase of pension to Anton Lawrence; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EDGE:

A bill (S. 409) to consent to the proposed compact or agreement between the States of New Jersey and New York for the construction, operation, repair, and maintenance of a tunnel or tunnels under the Hudson River between the cities of Jersey City and New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 410) for the relief of Roland S. Robbins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

A bill (S. 411) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to certify certain findings of fact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 412) to transfer Frederick W. Cobb from the list of chief machinists, United States Navy, temporary lieutenant, United States Navy, to the list of chief pay clerks, United States Navy, temporary lieutenant, Pay Corps, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 413) for the relief of Canadian Car & Foundry Co. (Ltd.); to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 414) for the relief of Edward B. Fox, administrator of the last surviving partner of the firm of Child, Pratt & Fox; and

A bill (S. 415) for the relief of the owners of lighter *No. 128;* to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 416) providing for the construction of bridges and culverts or roads under reclamation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

A bill (S. 417) for the relief of Henry Wagner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 418) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, providing for the selection of lands for educational purposes in lieu of those appropriated;

A bill (S. 419) to permit the State of Wyoming to relinquish to the United States lands heretofore selected and to select other lands from the public domain in lieu thereof;

A bill (S. 420) providing for the extension of time for the reclamation of certain lands in the State of Wyoming under the Carey Act (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 421) granting to the State of Wyoming 2,000,000 acres of public land to aid in the maintenance of a system of public roads (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 422) granting an increase of pension to Abbie C. Moore;

A bill (S. 423) granting an increase of pension to Dennis Driscoll; and

A bill (S. 424) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Lake; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 425) to establish the Zion National Park in the State of Utah;

A bill (S. 426) for the relief of Ira W. Hatch;

A bill (S. 427) to consolidate certain forest lands within the Cache National Forest, Utah, and to add certain lands thereto;

A bill (S. 428) for the relief of Thomas Sevy;

A bill (S. 429) to authorize an exchange of lands with Henry Blackburn; and

A bill (S. 430) to authorize the exchange of certain lands within the Fishlake National Forest, Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 431) to increase the cost of the public building at Spanish Fork, Utah;

A bill (S. 432) to provide for the erection of a public building at Price, Utah;

A bill (S. 433) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Bingham Canyon, in the State of Utah;

A bill (S. 434) for the purchase of a post-office site at Cedar City, Utah;

A bill (S. 435) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at St. George, Utah;

A bill (S. 436) for the purchase of a post-office site at Tremonton, Utah;

A bill (S. 437) for the purchase of a post-office site at Mount Pleasant, Utah;

A bill (S. 438) to increase the cost of the public building at Park City, Utah;

A bill (S. 439) to increase the cost of the public building at Vernal, Utah;

A bill (S. 440) to increase the cost of the public building at Eureka, Utah; and

A bill (S. 441) to authorize the appropriation of $50,000 for the erection of a public building at Nephi, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 442) providing for the leasing of arid lands which are irrigable, belonging to Indian allottees, and fixing the maximum time for which such leases may run; and

A bill (S. 443) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations,' approved January 11, 1915"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 444) providing for acquiring a site and erecting a national memorial to irrigation at Salt Lake City, Utah; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

A bill (S. 445) for the relief of William B. Lancaster; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 446) to make April 6 in each year a national holiday, to be called liberty day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 477) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to pension the survivors of certain Indian wars from January 1, 1859, to January, 1891, inclusive, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1917;

A bill (S. 448) to increase the pensions of widows of men who served in the War with Mexico; and

A bill (S. 449) to increase the pensions of Army nurses; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCORMICK:

A bill (S. 450) to provide for an independent audit of the departmental accounts, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 451) to transfer the Coast Guard from the Department of the Treasury to the Department of the Navy;

A bill (S. 452) to transfer the Secret Service from the Department of the Treasury to the Department of Justice;

A bill (S. 453) to transfer the Office of the Supervising Architect from the Department of the Treasury to the Department of the Interior;

A bill (S. 454) to transfer the Public Health Service from the Department of the Treasury to the Department of the Interior;

A bill (S. 455) to transfer the Bureau of War Risk Insurance from the Department of the Treasury to the Department of the Interior; and

A bill (S. 456) to provide for the coordination, revision, and unification of the annual departmental estimates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 457) to establish a new judicial circuit of the United States with a circuit court of appeals, hereafter to be called the tenth circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 458) to reimburse Capt. K. E. Kern, Fifty-fourth Infantry, for certain expenditures; and

A bill (S. 459) for the relief of W. K. Ellis; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 460) to raise revenue by taxing certain articles of food held in cold storage; and

A bill (S. 461) to reduce the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 462) to increase the cost of the public building at Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 463) for the reduction of postage on first-class mail matter; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 464) reappointing Edgar C. Campbell as pay clerk in Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, with rank of second lieutenant;

A bill (S. 465) tendering the thanks of Congress to Gen. John J. Pershing, United States Army, and the officers and men under his command, and to Maj. Gen. Enoch H. Crowder, provost marshal general, and the members of the local and district boards throughout the United States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico;

A bill (S. 466) to provide relief for commissioned officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted persons in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and the Army Nurse Corps;

A bill (S. 467) for the relief of Barneybas Eastridge;

A bill (S. 468) to correct the military record of E. D. Judkins;

A bill (S. 469) to authorize the reinstatement of honorably discharged soldiers and sailors to former positions in Government service and restoration to eligible register of the names of honorably discharged soldiers and sailors;

A bill (S. 470) for the relief of Charles Lee Baker;

A bill (S. 471) for the appointment of an inspector of national parks and cemeteries;

A bill (S. 472) to establish and maintain military-training colleges in the several States of the Union, in Alaska, and in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 473) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the town of Murfreesboro, Tenn., five condemned bronze or brass cannon or fieldpieces and suitable outfit of cannon balls;

A bill (S. 474) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the town of Murfreesboro, Tenn., two condemned bronze or brass cannon or fieldpieces and suitable outfit of cannon balls;

A bill (S. 475) for the relief of National Guard officers;

A bill (S. 476) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Trenton, Tenn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; and

A bill (S. 477) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lewisburg, Tenn., three German cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 478) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hart;

A bill (S. 479) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Brown;

A bill (S. 480) granting a pension to Nancy Cook;

A bill (S. 481) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hawkins;

A bill (S. 482) granting a pension to Eva Durham;

A bill (S. 483) granting a pension to Emil K. Schroeder;

A bill (S. 484) granting a pension to Susan E. Nash;

A bill (S. 485) granting a pension to Walter L. Jewell;

A bill (S. 486) granting an increase of pension to Susan E. Nash;

A bill (S. 487) granting an increase of pension to J. S. Driggs;

A bill (S. 488) granting a pension to Catherine N. Wilson;

A bill (S. 489) granting a pension to L. F. Pampe;

A bill (S. 490) granting a pension to Albert M. Griffith;

A bill (S. 491) granting a pension to James Besheers; and

A bill (S. 492) granting a pension to George W. Hacker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 493) providing for an additional session of the Congress on the 5th day of March following the election of such Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 494) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and an act in amendment thereto approved October 6, 1917; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 495) for the relief of Walston H. Brown, sole surviving partner of the firm of Brown, Howard & Co., and of the Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (S. 496) for the relief of the legal representatives of Henry D. Geddings; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 497) to increase the area of the United States Botanic Garden in the city of Washington, D. C.; and

A bill (S. 498) to create the World War memorial commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 499) to donate a gun or howitzer to the city of Dover, in the State of New Hampshire;

A bill (S. 500) to correct the military record of Samuel C. Rowe;

A bill (S. 501) to donate a gun or howitzer to the town of Plaistow, in the State of New Hampshire;

A bill (S. 502) to donate a gun or howitzer to the city of Portsmouth, in the State of New Hampshire;

A bill (S. 503) to donate a gun or howitzer to the town of Claremont, in the State of New Hampshire;

A bill (S. 504) to donate a gun or howitzer to the town of Bennington, in the State of New Hampshire; and

A bill (S. 505) to donate a gun or howitzer to the town of Littleton, in the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 506) granting a pension to Hattie M. Cosgriff (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 507) granting an increase of pension to John W. Fletcher (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 508) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Boudette (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 509) granting privilege of the floor and right to participate in debate to heads of executive departments and other officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 510) authorizing the Secretary of War to erect a monument at Valparaiso, Chile; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 511) for the improvement of navigation of the Connecticut River and authorizing the Connecticut River Co. to relocate and construct a dam in said river above the village of Windsor Locks, in the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 512) for the relief of Lester A. Rockwell;

A bill (S. 513) to correct the military record of Walter H. Hutchinson;
A bill (S. 514) for the relief of Henry E. Williams;
A bill (S. 515) to correct the military record of Charles K. Bond, alias Kimball W. Rollins;
A bill (S. 516) for the relief of John M. Squire;
A bill (S. 517) for the relief of Joseph Wygant;
A bill (S. 518) for the relief of Charles Yarrington;
A bill (S. 519) for the relief of Edward Shannon;
A bill (S. 520) to grant medals to survivors and heirs of volunteers of the Port Hudson forlorn-hope storming party;
A bill (S. 521) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Waterbury, Conn., three German cannons or fieldpieces; and
A bill (S. 522) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Enfield, Conn., three German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 523) for the relief of the estate of Philip Halsey Remington;
A bill (S. 524) for the relief of Mrs. Jarvis M. Williams;
A bill (S. 525) for the relief of James Gilfillan;
A bill (S. 526) for the relief of the heirs of Paul Noyes;
A bill (S. 527) for the relief of Charles J. Fuller;
A bill (S. 528) for the relief of Joshua A. Fessenden and others; and
A bill (S. 529) for the relief of the heirs of Adam and Noah Brown; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 530) granting an increase of pension to Ralph Kent, jr.;
A bill (S. 531) granting a pension to Joseph Povencher, jr.;
A bill (S. 532) granting an increase of pension to Curtis B. Ralph;
A bill (S. 533) granting an increase of pension to Rosanna Miller;
A bill (S. 534) granting an increase of pension to David Burns;
A bill (S. 535) granting an increase of pension to William Brant;
A bill (S. 536) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Winter;
A bill (S. 537) granting an increase of pension to Marietta Silvernail;
A bill (S. 538) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Atwood;
A bill (S. 539) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Chappell;
A bill (S. 540) granting a pension to Conrad Hockenberger;
A bill (S. 541) granting a pension to Mary Elizabeth Crowe;
A bill (S. 542) granting an increase of pension to Sherman E. Deming;
A bill (S. 543) granting an increase of pension to George W. Garthwaite;
A bill (S. 544) granting an increase of pension to Milo K. Gray (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 545) granting a pension to Terrence O'Connor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:
A bill (S. 546) to repeal the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. PITTMAN:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) authorizing the President of the United States to cause to be struck bronze medals commemorating the winning of the World War and the valor of our military forces and to distribute and present such medals to the officers and men of our land, sea, and air forces; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 3) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 4) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 5) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 6) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. McKELLAR:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 7) to amend the census act of March 3, 1919; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 8) relative to claims of citizens of the United States against the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 9) relating to transfer of control of telegraph, telephone, marine cable, and radio systems; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. GORE:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 10) to return the telephone, telegraph, and marine cable systems to the owners thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. KENYON:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 11) creating a commission to report a plan for a national budget system; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EDGE:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 12) creating a commission to report upon ways and means of securing a national budget system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SMOOT:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) changing the name of the Panama Canal to the Roosevelt Canal; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

By Mr. WATSON:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 14) to repeal sections 628 and 904, respectively, of the revenue act approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CALDER:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 15) providing a commission to consider the question of the adoption of a zone system for the construction of buildings in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McKELLAR:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 16) creating offices of congressional examiners; to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 17) authorizing the Secretary of War to accept resignations of officers and to grant discharges to enlisted men in the Army under certain conditions; and
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 18) providing for a review of the findings of courts-martial convened during the war with Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. JONES of Washington submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $50,000,000 to resume and prosecute work on projects and units thereof, under the reclamation act, stopped during the war, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands and ordered to be printed.

SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN.

Mr. POMERENE. I offer a resolution which I ask to have read for the information of the Senate, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The resolution (S. Res. 11) was read and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, as follows:

Whereas charges and countercharges of excessive and illegal expenditures of money and of unlawful practices have been made in connection with the election of a Senator from the State of Michigan, which election was held on the 5th day of November, 1918: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and it is hereby, authorized and directed to investigate the said charges and countercharges or excessive and illegal expenditures of money and of unlawful practices in connection with the said election of a Senator from the State of Michigan and to take possession of the ballots, poll books, tally sheets, and all other documents and records relating to the said election; and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and his deputies and assistants be, and they are hereby, instructed to carry out the directions of the said Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, in that behalf; and that the said Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and it is hereby, directed to proceed with all convenient speed to take all necessary steps for the preservation of the said ballots, poll books, tally sheets, and other documents, and to recount the said ballot, and to take and preserve all evidence as to the various matters alleged in the said charges and countercharges and of any alleged fraud, irregularity, and excessive and illegal expenditures of money and of any unlawful practices in the said election and primary and as to the intimidation of voters or other facts affecting the result of said election; and be it

Resolved further, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate and during any recess of the Senate or of the Congress and to hold its sessions at such place or places as it shall deem most convenient for the purposes of the investigation, and to have full power to subpœna parties and witnesses and to require the production of all papers, books, and documents and other evidence relating to the said investigation, and to employ clerks and stenographers at a cost not to exceed $1 per printed page to take and make a record of all evidence

taken and received by the committee and to keep a record of its proceedings, and to have such evidence, records, and others matter required by the committee printed; and be it

Resolved further, That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and his deputies and assistants are hereby required to attend the said Committee on Privileges and Election, or any subcommittee thereof, and to execute its directions; that the chairman or any member of the committee be, and is hereby, empowered to administer oaths; that each of the parties to the said contest be entitled to representatives and attorneys at the recount and the taking of evidence; that all disputed ballots and records be preserved so that final action may be had thereon by the full committee and the Senate; that the committee may appoint subcommittees of one or more members to represent the committee at the various places in the making of the recount and the taking of evidence, and the committee may appoint such supervisors of the recount as it may deem best; and that the committee may adopt and enforce such rules and regulations for the conduct of the recount and the taking of evidence as it may deem wise, not inconsistent with this resolution; and that the committee shall report to the Senate as early as may be and, from time to time, if it deems best, submit all the testimony and the result of the recount and of the investigation; and be it

Resolved further, That the expenses incurred in the carrying out of these resolutions shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers ordered by the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, and approved by the chairman of the committee.

TREATY OF PEACE.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate hearing.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let the resolution be read first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 12) was read, as follows:

Whereas the peace treaty has been completed and has been delivered to the representatives of Germany; and

Whereas a synopsis only of the treaty has been given publicity in the United States and our people are entitled to know its full contents and to what, if any, engagements they may have been committed; and

Whereas it is reported in the press that the entire treaty has been cabled to the State Department and is now in the possession of the State Department: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested forthwith to transmit to the Senate the full text of the treaty of peace completed at the Paris conference and delivered to the representatives of Germany.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I ask the Senator from California if he will not withhold his request for the consideration of this resolution until Senators may be allowed to introduce certain bills?

Mr. ROBINSON. I object to the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule and be printed.

UNITED STATES SOLDIERS IN SIBERIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I offer another resolution and ask unanimous consent for its adoption immediately.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 13) was read, as follows:

Whereas it is reported in the public press that 8,000 United States soldiers are to be sent to Siberia; and

Whereas the purposes for which the said soldiers are dispatched to Siberia are undisclosed and unknown: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State and the Secretary of War be, and they are hereby, requested immediately to inform the Senate of the reasons for sending 8,000 United States soldiers to Siberia, what duties are there to be performed by these soldiers, how long they are to remain, and generally to advise the Senate of the policy of the United States Government in respect to Siberia and the maintenance of United States soldiers therein.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ROBINSON. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule and be printed.

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICS.

Mr. NEW. I offer a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 14) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules is hereby authorized and directed to report a committee of the Senate to be known as the committee on aeronautics, the general purpose and functions of which shall be to consider all matters appertaining to aircraft and aviation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I do not think the rules, under their express terms, can be amended in that way. The rules require their amendment by formal notice of a purpose to submit an amendment to them; and I make the point of order against the resolution.

Mr. LODGE. It is simply a request to refer a resolution to a committee.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Oh, no; it is a direction to the committee to bring in a particular character of rule.

Mr. LODGE. The resolution of the Senator from Indiana, as I understood it when I heard it read, proposes to give instructions to a committee of the Senate to consider a certain matter. The committee has the right to bring in a rule. The day's notice comes before the rule is brought in.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But I do not think the committee could be directed to report a rule. I suggest, Mr. President, that the resolution be read again.

Mr. LODGE. The resolution can be perfectly well changed to meet the objection of the Senator from Georgia. All that the Senator from Indiana has to do is to state the rule which he wishes to change.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I make the point of order against its immediate consideration, at any rate. I ask that the resolution may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under objection, and in the meantime the Chair will endeavor to find out whether or not it is subject to a point of order.

TREATY OF PEACE.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I submit a resolution and ask that it be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 15) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be, and hereby is, requested to secure for the Senate of the United States a copy of the proposed treaty of peace delivered to the German plenipotentiaries on May 7, 1919.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. ASHURST. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution goes over under the rule.

PENINSULA OF LOWER CALIFORNIA.

Mr. ASHURST. I offer a Senate resolution which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution (S. Res. 16) was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to open negotiations with the Republic of Mexico for the purchase of the peninsula of Lower California and for the purchase of that tract of land in the State of Sonora, Republic of Mexico, approximating in area 10,000 square miles, and lying north of the parallel of 31° 20′ north latitude.

MISS ALICE WOOD.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, a short time ago one of the teachers in the District of Columbia, Miss Alice Wood, was suspended for a week. Some charges were made to the effect that she was teaching Bolshevism in the schools. I have no defense for Bolshevism. I think if she were teaching Bolshevism in the schools she ought to have been dismissed instead of being suspended.

Charges have been made that she was not given a proper hearing. Charges have been made indicating that very autocratic action was taken and rather secret proceedings had. I do not know whether that is true or not. If that is true, we have the essence of Bolshevism in high places, and the practice of Bolshevism by those in authority is as bad, if not worse, than is the preaching of Bolshevism.

All I know is that Miss Wood was assured by the superintendent of schools of the District of Columbia that the hearing she had been invited to attend was simply an informal hearing and an inquiry of a friendly character. I know that much myself. A short time after the hearing there appeared under large headlines statements given out by the board or by the superintendent putting Miss Wood in a very unpatriotic light and position and setting out the action of the board. Only two members of the board were present at the meeting attended by Miss Wood. She was never called before the board. She had no opportunity to refute any charges before the board, and did not know that she was being prosecuted.

I think we ought to know the facts with reference to this incident, and so I am presenting a resolution authorizing the Committee on the District of Columbia or some subcommittee thereof to investigate the matter. I ask that the resolution may be read, and then I suppose it will have to go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 17) was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and it is hereby, directed to investigate and ascertain the facts relative to the suspension by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia of Miss Alice Wood, a teacher in the

schools of the District, and report the same to the Senate with its recommendations; and the committee or any subcommittee conducting such investigation is authorized to subpœna witnesses, send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths and take all steps necessary to ascertain the facts, and to employ such stenographic help as may be necessary at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and the committee or any subcommitte thereof may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate in conducting such investigation.

UNITED STATES MILITARY OPERATIONS IN RUSSIA.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I submit a resolution which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution (S. Res. 18) was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the Constitution provides that the President shall from time to time inform the Senate of the state of the Union: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President is requested to inform the Senate what plan, purpose, and policy has been adopted by the executive branch of the Government as to the military operations now being conducted by the United States Army in Russia; whether these operations are against the all-Russian Government at Omsk or against the Bolshevist party in control at Moscow; and if against either of these governments, to what extent it is proposed to proceed to carry out by force the objects of said several military expeditions; and to inform the Senate, if said expeditions have a military object, why the number of troops therein has been so limited and is so inadequate that it is impossible to accomplish such purpose, or any purpose: and that the only and inevitable result of said expeditions with inadequate numbers, and with no plan or purpose of policy or campaign, is the needless hardship, suffering, loss of life of men conscripted into the United States Army for the war with Germany, and vast expenditures from the Treasury of the United States, without the possibility of beneficial results.

CLAIMS AGAINST MEXICO.

Mr. KING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 19), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That the President is requested to open negotiations through diplomatic channels with Mexico for the appointment of a joint high commission on the part of the United States and upon the part of Mexico, which shall be authorized to consider, liquidate, and settle claims made by the citizens of the United States to recover damages suffered on account of the delinquency of the Government of Mexico.

REPEAL OF REVENUE LAW.

Mr. KING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 20), which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Resolved, That it be the sense of the Senate that sections 630 and 904 of the act entitled "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes," approved February 24, 1919, be repealed.

INDIAN LANDS IN UTAH.

Mr. KING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 21), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas in the counties of Duchesne and Uinta, in the State of Utah, there is a large body of Indian lands known as Indian grazing lands, which has not been allotted in severalty to the Indians of the Ute Tribe, which lands adjoin the Ashley National Forest in the State of Utah; and

Whereas said lands are valuable for grazing purposes and contain areas which are also specially adapted to agricultural use and occupation; and

Whereas said lands are not being utilized for any beneficial purpose and are excluded from the use of the white settlers in said counties; and

Whereas the said Indians for whose use said lands have ostensibly been set apart are unable to occupy or make any economic or beneficial use of the same; and

Whereas said Indians for whose use said lands have been segregated and set apart are not making an economic or adequate use of said lands, and will not in the future be able to make an economic or adequate use of said lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate the present status of the said so-called Indian grazing lands in Duchesne and Uinta Counties, Utah, and what means may be taken to extinguish the Indian title to said lands and open the same to use, settlement, and occupation, and whether it is convenient and advantageous to add said lands, or any part thereof, to the Uinta National Forest.

GRAZING LANDS IN UTAH.

Mr. KING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 22), which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

Whereas in the counties of Duchesne and Uinta, in the State of Utah, there is a large body of Indian lands known as Indian grazing lands, which has not been allotted in severalty to the Indians of the Ute Tribe, which lands adjoin the Ashley National Forest in the State of Utah; and

Whereas said lands are valuable for grazing purposes and contain areas which are also specially adapted to agricultural use and occupation; and

Whereas said lands are not being utilized for any beneficial purpose and are excluded from the use of the white settlers in said counties; and

Whereas the said Indians for whose use said lands have ostensibly been set apart are unable to occupy or make any economic or beneficial use of the same; and

Whereas said Indians for whose use said lands have been segregated and set apart are not making an economic or adequate use of said lands, and will not in the future be able to make an economic or adequate use of said lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate the present status of the said so-called Indian grazing lands in Duchesne and Uinta Counties, Utah, and what means may be taken to extinguish the Indian title to said lands and open the same to use, settlement, and occupation, and whether it is convenient and advantageous to add said lands, or any part thereof, to the Uinta National Forest.

ARMY OF 500,000 MEN.

Mr. KING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 23), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Whereas representatives of the United States and the allied Governments have met at Paris for the purpose of negotiating terms of peace between the said Governments and the Central Powers; and

Whereas under the law providing for the present military forces of the United States most of said forces within a short period after the terms of peace have been signed will automatically be released and discharged from military service; and

Whereas it may be necessary for the United States to maintain military forces in Europe for a considerable period after peace conditions have been agreed upon, not only for the purpose of procuring a fulfillment of the necessary guaranties exacted from the Central Powers but for other proper, legitimate, and imperative reasons; and

Whereas the unsettled and confused conditions existing throughout the world require that provision be made for the safety and security of this Nation and its interests, and for such purpose, in addition to the maintenance of a strong Navy, an Army of sufficient strength and size should be organized: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Senate legislation should be enacted authorizing the organization of an Army of 500,000 men.

THE NATIONAL GUARD.

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 24), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, respectfully requested to furnish the Senate the names of all National Guard officers that have been dismissed from the service since the beginning of the present war, by States, together with the rank of each officer and the organization to which he belonged, and the dates and causes of dismissal.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS TO MILITARY SERVICE.

Mr. KELLOGG submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 25), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Whereas during previous months the press of the country published articles relative to the release of conscientious objectors from the military service and from confinement; and

Whereas it is alleged that the War Department considered the matter subjectively and authorized that conscientious objectors should be given honorable discharges from the military service and become entitled to all compensation in arrears at the time of their discharge, which compensation was tendered them; and

Whereas the people of the United States, and particularly those who served faithfully in the military service, are entitled to a complete, true, and detailed report of the action of the War Department alleged above: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of War shall be, and he is hereby, requested to furnish a complete and detailed report of the action taken by the War Department affecting conscientious objectors, which report shall set forth names, dates of confinement, and dates of discharge, amount of compensation tendered each individual, and the character of the discharge granted in each instance; said report to be submitted to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

STANDARD VALUATIONS.

Mr. THOMAS. By request I offer a concurrent resolution, which I ask to have referred to the Committee on Standards, Weights, and Measures.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) was referred to the Committee on Standards, Weights, and Measures, as follows:

Whereas the lack of uniformity in determining value or relative value results at once in general confusion and inequality in taxation burdens; and

Whereas a scientific study of the subject by some recognized bureau of the General Government would be helpful; and

Whereas the Bureau of Standards, already established, would seem to be best fitted for such research and service: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Bureau of Standards be, and it hereby is, empowered and directed to assign to the special study and investigation of the subject of value and relative value men of scientific and practical attainments, with the view of making early and comprehensive report on the subject to the Congress.

Resolved further, That in addition to suggesting and recommending a plan whereby value and relative value of all things shall be determined, the bureau shall recommend the manner in which it is believed the standard determined upon may be made of uniform application in the several States and the lesser political subdivisions, all that inequalities in valuations made for revenue, as well as for all other purposes, may be reduced to the minimum or altogether eliminated.

Resolved further, That the Bureau of Standards and the men assigned to the investigation of the subject of this resolution shall give to Dr. Napoleon Wagner, of Denver, Colo., and other students of relative value or the just distribution of the tax burden, not whose dollar but each dollar on the same basis to all alike, as they shall offer to submit the result of their studies, reasonable opportunity in the premises, and, moreover, may ask men of the bureau's selection to appear and present orally or submit in writing that which they believe would be helpful in the solution of the world-wide important question of relative value.

Resolved further, That in addition to stabilizing and standardizing in the Bureau of Standards, Washington, D. C., the daily purchasing power of the value of the present gold dollar or medium of exchange equally with all other commodities to be definitely determined by the present statistical or improved scientific Federal index numbers—as illustrated by the Federal Labor Bureau, the Hon. Samuel Gompers, Labor Statistician, enlarged and improved—on the basis of the natural use—not the profiteering speculative or temporarily artificially forced use—of the Federal determined, daily, publicly declared average value of each commodity based on the real national supply and demand, exactly as per the daily rate of value of money exchange of pound sterling by the Bank of England or by our rate of value of money exchange of the present gold dollar or medium of exchange by the Amer-

ican clearing house by regulation and control of the United States Congress. Thus the value of each commodity publicly daily declared at Washington, D. C., for universal use.

Resolved further, That the expenditure of the sum of $25,000 in furtherance of the investigation contemplated herein is hereby authorized, to be paid from funds not otherwise appropriated.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENTAL ACCOUNTS.

Mr. McCORMICK submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That a committee is hereby created to be known as the joint committee on departmental accounts, to consist of 15 Members from each House of Congress, the membership to be appointed in the usual manner.

That said committee shall each year receive the departmental accounts, with the audit and report of the controller-auditor general thereon; shall submit them to a detailed examination; and shall report to the Congress their recommendations in regard to the same not later than the 1st day of March of each year.

That said committee shall not be limited in its examination to the points raised in the audit of the controller-auditor general, but may inquire into any question of irregularity, illegality, fraud, waste, loss, or other such matters which may arise in connection with the accounts: *Provided, however*, That said committee shall not inquire into questions relating to the wisdom or the policy of the legislation appropriating the money to which the accounts relate, nor shall it inquire into questions of purely an administrative nature.

That said committee shall have authority to call for all necessary documents and papers relating to the departmental accounts, and may compel the attendance of witnesses and administer oaths: *Provided, however*, That no witnesses may be called or examined who are not employed in the executive departments of the Government.

That this concurrent resolution shall take effect upon the passage of the independent audit bill now pending.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—JAMES N. SEIP.

On motion of Mr. CURTIS, it was

Ordered, That the papers accompanying the bill S. 1278, Sixty-fifth Congress, first session, granting an increase of pension to James N. Seip, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

COMMITTEE ON AVIATION AND AERONAUTICS.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I desire at this time to give notice that at the next meeting of the Senate I shall move an amendment to Rule XXV so as to have it include a provision for the appointment of a committee on aviation and aeronautics.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The notice must be in writing, the Chair will state to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. NEW. I will reduce it to writing.

The notice was reduced to writing, as follows:

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I desire at this time to give notice that at the next meeting of the Senate I shall move to amend Rule XXV to make it include a provision for the appointment of a committee on aviation and aeronautics.

REPORT ON TREATIES OF COMMERCE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, at the last session of Congress the Senate passed a resolution calling on the Secretary of State for information with reference to treaties of commerce under which notice had been given for the abrogation following certain information. The report of the department did not get down before Congress adjourned. The report, however, is here. I think it furnishes some information that would be of considerable value to the Committee on Commerce in considering matters that very likely will come before it. So I ask that the report may be printed and referred to that committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COVENANT OF LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the covenant of the league of nations in its original form, together with the address of the President in the presentation of it, which has already been printed as a public document, be reprinted as a public document containing the amended form of the covenant of the league of nations, so that we may have it conveniently before us.

Mr. LODGE. I think that ought to be done.

Mr. PITTMAN. The covenant, together with the address of the President in presenting the amendments.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will permit me, it ought to be printed in parallel columns, I think, to show the different drafts side by side.

Mr. PITTMAN. I think that is a very good suggestion.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the only way it should be printed. The original document could not well be printed with the amendments incorporated in it. It either ought to be printed by itself or else printed in parallel columns, as suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. PITTMAN. I adopted the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY.

Mr. LODGE. I ask for the adoption of an order that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Friday next. My object is to give time to the committees on committees of the two parties to arrange the standing committees, because until they are arranged business is hampered. We have a great deal of business that will soon be before us in the way of appropriation bills requiring immediate attention. Therefore I ask that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Friday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. ALBERT ESTOPINAL, late a Representative from the State of Louisiana, and transmitted resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. CARL C. VAN DYKE, late a Representative from the State of Minnesota, and transmitted resolutions of the House thereon.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE ALBERT ESTOPINAL.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolutions were read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
May 19, 1919.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ALBERT ESTOPINAL, a Representative from the State of Louisiana.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate a copy of these resolutions to the Senate.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I submit the resolutions which I send to the desk and ask for their immediate consideration.

The resolutions (S. Res. 26) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep sensibility the announcement of the death of Hon. ALBERT ESTOPINAL, late a Representative from the State of Louisiana.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CARL C. VAN DYKE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolutions were read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
May 20, 1919.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. CARL C. VAN DYKE, a Representative from the State of Minnesota.

Resolved, That a committee of 18 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect this House do now adjourn.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I offer the following resolutions and ask for their adoption.

The resolutions (S. Res. 27) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CARL C. VAN DYKE, late a Representative from the State of Minnesota.

Resolved, That a committee of six Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

Under the second resolution the Vice President appointed Mr. NELSON, Mr. KELLOGG, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. PHELAN, Mr. WALSH of Montana, and Mr. LENROOT as the committee on the part of the Senate.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representatives named in the resolutions just adopted, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, May 23, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *May 20, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, our Father in heaven, for the beautiful spirit of harmony which prevailed in the opening day of the Sixty-sixth Congress, and we most earnestly pray that the spirit of brotherly love may follow in the wake of that day's opening. Men who think for themselves and act on their initiative in great problems, questions of state, will differ, but we pray that the spirit of Americanism may dominate them in their discussion, and that the love of home, the love of country, and all that is best in us may be guided by the angel of mercy.

And now, O God, our Father, help us to bend to Thy mighty will and believe that what Thou doest Thou doest for the good of mankind. Comfort us, therefore, in the loss of a Member of this House who was taken suddenly away; comfort his friends and family and bring them together again in thine own good time in one of the mansions Thou hast made for Thy children. In the name of Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE—WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House joint resolution 17, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women, and House joint resolution 18, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women, be rereferred from the Committee on the Judiciary to the Committee on Woman Suffrage. I do this by request of the Committee on Woman Suffrage, which met this morning.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent for the change of reference of the joint resolutions referred to, 17 and 18, from the Committee on the Judiciary to the Committee on Woman Suffrage. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask when the Committee on Woman Suffrage was elected? There are no minority members on that committee, and I object.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a privileged motion. By direction of the Committee on Woman Suffrage, I move that House joint resolutions 17 and 18 be taken from the Committee on the Judiciary and referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois that the Committee on Woman Suffrage has not yet been selected by the House.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Woman Suffrage has not only been elected by the House, but it has met, with a majority of the members present, a majority of the entire 13 members acting. The fact that there are vacancies on that committee does not establish that the committee has not been elected. There are vacancies, and will be on many committees.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the committees of this House are composed of members selected by the majority and the minority.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the committees of the House are elected by the House.

Mr. WALSH. If the majority Members of the House select their members of various committees, and the minority Members of the House have not done so, not only are there vacancies on the various committees, but there is a failure to select the committee. This Committee on Woman Suffrage has not been completed by this House. The mere fact that the minority have not selected their representatives on the committee can not be said to leave a vacancy only on the committee. The committee organization has not been completed, and I submit that until the organization of the committees of the House have been completed this motion is not a preferential motion and can not be made.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. DYER. What would the gentleman say if the minority did not select its members for the Woman Suffrage Committee at all? Would the gentleman say that the Woman Suffrage Committee would be unable to proceed with business?

Mr. WALSH. I certainly should, until the organization of the committees of the House had been completed. That is the orderly way and the usual way. Why, of course if that was so, if the contention of the gentleman from Missouri and that of the gentleman from Illinois was correct, the minority Members who have been selected upon committees could hold meetings, report out resolutions and bills, have them considered here in the House without any representation from the other side whatever, and I think—though I do not know—that that is what is attempted to be done with the woman-suffrage resolution in this case.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair is of the opinion that when a majority of a committee has been elected by the House that committee is duly constituted, and whether it is usual or ordinary or expedient is a matter for the House to judge. The gentleman from Illinois moves, by direction of the committee, the change of reference from the Committee on the Judiciary to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLACKMON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 211, noes 12.

So the motion was agreed to.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New Jersey rise?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I ask unanimous consent for the change of reference of a bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] introduced the bill H. R. 261, a bill to provide for the retirement of superannuated civil employees of the Government on annuity. This bill was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The subject matter is clearly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service. I am further informed that the introducer of the bill [Mr. SIMS] indorsed the bill himself for reference to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, and the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce does not claim jurisdiction.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, that is correct. As the gentleman from New Jersey stated, I did so mark the bill for reference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, we could not hear the request.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman who introduced the bill if this is the same measure which was in the last Congress reported out by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and whether it provides for its administration under the Bureau of War Risk Insurance?

Mr. SIMS. It is exactly the bill, word for word, as reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during the last session of the Sixty-fifth Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would like to ask why the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce does not have jurisdiction?

Mr. SIMS. I will state, Mr. Speaker, that the chief object and purpose of the bill is to provide for retirement pay for the civil employees of the Government, and the providing for the law to be administered by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance is merely an administrative matter and is not the subject matter or the chief object and purpose of the bill. The substance of the bill is to create a law retiring these civilian employees and providing for retirement pay for them, and therefore I did not think the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was entitled to jurisdiction of the subject matter, and do not think so now.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall object for to-day. I want to look into the matter further.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky objects.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the Chair understand the gentleman from Minnesota desires to correct the RECORD?

Mr. MADDEN. I thought I had been recognized.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 274, a bill to provide returned soldiers with land, be taken from the Committee on Appropriations and be given to the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which it properly belongs. It is a mistake in reference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the bill in reference to land for returned

soldiers be taken from the Committee on Appropriations and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we can not hear a thing over here, and nobody knows what that bill is.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire by what right the bill should go to the Committee on Banking and Currency?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the House for one hour on next Monday, immediately after the reading of the Journal, on America in the war.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to address the House next Monday, immediately after the reading of the Journal, for one hour. Is there objection?

Mr. ASWELL. Will the gentleman state the subject?

The SPEAKER. America in the war. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

LEAVE TO FILE A MINORITY REPORT.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], though not yet elected members of the Committee on Woman Suffrage, have leave to file minority views on House joint resolution No. 1, reported this morning from the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, what happened to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] about that bill?

The SPEAKER. That was objected to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to serve notice on the House that I am going to object to everything if there is not enough order so that the ordinary Member can hear.

REFERENCE OF CERTAIN BILLS.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress, as the House will remember, there was a very important bill pending on the calendar providing for homes and work for returning soldiers, sailors, and marines. I introduced the bill I refer to, which was H. R. 15993. It is the Secretary Lane reclamation measure.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, we have not disposed of this other matter yet.

The SPEAKER. That was agreed to.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I thought that matter was disposed of.

The bill was referred in the last Congress to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, and as the chairman of that committee I reported the bill to the House. On yesterday there were some half dozen bills introduced in the House that are practically identical copies of that bill. All of those bills but one have been referred, I think erroneously, to the Public Lands Committee. One of those bills, introduced by Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina, was referred to the Committee on Irrigation. The bill of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] and my own bill, which I reintroduced, and the other similar bills that were introduced were all referred to the Committee on the Public Lands, and I feel that they all ought to be rereferred to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands because this is not a public domain matter. It is a great governmental irrigation and reclamation matter. I ask, then, so far as my own bill is concerned, H. R. 457, that it be referred to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, the committee that considered the same bill in the last Congress. I think all the other similar bills ought also to go to that committee. The Public Lands Committee has no right to this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] asks unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 457 be rereferred from the Committee on the Public Lands to the Committee on Irrigation. Is there objection?

Mr. SINNOTT. I object.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

The SPEAKER. If there are any Members present who were not sworn in yesterday, they will now present themselves and be sworn.

Mr. JONES of Texas, Mr. JACOWAY, Mr. BLACKMON, Mr. SUMNERS of Texas, Mr. NEWTON of Missouri, Mr. MCPHERSON, Mr. BABKA, and Mr. MOONEY presented themselves at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, administered by the Speaker.

PRIVILEGES OF FLOOR TO COMMISSIONERS FROM PHILIPPINES.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there is no provision under the rules of the House——

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] will proceed.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there is no provision under the rules of the House extending the privileges of the floor to the Resident Commissioners from the Philippine Islands. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the privileges of the floor be extended during this Congress, or until the rules of the House provide formally for those privileges, to the said commissioners.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman from Kansas yield?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Kansas yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Will not the gentleman also include the Commissioner from Porto Rico?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The rules of the House provide for the privileges of the floor for the Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico.

Mr. CANNON. How many Resident Commissioners are there from the Philippine Islands for whom you desire the privileges of the floor?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Two.

Mr. CANNON. Has that been the rule heretofore?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It has.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] asks unanimous consent that the privileges of the floor be extended to the Commissioners from the Philippine Islands. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY PRESIDENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the committee, consisting of Messrs. JAMES R. MANN, CHAMP CLARK, and F. W. MONDELL, appointed by the House to notify the President that a quorum of each House is assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make, begs leave to report that it has communicated with the President, that the President has expressed his thanks for the notification, and informed the committee that he will address the Congress in writing.

PETITION FOR WITHDRAWING TROOPS FROM RUSSIA.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MASON. To present a petition sent by 70,000 people to the President and the Congress asking that our troops be returned from Russia. I present it at the request of the mothers and wives of the soldiers in that country; and I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk forward these petitions to the President of the United States.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MCARTHUR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the House has before it a message from the President of the United States. I suggest that the regular order of business be transacted.

Mr. MASON. I can not hear the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

ANNUAL MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk of the House:

GENTLEMEN OF THE CONGRESS: I deeply regret my inability to be present at the opening of the extraordinary session of the Congress. It still seems to be my duty to take part in the counsels of the peace conference and contribute what I can to the solution of the innumerable questions to whose settlement it has had to address itself: for they are questions which affect the peace of the whole world and from them, therefore, the

United States cannot stand apart. I deemed it my duty to call the Congress together at this time because it was not wise to postpone longer the provisions which must be made for the support of the government. Many of the appropriations which are absolutely necessary for the maintenance of the government and the fulfillment of its varied obligations for the fiscal year 1919–1920 have not yet been made; the end of the present fiscal year is at hand; and action upon these appropriations can no longer be prudently delayed. It is necessary, therefore, that I should immediately call your attention to this critical need. It is hardly necessary for me to urge that it may receive your prompt attention.

I shall take the liberty of addressing you on my return on the subjects which have most engrossed our attention and the attention of the world during these last anxious months, since the armistice of last November was signed, the international settlements which must form the subject matter of the present treaties of peace and of our national action in the immediate future. It would be premature to discuss them or to express a judgment about them before they are brought to their complete formulation by the agreements which are now being sought at the table of the conference. I shall hope to lay them before you in their many aspects so soon as arrangements have been reached.

I hesitate to venture any opinion or press any recommendation with regard to domestic legislation while absent from the United States and out of daily touch with intimate sources of information and counsel. I am conscious that I need, after so long an absence from Washington, to seek the advice of those who have remained in constant contact with domestic problems and who have known them close at hand from day to day; and I *trust that* it will very soon be possible for me to do so. But there are several questions pressing for consideration to which I feel that I may, and indeed must, even now direct your attention, if only in general terms. In speaking of them I shall, I dare say, be doing little more than speak your own thoughts. I hope that I shall speak your own judgment also.

The question which stands at the front of all others in every country amidst the present great awakening is the question of labour; and perhaps I can speak of it with as great advantage while engrossed in the consideration of interests which affect all countries alike as I could at home and amidst the interests which naturally most affect my thought, because they are the interests of our own people.

By the question of labour I do not mean the question of efficient industrial production, the question of how labour is to be obtained and made effective in the great process of sustaining populations and winning success amidst commercial and industrial rivalries. I mean that much greater and more vital question, how are the men and women who do the daily labour of the world to obtain progressive improvement in the conditions of their labour, to be made happier, and to be served better by the communities and the industries which their labour sustains and advances? How are they to be given their right advantage as citizens and human beings?

We cannot go any further in our present direction. We have already gone too far. We cannot live our right life as a nation or achieve our proper success as an industrial community if capital and labour are to continue to be antagonistic instead of being partners. If they are to continue to distrust one another and contrive how they can get the better of one another. Or, what perhaps amounts to the same thing, calculate by what form and degree of coercion they can manage to extort on the one hand work enough to make enterprise profitable, on the other justice and fair treatment enough to make life tolerable. That bad road has turned out a blind alley. It is no thoroughfare to real prosperity. We must find another, leading in another direction and to a very different destination. It must lead not merely to accommodation but also to a genuine cooperation and partnership based upon a real community of interest and participation in control.

There is now in fact a real community of interest between capital and labour, but it has never been made evident in action. It can be made operative and manifest only in a new organization of industry. The genius of our business men and the sound practical sense of our workers can certainly work such a partnership out when once they realize exactly what it is that they seek and sincerely adopt a common purpose with regard to it.

Labour legislation lies, of course, chiefly with the states; but the new spirit and method of organization which must be effected are not to be brought about by legislation so much as by the common counsel and voluntary cooperation of capitalist, manager, and workman. Legislation can go only a very little way in commanding what shall be done. The organization of industry is a matter of corporate and individual initiative and of practical business arrangement. Those who really desire a new relationship between capital and labour can readily find a way to bring it about; and perhaps Federal legislation can help more than state legislation could.

The object of all reform in this essential matter must be the genuine democratization of industry, based upon a full recognition of the right of those who work, in whatever rank, to participate in some organic way in every decision which directly affects their welfare or the part they are to play in industry. Some positive legislation is practicable. The Congress has already shown the way to one reform which should be world-wide, by establishing the eight hour day as the standard day in every field of labour over which it can exercise control. It has sought to find the way to prevent child labour, and will, I hope and believe, presently find it. It has served the whole country by leading the way in developing the means of preserving and safeguarding life and health in dangerous industries. It can now help in the difficult task of giving a new form and spirit to industrial organization by coordinating the several agencies of conciliation and adjustment which have been brought into existence by the difficulties and mistaken policies of the present management of industry, and by setting up and developing new Federal agencies of advice and information which may serve as a clearing house for the best experiments and the best thought on this great matter, upon which every thinking man must be aware that the future development of society directly depends. Agencies of international council and suggestion are presently to be created in connection with the league of nations in this very field; but it is national action and the enlightened policy of individuals, corporations, and societies within each nation that must bring about the actual reforms. The members of the committees on labour in the two Houses will hardly need suggestions from me as to what means they shall seek to make the Federal Government the agent of the whole nation in pointing out and, if need be, guiding the process of reorganization and reform.

I am sure that it is not necessary for me to remind you that there is one immediate and very practical question of labour that we should meet in the most liberal spirit. We must see to it that our returning soldiers are assisted in every practicable way to find the places for which they are fitted in the daily work of the country. This can be done by developing and maintaining upon an adequate scale the admirable organization created by the Department of Labor for placing men seeking work; and it can also be done, in at least one very great field, by creating new opportunities for individual enterprise. The Secretary of the Interior has pointed out the way by which returning soldiers may be helped to find and take up land in the hitherto undeveloped regions of the country which the Federal Government has already prepared or can readily prepare for cultivation, and also on many of the cutover or neglected areas which lie within the limits of the older States; and I once more take the liberty of recommending very urgently that his plans shall receive the immediate and substantial support of the Congress.

Peculiar and very stimulating conditions await our commerce and industrial enterprise in the immediate future. Unusual opportunities will presently present themselves to our merchants and producers in foreign markets, and large fields for profitable investment will be opened to our free capital. But it is not only of that that I am thinking; it is not chiefly of that that I am thinking. Many great industries prostrated by the war wait to be rehabilitated, in many parts of the world where what will be lacking is not brains or willing hands or organizing capacity or experienced skill, but machinery and raw materials and capital. I believe that our business men, our merchants, our manufacturers, and our capitalists, will have the vision to see that prosperity in one part of the world ministers to prosperity everywhere: that there is in a very true sense a solidarity of interest throughout the world of enterprise, and that our dealings with the countries that have need of our products and our money will teach them to deem us more than ever friends whose necessities we seek in the right way to serve.

Our new merchant ships, which have in some quarters been feared as destructive rivals, may prove helpful rivals, rather, and common servants, very much needed and very welcome. Our great shipyards, new and old, will be so opened to the use of the world that they will prove immensely serviceable to every maritime people in restoring, much more rapidly than would otherwise have been possible, the tonnage wantonly destroyed in the war. I have only to suggest that there are many points at which we can facilitate American enterprise in foreign trade by opportune legislation and make it easy for American merchants to go where they will be welcomed as friends rather than as dreaded antagonists. America has a great and honor-

able service to perform in bringing the commercial and industrial undertakings of the world back to their old scope and swing again, and putting a solid structure of credit under them. All our legislation should be friendly to such plans and purposes.

And credit and enterprise alike will be quickened by timely and helpful legislation with regard to taxation. I hope that the Congress will find it possible to undertake an early reconsideration of Federal taxes, in order to make our system of taxation more simple and easy of administration and the taxes themselves as little burdensome as they can be made and yet suffice to support the Government and meet all its obligations. The figures to which those obligations have arisen are very great indeed, but they are not so great as to make it difficult for the nation to meet them, and meet them, perhaps, in a single generation, by taxes which will neither crush nor discourage. These are not so great as they seem, not so great as the immense sums we have had to borrow, added to the immense sums we have had to raise by taxation, would seem to indicate; for a very large proportion of those sums were raised in order that they might be loaned to the governments with which we were associated in the war, and those loans will, of course, constitute assets, not liabilities, and will not have to be taken care of by our taxpayers.

The main thing we shall have to care for is that our taxation shall rest as lightly as possible on the productive resources of the country, that its rates shall be stable, and that it shall be constant in its revenue-yielding power. We have found the main sources from which it must be drawn. I take it for granted that its mainstays will henceforth be the income tax, the excess-profits tax, and the estate tax. All these can be adjusted to yield constant and adequate returns and yet not constitute a too grievous burden on the taxpayer. A revision of the income tax has already been provided for by the act of 1918, but I think you will find that further changes can be made to advantage both in the rates of the tax and in the method of its collection. The excess-profits tax need not long be maintained at the rates which were necessary while the enormous expenses of the war had to be borne; but it should be made the basis of a permanent system which will reach undue profits without discouraging the enterprise and activity of our business men. The tax on inheritances ought, no doubt, to be reconsidered in its relation to the fiscal systems of the several States, but it certainly ought to remain a permanent part of the fiscal system of the Federal Government also.

Many of the minor taxes provided for in the revenue legislation of 1917 and 1918, though no doubt made necessary by the pressing necessities of the war time, can hardly find sufficient justification under the easier circumstances of peace, and can now happily be got rid of. Among these, I hope you will agree, are the excises upon various manufacturers and the taxes upon retail sales. They are unequal in the incidence on different industries and on different individuals. Their collection is difficult and expensive. Those which are levied upon articles sold at retail are largely evaded by the readjustment of retail prices. On the other hand, I should assume that it is expedient to maintain a considerable range of indirect taxes; and the fact that alcoholic liquors will presently no longer afford a source of revenue by taxation makes it the more necessary that the field should be carefully restudied in order that equivalent sources of revenue may be found which it will be legitimate, and not burdensome, to draw upon. But you have at hand in the Treasury Department many experts who can advise you upon the matters much better than I can. I can only suggest the lines of a permanent and workable system, and the placing of the taxes where they will least hamper the life of the people.

There is, fortunately, no occasion for undertaking in the immediate future any general revision of our system of import duties. No serious danger of foreign competition now threatens American industries. Our country has emerged from the war less disturbed and less weakened than any of the European countries which are our competitors in manufacture. Their industrial establishments have been subjected to greater strain than ours, their labour force to a more serious disorganization, and this is clearly not the time to seek an organized advantage. The work of mere reconstruction will, I am afraid, tax the capacity and the resources of their people for years to come. So far from there being any danger or need of accentuated foreign competition, it is likely that the conditions of the next few years will greatly facilitate the marketing of American manufactures abroad. Least of all should we depart from the policy adopted in the Tariff Act of 1913, of permitting the free entry into the United States of the raw materials needed to supplement and enrich our own abundant supplies.

Nevertheless, there are parts of our tariff system which need prompt attention. The experiences of the war have made it plain that in some cases too great reliance on foreign supply is dangerous, and that in determining certain parts of our tariff policy domestic considerations must be borne in mind which are political as well as economic. Among the industries to which special consideration should be given is that of the manufacture of dyestuffs and related chemicals. Our complete dependence upon German supplies before the war made the interruption of trade a cause of exceptional economic disturbance. The close relation between the manufacturer of dyestuffs, on the one hand, and of explosives and poisonous gases, on the other, moreover, has given the industry an exceptional significance and value. Although the United States will gladly and unhesitatingly join in the programme of international disarmament, it will, nevertheless, be a policy of obvious prudence to make certain of the successful maintenance of many strong and well equipped chemical plants. The German chemical industry, with which we will be brought into competition, was and may well be again, a thoroughly knit monopoly capable of exercising a competition of a peculiarly insidious and dangerous kind.

The United States should, moreover, have the means of properly protecting itself whenever our trade is discriminated against by foreign nations, in order that we may be assured of that equality of treatment which we hope to accord and to promote the world over. Our tariff laws as they now stand provide no weapon of retaliation in case other governments should enact legislation unequal in its bearing on our products as compared with the products of other countries. Though we are as far as possible from desiring to enter upon any course of retaliation, we must frankly face the fact that hostile legislation by other nations is not beyond the range of possibility, and that it may have to be met by counter legislation. This subject has, fortunately, been exhaustively investigated by the United States Tariff Commission. A recent report of that commission has shown very clearly that we lack and that we ought to have the instruments necessary for the assurance of equal and equitable treatment. The attention of the Congress has been called to this matter on past occasions, and the past measures which are now recommended by the Tariff Commission are substantially the same that have been suggested by previous administrations. I recommend that this phase of the tariff question receive the early attention of the Congress.

Will you not permit me, turning from these matters, to speak once more and very earnestly of the proposed amendment to the Constitution which would extend the suffrage to women and which passed the House of Representatives at the last session of the Congress? It seems to me that every consideration of justice and of public advantage calls for the immediate adoption of that amendmdent and its submission forthwith to the legislatures of the several states. Throughout all the world this long delayed extension of the suffrage is looked for; in the United States, longer, I believe, than anywhere else, the necessity for it, and the immense advantage of it to the national life, has been urged and debated, by women and men who saw the need for it and urged the policy of it when it required steadfast courage to be so much beforehand with the common conviction; and I, for one, covet for our country the distinction of being among the first to act in a great reform.

The telegraph and telephone lines will of course be returned to their owners so soon as the retransfer can be effected without administrative confusion, so soon, that is, as the change can be made with least possible inconvenience to the public and to the owners themselves. The railroads will be handed over to their owners at the end of the calendar year; if I were in immediate contact with the administrative questions which must govern the retransfer of the telegraph and telephone lines, I could name the exact date for their return also. Until I am in direct contact with the practical questions involved I can only suggest that in the case of the telegraphs and telephones, as in the case of the railways, it is clearly desirable in the public interest that some legislation should be considered which may tend to make of these indispensable instrumentalities of our modern life a uniform and coordinated system which will afford those who use them as complete and certain means of communication with all parts of the country as has so long been afforded by the postal system of the Government, and at rates as uniform and intelligible. Expert advice is, of course, available in this very practical matter, and the public interest is manifest. Neither the telegraph nor the telephone service of the country can be said to be in any sense a national system. There are many confusions and inconsistencies of rates. The scientific means by which communication by such instrumentalities could be rendered more thorough and satisfactory has not been made full

use of. An exhaustive study of the whole question of electrical communication and of the means by which the central authority of the nation can be used to unify and improve it, if undertaken, by the appropriate committees of the Congress, would certainly result, indirectly even if not directly, in a great public benefit.

The demobilization of the military forces of the country has progressed to such a point that it seems to me entirely safe now to remove the ban upon the manufacture and sale of wines and beers, but I am advised that without further legislation I have not the legal authority to remove the present restrictions. I therefore recommend that the Act approved November 21, 1918, entitled, "An Act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the purposes of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products,' and for other purposes," be amended or repealed in so far as it applies to wines and beers.

I sincerely trust that I shall very soon be at my post in Washington again to report upon the matters which made my presence at the peace table apparently imperative, and to put myself at the service of the Congress in every matter of administration or counsel that may seem to demand executive action or advice.

WOODROW WILSON.

20 May, 1919.

[Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the President's message be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming moves that the President's message be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to suggest to the gentleman from Wyoming that this message of the President ought to be referred to the various committees dealing with the subjects treated by the President.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the more recent usage of the House is to report the President's message—a message of this sort—to the Committee of the Whole, and I am following the recent precedents in that regard.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Wyoming.

The motion was agreed to.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members of the House, I desire to state that among other matters that will be taken up for consideration to-morrow will be the woman-suffrage resolution. [Applause.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. ALMON (at the request of Mr. OLIVER, of Alabama) was granted leave of absence on account of sickness.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] desires to make an announcement.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I wish to state, without objection from the House, that immediately upon the adjournment of the House there will be a Democratic caucus held in this Hall to consider certain matters.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE VAN DYKE, OF MINNESOTA.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the House of the very recent and very unexpected death of Hon. CARL C. VAN DYKE, of St. Paul, Minn.

In the near future I shall offer a resolution asking that a day be set apart in order that eulogies may be delivered upon his life and memory. At this time, however, I desire to offer the following resolution and ask its immediate adoption.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. CARL C. VAN DYKE, a Representative from the State of Minnesota.

Resolved, That a committee of 18 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend such funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, just one moment. I am informed that a very dear comrade of CARL C. VAN DYKE, Mr. GRIFFIN, of New York, who was associated with him in the Spanish-American War, desires to have his name placed on the list.

The SPEAKER. It is upon the list. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following committee: Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. SCHALL, Mr. KNUTSON, Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota, Mr. CARSS, Mr. MAHER, Mr. ASWELL, Mr. RAGSDALE, Mr. ROMJUE, Mr. REAVIS, Mr. GANDY, Mr. MCCLINTIC, Mr. MUDD, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. GRIFFIN.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I offer this additional resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect, this House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 21, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture giving reasons for not including an appropriation for general expenses of the Forest Service for 1919 in the deficiency bill now in course of preparation (H. Doc. No. 21); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, submitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Bureau of Fisheries for miscellaneous expenses of the bureau and improvements at stations for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 22); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting certain data regarding estimates of appropriations required by the Bureau of Fisheries, Department of Commerce, for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 23); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the president of the Civil Service Commission requesting that the unexpended balance of certain appropriations for the fiscal year 1919 be made available during the fiscal year 1920 for the same purposes and with the same conditions (H. Doc. No. 24); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce inviting attention to certain items in the estimates of appropriations for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 25); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia inviting attention to certain items of deficiency submitted in House Document No. 1788, Sixty-fifth Congress, third session (H. Doc. No. 26); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. MANN, from the Committee on Woman Suffrage, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 1037) for the relief of the Wichita and affiliated bands of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 1038) granting increase of pensions to surviving widows of soldiers of the various Indian wars; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1039) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay and to distribute the balance now in the Treasury to the credit of the Alsea and other Indians on the Siletz Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 1040) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Montezuma, Poweshiek County, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1041) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of What Cheer, Keokuk County, in the State of Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1042) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Grinnell, Powesheik County, in the State of Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1043) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Albia, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1044) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bloomfield, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1045) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Oskaloosa, Mahaska County, in the State of Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1046) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Colfax, Jasper County, in the State of Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1047) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ottumwa, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1048) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sigourney, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1049) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of New Sharon, Mahaska County, in the State of Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1050) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Newton, Jasper County, in the State of Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 1051) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Marshall, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1052) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Gilman, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1053) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Rankin, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1054) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Kansas, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1055) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mantenoa, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1056) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hoopeston, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1057) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Oakwood Township High School, Catlin, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1058) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Neoga Township High School, Neoga, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAGEE: A bill (H. R. 1059) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Onondaga, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1060) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Cortland, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 1061) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lubec, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1062) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Eastport, Me., two bronze or brass cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1063) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Troy, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1064) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Waterville, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1065) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Belfast, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1066) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Unity, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1067) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the third congressional district in Maine 25 cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 1068) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ackley, Hardin County, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1069) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lamont, Buchanan County, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1070) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Eldora, Hardin County, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1071) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Eagle Grove, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece, to be placed on the lawn of the public library at said place; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1072) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Dubuque, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1073) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Eagle Grove, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece, to be placed in the city park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1074) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Laporte City, Black Hawk County, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER: A bill (H. R. 1075) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the city of Memphis, Tenn., captured cannon or fieldpieces and suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1076) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the town of Somerville, Tenn., captured cannon or fieldpieces and suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1077) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the town of Bolivar, Tenn., captured cannon or fieldpieces and a suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1078) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the town of Covington, Tenn., captured cannon or fieldpieces and a suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 1079) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Langhorne, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1080) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Bridgeport, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1081) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Cheltenham, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1082) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Norristown, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1083) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Conshohocken, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1084) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Doylestown, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1085) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Lansdale, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PARK: A bill (H. R. 1086) to donate one captured machine gun or cannon to Worth County, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1087) to donate one captured cannon or fieldpiece to Dougherty County, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1088) to donate one captured cannon or fieldpiece to Mitchell County, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1089) to donate one captured cannon or fieldpiece to Calhoun County, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1090) to donate one captured machine gun or cannon to Colquitt County, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1091) to donate one captured machine gun or cannon to Early County, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1092) to donate one captured cannon or fieldpiece to Baker County, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1093) to donate one captured machine gun or cannon to Miller County, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1094) to donate one captured machine gun or cannon to Thomas County, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1095) to donate one captured machine gun or cannon to Decatur County, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1096) to donate one captured machine gun or cannon to Tift County, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1097) to donate one captured machine gun or cannon to Grady County, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 1098) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and shells, to the city of Rock Island, Ill.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1099) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and shells, to the city of Warsaw, Ill.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1100) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and shells, to the city of Macomb, Ill.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 1101) to increase the cost of the public building at Woodbury, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1102) to provide for the erection of a public building at Salem, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 1103) requiring The Adjutant General of the United States Army and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain data to the adjutants general of the several States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1104) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Egg Harbor, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1105) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mays Landing, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 1106) to prohibit the coming of Asiatic laborers into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1107) to prohibit immigration for a period of four years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1108) to make accessible to all the people the valuable scientific and other research work conducted by the United States through establishment of a national school of correspondence; to the Committee on Education.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1109) to create a bureau for the deaf and dumb in the Department of Labor, and prescribing the duties thereof; to the Committee on Education.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1110) authorizing and directing the Public Printer to provide a pulp and paper mill or mills for the manufacture of print paper for the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1111) for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1112) to amend an act entitled "An act to parole United States prisoners, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910, as amended by an act approved January 23, 1913; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1113) to establish a standard box for apples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1114) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish postal savings depositories for depositing savings at interest with security of the Government for the repayment thereof, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1115) authorizing, empowering, and requiring postmasters of the United States to administer any and all oaths required under section 2 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1912 (U. S. Stats., pp. 539, 560); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1116) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1912 (37 Stats., pp. 539–560, ch. 389), relating to publications admitted to the second class of mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1117) transferring the control and jurisdiction of Alcatraz Island and buildings, machinery, and improvements thereon from the Department of War to the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1118) making appropriation to purchase land for homeless Indians in California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1119) for the support and education of the Indian pupils at the Greenville Indian School, Calif.; for repairs and improvements; for new school building, erecting building and furnishing same; for the purchase of land to connect Government property with public highway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1120) for the protection and improvement of the Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1121) making appropriation to carry out the provisions of an act entitled "An act to create the California Débris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," approved March 1, 1893; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1122) making an appropriation for the investigation of underground currents and artesian wells in California; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1123) to provide for summer residence homesteads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1124) to authorize the entry of the public lands by school districts for schoolhouse site and ground; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1125) to authorize the Secretary having jurisdiction of the same to set aside certain public lands to be used as national sanitariums by fraternal or benevolent organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1126) making an appropriation for the destruction of animals affected with rabies or other animal diseases dangerous to the health of human beings, as well as domestic animals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1127) to provide for the inspection of any parcel sent by mail which contains fruit, plants, trees, shrubs, nursery stock, grafts, scions, peach, plum, almond, or the pits of other fruits, cotton seed, or vegetables, at the point of delivery in any post office of the United States that requests such inspection and where the requisite inspectors are provided by the States to perform such service; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1128) to establish, equip, and maintain an agricultural experimental station near the town of Dorris, Siskiyou County, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1129) making an appropriation for the investigation, study, and testing of sagebrush and greasewood which may be used for producing rubber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1130) to authorize the construction of the Southern Lassen Reservoir in Nevada and California, for impounding the waters of the Little Truckee River and Long Valley Creek and their tributaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1131) to provide for the application of the reclamation law to irrigation districts; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1132) for improvement of Sacramento River between Chico Landing and Red Bluff, Calif.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1133) for improvement of Sacramento River between Chico Landing and Red Bluff, Calif.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1134) to establish in the Department of Labor a division to be known as a woman's division; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1135) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide capital for agricultural development, to create standard forms of investment based upon farm mortgage, to equalize rates of interest upon farm loans, to furnish a market for United States bonds, to create Government depositaries and financial agents for the United States, and for other purposes," approved July 17, 1916 (1st sess., ch. 245, p. 360, 64th Cong.); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 1136) providing for the transfer of jurisdiction of and all claims for compensation for death or disability from the Bureau of War Risk Insurance to the Bureau of Pensions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1137) to pension certain widows and former widows of deceased soldiers and sailors of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1138) to increase pensions of certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1139) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Peru, in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1140) providing for the erection of a public building at Mendota, Ill., on a site heretofore provided for the same; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1141) to increase pensions of Army nurses; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1142) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sandwich, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 1143) granting a gratuity to members of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, Army Nurse Corps, Army field clerks, and naval reservists; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1144) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chilton, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1145) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Berlin, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1146) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Endeavor, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1147) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ripon, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1148) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fond du Lac, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1149) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Oshkosh, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1150) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Manitowoc, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1151) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Oxford, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1152) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Waupun, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1153) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Montello, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1154) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Menasha, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1155) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Kiel, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1156) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Neenah, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1157) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Westfield, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1158) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Omro, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1159) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Winneconne, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1160) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Green Lake, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1161) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of New Holstein, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1162) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Brillion, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1163) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Hilbert, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1164) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Two Rivers, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1165) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Brandon, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1166) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Oakfield, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1167) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Princeton, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1168) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Markesan, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 1169) to grant to the several States all the public lands therein for common-school purposes when the same shall become less than 50,000 acres in such State; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1170) in aid of the common schools in Mississippi; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1171) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Fulton, Miss., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1172) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Columbus, Miss., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1173) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Aberdeen, Miss., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1174) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Booneville, Miss., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1175) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Iuka, Miss., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1176) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Macon, Miss., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1177) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Starkville, Miss., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1178) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Tupelo, Miss., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1179) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Corinth, Miss., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1180) to extend the limits of Shiloh National Military Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1181) for the improvement of the Federal building at Aberdeen, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1182) to refund to lawful claimants the cotton tax collected for the years 1863, 1864, 1865, 1866, 1867, and 1868; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1183) to prohibit in the District of Columbia the intermarriage of whites with Negroes or Mongolians; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1184) making an appropriation for the improvement of the Tombigbee River, in the State of Mississippi and in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1185) providing for the local commemoration in his home county of the service rendered and sacrifice made by each soldier, sailor, marine, and aviator who lost his

life while in the service of the United States during the present war; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 1186) to confer certain additional powers upon the Federal Trade Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1187) authorizing the several district courts of the United States to appoint official stenographers and prescribing their duties and compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1188) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Easton, Pa., four German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1189) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bethlehem, Pa., three German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1190) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Northampton, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1191) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Stroudsburg, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1192) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Milford, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1193) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Nazareth, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1194) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Palmerton, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1195) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Mauch Chunk, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1196) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Lehighton, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 1197) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents"; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1198) to regulate the printing and distribution of public documents; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1199) to prohibit the purchase, sale, or possession for the purpose of sale, of certain wild birds in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 1200) making appropriation for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1201) to provide a national budget system and an independent audit of the Government accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 1202) to amend the act of March 3, 1891, incorporating the National Conservatory of Music; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1203) authorizing the construction of a post office at Newburgh, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 1204) to promote the education of native illiterates, of persons unable to understand and use the English language, and of other resident persons of foreign birth; to provide for cooperation with the States in the education of such persons in the English language, the fundamental principles of government and citizenship, the elements of knowledge pertaining to self-support and home making, and in such other work as will assist in preparing such illiterates and foreign-born persons for successful living and intelligent American citizenship; to the Committee on Education.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1205) providing for a site and public building for post office and other Federal purposes at Russellville, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1206) to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment; to the Committee on Education.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1207) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Carbon Hill, in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1208) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Fayette, in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 1209) to regulate the personnel of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1210) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Warwick, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1211) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of North Kingstown, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1212) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of West Warwick, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1213) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Varnum Continentals, of East Greenwich, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY of California: A bill (H. R. 1214) to divide the northern district of the State of California into two judicial districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1215) to fix the status and rank of officers of the retired list of the Army who have been or shall be detailed on active duty by direction of the President of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1216) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States," approved August 27, 1888, as amended March 2, 1889; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1217) to provide honorable discharges to certain members of the Military Establishment of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 1218) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building at Columbia, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1219) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Lancaster, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1220) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Christiana, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1221) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Columbia, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1222) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Elizabethtown, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1223) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lancaster, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 1224) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, consider, and adjudicate claims which the Cherokee, Creek, or Seminole Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1225) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the repairing and enlargement of a Federal building thereon at Okmulgee, Okla., or to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building thereon at Okmulgee, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1226) to amend sections 12 and 15 of an act entitled "An act to provide capital for agricultural developing, to create standard forms of investment based upon farm mortgage, to equalize rates of interest upon farm loans, to furnish a market for United States bonds, to create Government depositaries and financial agents for the United States, and for other purposes," authorizing loans to be made to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the war with Germany; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 1227) to establish an agricultural plant, shrub, fruit and ornamental tree, berry, and vegetable experimental station at or near the city of Mauston, Juneau County, in the State of Wisconsin, on reclaimed swamp land; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1228) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish two condemned cannons to the Sixth Wisconsin Battery Association, of Lone Rock, Wis., for use at Lone Rock; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PARK: A bill (H. R. 1229) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Camilla, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1230) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Cairo, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 1231) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render

judgment in claims of the Iowa Tribe of Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1232) to adjust and settle the claims of the loyal Shawnee, loyal Cherokee Shawnee, loyal Absentee Shawnee, and Delaware Tribes of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 1233) to provide for ocean mail steamship lines to South America and to provide for their operation and disposition, and for other purposes in connection therewith; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 1234) authorizing and providing for the construction of a military highway paralleling the Rio Grande border of that portion of the United States between Texas and Mexico and along the entire border or certain section thereof of that portion of the United States between Mexico and the States of New Mexico, Arizona, and California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 1235) to fix the compensation of certain employees of the United States; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 1236) to provide for the erection of a public building at Pikeville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FISHER: A bill (H. R. 1237) to increase the cost of the public building at Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 1238) to extend the provisions of the pension act of May 11, 1912, to the officers and enlisted men of all State militia and other State organizations that rendered service to the Union cause during the Civil War for a period of 90 days or more and providing pensions for their widows, minor children, and dependent parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 1239) to repeal an act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KLECZKA: A bill (H. R. 1240) to expel and exclude from the United States certain undesirable aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAYS: A bill (H. R. 1241) to extend the provisions of the pension act of May 11, 1912, to the officers and enlisted men of all State militia and other organizations that rendered service to the Union cause during the Civil War for a period of 90 days or more, and providing pensions for their widows, minor children, and dependent parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 1242) to amend section 4 of the act of June 29, 1906, as amended by the act of May 9, 1918, relative to the naturalization of aliens serving in the forces of the Allies during the present war; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 1243) to repeal section 3 of an act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States, approved March 19, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DONOVAN: A bill (H. R. 1244) to establish a national conservatory of music and art for the education of advanced pupils in music in all its branches, vocal and instrumental; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 1245) to increase the efficiency of the Medical Department of the United States Army, to provide a pharmaceutical corps in that department, and to improve the status and efficiency of the pharmacists in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 1246) to provide a tariff and obtain revenue in connection with the metal contents of zinc ore; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 1247) to provide for the erection of an armory in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 1248) to establish homes for dependent mothers and dependent widows of soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LAYTON: A bill (H. R. 1249) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Georgetown, Del., one piece of artillery or like trophy captured or obtained from the enemy during or at the close of the war with Germany, in memory of Lieut. Lawrence Layton, killed in the Aviation Service at the Battle of the Marne on the 18th day of July, 1918; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 1250) amending the provisions of the act approved March 4, 1913, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to contract for the purchase of a site and the erection of a suitable building for the post office at Saranac Lake, N. Y., so as to increase the cost of said building and site from $90,000 to $105,000; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: A bill (H. R. 1251) to enlarge, extend, and remodel the post-office building at Portsmouth, N. H.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 1252) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Gen. George Rogers Clark at Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 1253) to repeal the law known as the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 1254) to provide soldiers, sailors, and marines with capital for agricultural development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: Resolution (H. Res. 30) for the appointment of a clerk for the Committee on Rules; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Resolution (H. Res. 31) authorizing the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries to proceed with an investigation of the operations of the Emergency Fleet Corporation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolution (H. Res. 32) creating a committee on water powers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Resolution (H. Res. 33) amending paragraphs 25 and 26 of Rule XI; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WELTY: Resolution (H. Res. 34) providing for the appointment of a committee to investigate irregular and unlawful expenditures during the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CURRY of California: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 39) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 40) extending the thanks of Congress to the members of local and district boards, Government appeal agents, and members of medical and legal advisory boards, and authorizing the President to appoint by brevet the members of same as officers in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 41) directing the United States peace commission to see that justice is done Italy in the matter of Fiume; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 42) directing the Secretary of War to report to Congress the number of United States soldiers in Russia and when they will be withdrawn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 5) extending the thanks of Congress to the American Army, Navy, and Marines, and the women in the medical and other auxiliary work for their heroic services in the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 6) in recognition of the great sacrifices made by the sailors of the United States and favoring their discharge from the service as rapidly as possible; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress to prohibit the purchase of liberty bonds by scalpers, and providing a penalty therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), resolution of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, favoring a national system of highways; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. CURRY of California: Senate joint resolution No. 21, California Legislature, relative to the extension of the benefits of legislation relating to the reservation and distribution of Government lands to include Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, joint resolution of the California Legislature in favor of the extension of the merchant marine of the United States and the retention of the seamen's act; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, joint resolution of the California Legislature relative to more strict examination of national banks by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HULINGS: Resolution of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, for increase in pensions of maimed soldiers who served during the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, for suitable recognition of services

rendered by members of local and district draft boards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENDALL: Resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, favoring the establishment of a national system of highways; to the Committee on Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 1255) granting a pension to Thomas Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1256) granting a pension to Alice Swinford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1257) granting a pension to Eddie E. Sterrett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1258) granting a pension to Parkman S. Warren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1259) granting an increase of pension to George F. Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1260) granting an increase of pension to Eli C. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1261) granting an increase of pension to Rodolph Matthews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1262) granting an increase of pension to John C. Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1263) granting an increase of pension to Albert J. Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1264) for the relief of Benjamin F. Burch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 1265) granting an increase of pension to S. Augustus Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 1266) for the relief of Mrs. Mamie Duffer, of Shannon, Miss.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 1267) granting an increase of pension to Dora F. Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1268) for the relief of C. L. Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1269) granting an increase of pension to James T. Kent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1270) granting a pension to Oscar Fry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 1271) for the relief of George Killeen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 1272) granting a pension to Abbie M. J. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURRY of California: A bill (H. R. 1273) for the relief of Charles L. McCulley; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1274) for the relief of Robert L. Brantley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1275) for the relief of W. L. Rose; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 1276) granting a pension to Mary L. Marik; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1277) granting a pension to Emma R. Steen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1278) granting a pension to Cyrus H. Saltzman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1279) granting an increase of pension to Freda Burow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 1280) for the relief of H. A. M. Steen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 1281) granting an increase of pension to Lewis M. Strain; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 1282) granting a pension to Margaret E. Bradford; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1283) granting a pension to Roy R. Dunham; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1284) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie M. Worster; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1285) granting an increase of pension to Ruth McClay; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1286) granting an increase of pension to Herbert A. York; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1287) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Duffy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 1288) for the relief of George W. Gamble; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 1289) granting a pension to Phebe A. Hand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1290) granting a pension to Sarah Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1291) granting an increase of pension to Hamilton W. Manner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 1292) for the relief of Dennis Shevlin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1293) granting an increase of pension to William McKeon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1294) granting a pension to Matilda Levy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 1295) granting a pension to John Paster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1296) granting a pension to Alice C. Sturgis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 1297) for the relief of J. C. Garrett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAGEE: A bill (H. R. 1298) granting a pension to Bernard M. Stanton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1299) for the relief of George LeClear; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1300) for the relief of Alfred E. Lewis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1301) providing for refund to the Haberle-Crystal Spring Brewing Co. of a sum paid in excess of a certain special excise tax; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1302) granting a pension to Ethel A. Kane; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1303) granting a pension to Adell O'Neil; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 1304) to correct the military record of Sylvester De Forest; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1305) to establish the military record of Marshall M. Pool; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 1306) granting an increase of pension to Charles Voos; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1307) for the relief of the heirs of Adam and Noah Brown; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1308) for the relief of Francis M. Johnston; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1309) for the relief of Perry L. Haynes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 1310) granting a pension to Fanny Weill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 1311) for the relief of Albert Greenlaw; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 1312) for the relief of William B. Fowler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1313) for the relief of Evelyn Browne; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1314) for the relief of Thomas A. Winn; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1315) for the relief of Maurice B. Browne; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1316) for the relief of Bert Harris; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1317) for the relief of Robert T. Legge; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1318) for the relief of the estate of P. A. Clute; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1319) for the relief of James Diamond, for horse lost while hired by the United States Forest Service; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1320) for the relief of J. A. Perry; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1321) for the relief of Mrs. Annie M. Lepley, as postmaster at Plymouth, Amador County, Calif., for money, postal-money orders, and postage stamps stolen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1322) for the relief of W. S. Curless, of California; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1323) for the relief of W. F. Peck and M. B. Gott; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1324) granting a pension to Mary A. Blair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1325) granting a pension to George W. Keenan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1326) granting an increase of pension to Edward S. Atkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 1327) for the relief of Bertrand W. Heim; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 1328) granting an increase of pension to George H. Hathaway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1329) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1330) granting an increase of pension to Michael C. Bierring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TEMPLE: A bill (H. R. 1331) granting an increase of pension to John B. Rayle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 1332) granting an increase of pension to Paschall C. Hibbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 1333) granting a pension to William H. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1334) granting an increase of pension to Louis Melcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: Resolution adopted by General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, favoring the establishment of a national system of highways; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: Resolutions of Local Union No. 151, Manchester, N. H., Journeymen Barbers' International Union of America, relating to purchase and improvement of arid land to be sold to soldiers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of over 700 citizens of Derry, N. H., and vicinity, urging that the necessary legislation be enacted whereby all men discharged from service be paid their military or naval wages for a period of six months after their honorable discharge, or until they have obtained useful and remunerative employment; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolutions of Local Union No. 151, Manchester, N. H., Journeymen Barbers' International Union of America, in favor of legislation to prohibit immigration to this country until the soldiers, sailors, and war workers have secured sustaining employment; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Local Union No. 151, Manchester, N. H., Journeymen Barbers' International Union of America, in favor of legislation to appropriate funds to complete all public improvements authorized by Congress which have been postponed because of the war; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolution of Local Union No. 151, Manchester, N. H., Journeymen Barbers' International Union of America, relating to salary for discharged soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolutions of citizens of Franklin, N. H., relating to the persecution of Greeks; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of citizens of Concord, N. H., urging Congress to bring an end to the suffering and persecutions of the people in northern Epirus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of National Garment Retailers' Association, protesting against taxation and urging immediate repeal of section 904; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY of California: Petition of owners of retail ice cream parlors of Martinez, Calif., protesting against the revenue tax on ice cream and soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Petition with 23 signers of Cass County, Mo., for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOOLING: Petition of board of aldermen of city of New York, relating to mail tubes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. EMERSON: Resolutions adopted by Cleveland Federation of Labor, urging the withdrawal of United States soldiers from Russia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution adopted by the Cleveland Federation of Labor against lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts: Petition of Arthur L. Johnson and 84 others, protesting against the tax of 10 per cent levied on sporting goods, and petition for its annulment on the ground that it lays an excessive burden on normal exercise and healthful recreation, both of which are vital to the well-being of the American people; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Resolutions adopted by the National Committee of the Fur Industry, New York City, asking repeal of subdivision 19 of section 900, Title IX, of internal-revenue law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Typographical Union No. 6, indorsing work of training and teaching the foreign-born unnaturalized residents, as such work is carried on by the Naturalization Bureau of the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of New York Chamber of Commerce, relating to the operation of telephone, telegraph, and cable systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Farmers' National Council, relating to reconstruction program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: Petition of Bakersfield (Vt.) Grange No. 305, Patrons of Husbandry, for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIEST: Resolution adopted by members of General George H. Thomas Post, No. 84, Grand Army of the Republic, of Lancaster, Pa., urging enactment of legislation to provide a minimum pension rate of $50 a month for veteran Union soldiers, and $30 a month for their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of Board of Aldermen of New York City, relating to mail tubes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MASON: Petition of relatives and friends of the Twenty-seventh Infantry, demanding the return of troops in Siberia immediately; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of National Garment Retailers' Association, protesting against taxation and asking for repeal of section 904; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Board of Aldermen of New York City, relating to mail tubes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SIEGEL: Resolution by the Board of Aldermen of the City of New York, asking that pneumatic tubes be retained; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of the Rhode Island Congregational Conference, favoring the passage of adequate legislation for the effective enforcement of the prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Keystone Lodge, I. A. M., New Brighton, Pa., urging the enactment into law of a bill similar or identical with House bill 10550 of the Sixty-fifth Congress, providing for the Government ownership and operation of all railroads within the territory of the United States and its possessions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Geneva Reformed Presbyterian Church, Beaver Falls, Pa., urging amendment of the preamble of the National Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Thomas Goodson and others, of New Castle and Lawrence County, Pa., urging recognition of the Irish Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *May 21, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Let Thy blessing descend, our Father in heaven, upon these Representatives of a great people, in the committee rooms and upon the floor of this House, as the gentle dew from the heavens falls upon the vegetation, with its quickening and fructifying influence, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater; that they may think clearly, act wisely, do justly in this hour of reconstruction; that our people and all peoples may be restored to new life and activities. In the Spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

The SPEAKER. If there are any Members present who have not been sworn in, they will now present themselves to be sworn.

Mr. ALMON, of Alabama, and Mr. MCFADDEN, of Pennsylvania, presented themselves at the bar of the House and took the oath of office administered by the Speaker.

VICTOR BERGER.

The SPEAKER. In compliance with House resolution No. 6, the Chair appoints the following special committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

DALLINGER, of Massachusetts, chairman; ROSE, of Pennsylvania; RODENBERG, of Illinois; COLE, of Ohio; RANDALL, of Wisconsin; LUHRING, of Indiana; EAGLE, of Texas; ROBINSON, of North Carolina; WELTY, of Ohio.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep sensibility the announcement of the death of Hon. ALBERT ESTOPINAL, late a Representative from the State of Louisiana.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

Also:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CARL VAN DYKE, late a Representative from the State of Minnesota.

Resolved, That a committee of Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

And that in compliance with the foregoing resolutions, the Vice President had appointed as said committee Mr. NELSON, Mr. KELLOGG, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. PHELAN, Mr. WALSH of Montana, and Mr. LENROOT.

Also:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of Hon. ALBERT ESTOPINAL, late a Representative from the State of Louisiana, and Hon. CARL C. VAN DYKE, late a Representative from the State of Minnesota, the Senate do now adjourn.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. JONES of Washington and Mr. KIRBY members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Department of Labor.

COMMITTEE IN CONTROL OF HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the appointment of the following members of the committee in control of the House Office Building.

The Clerk read as follows:

GILLETT, of Massachusetts, chairman ex officio; BACHARACH, of New Jersey; CLARK, of Missouri.

COMMITTEE ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker I send to the desk the following nominations of the minority members for the Woman Suffrage Committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KITCHIN moves the election as additional members of the Woman Suffrage Committee the following names: JOHN E. RAKER, of California; FRANK CLARK, of Florida; JAMES H. MAYS, of Utah; CHRISTOPHER D. SULLIVAN, of New York; THOMAS L. BLANTON, of Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

PRINTING AND BINDING.

Mr. KIESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk to be read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution authorizing the printing and binding for the committees, the floor leader, and conference minority chairman of the House of Representatives during the Sixty-sixth Congress.

Resolved, That the standing committees of the House of Representatives, the floor leader, and chairman of the conference minority are hereby authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be actually necessary for the transaction of their official business during the Sixty-sixth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this include all the standing committees of the House?

Mr. KIESS. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Heretofore each committee has asked for it as necessity arose.

Mr. KIESS. Not in the Sixty-fifth Congress; it was done by joint resolution.

Mr. BUTLER. May I ask the gentleman if it will not be necessary for the different committees after the passage of this resolution to ask for authority for printing and binding?

Mr. KIESS. It will not be necessary under this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday, and the Clerk will call the committees in their order.

The Clerk called the committees, and when the Committee on Woman Suffrage was reached,

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Woman Suffrage, I call up House joint resolution No. 1, proposing an amendment to the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women, and ask that the resolution be reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women.

Resolved, etc., That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —.

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the rules provide that on Calendar Wednesday general debate shall be confined to two hours. I am not entirely sure whether that rule applies to debate on a House Calendar bill, although I think it has been so construed in the past. It had been my intention to ask the House to proceed with the debate to-day and for a time to-morrow before asking for a final vote on the resolution; but there is a committee appointed to attend the funeral of our late colleague, Mr. VAN DYKE, and the Nebraska delegation has an appointment to meet the Nebraska soldiers returning to New York to-morrow morning. I desire to have the House complete consideration of the resolution to-day, and I would like, especially in order to accommodate the proponents and opponents of the resolution, to give a longer time for debate than two hours. I ask unanimous consent that the rule, so far as it limits debate, may be abrogated for the consideration of this resolution, and that at 5 o'clock the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and any pending amendments, and that the time between now and then shall be equally divided, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that general debate be extended until 5 o'clock; that then the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and all pending amendments; and that the time be controlled one half by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] and the other half by himself. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, I do not expect to debate this question or ask for time, but I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois, in view of the fact that the bill as reported proposes a constitutional amendment, whether hearings have been had on the bill, since there are two sides to this question?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, hearings have been had on this resolution for more than 50 years. [Applause.] Hearings have been had on similar resolutions in the House of Representatives for a number of Congresses. There has been no hearing had on House joint resolution No. 1 in this Congress, nor is there anything new to be said in a hearing.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the gentleman this question: In view of the fact that women opposed to woman suffrage have indicated, yesterday and to-day, that they are surprised by this action—and I give full credit to the gentleman from Illinois for his parliamentary cleverness in bringing it up at this time—whether he thinks it would be fair to let this matter stand over for a few days until those opposed to the resolution may be heard upon it?

Mr. MANN. I do not think it would be fair to the rest of us.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am willing that the gentleman shall have the credit for the passage of the resolution, if it goes through, but I think it fair to have what has been said go into the RECORD.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question about the parliamentary status. If unanimous consent is agreed to and the previous question shall be considered ordered, will that give an opportunity of reading the resolution under the five-minute rule?

Mr. MANN. There is no opportunity for reading a House Calendar resolution or bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. GARNER. Would there be any opportunity to offer an amendment unless the one offering the amendment should get recognition for that purpose?

Mr. MANN. There would not be, unless the Member offering the amendment should get recognition for that purpose.

Mr. GARNER. I wanted Members of the House to understand the situation.

Mr. MANN. That is the rule with reference to a House Calendar proposition.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to ask the gentleman a question. The gentleman's proposal as to time gives one-half to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and one-half to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], who is opposed to the resolution. The gentleman from

Florida is the one member on the committee who is opposed to the resolution. All of the members upon the majority side of the committee are in favor of it, and all of the rest of the minority members are in favor of it, as disclosed by the vote yesterday. Of course, the Democrats upon this side of the House desire to be heard, so that they may speak on the resolution. I take it the gentleman from Illinois will yield me time so that time can be divided among the Members on the Democratic side of the House who desire to speak for the resolution?

Mr. MANN. I shall not make any agreement with the gentleman upon the floor about it, and I told him so yesterday. The gentleman can take time to delay the consideration of the measure if he desires, but I am in a position where I can not be held up, because if the extension of time is not agreed to, there will be but two hours of general debate. I have always dealt fairly with every Member of the House about debate.

Mr. RAKER. That is not the question. Just one moment further. It ought not to appear that Members on this side are opposed to the resolution, for that is not the fact; they favor it; and I know the gentleman from Illinois does not want it to appear that a large majority here are not in favor of the resolution; but by fixing the time and giving one Member who happens to oppose it on the Democratic side half of the time for debate in opposition, the impression might be conveyed that we are opposed to the resolution.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, after all, the RECORD will show who votes for it and who votes against the resolution, and it will not be determined by those who talk as to who is for or against it.

Mr. RAKER. I think that is right, but, nevertheless, this side of the Chamber must be heard.

Mr. MANN. There will be a very small amount of talk as compared with the real vote upon it.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] has about stated my position. I have voted for this same measure before and expect to vote for it again.

Mr. MANN. I hope so.

Mr. RUBEY. I would like to speak for it to-day. I would like to have the gentleman's assurance that we on this side of the House will be given opportunity to say a few words in behalf of the resolution.

Mr. MANN. I can not promise the gentleman any time. I shall be just as fair with those in favor of the resolution on the Democratic side of the House as with those on the Republican side of the House, but in dividing the time I shall first give preference to members upon the committee, if they desire the time, and then I shall do the best I can, intending to take little or no time myself.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, I would ask a question of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] will yield for that purpose.

Mr. MANN. Certainly; but I think the gentleman from Florida understands that he gets the time in opposition to the resolution.

Mr. RUBEY. What I want to ask is whether he would yield to this side of the House any of his time to those who desire to speak in behalf of the resolution?

Mr. MANN. I expect to yield to members on the Democratic side of the House to speak on behalf of the resolution.

Mr. RUBEY. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Illinois has at all times in the past been fair, and he knows the rules better than anyone else. Why did not the gentleman make the request, allowing the ranking Democratic Member on our side to control the time, which is the usual custom?

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not think I am.

Mr. MANN. Where a majority of the committee on both sides of the proposition are in favor of a resolution or a bill, and there is opposition, the one in opposition is entitled to take the time. Under this rule of the House, on Calendar Wednesday, one hour would be allotted to those in favor of the resolution and one hour to those opposed to the resolution. I have asked to extend the time, so that a longer time than one hour will be given on each side.

Mr. FERRIS. But if the gentleman will indulge me a moment further, although the gentleman has been here more years than I have, yet I have been here for 12 years, and my recollection is that the rule has been to divide the time equally between the chairman of the committee and the ranking member, with an agreement that the time be yielded equally on the two respective sides as between those opposed to and those in favor of the proposition.

Mr. MANN. That is a very common practice, and a perfectly proper one where all parties agree to it.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances, the minority members of the Committee on Woman Suffrage not having had a chance to be appointed and to participate in the matter, I object.

Mr. MANN. Well, I will say to the gentleman that the Democratic members of the committee participated. They were at the meeting and made the agreement which I have asked to have carried out.

Mr. FERRIS. But the announcement was made——

Mr. MANN. Very well; there is to be only two hours' debate on the bill then.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma object?

Mr. FERRIS. I do object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. I take it that I am now recognized for an hour, allowed under the rules in favor of the bill?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for one hour.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], a member of the committee, is opposed to the resolution. I take it the gentleman from Florida will be entitled to recognition at the proper time to control the hour in opposition?

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Florida a member of the committee?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, before the Chair decides on that. Now, I trust the chairman of the committee will not make that statement to the Chair. Just one moment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has the floor.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order!

Mr. MANN. This is a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RAKER. Now, the gentleman from Illinois has his hour. He states that the gentleman from Florida would get his hour. The gentleman from Florida has not been recognized yet.

Mr. MANN. I submitted a parliamentary inquiry, making a statement, and asking whether the gentleman from Florida would be recognized for an hour.

Mr. RAKER. Of course, I can not say yet as to that.

Mr. MANN. I am not asking the gentleman. [Laughter.] It is out of the gentleman's power to recognize him.

Mr. RAKER. May I state this: Now, in fairness to the gentlemen on the other side and this side, when this resolution was up last year the gentleman from Florida made a minority report. The ranking member on the other side, Miss Rankin, was given half the time——

Mr. MANN. I have nothing to do with what was up last year. I am proceeding under the rules of the House.

Mr. RAKER. Well, I know——

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is asking about a special rule of the House. I am not asking any special rule of the House. I am proceeding under the ordinary rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for an hour.

Mr. MANN. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE], the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Woman Suffrage. [Applause.]

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] suggests that the ladies who are not in favor of woman suffrage are taken unawares. To register surprise at the appearance of propositions of a certain welcome, friendly, complimentary, and anticipated tenor is one of the most highly valued privileges of that charming sex, which no gentleman, even in the heat of debate, would ask them to surrender for any political right, however important. The ladies are certainly no more surprised than I am, because it is scarce 30 minutes since notification from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], chairman of the Woman Suffrage Committee and author of the resolution at issue, whose rare parliamentary sagacity and unrivaled parliamentary leadership made this day's work possible, that I was to open this debate. This is a good time to bring it up.

Five years ago Julius Cæsar, after 19 centuries, challenged Jesus Christ to a final contest. The Kaiser threw down the gantlet and the friends of Christian civilization took it up. The tide of war turned in favor of the Son of Bethlehem and against the Prussian; and, if anything has been decided, it has been decided that now right, not might, shall rule the world. [Applause.] Unless our sons and our billions have been sacrificed in vain, the world is about ready to substitute the rule of reason for the rule of force in the government of reasoning creatures. What better expression of that could there be than to say now that the mothers who risked their lives to bring into the world the four millions of soldiers we mustered shall have

some word to say about the destinies of their sons? [Applause.] The British House of Commons voted, I think, 7 to 1, and recently, I believe, the French Chamber of Deputies voted 7 to 1, for woman suffrage. The time is opportune for marking an era's close. Civilization has reached a stage, a period, a moment, when we can ring the liberty bell again and announce that this great step forward has been taken.

They tell us that woman should not vote merely because she is a female. No other reason has been advanced except that form which says that she can not bear arms. Every mother who bears a son to fight for the Republic takes the same chance of death that the son takes when he goes to arms. The fact that she is a woman is a reason for, not against, the utilization of every force for the advancement of society. Ninety-nine per cent of the murderers in the world are men. Ninety-nine per cent of the burglars are men. Ninety-nine per cent of the gamblers are men. Ninety-nine per cent of the counterfeiters are men. Ninety-nine per cent of all the thieves, outlaws, forgers, pickpockets, bank robbers, train robbers, pirates, and drunkards in the world are men. Ninety-nine per cent of all criminals are men.

Ninety-nine per cent of all diseases inherited by reason of evil lives of parents come down from the male side. For every courtesan there is a seducer and panderer and a thousand customers. When one considers the character of the two sexes, he better appreciates the power of the instinct of race preservation which nature has planted in the human kind, which certainly is all that has induced women to remain on the same continent with man for 60 centuries. If the world were open and the best character of votes were the dominating factor, women would control the ballot entirely. If good character were the basis for the franchise, most of the voters would probably have been women long ago.

In the last analysis those who oppose woman suffrage simply ignore everything except brute force. They discard brains, scholarship, character, and simply seek to enforce the law of the herd, that the biggest bull is the boss. Under their theories Napoleon Bonaparte was a greater man than Abraham Lincoln; John L. Sullivan a more useful citizen than Thomas Edison. I challenge all such claims as unworthy of the citizens of a Christian and cultured land. Carried to their logical conclusion those theories have dominated and guided and wrecked and ruined the great Empire of Germany perhaps for centuries to come, and at the very moment when they had attained the rounded summit of a successful, brutal, despotic development of brute force. If during the last 40 years the women had held absolute control of Germany, that mighty State would now be rich, happy, contented, and yet there are still those who will tell you woman should not vote because she can not fight.

They told us last year the determination of this issue should be relegated to the States. One of the fundamental privileges under the Constitution is to amend it. If three-fourths of the States wish it, there is no authority under the Constitution that endows any State with the privilege of denying it. They suggested they wanted a referendum vote. The Constitution prescribes, orders, another method. When the women come here and ask for the ballot, they simply invoke the methods by which the Constitution has always been amended. Any other system would be illegal. If you say to them that you are not willing to abide by those rules under which every amendment has been made, you simply plead the baby act; and when the mother of a soldier comes here to demand the privilege of the ballot you should not do that.

Men have argued here for 50 years that woman suffrage would break up the home. But in the Western States, where we have had woman suffrage in one form and another for years, we know of no family that has ever been disrupted by quarrel over politics. We know of no fireside that has burned more dimly because of any difference of opinion about the use of the ballot. To permit the mothers of this country to express their views on important issues will not injure the homes. As I reflect now I realize that every time I followed my mother's advice I did well. Generally when I did not listen to her I lived to regret it. She was a thoughtful and prudent woman. The long and short of the whole matter is that for centuries you have treated woman as a slave, dragged her over the pages of history by the hair, and then you pretend to think she is an angel, too good to interfere in the affairs of men. Give her now a fixed, reasonable status, as becomes a rational human being like yourself.

I wish there were a home for every woman. But our civilization has developed in another direction. During this great war it has been determined that women are to take part in every vocation of human life. There is no place they have not filled with ability. The increase in population, the complex demands of a complicated civilization, have made it absolutely essential that many women shall come away from the fireside and go to work for a living and fight and struggle with men.

In the streets of Strasburg I have myself seen women assisted by dogs hitched in harness pulling carts and selling milk at the homes along the streets. My friends and I traveling the path through an Egyptian wheat field were suddenly accosted by a woman, who rose with her sickle from among the wheat to cry in Arabic, "In your great country, sir, women do not thus toil in the field." But now, in my great country, women throng the shops, the offices, the factories, in their strife with men to earn a living. In uncivilized nations they still treat her as a slave and as an angel. Your great civilization gives woman the glorious privilege that man has to battle for a livelihood if she will do so for smaller wages, but denies her the use of the ballot in her struggle. What are you afraid of? The Burmese women handle all the business of that country. Is this, then, a Burmese peril which menaces you?

The gentleman who leads the opposition to-day said once that she could not have the rights of a man and the privileges of a woman. Why can she not? That can not be true. If we are going to be the gentlemen we assume to be, why should she not have the rights of a man and the privileges of a woman? Men retained all the male privileges of drinking whisky, playing poker, and racing horses when they cast the ballot. Why can not she still retain the privilege of being treated like a lady, a wife, a mother, even if she votes? God Almighty placed upon her certain duties from which you escape, and you are wonderfully fortunate that you do, and every time you think of it you should blush for shame that you would deny any rights you have because of the responsibility that God has placed upon her.

It has been a source of profound regret to me this morning that I did not have some notice that would enable me to present this subject more thoroughly. The women of the Republic come here and say to you that they want the ballot. Gentlemen, God Almighty has made you strong; they have made your Republic great and made you statesmen of the great Republic. They have given you infinite powers, mighty responsibilities. Now, the mother who bore you, the wife who brought your son into the world, and those who have gone before reach out and ask that you apply to them the rules of common sense, and no more, no less.

If you should throw 200 people upon an island, why should any particular member or set of members there for any reason have the power to say what should be done? Why should not a sensible, God-fearing, intelligent woman have just as good a right to have her say about what goes on in any nation as any man that walks the earth?

As I have said to you, she takes the same risk that every soldier did. Which of you is there who has taken the same chance on any battle field that a mother has taken every time a child comes into the world? Who are you that you should say to the mothers of America that they can not vote as you do?

The world must progress according to the methods of Julius Cæsar or the theories of Jesus Christ. During the last five years that ancient contest came to a head and the cross of Christ must henceforth and forever be made the standard of civilization instead of the crown of Julius Cæsar. For the second time in this House I appeal from the rule of force to the rule of reason. The conquering armies camped on the Rhine have fought to establish the fact that civilization is better civilized than barbarism. If common sense is more potent than the sword, if men have determined on the field of battle that that is their sober intention and their law, woman should now be accorded the same opportunity to take part in life that men have always had.

When I am laid away on the hillside, Bert Berry, my orderly in the Philippines, will bring the bugle he blew for me at Marilao, Guiguinto, and San Fernando and sound taps above my last earthly resting place, and I trust I shall hear no more of wars for all eternity. I hope, as my dear wife holds my hand for the last time as I pass out into the starlight, and as my dear mother extends her sainted hand to me as the trumpets sound the reveille on the other side, both will know that the sons for whom they went down into the valley of the shadow have granted to the mothers of this most august and stateliest Republic of all time the same power, authority, and opportunity to fashion and preserve the lives of their sons that is possessed by their fathers. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for one hour.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN].

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I shall vote against this resolution. I do not rise, however, to make an argument against it, but rather for the purpose of an explanation and expression of some congratulations. It appeared in the RECORD yesterday, though not intentionally, that the Democratic organization of the House had been a little amiss in nominating the membership of the Woman Suffrage Committee. I want to say that that is simply apparent. This morning was the first opportunity which the Democrats had to present the names of the Democratic membership of the Woman Suffrage Committee, though the identical Members that were this morning elected as minority members of that committee were notified and invited by Mr. MANN, the chairman of the Woman Suffrage Committee, to meet in his committee room yesterday along with the majority members elected on Monday and participate in the consideration of this resolution. They did meet and consider this resolution, and they did vote, with the exception, I think, of one, for its favorable report.

I want to say that in making up the minority of the committees the Democratic organization of the House hope to report all the nominations by Friday next, and when that is done it will have concluded and nominated its membership of the various committees earlier and with greater dispatch than has ever been done in this House since I have been a Member. The majority now will understand—and it does understand—how very difficult it is to make up committee assignments, and especially minority committee assignments. We are now working on them and will continue day and night, and we hope, as I said, to have them ready for nomination and election by the House on Friday.

In the Sixty-fifth—the last—Congress the Democrats, as in the case of the Republican Members this time, being in the majority then, did have on the first day of the session a complete list of the Democratic nominations for membership of all the committees, and they were elected on the first day of the session, but under the then existing circumstances the minority could not do so. They had a right to ask, as we have asked, for several days' time in which to prepare their list of nominations. While in the last Congress the Democrats presented and the House elected to the several committees the majority members on April 2, 1917, the first day of the session, it was not until April 18, 1917, that the minority was ready with its nominations.

In the Sixty-fourth Congress the Democrats were ready on the first day with their nominations—that is, on December 6, 1915—but not until December 14, 1915, was the minority ready. So that the minority in this Congress will be ready to present its nominations several days before the minority in the former Congresses was.

I wish now to express congratulations—sincere congratulations—to the Republicans on their quick response to the President's message on yesterday. [Applause and laughter.] The President yesterday in his message, read from the desk, requested this Congress—and he knew that the Republicans were in the majority and had control of the organization—to immediately pass the woman-suffrage amendment. "Immediate adoption" was his language, and in less time than 24 hours, the succeeding day, in come the Republicans, patriotically and loyally, presenting this amendment resolution in compliance with the President's request, and it will be carried. [Applause.] I want also to congratulate——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; I am sorry I have not the time, as I have only seven minutes.

Mr. MANN. I wanted to add that we reported it before the President's message was received. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. I want also, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate not only the leaders of the Republican Party on that side, but the entire membership on the Republican side, on the ease and celerity with which within 18 months they have been able to jump on the band wagon. [Laughter.] Let it be known that for 14 years, from 1897 to 1911, the Republican Party had control of every branch of this Government. It had control of the White House, it had control of the House of Representatives, it had control of the Senate. The Susan B. Anthony amendment—this amendment—had been before the American public for half a century. And yet during every one of those 14 years, session after session, its advocates came and appealed to the Republican Party in this House and the Senate to have this amendment considered by Congress, but a deaf ear was turned to them. They were absolutely ignored and were told to go back home and attend to their own business. The Republicans were in control of every branch of this Government for 14 years, I say, and when the advocates of this amendment found that they could not get the Republicans to submit this amendment to the consideration of the House or Senate they then asked them to create a woman-suffrage committee, so that they could have hearings and present their cause. Again they were refused, again they were sent back home empty handed and without hope.

For 14 years, I repeat, the Republicans of the House turned a deaf ear to the men and women of this country who desired woman suffrage. For 14 years, with absolute control of every branch of the Government, the Republicans in the House not only refused to allow them to have the suffrage amendment considered in the House—to have a vote on it—but refused even to allow a woman-suffrage committee to be created in the House before which they could submit reasons and arguments for their cause. But it was reserved for a Democratic Rules Committee and for a Democratic House to give the suffragists of this country a Woman Suffrage Committee before which they could go and put their case. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They did go before this Woman Suffrage Committee, composed of a majority of Democrats, who gladly heard them day after day and week after week and month after month plead their cause. Be it known that it was a Democratic Woman Suffrage Committee that for the first time favorably reported this very resolution to the House and gave the advocates of woman suffrage a chance to have their cause considered and voted on in the House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And, gentlemen, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], chairman of the Woman Suffrage Committee in this Congress, for promptly reporting out of that committee the same resolution which the Democratic chairman of the Woman Suffrage Committee in the last Congress reported out. His committee has adopted the same amendment resolution that the Democratic Woman Suffrage Committee, headed by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], adopted last Congress, and they ask the Members of this House to pass to-day the same resolution that the Democratic House passed last Congress, and which a Democratic President approved and now insists on "immediate adoption." [Applause and laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman used all his time?

The SPEAKER. Yes. The gentleman from North Carolina used seven minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment to the resolution and have it pending, to be voted upon later.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend House joint resolution No. 1 by adding thereto as an additional paragraph the following language:

"This amendment shall not be valid unless the same shall be ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years after the adoption of this resolution by both Houses of the Congress."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] is recognized.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, this is a curious exhibition to me. I have watched the chasing of the band wagon on many occasions during all my life, but I never saw such a band-wagon chasing as there was yesterday and is to-day. I have just left my home in Texas, where an amendment to our State constitution giving our women the vote is pending. It is to be voted on May 24. I have written a letter, and authorized its publication, urging the great State of Texas to adopt for herself this amendment giving to her women the same right to vote as her men now have. I earnestly hope and believe the amendment will be adopted.

But, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the very foundation of the original agreement under which the thirteen sovereign States formed the Union that constitutes this Nation is undermined and the agreement itself violated in spirit and in principle by the attempt to incorporate in the Federal Constitution a provision fixing or affecting the qualification of electors in the several States, and giving to Congress or to the Federal Government the right to enforce that provision.

The very first reservation in the Constitution of the United States when it was made by our fathers was a reservation reserving to the States the right to determine the qualifications

of electors for electing Members of Congress. Article I, section 2, of the Constitution reads:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States * * * and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

This joint resolution violates that section by providing that Congress shall determine who may vote or who shall not vote, or who may be permitted to vote or who shall not be excluded from voting by the several States, and it goes further and provides that Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

When the States of this Union find Federal supervisors and inspectors attending all our elections, and perhaps Federal appointees holding all our elections under this provision, which violates the principle and destroys the rock on which our ship of state was anchored, the rock of local self-government, they may rue the day when they refused to let each State decide for itself this great fundamental question.

We first violated this principle when we adopted the fifteenth amendment. Under the fifteenth amendment, not only the negro, for whom it was adopted, but the sons of every other race under the sun may vote in any State in the Union, provided they or their ancestors have once been naturalized. Our immigration and naturalization laws are in the jurisdiction and control of the Federal Government. What evils may yet come of the fifteenth amendment only the future may unfold. Under it the old force bill was introduced, and defeated only after a long and bitter fight. When a new force bill shall be introduced under the fifteenth amendment and this proposed amendment, it will not be defeated.

Encroachments upon established rights are rarely wholesale; usurpations of power are gradual.

The question of suffrage, once exclusively for the States, has been taken over by the Federal Government, first as to race and now as to sex qualification. Next, perhaps, it will be taken over as to educational or property qualifications.

Texas now has a poll-tax payment requirement for suffrage; other States have not. Agitation and clamor for an amendment prescribing uniform requirements for suffrage in all the States may well be next.

Even now, if and when Congress shall pass laws to enforce the fifteenth and this proposed amendment, the Federal Government will or may control not only all our elections for Federal offices, but every State, county, and municipal election.

Every thoughtful man is asking himself to-day if this country of ours no longer recognizes the separate identity and autonomy of the States that compose the Union. That is the question upon which every lover of the original principles on which our fathers founded this Government must vote, and ought to vote against this resolution.

Aye, we ought to look further. We are contemplating the formation of a league of the great nations of the earth and our Government is looked to for example and precedent. We are setting an example and precedent under which if that league shall be formed its central authority may be tempted to greatly encroach upon the rights of the States or countries that may become the constituent members of the league. If our example had been to respect through all time the reservations made by our States in our Constitution, then a world-wide union of nations for limited purposes might have been invited to follow us with confidence of perpetual safety against all encroachments and usurpations of power. But now the example has been set, one by one we have absorbed the powers that the fathers reserved to the States. We have taken them sometimes consciously, sometimes avowedly, sometimes unconsciously, and at times without confessing it, until to-day there is no sacred right once reserved to the several States that we dare not put the unholy hand of usurpation upon and take it away.

For one, I love my whole country; for one, I believe that the women ought to vote; but for one, I believe that each and every State in the Union should determine the qualifications of its own electors. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am sorry that we are unable to have the time extended, so that more Members may have an opportunity to express their views to the membership of this House and to the country at large. They have been in favor of the resolution, and they feel as though a few words would give them the opportunity to express what has been in our mind for many years. This is one of the great fundamental questions confronting the American Nation to-day. We have settled many of the other questions ahead of the civilized world, but we have been behind when it comes to treating half of our population and giving them the same right the other half has had with respect to participation in the Government. We are behind the other nations of the world in that respect. There are some things that I would like to adopt from the Old World and add to ours, but a great big majority of the things that our people have and that this country has the Old World has not. This country has stood for the right of the individual to express his opinion, for the doctrine that he is responsible only to himself and to his God, and up to this date, so far as the Federal Government is concerned, we have said that one-half only of our population should express their views, give their sentiment, and have a voice in our Government. But the time is coming, and it is coming fast, when there will be a change in this respect, and to-day we will see this resolution passed by a good substantial vote over and above the two-thirds majority necessary. I expect that within the next week or 10 days the resolution will have passed the Senate and will then go to the States for ratification, as it ought to.

When we come to look back it is somewhat remarkable to see what the States have done. We find that there are 15 States which have full woman suffrage. There are 29 States where women can vote for President. These 29 States control 306 electoral votes, but still you do not permit those women to vote for Members of this House; you do not permit them to vote for Members of the United States Senate, and in many other instances you fail to allow them to vote for State officers. Before the last Congress adjourned, and after it had passed this resolution by a two-thirds vote on the 10th of January, 1919, it is remarkable to find what the countries of the Old World had done with respect to woman suffrage. Practically every civilized country in the world has extended the right of suffrage to women. Let us take first the little country that was devastated some four years ago by the rude Huns. They recognized that had women been able to participate in the affairs of the world before the war began humanity would have been different, the conditions of the world would have been different, and we would have saved the lives of many hundreds of thousands of our best people not only in this country, but abroad, as well as billions of dollars. While in Europe some months ago we had the pleasure of riding with the chief deputy of the Belgian Congress from Paris to Brussels, and the next day that congress met and extended the right of suffrage to women. Let us go right on down the line. England with all her colonies, New Zealand, Canada, Australia, has extended the right of suffrage to women. This is also true of Sweden and Denmark. Even the country that the world has been fighting has extended a limited suffrage to women, and should we be the last of the civilized countries of the world to extend this right—we who boast that we stand for humanity, who boast that we stand for giving men the opportunity to express their voice in our Government, that we might have a Government of the people, not by heredity, but that the people might express their will and desire as to what their Government should be? Is it right that we should be the last?

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], as I think I am entitled to, upon his insisting that this resolution be brought up the first thing when this Congress met in extraordinary session. The House by a large vote expressed its desire in the last Congress that it should pass. The Senate by one vote failed to give it passage. The President of the United States, not only yesterday but some three months ago, appeared before the Senate urging that body, with all its conservatism and its rules, because of the work women had done, because of the advantage they have been to America in winning the war, because of their loyalty and unselfishness and their ability to cope with all the vicissitudes of war, be given the same right to participate in their Government as the men have. So with propriety, with justice, with fairness this proposition was placed on the calendar yesterday and comes up to-day as House joint resolution No. 1. It is now up for consideration by the House and within the next hour and a half the vote will have been taken and America will have taken her place with the civilized nations of the world in extending this God-given right, this thing that makes America worth while, this thing that men have died for, even within the last year, to the women of the country in order that they may exercise their individual right; that they may participate in the affairs of their country; that they may say that the laws under which they are living shall be such as human beings should live under—to the advantage of this country and of the children that are to come, so that we might have a stronger, a more virile, and a better race.

We are going to pass this resolution to-day, and instead of having just enough to make the necessary two-thirds, I hope that we will have 50 votes to spare. Some of the States, since the last Congress adjourned, even in the very heart of the sunny

South, in the very center of where some say there is the greatest opposition, have given the women the right to vote. We find that the great State of Tennessee has extended the right to women to vote for the President of the United States. What little objection there might have been is being eliminated. Even our good Republican friends who voted against it in the last Congress will vote for it this time, and, so far as politics are concerned, there should be no attempt to take advantage by either the Democratic or the Republican Party. This Congress has elected as Speaker a man whom we all admire, who was opposed to woman suffrage, but the people demand, notwithstanding the individual vote of any particular man, that this recognition be given the women of the country. The leader of the Senate was opposed to woman suffrage, but that body will pass it. There may be a few Democrats and a few Republicans who in the past have voted against this who will again vote against it to-day, but they are going to be so scarce that you will hardly be able to count them. Notwithstanding that fact, the great body of the Representatives, Democrats and Republicans, will vote for this resolution, because neither party has a sufficient number of votes to pass it as a political measure.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

By unanimous consent Mr. RAKER was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have the privilege of extending in the RECORD their remarks upon this resolution for five days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, for the present I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am for this resolution and desire to speak in its behalf, because I believe that the time is now here when we ought to express ourselves in favor of one-half of the loyal, patriotic, and conscientious citizenship of our country—the faithful women who have stood by us in the hour of need and in the hour of the greatest crisis of our history. Equal suffrage for the women of the United States is certain to come. It is futile to stem the ever-growing tide in its favor any longer. Delay will only intensify its demand. Our people are impatient. They demand this simple act of justice to our great American womanhood. The Republican Party will to-day add additional honor to its glorious history of statesmanlike achievements by overwhelmingly passing this amendment to our Constitution. [Applause.]

Wyoming was the first Territory in the Union to adopt equal suffrage, in 1869, and the first State to incorporate equal suffrage into its State constitution, 1890, and Congress gave its first official approval of equal suffrage when it admitted Wyoming as a State, July 10, 1890. State after State has followed in adopting equal suffrage until now complete enfranchisement of women is given in 15 States; right to vote for presidential electors in 11 States; full suffrage at primary election in 2 States; and partial suffrage in 13 States. This means that 41 out of the 48 States of the Union have already granted women the right of the ballot in some form and to some degree. I am proud this afternoon to say that in my own State of Wisconsin the legislature recently granted to women suffrage as far as it relates to presidential electors, and if the United States Senate promptly acts upon this joint resolution and passes it, as we confidently believe it will, my own Legislature of Wisconsin, which is still in session, I think will, without question, promptly ratify this amendment, and the State of Wisconsin will thus become one of the first States in the Union to ratify the equal suffrage amendment.

I believe that the time is now ripe for this Congress to vote to submit to the several States of the Union for ratification the constitutional amendment making equal suffrage a part of the Constitution of the United States. The privilege of ratifying the amendment by three-fourths of the States should no longer be denied. In the interest of justice, right, and equality, the equal-suffrage amendment should be passed by this Congress and be speedily ratified by the several States. Woman has demonstrated in the awful war just ended, as well as in every crisis of the world's history, her undisputed right to equal suffrage. President Wilson has said: "This war could not have been fought had it not been for the services of the women." Gen. Pershing says: "This war is being fought by women; it is women who suffer and lend courage to us; women are the ones who will deserve honor for their aid in establishing democracy." Gen. Wood says: "The support and efforts of American women made our part in the war possible." Ex-President Roosevelt, the matchless leader of American thoughts and ideals, and one of the three greatest statesmen of our history, was very pronounced in his views in favor of woman suffrage.

In home, in religion, in education, in society, and in the very fundamentals of civilization itself, it has been woman who has been the moulder of our highest ideals and purposes and the inspiring genius for the achievement of liberty, justice, and democracy. In all the great spiritual, moral, and social movements and reforms of the world for the uplift and blessing of the human race, women have taken a conspicuous part and have been willing to suffer and die that civilization might be advanced and the blessings of liberty vouchsafed. The family, the church, the school, and the State are dependent upon women for their highest development and largest achievement. [Applause.]

Taxation without representation should no longer apply to womankind. Only those who place the rights of property over the rights of humanity can possibly oppose women's suffrage. Disfranchisement of women is merely a relic of barbarism and is founded on the old spirit that might makes right. Real democracy is built on equality and justice and a government by the consent of the governed. Real democracy, therefore, demands the full enfranchisement of women.

In the work of the Red Cross—the great mother of the world—in the hospitals and trenches on the battle fields of Flanders and France, and in all the tasks that lie at the very heart of civilization, women have displayed a patriotism and heroism born of devotion, sacrifice, and service that has meant and means to-day a larger interpretation of the "Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man," in which there shall be no supermen of autocracy to despoil and crucify by acts of tyranny, but supermen of democracy to sacrifice and die for the freedom of mankind and the liberation of the world. The heroic and supreme sacrifices of our women inspire us to-day to permit our women to contribute jointly with our men in the work of our reconstruction period that is before us, our utmost power of service to the end that not only our own Nation but the whole human family shall be enriched spiritually, physically, socially, and economically.

The world is now calling as never before for both men and women of great brains and noble hearts to meet our large and complex problems of national and international reconstruction. Problems that will tax to the very limit our best statesmanship must be solved patiently and wisely yet heroically and resolutely, ever looking to the interest not only of our own Nation but to the lasting interest of all mankind. With the allied powers we have won a triumphant and glorious victory over militarism, materialism, and autocracy, but if this great victory is to bear fruit for the interest and benefit of future generations we must now unite in a peace program of reconstruction that will challenge our highest resolves and greatest determinations. In this great work we need the constant aid and counsel of our women in order that we may unitedly accomplish the best results. We need the aid of our American womanhood to build a democracy competent, constructive, and achieving.

Nothing less than absolute equality will begin to do justice to our glorious American womanhood. Right, justice, liberty, and democracy will then be our common aspiration, attained by a united citizenship of men and women who shall believe in a culture, a religion, a government, and a civilization subject not to the distinction of sex, but to the highest law of morals and justice, and which shall make right might and righteousness power and help usher in the glad day when the whole world shall be a glorious sisterhood of democracies dedicated to the welfare of all mankind. [Applause.]

The battle for the equal-suffrage amendment in the United States was begun by Susan B. Anthony, and the first amendment was drafted by her in 1875. The proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution to give the right of the ballot to women reads:

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

This amendment is practically the same as the one proposed by Susan B. Anthony in 1875. The amendment was first introduced by Senator Sargent, of California, January, 1878. It was voted on in the Senate four times, as follows: In 1887, yeas 17, nays 34; in 1914, failing by 11 votes; in 1918, failing by 2 votes; February, 1919, failing again by 1 vote. In the House it was voted on in 1915, failing by 78 of the necessary two-thirds vote. On January 10, 1918, it passed by 1 vote over the necessary two-thirds majority.

WHERE WOMEN VOTE.

The 28 States in which women now have presidential suffrage control about 55 per cent of the Electoral College, over

one-half of the Senate, 45 per cent of the House, and 55 per cent of the votes in the party conventions.

Full suffrage is granted to women in the following States:
Wyoming, granted 1869.
Colorado, granted 1893.
Utah, granted 1896.
Idaho, granted 1896.
Washington, granted 1910.
California, granted 1911.
Kansas, granted 1912.
Arizona, granted 1912.
Oregon, granted 1912.
Nevada, granted 1914.
Montana, granted 1914.
New York, granted 1917.
Michigan, granted 1918.
Oklahoma, granted 1918.
South Dakota, granted 1918.
Texas, granted 1919.
Tennessee, granted 1919.

Presidential suffrage (those with star have municipal also):
* Illinois, granted 1913.
* Nebraska, granted 1917.
Rhode Island, granted 1917.
* North Dakota, granted 1917.
Iowa, granted 1919.
Tennessee, granted 1919.
Vermont, granted 1919.
Wisconsin, granted 1919.
* Indiana, granted 1919.
Maine, granted 1919.
Minnesota, granted 1919.
Missouri, granted 1919.

Primary suffrage, which is considered practically equal to full suffrage in the following States:
Arkansas, granted 1917.
Texas, granted 1918.

School or tax suffrage in the following States:
Kentucky, granted 1838.
Minnesota, granted 1875.
New Hampshire, granted 1878.
Massachusetts, granted 1879.
Mississippi, granted 1880.
New Jersey, granted 1887.
Connecticut, granted 1893.
Iowa, granted 1894.
Ohio, granted 1894.
Delaware, granted 1898.
Louisiana, granted 1898.
Wisconsin, granted 1900.
New Mexico, granted 1910.

Foreign countries in which women have full suffrage are as follows:
Isle of Man, granted 1881.
New Zealand, granted 1893.
Australia, granted 1902.
Finland, granted 1906.
Norway, granted 1907.
Iceland, granted 1913.
Denmark, granted 1915.
Russia, granted 1917.
Canada, granted 1918.
Austria, granted 1918.
Czecho-Slovakia, granted 1918.
England, granted 1918.
Germany, granted 1918.
Hungary, granted 1918.
Ireland, granted 1918.
Poland, granted 1918.
Scotland, granted 1918.
Wales, granted 1918.
Holland, granted 1919.
Sweden, granted 1919.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask the privilege of revising and extending my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the same permission.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. No; I have no objection to everybody having the privilege, but I am not going to stop at this time to have each individual Member of the House make the request.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have the right to print speeches in the RECORD, because we will spend half an hour here for individuals to get leave.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks on this subject.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. For five days.

The SPEAKER. For five days. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I object for the present.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Kansas——

Mr. HARDY of Texas. And I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks also.

The SPEAKER. And the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACCRATE].

Mr. MACCRATE. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I realize thoroughly that a man only three days in Congress should hold his tongue, but coming as I do from a district which has equal suffrage, and being a member of the Committee on Woman Suffrage, I felt it obligatory to say why we from our section believe this national resolution or amendment should be submitted to the States for the States to decide in the constitutional way whether it shall be adopted. Now, whether you consider the franchise a right or a privilege, the women of America deserve the right, or they have earned the privilege. Everywhere you went during the past two years you saw women in uniform. You saw them in the Salvation Army, the Red Cross, the Knights of Columbus, the Young Men's Christian Association, Young Men's Hebrew Association, and other allied war activities. Whether you were at home or whether you were abroad, and like myself had the privilege of seeing the streets of London and Liverpool in January of this year, you realized that American womanhood had met the last argument that men have given for denying them the suffrage privilege, namely, that no one who is not a potential soldier is entitled to the franchise. I submit to your fairness and judgment that the women of America have been as potential soldiers during the past war as have been the men of America. [Applause.] And if potentiality for military service is the last objection, then certainly with the men who avoided the draft, or with the slackers, the women of America ought never be compared; and more certainly if men who continued in agricultural pursuits to win the war, if men who continued in shipyards to win the war, if men who continued in other branches of activities to win the war are entitled to the franchise, the women who maintained equal industrial and agricultural burdens and high moral burdens to win the war are entitled to the franchise. [Applause.] Not only that, but this resolution seems to me to be in perfect harmony with the Constitution itself. The preamble of the Constitution declares its purpose to be "to form a more perfect Union." This amendment will help us perfect the Union. It does not go into the homes of the country and tell the people what they shall put on or what they shall eat or what they shall drink. It does not say to the men and women of America they shall not do this or they shall not do that, but it does recognize a fundamental of our Government that rights and privileges shall be equal, and declares that sex alone shall not deprive women of the right or privilege of voting. I submit to you that this resolution is in harmony with the spirit of the Constitution itself. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I now renew my request that all Members have leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this subject for five legislative days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this subject——

Mr. RAGSDALE. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina objects.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT].

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not think it fair to let in any more extensions unless we let in those who did not have a chance to speak, and so I object—of course, without any discourtesy whatever to the gentleman.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, we all realize that this is a transcendent and far-reaching question. It has been decided in Pennsylvania more than once what the people there think about it. It has been decided in many, many States what they think about it there. It has been brought to Congress for decision.

In Pennsylvania the last time the test was made the amendment was defeated by 50,000 majority, and it is conceded it would have been 250,000 majority or 300,000 majority had the question been voted on separately instead of in connection with four other amendments.

In my own district in Pennsylvania, comprised of eight counties, which are typical of the Christianity, civilization, and the chivalry of America, every last county went against it after a full discussion of the question. I dare say, if it were submitted again, yes or no on its merits, it would go double what it was the last time against it. I appreciate the tribute that has been paid here, very tenderly and, I might say, patriotically, to womanhood. How could any of us do otherwise than pay high tribute to the mother or wife or daughter? These gentlemen say that those of us who are opposed to this amendment are denying the women something; that we are defeating them in a high and laudable purpose. I challenge that statement and that argument. My proposition is that those mothers of the soldier boys do not ask for this thing. I need not dwell upon the greatness of Pennsylvania, or her glory, or the soldiers she sent to the front, or the money she gave to back them up, but it is well that you be reminded that Pennsylvania's only vote of record is against woman suffrage. In the time I have here I want to enter the protest of one Member from Pennsylvania against going so far afield at this particular time in this uncharted matter, simply because a few States out West have adopted the suffrage program. And with all respect for the Members who come from those States where they have had woman suffrage, I do not believe many appeals come to them or much concern is felt for the franchise by most women. I do not believe a vast majority of women want the vote, nor do they need it for their protection.

Furthermore, let me say that in the State of Pennsylvania 20 years ago we had better laws for the protection of womanhood than they have in the States where they have had woman suffrage for 25 years, and we have better laws there now; hence it is to be seen that it is not necessary for women to engage in the conflict and asperities of politics to secure more than equality of protection with men. Formerly it was contended that the vote for women was necessary to win the war and to further prohibition, but the fallacy of these arguments was made manifest by subsequent events.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. FOCHT. I can not, having but a few minutes' time. I know where your heart is. You are really not for this. [Laughter.] There is no Member here, either from the States of New York, Pennsylvania, or Ohio, who down in his heart is for this sort of thing.

Another reason why women in their good sense are not here appealing for the vote and sphere of political activity may be that they have a better conception of the biological and physiological laws than some gentlemen who will vote in the affirmative on account of coming from States where women now vote—laws ordained by God, and which the vote of Congress nor an amendment to the Constitution can not change or set aside. [Applause.]

In conclusion I will submit a letter I received this morning from Mrs. Horace Brock, president of the Pennsylvania Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, and which includes some salient points on this question:

> By the submission of the question of woman suffrage to the voters of the State in 1915 Pennsylvania declared against Federal interference and for the right of the electorate to decide this question. There is a bill now before the State senate, which has passed the house, providing for a resubmission to the people. We opposed this bill in the house, for, while we agree a referendum to the people is the only democratic and just way of deciding this issue, we know there is no increased demand for woman suffrage, but rather increased opposition to it. Since the passage of the bill in the house, however, we have made no further opposition and are making our opposition to the passage of an amendment to the Federal Constitution, which would deprive the State of the right to decide its own electorate.
>
> A Federal amendment to the Constitution is a serious matter, because it is irrevocable. The voters of New York State, men and women, finding double suffrage increases taxes and the socialist vote, are planning a resubmission of this question to the voters before long. If the Federal amendment is not passed, this will certainly be done.
>
> A noisy minority are demanding votes for women as a reward for their war work, but the majority of women war workers, who have been largely antisuffragists desiring no reward, object to being penalized and given this added burden because of their work. Moreover, because a woman is efficient in Red Cross and industrial work, it does not follow she would be efficient in Congress. Also, it is not advisable to legislate for normal times extraordinary measures that may be useful and necessary in abnormal times.
>
> I therefore ask you, in justice to your State and its electorate, to vote against the Federal woman-suffrage amendment.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FESS). The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, of course there is no dispute upon the proposition that Congress by a two-thirds vote of both Houses may submit any amendment which it sees fit, and when such amendment is ratified by three-fourths of the legislatures of the several States it would become a part of the Constitution and binding upon all the States. There is no controversy upon that point. And since the right of a State to peaceably secede from the Union has forever been settled in the negative, there can no longer be any sound contention that any amendment which is adopted in the constitutional manner violates any of the rights of the other States. The minority States must, of course, yield to the will of the majority.

But this very fact makes all the more important that Congress should be careful in submitting amendments, and the States should be slow in ratifying those which delegate power to the Federal Government hitherto reserved to the States and exercised by their own legislative machinery.

Article I, section 2, of our Federal Constitution provides—

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States. * * * And the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Thus it will be seen that the framers of our Constitution, recognizing the State as the sovereign unit of government, deemed it wise to reserve to the States the right to regulate their own suffrage and provided in affirmative terms that the House of Representatives should be chosen by electors having the same qualifications as those who should choose the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

And when 123 years later the seventeenth amendment was adopted, which provided for the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people, this same provision was carried which prescribed that the electors should have the same qualifications as those required for electing the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

Now, the amendment which we have under consideration proposes to change all of this and turn over to the Federal Government one of the most essential elements of State sovereignty; that is, to limit and control the States in their right to determine and prescribe the qualifications of their own electors.

And while I concede that the method by which it is proposed to be done is a perfectly legal one, the question is, Should it be done as a matter of wise governmental policy?

Is suffrage such a question as should be snatched from the control of the States and lodged in a rapidly centralizing government? That is a question which I consider myself called upon to answer as the elected Representative of the people from the district which I have the honor to represent in this body.

When I consider the principles which underlie the structure of our republican form of government, with its "indissoluble Union of indestructible States"; when I consider the fact that I am a Democratic Representative and owe at least some allegiance to the historic principles of the party and some degree of obedience to its most recent national platform, then I am not in doubt as to how I should vote.

I should vote against the submission of this amendment and leave each State free to regulate and control the matter of its own suffrage.

Therefore I will vote the way I think and believe.

If my own State—Texas—for instance, wants to grant full suffrage to women, it has a perfectly simple method of doing it. On next Saturday, May 24, the people of our State will vote upon a constitutional amendment which has for its object this very purpose.

In the submission of this State amendment the voters get a real referendum. If they adopt it, they will have no need of this Federal amendment. If they do not adopt it, then why should I vote for a Federal amendment which would impose it upon them against their own will.

The committee at the last session of Congress who reported this resolution made this remarkable statement on page 4 of their report. I would not refer to it now except for the fact that it is illustrative of much of the logic used by the proponents of this amendment. The language was:

> To deny the States the opportunity to establish woman suffrage if they wish to do so is an act of autocratic injustice which would certainly be misunderstood abroad and would deeply incense the millions of women who are voters, as well as the millions more who are petitioning for the vote.

That is a very remarkable statement. I would like to inquire what provision there is in the Federal Constitution which in the slightest degree prohibits the States from granting full suffrage to their women whenever they desire to do so? And if

there is no such prohibition, then what possible power is there anywhere which can prevent a State from doing so?

Every schoolboy knows that all the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people. If that report had said, instead of the language which I have quoted, that "To deny the States the opportunity to control their own suffrage, if they wish to do so, is an act of autocratic injustice," then it would have been a statement, as I understand it, of the doctrine which the Democratic Party has championed for more than a hundred years and which has been so ably defended by many of the party's greatest leaders. I do not think that the matter has been more clearly stated anywhere than by President Wilson in a statement to a delegation of suffragists January 6, 1917:

> I am tied to a conviction which I have had all my life, that changes of this sort ought to be brought State by State. It is a deeply matured conviction on my part, and therefore I would be without excuse to my own constitutional principles if I lent my support to this very important movement for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Of course it will be conceded that the President has expressed some contrary opinions since then, but the newest is not always the best. The date or luster of the coin does not determine its true value, and "he who chooses without a proper test may perish, both a pauper and a fool."

When we put these different statements of the President to the test of Democratic principles, as interpreted throughout the history of our party and by our recent Democratic platforms, I am compelled to choose his opinion, as expressed on January 6, 1917, as the soundest and wisest one, rather than that of these more recent days.

Our platform at St. Louis in 1916 contained this declaration:

> We recommend the extension of the franchise to the women of the country by the States on the same terms as to men.

If the party had intended to take the position that woman suffrage is a Federal and not a State matter, then the platform would have recommended that Congress take action on the question instead of making its recommendation to the several States of the Union. There is no declaration in the platform anywhere for the submission of a national woman suffrage amendment, and no Democratic national convention in the history of the party has ever declared for it.

On the contrary, it is perfectly well known that the attitude of the party has long been that the regulation of suffrage belongs to the States, and that as a matter of proper public policy it should be left there.

It is for these reasons, and not because I am opposed to woman suffrage by State action, that I will vote against the submission of this amendment. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, there is an old adage, "Let justice be done though the heavens fall," and I invoke that principle in voting upon this resolution to-day.

The distinguished chairman of this committee [Mr. MANN] has well said that for 40 years one-half of the population of the United States of America have been clamoring for the privilege of suffrage, the privilege which we men have enjoyed since the foundation of this Republic. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], in raising opposition to the question of procedure this morning, said that he was willing to give the credit of the passage of this resolution to the distinguished chairman of this committee. I yield to no Democrat in loyalty to and love for my party. Yet if, in order to pass this resolution to-day, it were necessary to give the credit to the Republican chairman of this committee, I would say pass it and give credit to him. If, in order to pass this resolution to-day, it were necessary to give the credit to the Republican Party, I would say pass it, do justice, give them the credit of it if such credit has to go to any particular party. [Applause.]

But this resolution would pass regardless of anything I may say or do or anything that may be said or done by the chairman of this committee. If the poll we proponents have made is correct, this resolution will pass and receive 301 votes of this House.

The proponents of this measure have a right to expect that the opposition, in opening the discussion of this question, would send to us the best argument they have against woman suffrage. But when they open this discussion by sending to the floor that distinguished, astute, eloquent orator from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] we had the right to expect that the last word in opposition to woman suffrage would be forthcoming, but the distinguished gentleman was unable to say one word against the passage of this resolution. He was unable to give us one argument why it should not be passed. He said, in effect—and it was all he could say—that he would blindly shut his eyes and vote against the resolution. He did, however, call attention to the fact that this suffrage resolution was introduced in the Sixty-fifth Congress by a Democrat, that a suffrage committee was organized by a Democratic Congress, that it was reported by a suffrage committee with a Democratic majority, that it was handled on the floor of this House by a Democratic majority, and that it passed this House by a Democratic majority.

Mr. BAER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Not now. He said that it was called for as a piece of legislation by a Democratic President of this Nation. He called attention to that, and further to the fact that the President from France has asked this Congress to pass this resolution at this time. But, as good a Democrat as I am, I want to say to my colleagues that if the message read yesterday from the President of the United States had asked us to vote against woman suffrage, it would have reached a point when I could no longer do that which a Democratic President asked of this Congress to do. [Applause.]

The President has asked me to vote to put back wine and beer, but that is one question that I will not follow the President on when the time comes, although up to this time I have followed him on every issue. [Applause.] My good friends from Texas, my colleagues, Mr. HARDY and Mr. BLACK, and my good colleague from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL], seem to be so afraid that this resolution infringes on the sovereignty of the States, that it takes from the States some ancient rights which they have possessed for so many years, and that it interferes with their regulating the question of suffrage. I ask my good friends in what particular, aside from the question of sex, over which God Almighty alone has control, will this amendment restrict the regulation by States of suffrage? Why, the State of Texas, regardless of this resolution, will still by its legislation say what qualifications a person must possess in order to vote. They will say whether or not there should be a property right restriction placed upon it; they will say whether or not a person must have an educational qualification; they will say whether or not a person must pay a poll tax, whether they must register here or there; and in what particular. They will say this or that concerning every single regulation or control which will not interfere, except that by the Constitution of the Government they shall not say that one half of the citizens of the Union may vote and the other half, equally intelligent, equally qualified, shall not have equal rights that we men have possessed for time eternal. I say the time has come when justice must be done, though the heavens fall.

I am not afraid of this infringing on the sovereignty of my State. If it was intended to infringe upon its rights I would not support it, but it does not infringe on the rights of the sovereign States. The minority on many questions has to give up to the majority in the interest of the welfare of the whole people. I have the right, following the pursuit of happiness, to go just as far in that pursuit as I can without infringing upon the equal rights of every other citizen of the United States, and whenever in following the pursuit of happiness my action infringes on the equal right of any other citizen, then and there I must stop. I say that in this case we need not be afraid, and we need not anticipate trouble coming from this resolution which gives the women the right to have a part in governmental affairs of this country. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I must object. I renew the request that I made that all Members of the House may have the right to extend their remarks in the RECORD for five legislative days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that all Members of the House have the right to extend their remarks in the RECORD for five legislative days. Is there objection?

Mr. RAGSDALE. I object.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. VAILE].

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Speaker, following the example of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], I would like first to congratulate the President of the United States upon his final, though belated, acceptance of Republican principles.

But in this galaxy of brilliant advocates I prefer to appear as a witness, believing that residence in a State where women have voted for a quarter of a century will give my testimony some value.

I want to mention by name the women whom we have elected to office in Colorado. Aside from the incumbents of the office of State superintendent of schools, who have been invariably competent, and some of whom have shown marked ability, we have elected in the last eight years nine women to the upper and lower branches of the State legislature. First, Mrs. Alma V. Lafferty, a Democratic member of the lower house, in 1911, and a very close associate and coworker of that city builder, Robert W. Speer. Those of you who know my beautiful city know what it means to have been associated with him in that work. Mrs. Lafferty had a son who was a graduate of West Point and who fell mortally wounded at El Caney. In the same legislature was Mrs. Louise Kerwin. Mrs. Evangeline Heartz was in the house of representatives in 1915 and was reelected in 1917. Mrs. Frances S. Lee served in 1911. All of these women had been school-teachers, successful ones, and I submit that many Members of this House have been elected with no greater qualifications than those held by these women; and we used to regard as very high the qualification necessary in a candidate for the office of Member of Congress. Miss Louise U. Jones was elected to the Democratic lower house in 1911—a wealthy woman who made her wealth by wise investment in real estate and as a builder of hotels and residences. All of these women were Democrats. Mrs. Agnes L. Riddle was a Republican member of the lower house in 1911 and was later a candidate for secretary of state in 1912 and elected to the State senate in 1917. Mrs. Riddle is the daughter of a German peasant, and I heard her, addressing a liberty loan meeting, recall the fact that she had been twice elected to the Colorado Legislature. She asked her audience how far the daughter of a German peasant could advance under the Kaiser's autocracy. I heard her tell that audience that when with her mother and little brothers and sisters they first saw the Stars and Stripes in New York Harbor and said, "Mother, what a beautiful flag," her mother took from her handbag a silk miniature of that flag and made the children kiss it, and said to them, "Henceforth that is your flag, and this new beautiful country is your country." Mrs. Riddle had two sons serving under the Stars and Stripes in the war now happily ending.

Mrs. Helen Ring Robinson, a Democrat, was elected to the State senate in 1913. She has a grown daughter, is a brilliant newspaper woman, a skillful debater, an able parliamentarian. Mrs. Mary C. Bigelow was elected to the lower house as a Republican in 1919. She is a physician. Her husband is a banker, and she has a son who has been three years in the military service of the United States, and who has just returned a captain in the Expeditionary Force, after being through the stiffest fighting in the Argonne. Miss Mabel Ruth Baker, a school teacher, was elected as a Republican to the lower house in 1919. She is of tested metal, intellectual, sensible, and practical.

Those are the women actually elected in a suffrage State. They are all of the women that we have elected to the two branches of our State legislature, and I would willingly submit them to a comparison with an equal number of men legislators selected from the legislature of any Commonwealth in this country. They are just exactly the same kind of women as your own mothers and sisters. They were elected not because they were women but strictly upon their merits. Their opponents in every case were good men. They have left their names written on our statute books in measures for the benefit of the community, for the welfare of women and children, for the reclamation of unfortunates, the development of agriculture and industry, and the improvement of labor. I have not had the pleasure of agreeing very often with Senator Robinson, but both she and Mrs. Riddle are active and important in their party councils. Four of these women have grown children, including four men children who have served in the Armies of this Republic. Colorado has gained by electing the mothers of men to help make her laws, and, gentlemen of Dixie, I ask you men to help your own mothers reelect you. You may need their votes. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Florida to proceed now.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment at this time, to be pending, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia: "Page 1, line 6, after the word 'by,' strike out the words 'the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States,' and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'popular vote in three-fourths of the several States.'"

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Is this an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. No; it is an amendment to the resolution.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman can not offer an amendment until we first dispose of the amendment now pending.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I did not think that any question of order would be raised. I thought it was understood that an amendment could be offered if one obtained the time in which to offer it, the amendment to be considered pending.

Mr. MANN. I do not know that I have any objection to an agreement to that effect; but I want to say very frankly that I am not going to get into a position, if I can help it, where 40 amendments may be offered for the purpose of obstruction. Of course, I know that this is not offered for that purpose. If the gentleman asks unanimous consent that the amendment shall be considered as pending until the two hours of debate are disposed of, the amendment to be disposed of after that, I shall make no objection.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment I have offered be considered as pending, to be disposed of at the expiration of the two hours of debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request that the amendment be offered simply for information, to be disposed of at the end of the two hours of debate?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Did the Chair understand that I reserved a point of order against the amendment as being unconstitutional?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair did not.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I did.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair did not recognize the gentleman——

Mr. BLANTON. A moment ago I asked for recognition and reserved the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not called upon to pass upon the constitutionality of an amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to reserve a point of order against it.

Mr. MANN. I would like to have the amendment again reported, Mr. Speaker. I did not hear it read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If there is no objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the Chair hear me for a moment on the matter?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The matter can not be now considered. There is no time for its discussion at this time, but it will be considered at the close of the two hours' debate.

Mr. BLANTON. I merely wanted to call attention to the fact that it is in face of the provision of the Constitution of the United States, and I want to reserve the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is out of order at the present time.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. It is proposed to amend the Constitution in that respect. We are Constitution-making now.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, what became of the point of order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman reserved it.

Mr. MANN. I ask that it be disposed of. I do not propose, if I can help it, to get the House tied up where we can not have a chance to vote on the original proposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not pass upon the constitutionality of an amendment, and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have never set up as a prophet and I am not the son of a prophet, but on the 4th day of July, 29 years ago, I made a speech in which I indulged in two prophecies. One of them was that the justice of the American people would give the right of suffrage to women. [Applause.] The other one was that we would live to travel in flying machines. One of the prophecies has been realized and the other will be realized in a very few days. [Applause.] When I came here the voice of the suffragist was like that of John the Baptist crying in the wilderness. It was more a joke than anything else, but time and the expressed sentiment, in pieces, of the American people have converted a majority of the House and perhaps a majority of the Senate to this doctrine. In the last Congress by a curious accident they got just exactly enough votes to pass this amendment through the House. I did not vote; I rarely ever did. I do not think it was ever intended the Speaker should vote very much, but one gentleman was

going to change his vote to the negative, and I sent word if he did I would vote and that would tie it. So I came that near voting. [Applause.] I do not think woman suffrage is going to precipitate the millennium. I do not believe it is going to cause the damage to American institutions that some very good men think. The great State of Missouri at its last session of its legislature went as far as it possibly could go under the Constitution in favor of woman suffrage. They gave the right to women to vote for presidential electors and municipal officers, and several other States have done the same. I believe in State rights as much as any gentleman on the floor of this House, but in voting for this suffrage amendment I am representing the voice of the people of Missouri. I am not going to quarrel with anybody about voting the other way. This is a free country and we ought to have the right to vote here as we please. Now, another argument in favor of it, and I think it is founded on justice, is I think my wife and my daughter are as capable of voting as most men in this country are—— [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. More.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And I would be ashamed to have raised a daughter who was not. [Applause.] Well, now, there has been a good deal of talk first and last about the opinion of the President, and some people have insinuated I was not up to the mark in that respect. [Laughter.] From across the sea comes the voice of the leader of the Democratic Party and the leader of the American people, who was made that way by two elections in this country, and it ought to be a matter of pride to every American citizen that Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, is universally acclaimed the foremost man of all this world. [Applause.] He has arrived at that opinion by gradations, like a good many of the rest of us have. It is the progress of the human race going on all over the world, and if we want to keep in tune with them we ought to pass this amendment, and we can not afford very well, with our boasted civilization and our boast about our great intelligence, all of which I thoroughly indorse, to be behind every other civilized nation on earth in this matter. [Applause.] I wish instead of having two hours we had some more time, so we could talk freely, but we are limited as to time. There is an old saying that brevity is the soul of wit. If that is true, then these speeches which have been made here to-day judged by that standard would be very witty, although I doubt whether a good judge would so pronounce them. [Laughter.] My own judgment—one moment, Mr. Speaker [laughter]—my own judgment is that if submitted to a plebiscite, as the French call it, in the United States this amendment would carry overwhelmingly. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized. [Loud applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, two years ago when a similar resolution was pending in this body I took my life in my hands and came over here to vote, and for a week thereafter I did not know whether it would kill me or not. But to-day, strong and healthy [applause], I appear in the advocacy of a great cause, with the time ripe, with the people ready, with the beneficiaries eager, intelligent, and willing to perform their share in the functioning of good government. [Applause.]

The distinguished speaker who has just preceded me referred, as had a Democrat formerly, to the message of the President. I had hoped that this discussion might proceed without any partisan bias. It is true, my friends on this side of the House, that the President and Democratic leaders have frequently talked in favor of woman suffrage, but a majority of them have never voted for it. [Applause on the Republican side.] They have been long on promises, like they are on everything else, but very short on fulfillment. I heard the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] speak for seven minutes in favor of the amendment which he proposes to vote against.

Now, this is not a partisan question on either side of the House. If it were, it would not have any chance. Let both sides, Republicans and Democrats, feel their responsibility to civilization, to enlightenment, to progress, to the movement ahead. You can no more stop the wave of progression than you can roll back the sea with a broom, and which was tried once. Women will receive the suffrage; they will take their share in the management of the Government, and, in my judgment, good citizens everywhere will thank God shortly that we have the conservatism and good sense of women, the home makers and remaining mostly in the homes, standing against the wave of unreasonable wildness which seems now to be dominating the world in many quarters.

I hope that the Republican side of the House may vote almost as a unit, if not as a unit, in favor of the amendment, and I pray that the majority of the Democratic side of the House will see the light and vote accordingly. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I shall undertake in the few minutes left to say a word or two in reference to this proposed resolution. They say there is no zeal like that of a new convert. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who has just taken his seat, has not always been so zealous in support of this propositon. I remember very well, Mr. Speaker, as you do, and as the older Members of this House remember, that on one occasion these women for whom he speaks so eloquently now had a parade down Pennsylvania Avenue. Mr. Hobson, of Alabama, who was then the valiant defender of this cause, stood upon this floor and denounced what he said was the insulting conduct of certain ruffians toward some of these ladies on the floats as they went down the Avenue, and that such insulting conduct was winked at by the police.

He said, among other things, that he had just received a message over the telephone from some good lady to the effect that her daughter, who was upon one of these floats, had been insulted by a ruffian who had climbed on the float. And at that time my distinguished friend, whom I thought was right, then said, "Her daughter ought to have been at home." But now he wants her at the polling places; he wants her in the public offices; he wants her on the stump.

Ah, Mr. Speaker, we have had a lot of very great changes in this country. The former Speaker stood here a moment or two ago and lauded the President of the United States, who sent us a message from across the waters, so anxious is he for woman suffrage. But I prefer to follow the President, when it seems to me he was in, I will not say a saner state of mind, but when the President, in a letter to the Jane Jefferson Club, of Denver, Colo., in 1916, gave expression to this statement:

> Both the great political parties have in their recent platforms favored the extension of suffrage to women through State government.

That is where the President stood, and that is where the Democratic Party of this Nation in its last official utterance stands. The President can not prescribe Democratic law, and the gentleman from Missouri knows it. No power on this earth can lay down Democratic doctrine but a Democratic convention, and the last one that spoke declared that this was a matter for the respective States to attend to. And the Republican Party in convention declared practically the same thing. And I assert, without fear of successful contradiction, that any Democrat and any Republican who votes for this resolution to-day votes directly against the last official declaration of his party. You can not get away from it. It is there.

And there is some other good Democratic authority that I shall call to witness in this connection. Thomas Jefferson, the father of the Democratic Party, did not favor woman suffrage. I have not time to read his statement, but it is in the minority report, and gentlemen can read it, and I shall incorporate it in my remarks. And Grover Cleveland did not, and Woodrow Wilson did not. And when you come to the Republican thought on this question, the Hon. Elihu Root, the brainiest man in the Republican Party to-day, is not in favor of it, and William Howard Taft was not in favor of it. I believe he has seen the light, too, that my friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN] spoke of. A lot of these people have been traveling the road to Damascus lately. [Applause and laughter.]

A MEMBER. The present Speaker voted against it the last time.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Ah, Mr. Speaker, the Speaker of this House is loyal to his convictions and loyal to his declarations. A Member on the floor says that the present Speaker voted against it the last time, and my prediction is that he is going to vote against it this time.

I am opposed to submitting this amendment to the States for several reasons, Mr. Speaker, and one is because the franchise is not a right which attaches or belongs to any person of any sex or race. It is a privilege to be granted or withheld at the pleasure of the States. The power to control and regulate the suffrage was not delegated in the Constitution to the Federal Government, but was expressly retained by the several States, and these States have exclusively exercised this power ever since the Union was established. No member of the convention which framed our Federal Constitution suggested that the power should be delegated to the Federal Government, but by unanimous consent it was left as a reserved right to the respective States. Why should the States now delegate to the General Government a power which in the unanimous judgment of the fathers of the Republic it was deemed wise to retain when the organic law was written? I respectfully submit, Mr. Speaker, that a radical change in the structure of a great government should not be made unless it should be indisputably established that the proposed change is not only for the betterment of mankind, but that it is necessary for the welfare of the people.

What is it that we are asked to do here? We are asked to pass this joint resolution and thereby submit to the legislatures of the several States for ratification or rejection an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which amendment confers upon women the privilege of voting. What is the duty of a Representative? I ask my colleagues to listen to this: What is the duty of a Representative in Congress when he is confronted with a proposition to submit an amendment to the Constitution?

Just two or three days ago everyone of us took a solemn oath "to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic," and that Constitution itself, with unerring certainty, points out our duty in this emergency. The Constitution provides that "the Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution." It does not provide that whenever two-thirds of both Houses think it "advisable." It does not provide that whenever two-thirds of both Houses think it "politic." It does not provide that whenever two-thirds of both Houses think it "expedient." It does not provide that whenever two-thirds of both Houses "believe their seats are in jeopardy." It does not provide that whenever "a few women in the country desire it." But it provides that whenever two-thirds of both Houses, before the bar of their consciencies, under their oaths to defend the Constitution, deem it to be necessary to propose the amendments.

Why is it necessary? Is the Republic in danger? Is there any great public purpose to be subserved? Does the welfare of the country demand it? Why is it necessary? Not only must the Representative in his solemn judgment be convinced that it is necessary, but he ought to be able to point out the necessity which impels him to vote that way. Oh, my friends, some gentlemen say they will vote for it "because their people want it." That does not meet the constitutional requirement. Some people are for it "because the good women of the country say they want it." That does not meet the constitutional requirement under your oath to uphold and defend the Constitution. You can not excuse yourself upon the proposition that somebody wants it or that you believe it is a good thing. If the fathers who framed the organic law had intended that, they would have put in that solemn instrument that whenever two-thirds believed that it is a good thing, or that so many people want it, they will vote for it.

Oh, my friends, can you put your hands upon your hearts to-day, before God and man, with due respect to your oaths to uphold the Constitution, and say that you believe that it is absolutely necessary that this amendment be submitted to the American people? You can not say it. No; you can not say it. I have heard gentlemen give their reasons for voting for it. Some of them say one thing and some say another, but I want to tell you what I believe. It strikes me that a great political storm cloud has appeared on the horizon and many are running to cover. There are a whole lot of people who, if Indian nomenclature were adopted at this time, might properly be dubbed "Young-men-afraid-of-their-jobs." That is what is the matter with a great lot of people. [Laughter.]

Oh, my friends, let us stand here to protect the Constitution which we swore we would protect. The fathers put that in the Constitution because they did not think that that great instrument ought to be lightly amended, because they did not think that we ought to tinker with it in obedience to the demand of every passing fancy. They knew that these "isms" would arise. They knew that these fantastic propositions would come up in the future to meet and plague the people of this country, and they decided to fix the Constitution so that it would be hard to amend, and then not amended until the welfare of the people absolutely demanded it. And yet here we tinker with a Constitution that for a century and a third and more has stood the test of all the changes of time.

My fellow countrymen, I am opposed to woman suffrage straight out from the shoulder, every day in the week and every week in the year. I am against it because I agree with the great leader from Illinois [Mr. MANN], that the place for the women is at home. That is where they belong. That is where he said they belonged. I agreed with him then and I agree with what he then said now. [Applause.]

Oh, they want to "purify politics," and yet I had one gentleman tell me that he wanted women to vote because the communities in his country were dry before they got the suffrage and after that they went wet. [Laughter.]

While I am opposed to it straight, and in the State, if I had a chance, I would vote against it, vote against it everywhere, and all the time, yet if the good women of my State really wanted it I am willing for my State to give them the right to vote, but I want my State to regulate and control it. I do not want to turn over to the Federal Government the right to control the franchise in all the States of this Union. When you do it you are going to open a Pandora's box whose ills will sweep all over this country, and you gentlemen from the North need not think that the only ones who are going to suffer are those who live below the Potomac.

You need not worry about that, we will all have our troubles. We will go through them, probably, worse than the days of reconstruction, and I remember something about that. But you will have it up above the river with your millions of foreign population who can not speak English. With your Bolsheviki, with your anarchists, with your I. W. W.'s, you are breeding trouble for yourselves as well as you are cooking up the dish for us. Do not worry, you will have yours and plenty of it.

I know it is old-fashioned, and I know that some people laugh now when it is suggested that the good, pure woman, the queen of the American home, the mother of your children, your sister, and your daughter, all of them ought to be at home. I know that some of the women who are advocating this proposition laugh and jeer at that idea. It is old-fashioned and out of date.

I was amused when some gentlemen were talking to-day about women being entitled to this privilege because they had made this great fight for world liberty and world democracy. I am willing to leave it to the mothers of the sons who went to France. If you will leave it to them and cut out the agitators and soapbox orators, you will see that the vote would be overwhelmingly against it. The real mothers—I do not mean all of them, but the great majority of them—do not want it. The men of America have protected them for a century and a third, and they will do it yet. But when this comes, women have got to take their stand on a level with the men. There will be no more legislation in the different States in her interests. There will be no more legislation in the National Government in her interest. Take the case to-day in every State in the Union and let a man and a woman have a law case before the court and the jury and the man has as much chance as the proverbial snowball down in some other country. But when this comes, she will have to "stand up to the rack, fodder or no fodder."

I want to call attention here, for I have not the time to go through all of it, to some of the misrepresentations that are made in order to create a sentiment for this resolution. Why, I had a copy of a paper here called The Suffragist, and in it Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, one of the bright particular stars in the suffrage movement, in undertaking to argue her side of it, said that women were not expected to know the laws of all the States, and they could not be expected to know that the age of consent in Florida was 10 years, while in Wyoming it was 18. And yet the statute books of my State, section 3521 of the General Statutes of Florida, fixes 18 years as the age of consent.

But here she is advertising to all the world that in Florida the age of consent is only 10 years. We are heathen down in that country, we are barbaric, we do not protect the girls and the women. I want to say to you that no woman in Florida has ever yet needed protection that she did not get it and the day will never come when the men of my State will decline to come to the rescue of a woman in distress. [Applause.]

Ah, Mr. Speaker, this amendment is going to be carried. I know that; I am not deceiving myself. I am not doubting it for one moment. The cards have been stacked, the decree has been written and the leaders, or some of the leaders, I will not say all of them because, thank God, we have some Democratic and some Republican leaders both who are still faithful to their first love—but some of our leaders on both sides are trying to run over each other to see who can get there first and get a credit for the enactment of this proposition.

God bless your souls, it will not be anything to be proud of. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois said that everybody would be delighted to have it passed. I am looking for him to be back here asking to renig before long. You are going to get mighty sorry about this. You were right in 1914 when you made your reply to Hobson. The former Speaker was right when he was standing solidly on the eternal granite of truth and State rights, but he has got on the shifting sands of expediency and they are all floating out onto the bosom of this unknown fathomless sea, and I am fearful they will never again reach the harbor of sound political doctrine.

Oh, Mr. Speaker, let you and I stand put. [Laughter.] If all the other leaders leave us let you and I stay true to the Old Flag. [Laughter.]

Then we have got Senator LODGE on the other side. He is with us yet. Senator LODGE is all right on this question at least. Senator PENROSE is another distinguished Republican, I believe, who is still firm in the faith. And so we have got a

few leaders on our side. The enemy has captured a good many of them; some have been shot down; others have been wounded; some have almost had heart failure; and a great many of them are suffering from mental aberration, but a few are still strong, sound, and loyal.

I wish now they would come back, for "while the light holds out to burn the vilest sinner may return."

While we have a few minutes I wish the distinguished gentleman from Illinois and the distinguished leader over here, the former Speaker from Missouri, would get up and confess the fact that they are wrong for the time being and come back to where they both belong. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, I have been here a little over 14 years. I have sat at the feet of these gentlemen and tried to imbibe wisdom, and if there are any two men I have looked up to as my ideals of fixed stars in the political firmament of the immovable Rock of Ages kind of statesmen it was the gentleman from Illinois and the former Speaker from Missouri. [Laughter.] But they have quit.

I was following them trustingly and faithfully when, all at once, when I got into the tangled brush I found that they had gone around another way and had left me struggling in the bushes. Mr. Speaker, you are not going to do it, I know. [Laughter.]

One other thing. No class of persons ought to have the right to vote, I think everyone will agree, unless that class can perform all of the duties of citizenship. They ought not to have the privileges of citizenship unless they can perform the duties. I think that is a proposition which no one will dispute. Women can not do that. We have heard a great deal here about what they can do. We can not create our armies out of women. We can not depend upon them.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have not the time.

Mr. LITTLE. We can not create our armies without women, can we? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I agree with the gentleman absolutely on that proposition, but you can not form an army out of women. There is no use talking about that. They can not perform the duties of a sheriff. It would certainly be very disagreeable to them to perform jury duty. Take a murder case, for instance, with 12 jurors, 5 or 6 or 7 women with 4 or 5 or 6 men. The case takes a week to try. The judge orders them locked up, kept together, and all that sort of thing, and that would not be very agreeable, I am sure.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Just one moment, Mr. Speaker, if I may be indulged. I want to say this one thing in conclusion: I feel very deeply about this matter. I feel for my country. I believe that this is the worst act that the American Congress will have ever performed, so far as the future of this great country is concerned, and while I know this resolution is going through the House, I have an abiding faith that three-fourths of the States will never ratify it. [Applause.]

Democrats can not support this resolution because of the fact that it contravenes every principle of democracy, and particularly is it antagonistic to the doctrine of States' rights, which has ever been one of the cardinal principles of the Democratic Party. This resolution takes the matter of the regulation of the suffrage entirely out of the power of the respective States of the Union and confers upon the Federal Government the unrestricted power to regulate elections and prescribe the qualifications of voters.

I am aware that some Representatives, and especially some from the South, who are supporting this resolution are endeavoring to justify their support of it by claiming that the States will still control in this regard, notwithstanding the incorporation of this amendment in the organic law. The last paragraph of the amendment provides "Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." This provision either means what it says or it means nothing. It gives to Congress the full, absolute, unrestricted, and exclusive power to "enforce this article," and to enforce it "by appropriate legislation." The amendment gives to all women—white, black, and any other color—the right to vote, and invests Congress with complete power to carry it into effect by the enactment of any legislation which Congress may deem to be "appropriate." This opens up anew the negro question in all the Southern States, and I warn my colleagues from the South who are supporting this measure that they are "playing with fire," which is likely to produce another "reconstruction" conflagration in our Southland.

I am not an alarmist, Mr. Speaker, nor am I an extremist. The negro in the South to-day is as a class satisfied. He is treated fairly and justly under the law and is content to leave politics alone. He is now not a factor in politics and has no desire to become a factor. The two races understand each other perfectly, and are now dwelling in the same territory in amity, with nothing to disturb these relations. So far as I am concerned—and I am sure I speak for the real representative sentiment of the southern people—I would do the negro no harm, and would protect and defend him in the enjoyment of his every legal right. We do protect him under our laws in the full enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and no States in any portion of this country will go further to conserve his rights in these respects than will the States in the section from which I hail. But we had as well be plain. This does not mean that we will tolerate conditions of social equality with the negro or that we will allow the vicious and ignorant to control in our political affairs.

Our laws shall be, as they are now, fair, equitable, and just to all, but, with God's help, so framed that the intelligent, patriotic, and virtuous shall rule our beloved land. But why should this measure be forced upon us when the strong probability—yea, almost the certainty—is that it will disturb our local conditions to such an extent as to force us to go through the distressing trials of another "reconstruction" period? Gentlemen say this will not occur. Mr. Speaker, let us be candid with each other. While the great masses of the negroes in the South are contented with existing conditions, some of the alleged leaders of the race are agitators and disturbers and are constantly seeking to embroil their people in trouble with the white people by making demands for social recognition which will never be accorded them; and the real leaders in these matters are the negro women, who are much more insistent and vicious along these lines than are the men of their race.

Make this amendment a part of the Federal Constitution and the negro women of the Southern States, under the tutelage of the fast-growing socialistic element of our common country, will become fanatical on the subject of voting and will reawaken in the negro men an intense and not easily quenched desire to again become a political factor. White Bolsheviki will readily be found to organize and train this mass of ignorance and vice to the end that they may be elevated to places of honor and power, and they will make promises of social position and anything else to their deluded followers in order to accomplish their own ignoble purposes. But, say my southern colleagues who are enamored of this new and to Democrats strange doctrine, this will not happen. Let us see.

The Crisis, the official negro suffrage organ, issued by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, of which Jane Addams, pacifist and former suffrage president, is a director, says in its issue of November, 1917 (p. 8):

> It is going to be more difficult to disfranchise colored women in the South than it was to disfranchise colored men. Even southern 'gentlemen,' as used as they are to the mistreatment of colored women, can not in the blaze of present publicity physically beat them away from the polls. Their economic power over them will be smaller than their power over the men. * * * It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that every single black voter in the State of New York should this month cast his ballot in favor of woman suffrage and that every black voter of the United States should do the same thing whenever and as often as he has opportunity.

In the same issue of this negro suffrage organ (p. 12) there is an official resolution, passed by the National American Woman Suffrage Association, maintaining "that all American men or women, white or black, * * * shall share equally in the privileges and protection of democracy."

Also, in the same issue (pp. 19, 20, 21), are articles by Anna Howard Shaw, Carrie Chapman Catt, and Mary Garret Hay, leaders of the National Woman Suffrage Association, appealing for negro support, and demanding that distinction of color, as well as sex, be eliminated.

And this after the Crisis had distinctly pointed out the "discriminations" it wants to wipe out.

What say you, my brethren from the South, as to these statements of the Crisis? Suffragettes appealing to the negro vote in the North to support woman suffrage, because it means the ballot for the negro women of the South!

Again let us take a look at the Crisis. In the May, 1917, issue of the Crisis, page 41, is the following:

> INTERMARRIAGE OF RACES.
>
> Four bills against the interests of colored Americans have been introduced into the Sixty-fifth Congress—two to prohibit intermarriage of races and to provide Jim Crow street cars and one to provide a permanent colored military school, a fourth to segregate colored people.

From this it is clear that the Crisis wants free intermarriage, no military training for negroes, and no segregation!

Here we have the Crisis, negro suffrage organ, issued by an association of which Jane Addams, a leading suffragette, is a

director, boldly advocating the intermarriage of the white and negro races.

In this same (May, 1917) issue of this negro suffrage organ we find the following editorial paragraph entitled "A Suggestion":

The Republican Party is on the rocks. The disfranchised negro sees light but dimly. The disfranchised woman is still disfranchised in the vast majority of the inhabitated States. Suppose these three groups strike a simple bargain. Let them work for a constitutional amendment basing representation in Congress on the actual vote cast for President in each State. We pause for reply.

Here we see the proposed combination. The Republican party, the disfranchised negro, and the disfranchised woman. Listen: "Suppose these three groups strike a simple bargain. Let them work for a constitutional amendment basing representation in Congress on the actual vote cast for President in each State." Have they struck the "simple bargain"? Where do Democrats come in on this bargain? What do southern Democrats get out of the bargain? How can a Democrat, and especially a southern Democrat, in view of these disclosures, support this resolution?

The extracts from the "Crisis" I have taken from a pamphlet called "Constitutional Bulletin No. 1," published by the "American Constitutional League," and there is no question as to their authenticity, and I plead with my southern colleagues to defeat this amendment which can bring nothing of good to our people and our country.

Another thing which should be seriously considered by gentlemen before the vote to submit this amendment to the States is the fact that once it becomes a part of the Constitution it is practically irrevocable. If, therefore, its adoption does not usher in the millennium, as its advocates so confidently assure us it will, then it will be with us in all probability for all time to come. On the other hand, if we should leave it where it belongs—to the individual action of the several States—and those adopting it should find that it was not what was desired it could easily be repealed.

And, Mr. Speaker, if women are to be given the privilege of voting, why should not the right be conferred through the same agency which granted the suffrage to men? Men have the right to vote through the independent action of the different States and not by virtue of any act of the Federal Congress. It is true that the privilege of exercising the right to vote was accorded to negro men through the agency of an amendment to the Federal Constitution, but that amendment was submitted by the Congress in the midst of a season of bitter sectional hate immediately following the close of a bloody four years of war between the sections, and surely no such precedent as this will be invoked in behalf of a resolution of this character.

The fourteenth and fifteenth amendments were the offspring of the bitterest sectional hate and most unreasoning party passion that ever blighted any land, and God grant that our beloved country may never be cursed with its like again. But the blind passion of those dark days immediately following the War Between the States fastened these amendments upon our organic law, and they are there to remain apparently forever, and as long as they do remain we must respect them as part and parcel of our Constitution. Mr. Speaker, in my own State of Florida there is no discrimination under the law against any class of men with respect to the exercise of the elective franchise. We have the usual provisions which prohibit insane persons, persons convicted of crime, and the like, from voting, and in addition we require that a man shall be a resident of the State for 12 months and of the county in which he lives for 6 months before he can vote. We also require that he must pay a poll tax of $1 per year, which goes into the school fund, before he is qualified to vote.

In addition to these requirements we have the Australian ballot. We have no party emblems or marks of any character on the ballot, but the names of all candidates, regardless of party, are printed thereon in alphabetic order, and for a man to vote intelligently he must be able to read and must know the names of his party's candidates. Being able to read and knowing who are his party's candidates, he simply makes a cross mark opposite the name of each candidate for whom he desires to vote. Under our election laws the voting is secret, and this is all there is to the election laws of Florida, except that we have provision for the due registration of all qualified voters. I challenge any State in all the Union to present any cleaner and fairer election laws than Florida has written in her statute books.

Mr. Speaker, another objection which I have to woman suffrage is the fact that it will unquestionably materially aid the growth of socialism in this country. It will not only add to the growth of socialism, but will likewise contribute to the upbuilding of femininism and Bolshevism in America. Every Socialist and every Bolshevist throughout the land wherever you find him is an ardent advocate of woman suffrage, and he wants it by Federal amendment. Take the situation in the great State of New York. I desire to call attention to some facts connected with the New York election in 1917, and present the following extracts which I have taken from a circular issued by the Women Voters' Anti-Suffrage Party. These extracts, it will be seen, were taken from the New York Call, the official Socialist organ, in its issue of the day after the election.

[Extracts from the New York Call (official Socialist organ), Nov. 7, 1917, the day after election.]

Page 1, first column.—"Woman suffrage carried New York State. This was hailed as one of the biggest victories, not only by the women * * * but to radicals of all kinds."

Seventh column.—"Socialism and suffrage, inseparable companions in revolutionary thought and action, have triumphed in the election in New York City and State."

Third column.—Hillquit: "Socialist propaganda has undoubtedly been the most potent factor in the success of the woman-suffrage amendment."

Page 2, first column.—"It is pointed out that the Socialist vote throughout the Empire State was the decisive factor in the victory for woman suffrage."

First column.—"It is certain that if the women had had the vote before this election Morris Hillquit would have been elected mayor and the whole Socialist ticket would have been triumphant."

Fifth column.—"At the last referendum in New York on woman suffrage, only two years ago, the issue was snowed under. So was the issue of Socialism. And yesterday, hand in hand (you bet!), Socialism and feminism forced the fates to reverse their dictum and the voters to act accordingly."

Sixth column.—Hillquit: "Socialists can take the credit in a large measure for the success of the woman-suffrage amendment. From all indications the Socialist vote in the State exceeded 200,000, all of which counted for suffrage. Furthermore, our campaign, with its social and political background, had a visible effect on the increase of the suffrage vote. That alone was a great Socialist achievement."

In its issue of November 12, 1917, we have the following from a socialist leader:

Page 1, third column.—Elmer Rosenberg, Socialist assemblyman, representing the sixth assembly district, Manhattan, is quoted as saying of the election: "This was not a campaign; it was a rebellion. It is going to break out into a political revolution in America."

And on November 26, 1917, we have this extract from the speech of Morris Hillquit, the Socialist candidate for mayor of New York City:

Page 2.—Socialist jubilation meeting, November 25, 1917, in Madison Square Garden, New York City, after the 1917 election Morris Hillquit, former candidate for mayor, stated: "We have put Socialism on the map of New York and on the map of the United States. * * * We have opened the doors of many local legislative assemblies to our representatives. Our slogan now is 'On to Washington!'"

"On to Washington" is the "slogan," and they are here, my friends. They are here to carry out the bargain which was struck, the "simple bargain" which it was proposed to "strike" between the Republican Party, the disfranchised negro, and the disfranchised woman. What an alliance! And over the heads of this combination the Socialist proudly cracks his whip. Can it be possible that Democrats, and southern Democrats, will give this resolution their approval?

Mr. Speaker, aside from the question of principle and treating the matter purely from the viewpoint of expediency, why should a Democrat vote for this resolution? What can the Democratic Party expect to gain by its adoption? I make the prediction now that if this amendment becomes a part of the Constitution the women's organization will line up almost solidly with the enemies of the Democratic Party. The great President of the United States, the undisputed leader of the Democratic Party, Woodrow Wilson, has done more to make woman suffrage an accomplished fact than all the Republican leaders put together, and yet the leaders in the woman suffrage movement have denounced him and his party, "in season and out of season."

They have not been able to find language sufficiently strong to voice their opposition to the President and his party. In the election of 1916 the women at the head of the suffrage movement, almost without exception, took their stand against Woodrow Wilson and the Democratic Party. Their organ, The Suffragist, under date of November 11, 1916, gives an account of how Mrs. Harriet Stanton Blatch, on the night of Sunday, November 5, 1916, from the platform of the Blackstone Theater at Chicago, sent final appeals over long-distance telephone to the women leaders in the Western States to oppose President Wilson and the Democratic candidates for Congress. I present some of the messages of Mrs. Blatch and the replies thereto, as follows:

Boise, Idaho, was next on the wire, Mrs. Blatch said. "In the mountains the spirit of freedom was born. Mountain lands are the cradle of liberty. Women of Idaho, you are free. With the torch of freedom in your hand, blaze the way for your fellow women by using your political freedom against our enemies, Woodrow Wilson and the national candidates of the Democratic Party."

Mrs. Frederick Walker, state chairman, answered: "The people of Idaho are seriously considering their responsibility toward Federal woman suffrage. Consequently thousands will vote against President

Wilson, for the women realize that a vote for him is a vote against women."

Next came Montana. To the women of that State Mrs. Blatch sent this message: "All the political prophets put Montana among the doubtful States. Let no woman of Montana stand in doubt. Her course is plain. Let her use her whole power to defeat the party that blocks the way to freedom for women. Let her strike this blow for justice now—she has nothing to lose and the gratitude of all women to gain. Use your power, use every vote, against Woodrow Wilson and the national Democratic candidates."

Mrs. C. S. Haire, State chairman, in response said: "The Montana Woman's Party sympathizes with you in your fight for freedom and pledges you its support. We will unitedly vote on November 7 against President Wilson and the Democratic candidates for Congress. The Democratic Party has bitterly opposed national freedom for women during its whole term of power. We western women will not support a party that has done this injustice to women. We dedicate ourselves to a free womanhood, and wish you Godspeed in your work."

Mrs. Blatch's message to Nevada was: "The women of the East have known no State lines. Where the battle for liberty was being waged, there they were found. When you called for help they were at your side. Use now the power they helped you win, to strike down the party which has refused to give the women of America enfranchisement. Help lift up all your countrywomen to your plane of full citizenship. With your full political might strike down our enemies, Woodrow Wilson and the national candidates of the Democratic Party."

Miss Anne Martin, national chairman of the Woman's Party, said in reply, "Nevada women voters are determined to establish political liberty for women throughout the Nation. The record of the Democratic Party shows that this party has fought against justice to women. Therefore Nevada women will refuse their first vote to President Wilson and the national Democratic candidates, believing such a vote would be against women."

To Utah this message was given: "Women of Utah, when you were politically weak, two great pioneers, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, came to you from the East, preaching their evangel of freedom for women. They helped to set you free. Now, you are strong, stand bravely shoulder to shoulder with other voting women, and in your might help to emancipate all the women of the Nation. Serve your fellow women as the two pioneers served you. Strike down the enemy of enfranchisement for the women of America."

Mrs. L. M. Garnett, second district chairman, replying said: "The women of Utah promise loyalty and support to the unenfranchised women. The Woman's Party has made a wonderful compaign and has a strong organization which will continue to work for women's political freedom. Many prominent and brilliant women are putting aside political parties and standing by the Woman's Party. Everything looks bright and promising."

Next came Arizona. Mrs. Blatch's final word of appeal to that State was: "Women of Arizona, stand clear of partisan politics. Rise above all considerations of party. Place before all other questions that of achieving self-government for all citizens. With half the people politically enslaved, to establish a Government based on the consent of the governed becomes a matter of supreme moment. Back up with your votes the demand that a democratic form of government shall prevail throughout the Nation, that there shall be a true Republic, self-government for all, under our national flag. Stand against the Democratic Party in this supreme hour, and you liberate the women of a Nation."

Mrs. C. E. Hull, chairman of the Maricopa County branch of the Woman's Party, responded as follows: "We believe that out here in the West, Arizona men as well as Arizona women are standing by the disfranchised women of the Nation. The Woman's Party has awakened Arizona. We have adopted a new conscience here in the West. We believe that the vote of Arizona day after to-morrow will astonish the country. It will be a rebuke to the President who does not believe in the freedom of the women of America. Congratulations to the women of Illinois who are working with us."

To Cheyenne, Wyo., next on the wire, Mrs. Blatch sent this word: "When Wyoming sent its first constitution to Congress for approval it was urged to leave out woman suffrage. Wyoming men instantly sent reply: 'We will stay out of the Union of States with our women rather than go into the Union without them.' Women of Wyoming, be as great now as your men were then. Make a stand for the political liberty of the women of America. Annihilate the party that refuses to give women protection under the United States Constitution."

Mrs. Robert Morton, chairman of the Woman's Party, replied: "The women of Wyoming have responded loyally to the call of America's unenfranchised women. We will be with you on Tuesday and will not return to the White House the chief opponent of political freedom for women."

The next ring of the telephone brought Denver, Colo., on the line. Mrs. Blatch's message was: "Oh, women of Colorado, fate has placed in your hands a decision momentous for us, for you, for our country. Self-government for half the people of the Nation is in the balance. A step forward in democracy—democracy, the need of the hour, the world need, a world issue—is bound up with your foresight, with your devotion. Stand true in this hour of clash of arms to the spirit of freedom, true to America's faith in self-government for the people. So vote as to establish throughout our land a republican form of government for all women. Our Revolutionary fathers freed men; let the women of Colorado free their fellow women. Strike the blow and liberty is ours."

Mrs. Bertha Fowler, State chairman, replied: "Colorado women, regardless of party, are putting forth every effort to defeat President Wilson because of his hostility to the Federal amendment enfranchising women."

Then came Kansas, the State of which Mrs. Blatch herself is now a voting citizen. She said: "Women of Kansas, women of Topeka, you have an historic event to celebrate on November 7. Burnt into your memory is the occasion when you sent a deputation to President Wilson during his stay last winter at Topeka, to urge upon him the need of national justice to women. You will never forget the reception he accorded your representatives. Awaiting his pleasure, they stood one hour in a driving snowstorm. That is the way he and his party treat all women nationally. Women must wait outside the Federal Constitution. Build a monument to that incident. Snow Woodrow Wilson under on election day."

Miss Katharine A. Morey, of Kansas, replied for the State: "Women of the East, have courage. The women of Kansas have heard your call and will stand by you. We will not return to power the man who has blocked the political freedom of American women."

Last came California. This was the last appeal of the Woman's Party to the voting women of the suffrage States. "Wishing to help women to be free," Mrs. Blatch said, "knowing that Woodrow Wilson is the chief block to self-government for American women, there are those who try to balance against that the plea 'he has kept us out of war.' Never was a more undemocratic claim made. Imagine 100,000,000 people depending upon the kindly offices of one man to be kept out of war! How does that differ from Russia, with its Czar to keep that nation in or out of war?

"No, we are standing for the voice of the people to determine the momentous question, Shall it be peace or shall it be war? Had the people of Europe, the men and the women, been able to speak their desire in 1914 there would have been no war. The world bleeds to-day because of one-man power. The world needs a democracy, and no greater assurance of peace could be given than to include women in the democracy.

"Help, women of California, to answer this need. Stand against the party that opposes nation-wide self-government for women. Win for our country a government of the people, for the people, by the people. Punish, women of California, the party which stands against such a government. Vote solidly against Woodrow Wilson and the national candidates of the Democratic Party."

Mrs. Ida Finney Mackrille, State chairman, responded: "The women of California have responded magnificently to the appeal of the disenfranchised eastern women. Thousands of women have put suffrage first in this election and have done all in their power to defeat Wilson and the Democratic Party in our State as a protest against delayed justice to women. The votes of women are going to cause Wilson's defeat in California next Tuesday."

Mr. Speaker, again I desire to call the attention of my colleagues in this House to the seriousness of amending the organic law of the Republic. It should not be amended except the necessity to amend for the public welfare is made plainly to appear, and I respectfully submit that no such necessity is apparent. I may be old-fashioned and out of date, but I believe in the home woman. I believe in the American mother who presides in queenly dignity over an American home.

She needs no ballot for her protection. God bless her; she is and always will be protected by the deep and undying love of the American man. I want her to forever occupy the commanding place which she fills in our economic affairs, respected, honored, and revered. I would not drag her from the lofty pedestal on which she has been placed by the undying love of the American man—the pedestal of sisterhood, wifehood, and motherhood—to the low level of ward politics. God forbid.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to my distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH].

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, some surprise and, I might add, great gratification was expressed by my distinguished friend, the author of this resolution, when this morning I asked him for a few minutes' time in which to speak in favor of it. Some surprise has been also manifested by others of my friends when I told them that I intended to support it. If I am about to execute a volte-face, at least it will not be comparable to that executed by a most distinguished American now residing abroad, who sent us a cable on the subject yesterday. [Laughter.] It is true that upon the occasion when this resolution was last before the House I voted against it, but my vote was predicated upon a doubt as to the opportuneness of the time rather than upon the essential justice of the question. I have for a long time believed that suffrage was inevitable, that it would come soon, and that it ought to come. I am now convinced that the time has arrived when we ought to give suffrage to the women of the country.

Heretofore I have felt it my duty to follow the vote last cast by the citizens of my constituency. I believe, however, that since then the situation has changed. Certainly it has changed to the extent that in my State my party has gone on record in its platform in favor of suffrage. It is beyond argument that my party as a national party is in favor of suffrage, that it is now one of its main tenets. This is no longer a local question. It is a national question. I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] was right when he said it ought not to be a political question, but the fact remains that our action to-day, to be followed, I am confident, very shortly by another body, will make it indisputably evident to the country that suffrage has been granted to women, and could only have been granted, through the medium of the Republican Party. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished Republican leader, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I bring the balm of consolation to the agonized soul of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK]. I have been voting, lo! these many years, and I have never voted except where women voted. I come from a Commonwealth whose women have been exercising the elective franchise for a little more than half a century, and there are certainly no more patriotic, law-abiding, progressive folks on earth than those of the Commonwealth that first granted full suffrage to women. [Applause.] I think it is a splendid omen that this session of Congress, in which we hope to write upon the statute books a progressive, constructive legislative program, should begin with the prompt adoption of this great measure of franchise reform.

I want to congratulate the good women who fought the good fight all these years, and who now see the dawn of the day of final victory. Before this session closes, in my opinion, this resolution will be upon the statute books of the Nation. The resolution is in keeping with the spirit of the times; it is in keeping with the onward march of mankind toward better things. We are proposing to invite the better half of mankind into participation in the settlement of the multiplied and multiplying questions of government, and we shall have better laws, better administration, and a better world when that is accomplished. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution——

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman yield for just a moment, so that I may ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I again renew my request, and I hope gentlemen will not object that all Members have leave to extend their remarks for five legislative days on this subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen have the right to print their remarks for five legislative days on this subject. Is there objection?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent——

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask, coupled with that, that I have the same right to extend my remarks.

Mr. MANN. I shall not object to individual requests as Members make them.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Texas ask unanimous consent to extend their remarks on this subject. Is there objection?

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it on the same subject—woman suffrage?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. GARD, Mr. RANDALL of California, Mr. SMALL, Mr. RUBEY, Mr. AYRES, Mr. WELTY, Mr. OLIVER, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. LAGUARDIA, Mr. LANGLEY, and others asked unanimous consent to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to serve notice there will be no more extension of remarks by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question——

Mr. RAGSDALE. The gentleman can make it in writing or verbally.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and the two pending amendments to final passage.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend House joint resolution No. 1 by adding thereto as an additional paragraph the following language, viz:

"This amendment shall not be valid unless the same shall be ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years after the adoption of this resolution by both Houses of the Congress."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida demands the yeas and nays. Thirty-seven gentlemen have arisen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the amendment reported.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia: Page 1, line 6, after the word "by," strike out "the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States" and insert, in lieu thereof, the following: "popular vote in three-fourths of the several States."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia demands the yeas and nays. Fifty-two gentlemen have arisen; not a sufficient number.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the other side.

The SPEAKER. The other side is called for. Two hundred and forty-four Members are opposed; 52 is not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the joint resolution.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The yeas and nays were taken; and there were—yeas 304, nays 90, answered "present" 1, not voting 33, as follows:

YEAS—304.

Ackerman	Elliott	Kennedy, Iowa	Padgett
Alexander	Ellsworth	Kennedy, R. I.	Parker
Anderson	Elston	Kettner	Parrish
Andrews, Md.	Emerson	Kiess	Pell
Andrews, Nebr.	Esch	Kincheloe	Peters
Anthony	Evans, Mont.	King	Phelan
Ashbrook	Evans, Nebr.	Kinkaid	Platt
Aswell	Evans, Nev.	Kleczka	Porter
Ayres	Fairfield	Knutson	Purnell
Babka	Ferris	Kraus	Rainey, H. T.
Bacharach	Fess	LaGuardia	Rainey, J. W.
Baer	Fields	Langley	Raker
Barbour	Fisher	Lanham	Ramseyer
Barkley	Fitzgerald	Layton	Randall, Calif.
Bee	Fordney	Lea, Calif.	Randall, Wis.
Begg	Foster	Lehlbach	Reavis
Benham	Frear	Linthicum	Reber
Bland, Ind.	Freeman	Little	Reed, N. Y.
Bland, Mo.	French	Lonergan	Reed, W. Va.
Blanton	Fuller, Ill.	Longworth	Rhodes
Boles	Fuller, Mass.	Lufkin	Ricketts
Booher	Gallagher	Luhring	Riddick
Bowers	Gandy	McAndrews	Robsion, Ky.
Box	Ganly	McArthur	Rodenberg
Briggs	Godwin, N. C.	McClintic	Rogers
Britten	Goldfogle	McCulloch	Romjue
Brooks, Ill.	Good	McFadden	Rose
Browne	Goodall	McGlennon	Rowan
Burdick	Goodwin, Ark.	McKenzie	Rowe
Burroughs	Goodykoontz	McKeown	Rubey
Butler	Graham, Ill.	McKinley	Rucker
Byrns, Tenn.	Green, Iowa	McKinley	Sabath
Campbell, Kans.	Griest	McLane	Sanders, Ind.
Campbell, Pa.	Griffin	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sanford
Cannon	Hadley	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Schall
Cantrill	Hamilton	MacCrate	Scott
Carew	Hardy, Colo.	MacGregor	Sears
Carss	Haskell	Madden	Sells
Carter	Hastings	Magee	Sherwood
Casey	Haugen	Maher	Shreve
Chindblom	Hawley	Major	Siegel
Christopherson	Hayden	Mann	Sims
Clark, Mo.	Hays	Mapes	Sinclair
Classon	Hernandez	Mason	Sinnott
Cleary	Hersey	Mays	Slemp
Cole	Hersman	Mead	Smith, Ill.
Cooper	Hickey	Merritt	Smith, Mich.
Copley	Hicks	Michener	Smith, N. Y.
Costello	Hill	Miller	Smithwick
Cramton	Hoch	Minahan, N. J.	Snyder
Crowther	Houghton	Monahan, Wis.	Steenerson
Cullen	Howard	Mondell	Stiness
Currie, Mich.	Hudspeth	Mooney	Strong, Kans.
Curry, Calif.	Hulings	Moore, Ohio	Strong, Pa.
Dallinger	Husted	Moores, Ind.	Summers, Wash.
Darrow	Hutchinson	Morgan	Sumners, Tex.
Davey	Igoe	Mott	Sweet
Davis, Minn.	Ireland	Murphy	Taylor, Ark.
Davis, Tenn.	Jacoway	Neely	Taylor, Colo.
Dempsey	Jefferis	Nelson, Mo.	Taylor, Tenn.
Denison	Johnson, Ky.	Nelson, Wis.	Temple
Dickinson, Iowa	Johnson, S. Dak.	Newton, Minn.	Thomas
Dickinson, Mo.	Johnson, Wash.	Newton, Mo.	Thompson, Ohio
Donovan	Johnston, N. Y.	Nichols, Mich.	Tillman
Dowell	Jones, Pa.	Nolan	Timberlake
Drane	Jones, Tex.	O'Connell	Tincher
Dunbar	Juul	Ogden	Towner
Dyer	Kearns	Oldfield	Treadway
Eagan	Kelley, Mich.	Oliver	Upshaw
Echols	Kendall	Osborne	Valle

Vare	Weaver	White, Me.	Wood, Ind.
Vestal	Webster	Williams	Woodyard
Volstead	Welling	Wilson, Ill.	Yates
Walters	Welty	Wilson, Pa.	Young, N. Dak.
Ward	Wheeler	Wingo	Young, Tex.
Wason	White, Kans.	Winslow	Zihlman

NAYS—90.

Almon	Dunn	McDuffie	Steagall
Bankhead	Eagle	Mansfield	Stedman
Bell	Flood	Martin	Steele
Benson	Focht	Montague	Stephens, Miss.
Black	Gard	Moon	Stephens, Ohio
Blackmon	Garland	Moore, Pa.	Stevenson
Bland, Va.	Garner	Mudd	Tilson
Brand	Garrett	Nicholls, S. C.	Tinkham
Brinson	Greene, Mass.	Overstreet	Venable
Brooks, Pa.	Hardy, Tex.	Paige	Vinson
Browning	Harrison	Park	Voigt
Buchanan	Heflin	Pou	Walsh
Byrnes, S. C.	Holland	Radcliffe	Watkins
Candler	Hull, Iowa	Ragsdale	Watson, Pa.
Clark, Fla.	Hull, Tenn.	Rayburn	Watson, Va.
Coady	Johnson, Miss.	Riordan	Webb
Collier	Kitchin	Robinson, N. C.	Whaley
Crisp	Lampert	Rouse	Wilson, La.
Dent	Lankford	Sanders, La.	Wise
Dewalt	Lazaro	Sanders, N. Y.	Woods, Va.
Dominick	Lesher	Saunders, Va.	Wright
Doremus	Lever	Sisson	
Doughton	Luce	Small	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Greene, Vt.

NOT VOTING—33.

Brumbaugh	Edmonds	Kahn	Ramsey
Burke	Gallivan	Kelly, Pa.	Scully
Caldwell	Glynn	Kreider	Smith, Idaho
Caraway	Gould	Larsen	Snell
Connally	Graham, Pa.	Lee, Ga.	Sullivan
Crago	Hamill	McPherson	Thompson, Okla.
Dale	Huddleston	Morin	
Dooling	Humphreys	Olney	
Dupré	James	Quin	

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs.

On this vote:

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania and Mr. SULLIVAN (for) with Mr. GREENE of Vermont (against).

Mr. SCULLY and Mr. SNELL (for) with Mr. RAMSEY (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. DOOLING with Mr. MCPHERSON.

Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. MCPHERSON, is unavoidably absent to-day. If he were here, he would vote in favor of this resolution.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. MANN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks on this bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. RAKER. I desire to have a telegram put in the RECORD.

Mr. WALSH. I object, Mr. Speaker, to the reading of a telegram.

Mr. RAKER. See what it is first.

Mr. WALSH. It does not make any difference what it is.

Mr. RAKER. Oh, yes; it makes lots of difference.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, Mr. WHITE of Kansas, be allowed to extend his remarks on this bill.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] asks unanimous consent that his colleague, Mr. WHITE, be allowed to extend his remarks on this bill. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I make the same request to extend my remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] makes the same request.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I object.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Thursday, May 22, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of the Navy, submitting supplemental estimates of appropriations required by the Navy Department and Naval Establishment for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 27); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of appropriation for Treasury Department Building, Washington, D. C., for inclusion in the sundry civil appropriation bill for 1920 (H. Doc. No. 28); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DEWALT: A bill (H. R. 1335) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Reading, Pa., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1336) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Catasauqua, Pa., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1337) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Allentown, Pa., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 1338) exempting enlarged homesteads from liability for debt contracted prior to issuance of patent; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1339) for the erection of a public building at the city of Redding, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1340) for the erection of a public building at the city of Quincy, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1341) for the erection of a public building at the city of Alturas, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1342) for the erection of a public building at the city of Yreka, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1343) for the erection of a public building in the city of Auburn, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1344) for the erection of a public building at the city of Placerville, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1345) for the support and education of the Indian pupils at the Fort Bidwell Indian School, Calif.; for repairs and improvements, erecting barn and silo, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1346) to encourage the reclamation of certain arid lands in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1347) to expel and exclude from the United States certain undesirable aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CLASSON: A bill (H. R. 1348) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Little Chute, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1349) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Oconto Falls, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1350) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Oconto, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1351) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Florence, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1352) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Green Bay, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1353) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Crandon, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1354) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Appleton, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1355) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Marinette, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1356) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Antigo, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1357) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sturgeon Bay, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1358) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Oconto, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1359) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Kewaunee, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1360) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Kimberly, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUSTED: A bill (H. R. 1361) to authorize an issue of bonds in exchange for bonds of the first, second, third, and fourth liberty loan issues; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1362) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of North Tarrytown, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1363) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Mount Kisco, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1364) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Bedford village, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1365) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Larchmont, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1366) authorizing the purchase of a site and to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of White Plains, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1367) to provide for the erection of a public building in the village of Nyack, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1368) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the towns of Rye and Port Chester, Westchester County, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOIES: A bill (H. R. 1369) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Woodbury County, Iowa, German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1370) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Sioux County, Iowa, German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1371) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Osceola County, Iowa, German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1372) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Sac County, Iowa, German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1373) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Plymouth County, Iowa, German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1374) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to O'Brien County, Iowa, German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1375) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Lyon County, Iowa, German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1376) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Monona County, Iowa, German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1377) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Ida County, Iowa, German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1378) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Dickinson, Iowa, German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1379) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Clay, Iowa, German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1380) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Cherokee, Iowa, German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1381) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Buena Vista County, Iowa, German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 1382) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Coldspring, Tex., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1383) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Huntsville, Tex., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1384) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Anahuac, Tex., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1385) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Liberty, Tex., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1386) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Livingston, Tex., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1387) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Groveton, Tex., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1388) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Conroe, Tex., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1389) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Crockett, Tex., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1390) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Palestine, Tex., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1391) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Galveston, Tex., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 1392) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at the city of Brooklyn, in the State of New York, near the plaza at the east end of the Williamsburg Bridge; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1393) to increase the compensation of pressmen in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1394) to regulate the wages of certain employees employed in or under the Navy and War Departments of the Government; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1395) to regulate the wages of mechanics and laborers employed in or under any and all departments of the Government; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 1396) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Newport, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1397) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of East Providence, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1398) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Portsmouth, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1399) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Middletown, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1400) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Tiverton, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1401) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Little Compton, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1402) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of New Shoreham, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1403) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Bristol, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1404) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Jamestown, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1405) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Warren, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1406) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Barrington, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 1407) giving applicants under the stock-raising homestead law whose applications may be rejected a preference right to enter lands under other provisions of the homestead law; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1408) providing for appeals from the decisions of the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1409) providing for the sale of grazing lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1410) giving a new right of homestead entry to former homesteaders; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1411) granting locations and rights of way for purposes of irrigation and other beneficial use of water through the public lands and reservations of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1412) to add certain lands to the Yellowstone National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1413) providing for the payment to the State of Wyoming of one-half of the royalties collected from the Owl Creek Coal Co.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1414) to add certain lands on the North Fork of the Shoshone River to the Shoshone National Forest; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1415) authorizing an exchange of lands by the Mountain Home Co., of Glenrock, Wyo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1416) authorizing the sale to Johnson County, Wyo., of lands for poor-farm purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1417) for marking the site of the old Fort Phil Kearny and the Wagon Box fight; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1418) to increase the cost of the public building at Buffalo, Wyo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1419) to increase the cost of the public building at Cody, Wyo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1420) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Lusk, in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1421) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Wheatland, in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1422) to provide for the erection of a public building at Newcastle, in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1423) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Green River, in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1424) donating to the town of Thermopolis, Wyo., two brass or bronze cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1425) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Powell, Wyo., one piece of artillery, or like trophy, captured or obtained from the enemy during or at the close of the war with Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1426) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Kemmerer, Wyo., one piece of artillery, or like trophy, captured or obtained from the enemy during or at the close of the war with Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1427) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Newcastle, Wyo., one piece of artillery, or like trophy, captured or obtained from the enemy during or at the close of the war with Germany and Austria; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1428) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Shoshoni, Wyo., one piece of artillery, or like trophy, captured or obtained from the enemy during or at the close of the war with Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 1429) adding certain lands to the Idaho National Forest and the Payette National Forest, in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1430) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Weiser National Forest, Idaho; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1431) to restore homestead rights to settlers on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1432) to convey to the County of Kootenai, State of Idaho, certain lands for public park purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1433) to provide for an investigation and report relative to the adoption of a system of old-age insurance or pensions; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1434) for the protection of foodstuffs in the District of Columbia; to the Commitee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1435) to provide for the erection of a schoolhouse for the detached Indians living in the Kootenai Valley, Idaho; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1436) to provide for the enforcement of laws upon Indian reservations and superintendencies; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1437) relating to the limitation of hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics employed in lumber and woodworking industries whose products enter into interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1438) to promote the safety of travelers and employees upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to adopt uniform rules for the operation of railroad trains, and to use a uniform system of signals for authorizing the movement of railroad trains; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1439) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1906, as amended by the act approved August 23, 1912; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1440) to prevent the teaching or advocacy of crime, sabotage, violence, or other unlawful methods of terrorism under certain conditions, and providing penalty therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1441) to amend section 237 of an act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1442) to amend section — of an act defining matter that may be admitted to second-class mail privileges; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1443) authorizing the compensation of rural mail carriers or their heirs for injuries received while on duty; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1444) to eliminate the necessity for most of the expenses and work in connection with the Dead Letter Division of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1445) to punish the speculation by any person or body of persons for the purpose of cornering the market, and for other purposes, and providing a penalty therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1446) to pension the survivors of certain wars from January 1, 1858, to January 1, 1888, inclusive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1447) to protect the rights of women citizens of the United States to register and vote for Senators of the United States and for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1448) to provide for additional appropriation for the erection of a Federal building at Sandpoint, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1449) to provide for additional appropriation for the erection of a Federal building at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1450) to provide for the purchase of a site for a Federal building at Payette, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1451) to provide for the purchase of a site for a Federal building at Weiser, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1452) to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Nampa, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1453) to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Caldwell, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 1454) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Tipton, county of Tipton, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1455) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Kokomo, county of Howard, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1456) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of New Richmond, county of Montgomery, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1457) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wingate, county of Montgomery, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1458) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Crawfordsville, county of Montgomery, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1459) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Frankfort, county of Clinton, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1460) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Noblesville, county of Hamilton, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1461) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Covington, county of Fountain, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1462) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Veedersburg, county of Fountain, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1463) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lebanon, county of Boone, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1464) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Delphi, county of Carroll, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1465) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Attica, county of Fountain, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1466) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Sheridan, county of Hamilton, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1467) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Thorntown, county of Boone, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 1468) for the enlargement of the Federal building at Butte, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1469) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a post-office building at Anaconda, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1470) for the enlargement of the Federal building at Missoula, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 1471) providing for pensions for all American citizens who have reached the age of 65 years and who are incapable of manual labor and whose incomes are less than $500 per annum; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1472) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Port Clinton, in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 1473) to provide for public improvements, needs, and employment of discharged soldiers, unemployed, and other citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COLLIER: A bill (H. R. 1474) providing for an addition to the Federal courthouse and post-office building at Jackson, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1475) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-culture station at a point near the city of Jackson, in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1476) for the erection of a military post at or near the city of Vicksburg, in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 1477) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the cemetery trustees of Scipio Cemetery, Allen County, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1478) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Auburn, county of Dekalb, State of Indiana, one German connon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1479) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Angola, county of Steuben, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1480) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Columbia City, county of Whitley, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1481) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lagrange, county of Lagrange, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1482) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Albion, county of Noble, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1483) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ligonier, county of Noble, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1484) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Fort Wayne, county of Allen, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1485) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Harlan, county of Allen, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1486) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Kendallville, county of Noble, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1487) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of New Haven, county of Allen, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1488) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of South Whitley, county of Whitley, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1489) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Waterloo, county of Dekalb, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1490) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Butler, county of Dekalb, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1491) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Churubusco, county of Whitley, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1492) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Garrett, county of Dekalb, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1493) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Corunna, county of Kekalb, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 1494) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Alexandria Bay, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1495) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Pulaski, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1496) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Cape Vincent, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1497) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Dexter, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1498) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Oneida, N. Y., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1499) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Colgate University, of Hamilton, N. Y., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1500) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fulton, N. Y., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1501) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Watertown, N. Y., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1502) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Richland, N. Y., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1503) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Oswego, N. Y., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1504) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Hannibal, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1505) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Lowville, N. Y., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1506) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Carthage, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1507) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Adams, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1508) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Antwerp, N. Y., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1509) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Clayton, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1510) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Cazenovia, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1511) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Orwell, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 1512) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Rockford, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1513) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Kirkland, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1514) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Durand, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1515) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hinckley, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1516) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Rockton, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1517) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Cherry Valley, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1518) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of De Kalb, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1519) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mendota, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1520) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Morris, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1521) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of La Salle, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1522) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Belvidere, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1523) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Genoa, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1524) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Shabbona, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1525) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Plano, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1526) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Yorkville, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1527) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Pecatonica, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1528) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Peru, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1529) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sycamore, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1530) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ottawa, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SANFORD: A bill (H. R. 1531) to increase the limit of cost for the Federal post-office building at Cohoes, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1532) providing for the payment of the findings reported by the Court of Claims in favor of certain engineers, firemen, mechanics, and laborers for extra time; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 1533) for the completion of the Federal building at Muskogee, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1534) to establish a fish-cultural station at some point in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1535) providing for a survey of Arkansas River in the State of Oklahoma, with the view of making same navigable; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1536) to provide for the construction of a military road at the United States cemetery at Fort Gibson, Okla.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1537) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Checotah, county of McIntosh, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1538) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Stigler, county of Haskell, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1539) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Okmulgee, Okla., four German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1540) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Sequoyah, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1541) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Henryetta, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1542) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Cherokee, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1543) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Vian, county of Sequoyah, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1544) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Muskogee, Okla., four German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1545) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Muldrow, county of Sequoyah, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1546) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Eufala, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1547) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Stilwell, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1548) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Wagoner, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1549) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Westville, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 1550) to provide for the erection in the city of Washington, in memory of Theodore Roosevelt, of a museum of history and the arts; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1551) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Mineola, in the State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1552) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Port Washington, in the State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1553) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of New Hyde Park, in the State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1554) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Smithtown Branch, in the State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1555) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of West Babylon, in the State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1556) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Sea Cliff, in the State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1557) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Centerport, in the State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1558) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Manhasset, in the State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1559) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Westbury, in the State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1560) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Southampton, in the State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1561) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the district of Lawrence, comprising Cedarhurst, Woodmere, Hewlett, Inwood, and Lawrence, in the State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1562) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of St. Albans, in the State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1563) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Roosevelt, in the State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1564) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the armory of the National Guard at Flushing, in the State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1565) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Riverhead, in the State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1566) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Hicksville, in the State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1567) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Greenlawn, in the State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1568) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Bayshore, in the State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1569) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Bridgehampton, in the State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 1570) to amend sections 2237 and 2240 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1571) providing a building for post office and other purposes at San Bernardino, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1572) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Redlands, San Bernardino County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1573) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Santa Ana, Orange County; Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1574) to authorize the establishment of a fisheries experiment station on the coast of California; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1575) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Victorville, Calif., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1576) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Upland, Calif., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1577) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Santa Ana, Calif., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1578) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of San Bernardino, Calif., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1579) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of San Diego, Calif., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1580) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Redlands, Calif., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1581) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Riverside, Calif., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1582) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Orange, Calif., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1583) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Elsinore, Calif., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1584) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of El Centro, Calif., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1585) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Corona, Calif., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1586) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Anaheim, Calif., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 1587) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ashland, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1588) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Balsam Lake, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1589) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Grantsburg, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1590) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ladysmith, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1591) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Merrill, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1592) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Phillips, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1593) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Rhinelander, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1594) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Spooner, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1595) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Superior, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1596) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Washburn, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1597) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bayfield, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1598) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hurley, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1599) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Eagle River, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1600) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Shell Lake, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 1601) to establish the standard of weights and measures for flours, meals, and commercial feeding stuffs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1602) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and cannon balls, to the city of Mansfield, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1603) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and cannon balls, to the city of Mount Vernon, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1604) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and cannon balls, to the village of Johnstown, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1605) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and cannon balls, to the city of Delaware, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1606) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and cannon balls, to the city of Coshocton, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1607) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and cannon balls, to the city of Ashland, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1608) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and cannon balls, to the Grand Army of the Republic Club at the city of Newark, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1609) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and cannon balls, to the village of Shelby, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 1610) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bloomington, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1611) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Minonk, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1612) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lincoln, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1613) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of O'Dell, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1614) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Dwight, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1615) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Pontiac, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1616) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of El Paso, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IRELAND: A bill (H. R. 1617) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1917, and an act in amendment thereto approved October 6, 1917; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1618) granting duration-of-war status to certain enlisted men of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ACKERMAN: A bill (H. R. 1619) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Dover, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1620) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the township of Lyons Farms, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1621) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the township of Scotch Plains, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 1622) to appropriate the sum of $5,083.40 out of the United States Treasury to lay and construct a 30-foot strip of asphaltic concrete pavement around the United States post office in the city of Fayetteville, Ark.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1623) to repeal the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1624) to pay to Confederate soldiers and to widows of Confederate soldiers $500 and $30 per month during the remainder of their lives; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1625) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Van Buren, State of Arkansas, five German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1626) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Searcy, State of Arkansas, five German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1627) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Marion, State of Arkansas, five German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1628) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Carroll, State of Arkansas, five German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1629) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Newton, State of Arkansas, five German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1630) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Madison, State of Arkansas, five German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1631) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Boone, State of Arkansas, five German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1632) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Baxter, State of Arkansas, five German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1633) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Washington, State of Arkansas, five German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1634) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Benton, State of Arkansas, five German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1635) for the erection of a public building at Bentonville, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1636) for the erection of a public building at Springdale, Ark; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1637) for the erection of a public building at Cotter, Ark; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1638) for the erection of a public building at Huntsville, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1639) for the erection of a public building at Clinton, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1640) for the erection of a public building at Marshall, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1641) for the erection of a public building at Jasper, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1642) for the erection of a public building at Berryville, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1643) for the erection of a public building at Prairie Grove, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1644) for the erection of a public building at Leslie, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1645) for the erection of a public building at Green Forest, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1646) for the erection of a public building at Mountain Home, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1647) for the erection of a public building at Yellville, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1648) for the erection of a public building at Gravette, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1649) for the erection of a public building at Siloam Springs, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1650) for the erection of a public building at Gentry, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1651) for the erection of a public building at Decatur, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1652) for the erection of a public building at Sulphur Springs, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. IRELAND: A bill (H. R. 1653) awarding a medal in the name of Congress to the nearest living relative of those who gave their lives during the war with Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREAR: A bill (H. R. 1654) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hudson, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1655) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Menomonie, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1656) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Rice Lake, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1657) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chippewa Falls, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1658) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Eau Claire, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1659) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Stanley, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1660) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Augusta, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 1661) to provide in the existing emergency for naval protection of the country's chief commercial port and signally increase the exigently needed national revenue through development of traffic and transportation in the most populous industrial section of the Republic by the soonest achievable completion, at the least feasible cost, of improvement of East River, Hell Gate, Little Hell Gate, Harlem Kills, and Upper Bay in the harbor of New York, and improvement of the harbor of Buffalo; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1662) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of New York, Borough of Richmond, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1663) providing for a survey of Great Kills, Staten Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1664) making an appropriation for the improvement of the Arthur Kill River, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 1665) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Wellsboro, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1666) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one condemned cannon to the town of Renovo, Pa.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1667) to enlarge and extend the post-office building at Williamsport, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 1668) to authorize the erection of a Federal building at Oelwein, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1669) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Osage, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 1670) to repeal an act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy and all amendments thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1671) for the erection of a public building at Sylacauga, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1672) to establish a fish-culture station in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1673) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Oxford, Calhoun County, Ala., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1674) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Heflin, Cleburne County, Ala., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1675) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Clanton, Chilton County, Ala., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1676) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Jacksonville, Calhoun County, Ala., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1677) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Verbena, Chilton County, Ala., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1678) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Columbiana, Shelby County, Ala., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1679) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Anniston, Calhoun County, Ala., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1680) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Piedmont, Calhoun County, Ala., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1681) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Selma, Dallas County, Ala., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1682) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Talladega, Talladega County, Ala., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1683) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sylacauga, Talladega County, Ala., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1684) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Marion Junction, Dallas County, Ala., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1685) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Montevallo, Shelby County, Ala., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1686) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Calera, Shelby County, Ala., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 1687) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of St. Clairsville, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1688) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cadiz, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1689) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Carrollton, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1690) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Steubenville, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1691) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lisbon, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 1692) to authorize mining for metalliferous minerals on Indian reservations; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1693) to amend sections 2139 and 2140 of the Revised Statutes and the acts amendatory thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1694) granting pensions to certain Indian soldiers who served in the First Arizona Infantry during the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1695) to amend section 4 of the act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 1696) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Owego, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOIGT: A bill (H. R. 1697) to repeal section 3, title 1, and section 4, title 12, of the espionage act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 1698) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, consider, and adjudicate claims which the Cherokee, Creek, and Seminole Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 1699) to authorize and empower the Postmaster General to construct, maintain, and operate a mail tunnel in the city of New York; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 1700) to pay the balance due the loyal Creek Indians on the award made by the Senate on the 16th day of February, 1903; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 1701) to donate to the following municipalities each one or more obsolete (though not disabled) or captured German cannons: David City, Milford, and York, all in the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 1702) to protect the public against false pretenses in merchandising, under trade-mark or special brand, of articles of standard quality; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 1703) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of the clerks of the United States district courts and to provide for their office expenses, and for other purposes," approved February 26, 1919; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 1704) to repeal that part of section 1 of an act of Congress approved November 21, 1918, giving the President power to declare by proclamation nationwide prohibition after June 30, 1919; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 1705) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the cities of Aurora, Joliet, Woodstock, West Chicago, Elgin, Harvard, Batavia, Wilmington, Geneva, Plainfield, Hinsdale, Marengo, and Downers Grove, all in the State of Illinois, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured from the German Army in the recent war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 1706) authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Snake River about 3 miles above its confluence with the Columbia River, near Pasco, Wash.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 1707) to repeal the act entitled "An act to save daylight and provide standard time for the United States"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 1708) to amend paragraph 20 of section 900 of the revenue act of 1919, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 1709) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to adjust disputes or claims by entrymen, selectors, grantees, and patentees of the United States against the United States and between each other, arising from faulty surveys in townships 36, 37, and 38 south, ranges 29 and 30 east, Tallahassee meridian, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WEBSTER: A bill (H. R. 1710) providing for the investigation of certain lands in central Washington with a view to their reclamation; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 1711) to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 1712) extending the provisions of the act of May 27, 1908, entitled "An act providing for the removal of the restrictions of the lands of the Five Civilized Tribes, and for other purposes," over members of the tribes embraced within the Quapaw Agency, Ottawa County, Okla.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 1713) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to appoint a commission to investigate and report upon the available sources of water supply for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 1714) to create in the War Department and the Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as the "Civil War Volunteer Officers' Retired List," to authorize placing thereon with retired pay certain surviving officers who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the Civil War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 1715) to pension soldiers of the War with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, and the China relief expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COADY: A bill (H. R. 1716) to regulate the payment of interest on judgments for claimants of the Court of Claims, which have been affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 1717) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate a captured cannon or fieldpiece to certain cities and towns in the third congressional district of Tennessee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULLEN: A bill (H. R. 1718) authorizing a survey of Bay Ridge and Red Hook Channels, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 1719) providing for the purchase of site and for public building at New Brighton, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 1720) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a juvenile court in and for the District of Columbia," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCHALL: A bill (H. R. 2020) to authorize James D. Markham, Adella W. Kelsey, and John F. Druar and others to construct a dam across the St. Croix River between Minnesota and Wisconsin; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRENCH: Resolution (H. Res. 35) fixing an annual memorial day for the House of Representatives and providing for the appointment of a Committee on Memorials; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 36) amending the rules of the House of Representatives and providing for the appointment of a Committee on Memorials and defining the duties of such committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Resolution (H. Res. 38) relating to the atrocious treatment and massacres of men and women and children in Poland, Roumania, and Galicia, and requesting the President to cause steps to be taken as in his judgment may tend to prevent a recurrence of such outrages and assure humane treatment of the peoples against whom those persecutions are directed; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: Resolution (H. Res. 39) instructing the delegates from the United States of America to the peace conference to protest against former prejudices, hatred, and persecution against the Jews in certain portions of Europe forming part of newly created free governments; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. IRELAND: Resolution (H. Res. 40) providing for two clerks and a messenger at the rate of $2,500, $1,500, and $1,000 per annum, respectively, the said clerks and messenger to be appointed by and to be under the direction and control of the majority leader; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HASTINGS: Resolution (H. Res. 41) to amend clause 3, Rule XIII; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MONDELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 43) relating to the fuel supply of the city of Casper, Wyo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MAHER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 44) declaring November 11 of each year to be a national holiday; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HUSTED: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 45) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 46) to provide for a commission to inquire into the condition of public education in the several States, and to recommend such measures as it may deem advisable for the improvement of the same; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. FRENCH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 47) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 48) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANTHONY (by request): Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 49) authorizing retired officers to accept positions as clerk of Committee on Military Affairs or Committee on Naval Affairs of either House of Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 50) to repeal section 904 of the revenue act of 1919, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 51) to repeal paragraph 19 of section 900 of the revenue act of 1919, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUSTED: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 7) declaratory of the judgment of Congress respecting foreign alliances; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DENISON: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Illinois, favoring granting of six months' pay to all honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, favoring a reduction of freight rates on material used for road-building purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EMERSON: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Ohio, relative to the rights of the Jewish people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KLECZKA: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relating to the labor controversy in the city of Madison; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress in behalf of the farmers to repeal the law advancing the time one hour; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 1721) granting a pension to Kate Peck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1722) granting an increase of pension to Charles Fish; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 1723) to authorize the issue of a patent to certain land in Alabama to William M. Wilson; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 1724) granting an increase of pension to William O. Fraser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1725) for the relief of John Albus, jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 1726) granting an increase of pension to John F. Rose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 1727) granting a pension to Jacob M. Hizar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1728) granting a pension to John H. Kinkade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1729) granting a pension to Sarah J. Latta; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1730) granting a pension to Mary McLaughlin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1731) granting a pension to John Bishop; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr CLASSON: A bill (H. R. 1732) granting a pension to Ernest Meyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1733) granting a pension to Xavier Pocquette; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1734) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Martell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1735) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Britton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1736) for the relief of Jonas Archiquette; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1737) for the relief of Johanna Dunton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1738) to correct the military record of Thomas C. Tulley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1739) to correct the military record of John G. Day; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1740) for the relief of the Wisconsin Band of Pottawatomie Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER: A bill (H. R. 1741) for the relief of the estate of W. L. Johnston; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1742) for the relief of the heirs of John Wixon, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1743) granting a pension to Rachael S. Dobbs; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1744) for the relief of Dr. G. Y. Hicks; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1745) for the relief of the heirs or estate of David S. Sexton, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1746) for the relief of J. W. Cain, Morde Fuller, Charles Van Buren, and H. C. Perry; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1747) for the relief of Thomas H. Jett; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1748) for the relief of Maria Elizabeth Burnett; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1749) for the relief of James Richards, administrator of the estate of William Richards, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1750) for the relief of the heirs of Hariet B. Selma, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1751) for the relief of the heirs of Isaac Whitaker, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1752) for the relief of the legal representatives of James W. Brabston and Roche H. Brabston; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1753) for the relief of the heirs or estate of William J. Milligan, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1754) for the relief of the estate of John P. Gee; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1755) for the relief of the legal representatives of Ann D. Halsey, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 1756) granting an increase of pension to Ann Brooks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 1757) granting a pension to Emilie S. Hyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 1758) granting an increase of pension to James H. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1759) granting an increase of pension to Robert Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1760) granting an increase of pension to Walter O'Neal; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1761) for the relief of the Farmers' National Bank, of Wilkinson, Ind.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 1762) for the relief of Margie R. Ashbrook; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1763) granting a pension to Orville G. Willett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1764) granting a pension to Henry Buck; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 1765) granting a pension to Dora Snyder; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 1766) for the relief of Henry C. Prater; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1767) for the relief of James H. C. Mann; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 1768) granting an increase of pension to Jethro J. T. Garde; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1769) granting an increase of pension to Richard Harris; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1770) granting an increase of pension to Alwilda Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1771) granting an increase of pension to John W. Dickens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1772) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Jacks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1773) granting an increase of pension to Henry Pfranger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1774) granting a pension to Joseph N. Foster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1775) granting a pension to Susan C. Davidson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1776) granting a pension to Sarah Van Doozer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1777) granting a pension to Josephine Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1778) granting a pension to Emma E. Urquhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also a bill (H. R. 1779) granting a pension to Mary Botsford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1780) granting a pension to Thomas Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1781) granting a pension to Margery Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1782) granting a pension to Matilda J. Haines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1783) granting a pension to Horace G. Pope; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1784) granting a pension to William M. Pipkin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1785) for the relief of Aaron Kibler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1786) conferring authority upon the Secretary of the Treasury to consider application for bounty and back pay on account of the military services of John Wallace; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1787) for the relief of Kentuck Corbett; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1788) for the relief of Edward B. Sappington; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1789) for the relief of Thomas P. Darr; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1790) for the relief of John K. Ashley, jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1791) for the relief of O. W. Lindsley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1792) granting a patent to Joseph Robicheau; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: A bill (H. R. 1793) granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Wood; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1794) granting a pension to George B. Trayes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 1795) granting a pension to Albert McManaman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1796) for the relief of William Holsten; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 1797) granting a pension to George Matson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1798) granting a pension to Walter S. Stewart; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1799) granting a pension to Ida M. Hammon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1800) granting a pension to Paul Kroll; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: A bill (H. R. 1801) for the relief of the legal representative of Robert Dillon, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 1802) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester W. Sutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1803) granting an increase of pension to James F. Van Horn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 1804) for the relief of E. K. White; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1805) granting a pension to Philip F. M. Lutz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1806) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1807) for the relief of Daniel D. Stocton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1808) granting an increase of pension to David Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1809) granting a pension to Joseph S. Morton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1810) granting a pension to James O. Carroll; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1811) making an appropriation to Clarence W. Turner and William B. Hord in payment of service rendered by them to the Creek Nation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1812) making an appropriation to compensate James M. Moore for damages sustained while in the service of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1813) making an appropriation to compensate Samuel Grant for pay bounty and clothing pay while in the service of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1814) to correct the military record of William C. Pearson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1815) to correct the military record of Hulbert Bean; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1816) to correct the military record of Charles M. Lewallen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1817) for the relief of Eliza Audre, daughter of Maria Colston; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 1818) granting a pension to Jennie A. Stephens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERSEY: A bill (H. R. 1819) granting an increase of pension to Stuart D. Buswell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 1820) granting an increase of pension to James Harrold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1821) to provide for the payment to Mrs. Erastus Bennett of insurance money of Pvt. Joseph Griffin; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1822) granting a pension to Marie Merz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1823) granting an increase of pension to John H. Terry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1824) for the relief of Theodore Bloom; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1825) for the relief of the estate of Henry A. V. Post; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1826) for the relief of Lillian D. Boone; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1827) for the relief of Carolyn Wheeler Kobbe; to the Committee on Claims.

crease of pension to George Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid

By Mr. HOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 1828) granting an in-

Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1829) granting a pension to Chloe Lamb Delaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 1830) for the relief of Albert T. Huso; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1831) granting a pension to Mary Redfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1832) granting a pension to Claude H. Dean; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1833) granting an increase of pension to Amos Langfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 1834) granting a pension to James Shortell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULINGS: A bill (H. R. 1835) granting an increase of pension to Edward O'Flaherty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 1836) granting an increase of pension to Barnet Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: A bill (H. R. 1837) for the relief of James E. Van Horne; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1838) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Snook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 1839) granting an increase of pension to Maria Kuehn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1840) granting a pension to Margaret E. Leonard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1841) granting a pension to Esther C. Vernell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1842) granting a pension to Marion P. Barnett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1843) granting a pension to Lee Nolte; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1844) granting a pension to Joseph Roddy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. IRELAND: A bill (H. R. 1845) granting a congressional medal to Capt. Edward V. Rickenbacker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 1846) granting a pension to George W. Johnston; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 1847) granting a pension to John C. Graves; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1848) granting a pension to William E. Sloane; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1849) granting a pension to Schuyler van Tassell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1850) granting an increase of pension to George W. Mower; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 1851) to transfer Frederick W. Cobb from the list of chief machinists, United States Navy, to the list of chief pay clerks, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1852) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the record of Francis Fayette Lyons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1853) to reimburse E. T. Thing and S. A. Thing for losses and damages sustained by them by the negligent dipping of their cattle by the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1854) for the relief of Alfred Hardy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1855) for the relief of the H. D. Field Safe Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1856) for the relief of Arthur J. Burdick; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1857) for the relief of the heirs of Harold B. Stoebe; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1858) granting a pension to Samuel W. Van Riper; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1859) granting a pension to Harriet E. Schwyhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1860) granting an increase of pension to Sarah B. Greene; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KRAUS: A bill (H. R. 1861) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Ferguson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1862) granting an increase of pension to Martin Broderick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1863) granting an increase of pension to Ellen G. Frame; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1864) granting an increase of pension to Columbus Beaber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 1865) for the relief of the Baltimore Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., owner of a dry dock at Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 1866) granting an increase of pension to Dennis W. Riordan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1867) for the relief of Thomas Casey alias Clancy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1868) granting an increase of pension to John R. McCrillis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1869) granting a pension to Thomas Casey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUFKIN: A bill (H. R. 1870) granting a pension to Emma A. Rogers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 1871) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Aye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 1872) granting an increase of pension to Concetta Chieffo; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1873) granting an increase of pension to John Flood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1874) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor C. Doyle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1875) granting an increase of pension to James McCullough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1876) granting an increase of pension to Nellie McDonald Grimshaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1877) granting a pension to Patrick Macdonnell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1878) granting a pension to Elizabeth McGuiness; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1879) granting a pension to Elizabeth Frothingham; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1880) granting a pension to Mary Julian Conway; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1881) granting a pension to Elizabeth McGuiness; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1882) granting a pension to Joseph P. Hamblen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1883) granting a pension to Frances E. Herlehy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1884) granting a pension to John Coffey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1885) for the relief of John Hartnett; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1886) granting six months' pay to Katherine Taylor Dodge, widow of Charles Dodge, captain, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1887) to reinstate John K. Thompson as a gunner in the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 1888) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 1889) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel J. Orwig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1890) granting an increase of pension to James H. Perrin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1891) granting an increase of pension to Milton S. Davenport; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1892) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1893) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Hesler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1894) granting an increase of pension to Abraham E. Curlee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1895) granting an increase of pension to Henry Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1896) granting an increase of pension to Leonard Burton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1897) granting an increase of pension to Joseph T. Earl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1898) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1899) granting an increase of pension to Richard L. Rusk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1900) granting an increase of pension to Truston W. Shirley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1901) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Kinnaman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1902) granting an increase of pension to William J. Whipple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1903) granting an increase of pension to Reuben S. Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1904) granting an increase of pension to Jesse C. Barker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1905) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Hesler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1906) granting an increase of pension to John Maxwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1907) granting an increase of pension to Theodore R. Harbaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1908) granting an increase of pension to Reinhard Anschutz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1909) granting an increase of pension to John P. Bradfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1910) granting an increase of pension to Richard Renick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1911) granting an increase of pension to Amanda C. Deal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1912) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Hays; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1913) granting an increase of pension to Edward A. Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1914) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Kernodle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1915) granting an increase of pension to James M. Spencer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1916) granting an increase of pension to George Dempsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1917) granting an increase of pension to William A. Huffine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1918) granting an increase of pension to Lancetta Byram; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1919) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Munhall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1920) granting a pension to Elizabeth C. Fry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1921) granting a pension to Elizabeth Goodykoontz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1922) granting a pension to Philip Owen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1923) granting a pension to Violette F. McCool; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1924) granting a pension to Samuel L. Ensminger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1925) granting a pension to Ellen J. Kidwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1926) granting a pension to Sarah E. Mathis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1927) granting a pension to Alice Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1928) granting an increase of pension to Jacob L. Helms; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1929) granting a pension to Daisy May Lebo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1930) granting a pension to John Hannon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1931) granting a pension to Edward S. Coffin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1932) granting a pension to Emsley A. Lassiter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1933) granting a pension to Walter C. Thorp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1934) granting a pension to Serena Redden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1935) granting a pension to Mary Arnold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1936) granting a pension to Rebecca Whitacre; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1937) granting a pension to Nancy J. Crum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1938) granting a pension to Ellen Arbuckle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1939) for the relief of Ambrose D. Hunt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1940) for the relief of Willard Thompson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1941) for the relief of Thomas J. Gardner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 1942) granting an increase of pension to Randall M. Bates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1943) granting an increase of pension to Louis F. Ursenbach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1944) granting a pension to Francis A. Baxter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1945) granting a pension to Margaret L. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1946) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Haynes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1947) for the relief of John C. Howard; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1948) to correct the military record of James M. Wiley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1949) to correct the military record of George F. Reid; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

My Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 1950) granting an increase of pension to John L. Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1951) granting an increase of pension to Smith J. Dutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1952) granting an increase of pension to George H. Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1953) granting an increase of pension to William H. McKay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: A bill (H. R. 1954) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Garst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1955) granting a pension to Marion W. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 1956) for the relief of Thomas Crowley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1957) for the relief of the owners of the steam lighter *Rudolph*; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1958) for the relief of Davis & Lawrence Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1959) for the relief of Edmund F. Jenkins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1960) for the relief of Maurice Spillane, alias Maurice Splan; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1961) for the relief of Clarence F. Birkett; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1962) for the relief of William H. Sullivan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1963) granting a pension to Irving Wohl; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1964) granting a pension to Katharine Wilkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1965) granting a pension to Henry Padoult; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1966) granting an increase of pension to Margaret O'Connor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1967) granting an increase of pension to Matthew J. McKeon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1968) granting an increase of pension to Harriet K. Bailie; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1969) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Melson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 1970) granting an increase of pension to John W. Jenkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1971) granting an increase of pension to William Boone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWE: A bill (H. R. 1972) for the relief of the heirs of Robert M. Seward; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1973) for the relief of Lieut. Commander Jerome E. Morse, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1974) granting an increase of pension to Harriet S. Mansfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1975) granting a pension to Ida Weil; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 1976) for the relief of James P. Cornes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1977) for the relief of James M. Byrne; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SANFORD: A bill (H. R. 1978) granting an increase of pension to Richard Blackburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1979) granting an increase of pension to George A. Hitchcock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1980) granting a pension to John J. Burke; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1981) granting an increase of pension to John C. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1982) granting a pension to Henrietta De Groat; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1983) for the relief of Michael H. Feeley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1984) authorizing the appointment of Brig. Gen. John H. Patterson, United States Army, retired, as a major general on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1985) for the relief of Tennis W. Wade; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1986) for the relief of James Birney, alias James Brady; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1987) for the relief of Charles H. Palmer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1988) for the relief of Martin W. Joralemon, alias Martin Whitbeck; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1989) for the relief of Henry C. Romaine; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1990) for the relief of Charles Springer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1991) for the relief of John J. Dooley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1992) for the relief of John McNeil; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1993) for the relief of Anthony Schnell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1994) granting a pension to Elizabeth Hogan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1995) granting a pension to Louis F. Hickey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1996) granting a pension to Emma Magee, daughter of James Magee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1997) granting a pension to Morgan A. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 1998) granting an increase of pension to John C. Koepplinger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1999) granting a pension to Albert Beehler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2000) granting an increase of pension to Darwin H. Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 2001) granting an increase of pension to Alfred J. Skinner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2002) granting an extension of patent to Rosella Rebecca Reilly; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2003) granting an increase of pension to John D. Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2004) granting a pension to Henry Seebers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2005) granting an increase of pension to August Pfiffner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2006) granting an increase of pension to Edward Boehmler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2007) granting a pension to Samuel C. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2008) granting an increase of pension to John D. Caswell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2009) granting a pension to Mary J. Doyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2010) granting a pension to Angeline E. Holt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2011) granting an increase of pension to James H. Porcupile; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2012) granting a pension to Walter S. Hewitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2013) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie S. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2014) granting an increase of pension to Frank Stimpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2015) granting a pension to Ephraim James Hopkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINCHER: a bill (H. R. 2016) granting an increase of pension to Brother Buis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VENABLE: A bill (H. R. 2017) for the payment of sailor insurance to Annie Elliner and Mary Agnes Davidson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 2018) for the relief of Paschall C. Hibbs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 2019) for the relief of Frank H. Walker and Frank E. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Resolutions adopted by Yavapai Council, No. 1032, Knights of Columbus, Prescott, Ariz., asking President and both Houses of American Congress to recognize the Irish republic as a free and independent nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of organization representing 200,000 Jews of Philadelphia, protesting against the massacres of great numbers of Jews in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of F. Wang, representing Chinese residents of Milwaukee, Wis., asking cooperation in the case of justice to China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Baron de Favereau, president of the Senate, Brussels, Belgium, relating to the restoration in Belgium; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Lithuanians of Greater New York urging the President of the United States to prevent the violation of the principle of self-determination and prevent invasion of Lithuania by other foreign or militarist armies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, Albany Lodge No. 861, Albany, N. Y., urging Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENISON: Petition of sundry citizens of Campbell Hill, Ill., for legislation prohibiting teaching of German language in public schools; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 1202, U. M. W. A., Tilden, Ill., for certain remedial legislation in the interest of labor; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of Albert L. Reeves, asking that the conduct of the election of Representatives in Congress in the fifth congressional district of Missouri on the 5th of November, 1918, be investigated; to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

By Mr. EMERSON: Resolutions adopted by merchants of Cleveland, Ohio, requesting repeal of tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Western Sporting Goods Manufacturing Co., of Chicago, concerning tax on sporting goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of various citizens of Genoa and Kingston, Ill., for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Dr. John W. Cook, president Northern Illinois State Normal School, favoring the Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Mrs. Grace Wilbur Trout, president Illinois Equal Suffrage Association, for Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petition of the Consumers' League of New York, asking for support of bill for appropriation for women in industry service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolutions of the New York City Board of Aldermen, protesting against removal of pneumatic tubes, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GOODYKOONTZ: Petition of L. R. Lambert, Kenova, W. Va., and divers other citizens of Huntington, Kenova, and Ceredo, W. Va., favoring Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Williamson Federation of Labor, Williamson, W. Va., favoring Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: Petition of citizens of Iowa, protesting against luxury taxes and asking repeal of section 904 of revenue law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KETTNER: Telegram from Mrs. E. Morreson, secretary of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Santa Ana, Calif., opposing the ban being lifted on beer and light wine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution adopted at the Coronado, Calif., convention of Pacific coast section National Electric Light Association, protesting against standard of ethics by Bureau of Standards at Washington; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of National Garment Retailers' Association, urging repeal of section 904 of the luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Maryland State Federation of Woman's Clubs, declaring in favor of the extension of suffrage to women in all the States of the Union on equal terms with men; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of Baltimore section of Council of Jewish Women, advocating the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Auman & Werkmeister, importers, furriers, skin dealers, Baltimore, Md., protesting against the 10 per cent tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Alice J. Reilley, Baltimore Md., urging defeat of Smith bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of East Clay Grange, No. 469, of Clay, N. Y., protesting against the daylight-saving law and requesting the repeal thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of many members of Lamson Grange, No. 588, of Lamson, N. Y., protesting against the daylight-saving law and requesting the repeal thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of patrons of soda stands and ice-cream stores, asking that no tax be paid on purchases of less than 10 cents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY: Petition of West Point Grange, Lisbon, Ohio, praying for change of time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of St. Clair Grange, No. 1908, St. Clairsville, Ohio, praying for change of time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of National Garment Retailers' Association, appealing against the taxation and urging immediate repeal of section 904; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of Pike Grange, No. 1172, New York, urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Chili Grange, No. 393, New York, with 290 members, urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of 115 citizens of the town of Indian Falls, N. Y., urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition of citizens of the seventeenth congressional district of Illinois, asking that a tax of 6 cents a bushel be imposed upon corn imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of the seventeenth congressional district of Illinois, asking that a tax of 36 cents a bushel be imposed upon corn imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Common Council of the city of Putnam, Conn., against the increase of telephone rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Council of Jewish Women, that the United States approve the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Association of Collegiate Alumnæ for the continuance of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of National Garment Retailers' Association, to repeal the luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of Local Union, No. 868, Machinists' Helpers, Huntington, W. Va., asking for repeal of the present daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *May 22, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father Almighty, we come to Thee with gratitude in our hearts and praise upon our lips for the provisions Thou hast made for Thy children in this transitory life; for the preparations Thou hast made for them in the life eternal; the intellectual, moral, and spiritual attainments which are ours for the struggle and which bind us together in the home, society, State, and religion.

Give us the will, the courage, the strength, the disposition to obey Thy mandates now and always. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members shall have leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the woman suffrage resolution which was passed yesterday for five legislative days, not including telegrams or other extraneous matters not originally prepared by the Members.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that all Members may have the right to extend their remarks in the RECORD for five legislative days on the woman suffrage resolution which was passed yesterday, without including extraneous matter. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the House, for the first time in the last two years that I know of, even a member of the committee having in charge the proposed legislation was prevented from revising his remarks after he had spoken on the floor of this House. I had spoken on the floor of the House and I was prevented from revising my remarks after I had asked for the permission twice. I think it is a little hard for us not to be allowed to extend our remarks and that it is asking a great deal now to let in everybody else, even those who objected.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BLANTON. I will not object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears none, and the request is granted.

SWEARING IN A MEMBER.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DUPRÉ] is here and wants to be sworn in.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana is present. Are there any other Members present who have not been sworn in? If not, the gentleman from Louisiana will present himself to receive the oath.

Mr. DUPRÉ appeared before the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF.

The SPEAKER. The Chair submits to the House, through the Clerk, the following appointments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Under the law providing for the appointment, by the Speaker, of two Members of the House of Representatives on the board of directors for the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, the Chair announces the following appointments: Mr. PORTER, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RAKER, of California.

INVITATIONS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to call the attention of the House to two invitations which he was requested to convey to the House, one from the Secretary of the Interior, saying that there is an exposition of the activities of that department now open at Nineteenth and F Streets, to which he extends a cordial invitation to all Members of Congress from 10 a. m. to 10 p. m. on June 1, and the Secretary of the Navy says that at present there is at the foot of O Street dock a German submarine, U-17, which is one of the largest mine-laying submarines remaining after the armistice, and that the lieutenant in charge will be glad to tender any courtesies he can to those desiring to visit it.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, we are beginning the new session, and we are, all of us, anxious to expedite business and have affairs move along smoothly and avoid confusion. Members have occasion from time to time to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of various matters. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that if Members who expect to ask unanimous consent, other than for corrections of the RECORD and extension of remarks and matters of that kind, if the request relates to matters that are of some importance, I should appreciate it very greatly personally if they would be good enough, if it is convenient for them to do so, to let me know in advance of their intention to make such a request. I am of the opinion that it is a courtesy due to the minority leader to notify him in the same way when a request of that sort is to be made.

I am sure I do not make this request with any thought of being captious or of preventing Members from securing the consideration of those matters that they desire to have considered, but rather with a view of aiding and assisting, and I am sure that is the view of the minority leader. Many Members have a hesitancy about objecting to unanimous-consent requests, and yet they expect some one who is in a position of responsibility to be informed as to such requests. I think Members will be assisted in having their requests given favorable consideration and business will be expedited if we follow the practices I have suggested.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

COMMITTEE ON WATER POWER.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas submits a privileged report, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to which was referred House resolution 32, submit a privileged report on said resolution, with the recommendation that the resolution be agreed to:

"House resolution 32.

"*Resolved*, That the Speaker of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to appoint a special committee of 18 members to whom all bills and resolutions heretofore or hereafter introduced during the Sixty-sixth Congress pertaining to the development or utilization of water power shall be referred, notwithstanding any general rule of the House to the contrary."

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this resolution appointing this committee is made necessary because a similar committee, provided for in a resolution passed in the Sixty-fifth Congress, did not complete its work. The bill reported by that committee passed the House and passed the Senate, but failed in conference, and it is the purpose——

Mr. SIMS. If the gentleman will allow me, it did not fail in conference.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It did not fail in conference, but the conference report failed in the Senate.

Mr. GARRETT. On account of the filibuster over there.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman is correct. The House adopted the conference report, but the conference report failed in the Senate. Those interested in the legislation are anxious to have this committee appointed, so that the work may be undertaken at the earliest date possible.

Mr. GARNER. Does this resolution provide for the same arrangement as the former one?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The resolution is very general in its terms and provides for the reference to that committee of bills pertaining to this subject.

Mr. FLOOD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Certainly.

Mr. FLOOD. Is this the same resolution that was adopted in the last Congress?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. This resolution makes no reference in any way to boundary waters. The resolution is general in terms, and sends to this committee such bills as may be referred to it by the Speaker or the Speaker's clerk or by the action of the House.

Mr. FLOOD. The question I asked was if it was the same resolution that was adopted in the last Congress for the creation of the water-power committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Oh, yes.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBEL of Kansas. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman recalls, of course, that in the last Congress this committee was made up from the membership of three committees; and it was our understanding, I think, in the Committee on Rules that that same practice would prevail this time, without any reference to resolutions that may have been adopted by the steering committees affecting the right of any Member to serve on more than one committee. In other words, this is to be a special committee, and is to be made up from the membership of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Committee on the Public Lands, and the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is the understanding.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman from Tennessee has called my attention and the attention of the House to the fact that this committee provided for in this resolution has been made up in its membership heretofore of members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Committee on the Public Lands, and the Committee on Agriculture, and that the committee so created does not infringe upon the rule which prohibits Members from serving on certain other committees. The gentleman is correct in that statement.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I was about to ask a question similar to the one propounded by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]; but that question having been answered, I should like to inquire a little further. As I understand it, one of the pur-

poses, and perhaps the most important purpose, of having this committee appointed is to expedite water-power legislation.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is the purpose of the creation of this committee at this time.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. What language in the resolution confines the selection of this committee to the membership of the three committees which have been named?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No language in the resolution, and nothing except the understanding that was had in the former Congress, and probably an understanding with the Speaker and the members of the committees concerned in this legislation.

Mr. WALSH. An understanding between the Speaker and the Members who are to be members of this special committee?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No understanding except that it was arranged when the committee was created formerly that it should be composed of members of the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Public Lands, and Agriculture, and I assume that the same procedure will be followed in the appointment of the committee in this Congress.

Mr. MONDELL. It will.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. What necessity is there for appointing another special committee? Why can not this subject be handled as it has been handled heretofore, by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It has not been handled heretofore by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. WALSH. The greater part of the legislation has.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Owing to the contention concerning the question it was thought that a more satisfactory result would follow if the committee should be selected from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Committee on the Public Lands, and the Committee on Agriculture, and if such a committee were to give their united action to the preparation of such legislation.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Did the special committee on water power in the last Congress have jurisdiction of the water power at Niagara Falls or was that left to the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. There was no exclusion made. That was a matter that was settled here on the floor.

Mr. MANN. Was it settled on the floor or not?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Did not the Committee on Foreign Affairs have jurisdiction of the bill relating to the Niagara Falls water power?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield to me to allow me to answer that question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The way the question arose was this——

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can answer the question very easily by saying whether they did or not.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I think a word would not answer the question. If the gentleman will permit me, I will answer in this way: The committee reported a bill including all boundary streams, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs came in with an amendment to exclude the boundary streams. That was debated three days in the House, and at the end of that three days' debate the amendment proposed by the Foreign Affairs Committee failed in the House by a substantial majority.

Mr. MANN. I am asking for information. I do not know. Did the Committee on Foreign Affairs have jurisdiction of bills relating to the Niagara Falls water-power bill?

Mr. FLOOD. It did.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, are we proceeding under the one hour allowed the gentleman from Kansas, or how are we proceeding? We can not hear a thing over here. I should like to know if this comes out of the hour.

The SPEAKER. Certainly; the gentleman from Kansas has one hour.

Mr. SEARS. Then it comes out of his time.

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The Committee on Foreign Affairs was allowed to retain jurisdiction of the Niagara Falls bill. Of course, the Committee on Foreign Affairs would not obtain jurisdiction over such bills under this resolution.

Mr. FLOOD. I want to say that I think the statement made by the gentleman from New York is not exactly correct. When this rule was brought in in the last Congress it was intended not to take from the Foreign Affairs Committee jurisdiction over boundary waters, and particularly the Niagara Falls water-power bill.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I have so stated.

Mr. FLOOD. The water power committee so treated it. Gentlemen of that committee stated on the floor of the House that they had no hearings in reference to the Niagara Falls situation and did not intend to take any jurisdiction of it. When there was a small attendance in the House a resolution was offered by a member of the Commitee on Foreign Affairs to make this clear, which was voted down. That was the whole situation, and it was not the intention of the House to take from the Foreign Affairs Committee the control of the Niagara Falls water power. As I said, the resolution was defeated one day when there was a small attendance.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman from Virginia is mistaken in stating this matter came before the House "one day" when there was a small attendance. The matter was debated three separate days and the Foreign Affairs Committee was in attendance, and practically every member of that committee was heard on the question.

Mr. FLOOD. I think the gentleman from New York is mistaken. I was not present any one of the days he mentions, and I was chairman of the committee. I understood that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] offered a resolution, which he himself debated, and it was not debated by anybody else in favor of the resolution. I was away on account of sickness in my family, but before I left I conferred with the chairman of the Water Power Committee and was assured that Niagara Falls was not embraced in the bill.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman from Virginia is in error. I was here each of the three days, and while I now recollect that the gentleman from Virginia, the chairman, was not here, practically all the other members of the Foreign Affairs Committee were heard. The committee could not see any reason why boundary waters should not be considered the same as other water powers throughout the Nation. They could not see why they ought not to be put on a parity and have no preferential treatment; they could see no distinction between the two; and after a very full and complete debate on the question, after every phase of it had been considered elaborately and deliberately by the House, after three days of enlightening debate the resolution was voted down.

Mr. FLOOD. How many voted on the proposition?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Sixty-eight Members, a good membership in Committee of the Whole, much larger than you ordinarily have.

Mr. FLOOD. I thought it was something like that. Not one-sixth of the House. There is a very great distinction between a developed water power like Niagara Falls and an undeveloped water power. The Niagara Falls water power, worth millions and millions of dollars, can not be treated as an undeveloped water power could.

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMALL. This resolution as reported by the Committee on Rules does not limit the committee to members of any standing committees of the House?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. As the resolution reads it does not, but the assumption is that the committee would be made up as it was made up before.

Mr. SMALL. And it is on that assumption that I wish the gentleman to yield to me. Some gentleman referred to three committees—Agriculture, Public Lands, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Only one of these committees has anything to do with water powers, and that is the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It does not include the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and yet, as a matter of fact, 12 years ago the Committee on Rivers and Harbors was the only committee that assumed jurisdiction of water power in the House; and to-day the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has jurisdiction of all water powers upon navigable rivers which affect navigation. So that in the proscription of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, so that no member of that committee shall be appointed on the special committee, is unwarranted. I think the resolution of the committee is in proper form. I do not think the Speaker ought to be bound by any suggestion, because if a suggestion is to be made of any committee I submit that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, along with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on Foreign Affairs, are more entitled to representation on that special committee than the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on the Public Lands.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the gentleman from Kansas, I want to make a suggestion along the line of the gentleman from North Carolina. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has had jurisdiction of boundary waters, especially the Niagara Falls water power, on which it has worked for

years. The Committee on Agriculture and other committees named, with the exception of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, have no jurisdiction of water power. I think that the suggestion of the gentleman from North Carolina that the matter ought to be left open is a wise one, and that the Speaker should put on this committee the representatives from the Committees on Rivers and Harbors and Foreign Affairs, for the water-power committee, and not the Committee on Foreign Affairs, will have jurisdiction of that power under the resolution.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it is left open as the resolution reads. If there are no other questions, I ask for a vote on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

HOSPITAL FACILITIES IN CHICAGO.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes upon the question of the hospital situation for soldiers in the city of Chicago.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the last Congress passed a bill to increase the hospital facilities and to arrange for a very large hospital that is already completed in the city of Chicago. And after a long investigation by the legislative branch of the Government, the act was passed by the Congress and was signed by the President. It has been delayed for some reason in the Treasury Department, I suppose, on account of the engagements of the Secretary of the Treasury in the last Liberty loan. But the situation has increased to such an alarming extent that all the hospitals in the city of Chicago are very crowded, and this hospital which the Government arranged to purchase is ready for occupancy, or can be made so in 60 days, as I am informed, and can be furnished inside of 30 days. It has had the approval of everyone up to the present time. I ask to insert as a part of my remarks a telegram from the commissioner of health of the city of Chicago showing that every hospital is full to overflowing, and I desire to state to my colleagues that I have been endeavoring to get many soldiers transferred into the Chicago hospital who are in the hospitals of Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey, and other States, and I believe it is in the interest of the health of the soldiers if they could be transferred when they are able to travel to rooms in a hospital where they can occasionally meet their own people.

I have had called to my attention many instances of operations that have been performed in these hospitals, and they are now sending a good many to Camp Grant. The Chicago mothers and wives have to go to Camp Grant, and it costs $10 to go there and back at the present rate. I am filing a resolution, which I shall ask to have referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, which provides that the Secretary of War be allowed to furnish tents or such temporary relief as may be necessary until such time as the Secretary of the Treasury may find time to sign the necessary papers to furnish and complete the hospital which has already been ordered to be purchased by the Government. I ask that the telegram from Dr. Robertson, commissioner of health, be inserted as a part of my remarks, and shall not now take up the time of the House to read it in full.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to insert a telegram as a part of his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The telegram referred to is as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 20, 1919.*

Hon. WILLIAM E. MASON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The situation in regard to hospital beds in the city of Chicago is precarious. The total bed capacity of the city of Chicago is approximately 10,000. At the present time there are over 12,000 patients, making it impossible for me to enforce the city ordinances. In regard to bed space, the Municipal Tuberculosis Sanitarium is crowded to capacity and there is a waiting list of several hundred. The sanitarium has been caring for soldiers and relatives of soldiers, taking all the cases referred to us by the Red Cross. We have reached the limit of our endurance. Should an epidemic occur which would make hospital beds necessary the situation would be appalling. I wish you would hurry arrangements for marine hospital beds, so as to take this burden from the city of Chicago and provide the proper space for patients, so that I may be able to maintain proper sanitary control of the hospitals.

JOHN DILL ROBERTSON,
Commissioner of Health.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes upon the question of the food supply of the country at the present time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I think that everyone will agree that the question of the cost of living is the most important subject now before the American people. Yesterday the House by an overwhelming vote decreed that women should have the right to vote. I think, as important as that subject is to the women of America, that if an expression of opinion was asked of them they would like to know from their Representatives in the Congress of the United States how the cost of living could be reduced. It is the great vital question before the American people to-day. All other subjects dwarf by comparison. When they find a situation such as now exists, with hundreds of millions of pounds of canned meats and vegetables—to be specific 100,000,000 cans of beef and more than 50,000,000 pounds of bacon—in the surplus food stocks of the Army, some of which when about to be put upon the market three or four weeks ago were withdrawn because it would occasion a glut of food products, while they are told at the same time that the constantly increasing price of beef is due to the fact that there is a deficiency of food products, they wish to know how their Representatives in Congress reconcile these statements. They wish to know whether governmental agencies are being used by the Beef Trust to defraud the people of the United States. This matter is being discussed in every home, and necessarily so, because people wonder whether our Government, as far as food products are concerned, is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, or of the food buccaneer, by the food buccaneer, and for the food buccaneer. [Applause.] The life and existence of every American home is involved in this question. The poultry situation is as bad as the beef situation. Only last Saturday, at home, I paid 7 cents a pound more to my butcher than I paid a year ago, and yet I find that the official figures show that the storage of poultry in the warehouses of the United States from May 1, 1918, to May 1, 1919, increased 248 per cent in broilers, 107 per cent in roasters, 279 per cent in fowls, and 290 per cent in miscellaneous poultry products. Yet the price of poultry is from 10 to 20 per cent higher than last spring and summer.

I have a statement here from a New York paper in regard to shipments abroad. Under date of Monday, May 19, in a telegram to the New York Times from The Hague, it is stated "that the prices are too high for Dutch consumption; that the stuff is put upon the market every day, but that the Dutch do not buy it; and that American pork and meats are held there to spoil for nothing." I am reading this statement from the New York Times of Monday, May 19. Yet the American people are called upon to pay impossible prices for beef products because tons of beef are carried across the water and such high prices asked that the Dutch will not buy, and the stuff spoils on the wharves. How long will a self-respecting people stand this outrage? [Applause.] The same kind of management, it seems to me, is shown in respect to the flour situation. According to the best judgment of everyone, the wheat crops of this year will amount to 1,200,000,000 bushels and possibly 1,300,000,000 bushels. The crop is so enormous as to tax the imagination of the average American, who has been accustomed to six or seven hundred million bushels as an average wheat crop. Nine hundred million bushels are at our doors about to be gathered, yet the price of flour is soaring.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. RANDALL of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, the situation is such that flour, instead of decreasing from war prices, has increased about $2 a barrel. I went into the food administration at 42 Broadway, New York, two or three weeks ago. I saw by the papers that there was another increase of $2 a barrel to be put upon flour. Mr. Barnes was away, and I talked with Mr. Moore, who was in charge of the food administration. I asked him how it was that, with this tremendous wheat crop in sight, with the Texas crop coming in in less than five or six weeks, the people are being told in the daily newspapers that an increase of $2 a barrel was about to be made, making flour, which now costs $16.25 in Boston, $18.25 a barrel. I told him also it was a sad commentary on Mr. Barnes's handling of the wheat situation that England could provide for six months ahead, while our ele-

vators are filled with wheat cornered by foreign governments, and leave our own people at the mercy of speculators.

"Well," he said, "Mr. Representative, there are various reasons for this situation." But his explanation did not get him anywhere in my opinion. I then called his attention to these facts, which I had in my possession at that time, which showed that the carry over of wheat from 1917 was 28,000,000 bushels, which added to last year's crop of 918,000,000 swells the grand total to 946,000,000 bushels. The estimated consumption last year—500,000,000 bushels—and 100,000,000 bushels more for seed leaves us an exportable surplus of 346,000,000 bushels. The Government report gives the exports of wheat up to April 1 at 197,000,000 bushels, leaving with us 149,000,000 bushels, making the amount of wheat available for export and consumption up to July 1, when the new crop will come to market, 172,000,000 bushels. The prospective wheat crop of 1918 will exceed 1,300,000,000 bushels, which, after deducting 750,000,000 for home consumption and seed, will leave us with an exportable surplus of 550,000,000 bushels, which is enough to supply all the wheat-buying countries in the world for a whole year without any supply coming from Argentina, Australia, or Canada. As a result of this line of talk, an order was issued that night that no more wheat be bought in this country for export purposes, and the price of flour was not increased as predicted in the press. During my investigation I found that as high as $2.86 a bushel was being paid for northern wheat. This does not seem to me to be fair. I say to the Members of the House, much as I sympathize with the farmers, when we fix a minimum of $2.26 a bushel for wheat it is as much as the American people and the people of the world should pay, and that a maximum price of $2.26 as well as a minimum price should be made, thus giving the farmer a square deal and giving a square deal to every workingman and every workingman's family and every citizen of the United States. I am frank to say, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, that I have not the confidence that the administration seems to have in some of the men who are in charge of these food bureaus. We had an experience in Massachusetts in connection with the fish business, and we had some representatives of the Fish Trust in charge of the fish administration, with the result that people paid exorbitant prices for fish. Fish which was brought into the Boston market at a cost of a little better than a cent a pound was charged for at the rate of 6 or 8 cents a pound wholesale. People were robbed right and left all through the war because a man friendly to the fish interests held the job as fish administrator. Profiteers came over from New York, took over companies which they bought for a few hundred thousand dollars, and capitalized them into millions. Some of these men were tried and found guilty and are now awaiting sentence. The House of Representatives is the repository of the people's power in the United States, and it seems to me that the time has come when we should say to the administration authorities that the war being over it should rid itself of these so-called experts. [Applause.]

The President of the United States; Mr. Baker, the Secretary of War; and Mr. Daniels, the Secretary of the Navy, called upon every line of business for its experienced men in the time of stress to help the people of the country, and these men came in at a dollar a year, and in many cases their names were never off the salary rolls in their own corporations, and their interests, as you gentlemen know and I know, were with their own corporations in too many cases, rather than with the people. The fish industry is a striking example. Now, when the war is over we witness the spectacle of millions of pounds of surplus beef and vegetables being kept off the market because it would cause a glut, while prices are rising almost daily, because, according to the meat interests, there is a scarcity. It seems to me that these gentlemen have fooled the administration officials long enough and that they should get out, and if they will not get out they should be kicked out. God pity the American people when they can not find men big enough and honest enough to manage these departments in the interest of the people.

In conclusion I submit, for the information of the House, a statement of the amounts of canned beef and vegetables intended for shipment overseas, but which will not be used for that purpose. This tremendous amount of food products, if released at once for sale, would sensibly reduce the cost of living, and it should be done forthwith. Not to do it is to keep prices up for the benefit of various food combinations and is a crime against the people of this country, which they will not be slow to avenge when the right moment comes. [Loud applause.]

Here are the figures:

CANNED VEGETABLES.

No. 1 baked beans	cans	6,569,022
No. 2 baked beans	do	1,022,638
No. 3 baked beans	do	18,572,678
Corn	do	33,973,687
Rice	pounds	2,992,210
Hard bread	cans	3,642,495
No. 2 tomatoes	do	18,336,755
No. 2½ tomatoes	do	40,475,522
No. 10 tomatoes	do	3,127,288
No. 2 peas	do	28,655,920

CANNED MEATS.

Roast beef:		
6-pound cans		12,000,000
2-pound cans		17,330,000
1-pound cans		9,000,000
12-ounce cans		378,000
Corned beef:		
6-pound cans		5,600,000
24-ounce cans		18,000,000
1-pound cans		9,000,000
12-ounce cans		4,250,000
Corned-beef hash in 1 and 2 pound cans	pounds	20,820,000
Bacon	do	47,219,620

Of this amount 8,686,000 pounds is crated and stored in Columbus, Baltimore, and Chicago.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I thank the gentleman and the House for the courtesy, but I have said enough for the present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 3 o'clock to receive a report from the Committee on Appropriations, and, pending action on this request, I ask that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations be heard for a moment as to the necessity of this action.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks that the gentleman from Iowa be permitted to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee on deficiencies has held hearings regarding some deficiencies which are very urgent. The deficiency bill which failed of enactment in the last Congress carried an item for additional clerk hire and similar administrative expenses in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance of $4,220,000. This matter has been largely taken care of by an allotment from the President's fund of something over $2,800,000. This allotment will permit the bureau to function for the present, but the question of family allowances is quite a different thing. On the 1st of May there were over 700,000 family allowance checks which had been issued and which could not be sent out because of the lack of funds. There is no appropriation out of which they can be paid. They amount to about $13,000,000. On the 1st of June there will be another lot, about 600,000 checks, amounting in the aggregate to about $11,505,000, that can not be sent out because there will not be funds with which to pay them. It is estimated that the allowance under the law for June will amount to $9,615,000, and all of these checks must be held up until Congress appropriates the money.

The same condition, only in a lesser degree, exists with regard to the pension of the soldiers of the Civil War. The Commissioner of Pensions will not be able to send out after the 4th of June about 25,000 vouchers that should be sent out during the fiscal year because of a lack of funds. There is a deficiency in that bureau of about $3,000,000, which must be appropriated before those checks can be mailed. The subcommittee has been conducting hearings on these estimates and will submit the matter to the full committee this afternoon, and the committee will be able, I think, to report out a bill making appropriations to cover these very urgent deficiencies, and we hope to call it up immediately, in order that it be passed, so that 700,000 families and dependents of our soldiers that are entitled to this allowance will be supplied with the funds that Congress intended that they should have.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. I yield.

Mr. MANN. This appropriation would have to be passed in the form of a bill, I take it?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. And in order to become a law it must receive the signature of the President of the United States, or at least be presented to the President?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The President can not sign the bill unless it is either sent to him in Paris or he comes here to sign it. Does the gentleman know whether it is safe, if the bill is passed within a week or 10 days, to send it to the President, or whether it will be held until the President returns? Can anyone predict now how soon the President will return? I will say to the gentleman I have no objection to the consideration of the bill, but I see no possible way that this appropriation can be effective before the middle of June.

Mr. GOOD. The committee has not considered that at all. The committee has just considered the plain questions of the

obligations resting upon this body and upon Congress. If some other department should fail to perform its duty, that is not the blame of Congress.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield.

Mr. CARTER. I wanted to ask the gentleman if I understood him correctly to say that the amounts carried in this bill were for allotments to soldiers' families?

Mr. GOOD. The families of soldiers, sailors, and marines.

Mr. CARTER. Those carried in this bill are the same as carried in the other bill?

Mr. GOOD. No; there was no family allowance carried in the former deficiency bill. There was a provision in the sundry civil bill which made the amount appropriated for that purpose immediately available.

Mr. CARTER. But did that sundry civil bill pass?

Mr. GOOD. No; that failed of passage.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to change the reference of a bill, H. R. 261, introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS], which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It deals with the retirement of civil-service employees of the Government. I ask that it be rereferred to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, and this request is in accordance with the wish of the introducer of the bill and is not opposed by the chairman of the committee to which it is asked to be referred, or any member of it, so far as I know.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I will.

Mr. GARRETT. I hope the gentleman will withhold that request until the committees have all been organized. Personally I have no objection to the matter. I presume it is all right, but I think the committee should be organized first.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Everybody on that committee is satisfied.

Mr. GARRETT. I will have to object at this time.

RECESS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House stand in recess until 3 o'clock p. m.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 3 o'clock p. m.

AFTER RECESS.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations I present a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2329) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and for the payment of pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. The gentleman from Tennessee reserves all points of order on the bill.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa if it is his intention to ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of this bill?

Mr. GOOD. No. By order of the Speaker, it is printed under the rules. I desire to give notice, however, that I will call it up to-morrow when the House meets.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. In view of the very deplorable condition outlined by the gentleman this morning in reference to the needs of dependent families and soldiers who will not get their checks until this bill is passed, I had hoped that the gentleman would ask for unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill. If he does, in view of the statement made, I do not anticipate any objection from this side of the Chamber. For my part, I do not think we ought to delay even 24 hours.

Mr. GOOD. I quite agree with the gentleman that there should be no delay whatever. But this bill carries $45,044,500, and I would rather that the House should have an opportunity to read the bill and see the report and to thoroughly consider it. However, if it is the desire of the House to take the matter up, I have no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is a fact, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, that every dollar of the appropriations in this bill, except a small amount for salaries, will be paid out, if paid out at all, to the dependent families of soldiers who served in the recent war and also of soldiers of the Civil War. I am sure there will be no amendments offered, for it is a simple question of appropriating the amount of money needed to pay them what is due under the law.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman further that a couple of items were mentioned when the matter was under consideration that I was asked to look up and procure some further information about. I have not been able to get the additional information that was desired with regard to the purchase of furniture and what was included under that designation.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If I may be permitted——

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield for an inquiry?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to make this remark, with the permission of the gentleman from Iowa. The gentleman from Illinois this morning, in a rather indirect way, sought to throw upon the President of the United States the responsibility for the failure of this bill to become a law within the next week or two on account of his necessary absence at the peace table in Paris. It should have been stated at that time that the House at the last session of Congress, with a Democratic majority on the Committee on Appropriations and in the House, passed a bill carrying an appropriation of $33,000,000 to take care of the sums due to the dependent families of soldiers. That bill went to another body at the other end of the Capitol, and an organized Republican filibuster there prevented its passage. Now, I think it is up to the gentleman from Iowa and to his party to remedy the wrong that has been done to the dependent families of soldiers and to pass this bill at the earliest possible moment. I repeat, I was very anxious for the gentleman from Iowa to ask unanimous consent to take it up now, rather than delay it.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that I presented this report not in any spirit of partisanship, and I hope it will not be considered in that way. Seven hundred thousand families are involved in this matter, and, while I have no sympathy with a legislative filibuster carried on by three or four men, I also have no sympathy with an Executive filibuster carried on by one man that has prevented the consideration of a matter of this kind so that the checks might have been sent out on the 1st day of May. [Applause on the Republican side.] I hope that the gentleman will not interject any partisan politics into the consideration of this very worthy measure.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There is no disposition on the part of the gentleman——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There is no disposition on the part of the gentleman to interject any partisanship into this bill or any other appropriation that is necessary, and my remarks were only brought forth by the attempt this morning to inject partisanship into it by criticizing the President of the United States because he is necessarily absent in Paris attending to important business of the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GOOD. I am sorry that the gentleman is so tender that he regarded the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois as partisan.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And I will say further that if it had not been for the filibuster, to which I referred a moment ago, on the part of certain Republicans at the other end of the Capitol, the appropriation would have been made in March, when the President was here in Washington for the purpose of signing this and other bills. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman referred to what might have been said this morning. It might also have been said this morning, and properly be said now, that if the President had observed the proper amenities of the situation he could have called Congress in session in April, and this bill could have become a law, whether he was in the United States or in Paris, before the 1st of May, without any difficulty at all, and the delay is wholly because the President neglected or refused for personal reasons to call Congress in session when it ought to have been called in session at an early date.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That does not relieve those conducting that filibuster of the responsibility of defeating this particular appropriation at the last session, when they knew that by doing so they would subject the dependent families of

hundreds of thousands of soldiers to the conditions outlined in the gentleman's remarks this morning. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. The filibuster which occurred before March 3 does not relieve the President of the United States of the responsibility for refusing to call Congress in session at an early date, because he was afraid somebody would discuss the league of nations. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GOOD. I have yielded the floor.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and on a division there were—ayes 73, noes 77.

Accordingly the motion was rejected.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take this bill up for immediate consideration. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think never in the history of Congress has there been so much expedition in organization, at least on the part of the majority, and in bringing measures to the consideration of Congress as has occurred in the organization of this Congress.

When the Committee on Appropriations, acting immediately upon its organization, was prepared to report this bill, Members expected, of course, that the bill would be considered in the usual course—reported to-day and taken up to-morrow. Some Members, some on that side, expecting that the bill would be taken up in its regular course and dispatched in the usual way, are not here; but certainly we on this side are delighted that the gentlemen on the other side are anxious to help us in expediting business. Therefore we shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri for the immediate consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. GOOD. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and for the payment of pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, namely:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

BUREAU OF WAR RISK INSURANCE.

For salaries of officers and employees, $2,025,613.97; stationery and miscellaneous expenses, $100,000; furniture, equipment, and supplies, $195,000; printing and binding, $100,000; rental of quarters in the District of Columbia, $3,886.03; and traveling expenses, $5,000; in all, $2,429,500.

For the payment of military and naval family allowances as authorized by law, $39,615,000.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

BUREAU OF PENSIONS.

Army and Navy pensions: For invalids, widows, minor children, and dependent relatives, Army nurses, and all other pensioners who are now borne on the rolls, or who may hereafter be placed thereon, under the provisions of any and all acts of Congress, $3,000,000: *Provided*, That the appropriation aforesaid for Navy pensions shall be paid from the income of the Navy pension fund so far as the same shall be sufficient for that purpose: *Provided further*, That the amount expended under each of the above items shall be accounted for separately.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, the deficiency bill that passed the House and failed of enactment in the last Congress carried $7,220,000 for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. Of that amount $4,220,000 was for salaries of officers and employees and incidental expenses and $3,000,000 was for compensation for the medical expenses, and so forth. Since then the work that was anticipated to be performed by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance in taking care of the sick and disabled of our soldiers has been taken over by the Bureau of Public Health. The additional work that was contemplated to be done out of this appropriation is provided for in that way, so the department is not asking anything for that service and has withdrawn the estimate, the Bureau of Public Health having sufficient funds to take care of it.

Of the amount that was then necessary for administrative expenses, the President advanced out of the national defense fund that was appropriated to him $2,868,000, leaving a balance of $2,429,000, which this deficiency bill carries.

The situation at present is that even if the deficiency bill had passed, not a single dollar would have been available on the 1st day of May, when it was necessary to send out 700,000 checks to that many dependent members of the families of soldiers, sailors, and marines. The amount necessary to disburse on the 1st day of May to the families of our soldiers, sailors, and marines amounted to $13,170,000. That amount is contained in 700,000 checks that have already been executed and are lying upon the desks down in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, but which have not been mailed because of the lack of funds.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. BRITTEN. It occurs to me that beside the $13,170,000 that is being retained by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, there is also being retained some $15,000,000 of salaries that have been allotted to the dependents of various soldiers and sailors, and those two amounts, the Government allowance and the allotment to the soldiers, appearing on one check, naturally holds in the Treasury $15,000,000 of salaries which ought now to be in the hands of these 700,000 dependents all over the United States. A total of thirty million should long since have been in general circulation in a much-needed direction.

Mr. GOOD. Then, too, on the 1st of June it will be necessary for this bureau to send out checks for a similar purpose for the allowances for the month of May. That amount is estimated at $11,505,000. For the month of June there will be disbursed for a like purpose an aggregate of $9,615,000, or a total of $34,290,000 that should be disbursed under the law before the 1st day of July.

In addition to that there are like payments, because of reviews, where the amounts have been allowed, aggregating $3,375,000, and then there are back payments on allowances that were due prior to May 1, 1919, of $1,950,000, making a total of $39,615,000 absolutely necessary for the Government to pay in the discharge of its obligations for allowances to the dependents of our soldiers, sailors, and marines before the 1st day of July, and there is nothing available at present out of which to pay it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Did I understand the gentleman to make the statement that if all the appropriation bills had passed at the last session there would have been no money available to pay these families?

Mr. GOOD. I did not say anything of the kind and nothing which could be construed in that way. What I did say was that if the deficiency bill had passed there would not be a dollar available for this purpose, and if the deficiency bill and all appropriation bills had passed as they passed the House, not a dollar would have been available to pay the $3,000,000 that will be due the 25,000 Civil War and Spanish-American War veterans.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman knows that the sundry civil bill carried $33,000,000, which was made immediately available to take care of the allotments necessarily due dependent families of soldiers.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; $33,000,000 to take care of that; but how are you going to pay $39,000,000 out of $33,000,000?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That was all the Bureau of War Risk Insurance asked for, and that would have been more than sufficient to take care of the April and May checks and the greater part of the June checks.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; but what would the gentleman do if the bill had passed carrying $33,000,000 in the way of paying amounts due up to the month of December, 1919, when it takes $39,615,000 to pay the allowances up to the 1st of June? The sundry civil bill was intended to take care of deficiencies in this respect for the remainder of the fiscal year and for the entire fiscal year 1920.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. We have an extra session now to take care of that, but there would have been no such distress as the gentleman referred to this morning had the sundry civil bill passed at the last session, as it would have done if it had not been for the Republican filibuster.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman assumes that there would have been an extra session of Congress before the first Monday of December if the appropriation bills had passed. Well, the gentleman may know about that; I do not. I know that the law does not provide for a regular session of Congress until the first Monday of December, but I do know that there would have been a deficiency of more than $6,000,000 in the estimates of

the separation allowances due for the month of June, and there would have been nothing appropriated for separation allowances for the months of July, August, September, October, and November—in fact, for the rest of the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. ASWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. ASWELL. The gentleman was the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations at the last session of Congress. Did he call that to the attention of the last Congress?

Mr. GOOD. I was not the ranking member and not a member of the sundry civil or deficiency subcommittee.

Mr. ASWELL. Did anybody call that shortage to the attention of Congress?

Mr. GOOD. I do not believe that the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, as it was then functioning and has since functioned, knew from one day to the other what any man in charge of it ought to have known in regard to the obligation resting on the Government to take care of the widows, wives, mothers and fathers, and dependents of our soldiers. There seems to have been no consideration of just what our obligations were, because no one had presented up to this time from that department an intelligent statement that could be relied upon as to what our obligations really were.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The head of that department has recently resigned?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is the gentleman familiar with the circumstances connected with that resignation?

Mr. GOOD. Nothing further than what I have seen in the daily press.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It occurred to me that possibly the known shortage may have had something to do with the resignation.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRITTEN. It is a well-known fact, however, that this deficiency was known for some two months, and might have been cared for before to-day if the desire to do so really existed.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, the smaller item, that of $2,429,500 carried for administrative expenses, for salary, and so forth, will make up the estimated deficiency in the administration of the office, and will provide for the purchase of such machinery and furniture as is necessary to make some changes that are under way in the matter of insurance policies and enable them to continue the employment of the present force in the administration of the department.

I think it also includes some additional force, but in considering the matter the committee gave notice to the department that by granting this appropriation it should not be construed that the committee or Congress indorsed the program of the department to increase the number of the employees; that that matter would be considered at a later date, but because of the urgency of the matter we felt that we could not segregate the items to determine the question.

Mr. FLOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. FLOOD. Does the entire appropriation in this bill go to the War Risk Insurance Bureau?

Mr. GOOD. No. Forty-two million four hundred and forty-five thousand dollars go to the War Risk Insurance, and the sum of $3,000,000 goes to the Bureau of Pensions, under the Department of the Interior.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some objection has been made on this side of the House in regard to partisanship; some objection has been made that if there had been no filibuster at the other end of the Capitol the pensions of the old soldiers would have been paid. That is not the case. There was not contained in any appropriation bill that passed the House during the last session of Congress an item of $3,000,000, or for any sum, to pay the deficiency that exists in the Bureau of Pensions for the payment of pensions legally due to the Spanish-American soldiers and the soldiers of the late Civil War.

Twenty-five thousand of those soldiers would not receive pension checks which will be due them after the 4th of June and before the 30th of June, 1919, if all the bills which were enacted in the House at the last session of Congress had passed and become the law. This bill makes adequate provision, as we are advised by the Pension Department, to pay all the Nation's obligations to soldiers of the Civil War to June 30 of this year. Mr. Speaker, in a general way that explains the contents of this bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. An appropriation of $2,025,000, I think it is, is carried in this bill for clerk hire. Is that extra clerk hire?

Mr. GOOD. No; not extra clerk hire in the sense of their employment as extra clerks, but it is extra, of course, to the amount that has hitherto been appropriated and in addition to what the President allotted.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The President allotted how much out of his fund?

Mr. GOOD. Two million eight hundred and sixty-eight dollars out of his fund, and this carries about $2,429,000 for the same purposes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is reported they have 14,000 clerks in the War Risk Bureau. Is that about right?

Mr. GOOD. That is about correct.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Did the committee make inquiry in regard to the serviceability of those clerks or the necessity for them?

Mr. GOOD. This matter was brought to the attention of the committee only recently. We have had very brief hearings, and the matter of clerk hire, it is clearly understood with the bureau and the committee, will be taken up and gone into very thoroughly when the sundry civil bill will be under consideration in the near future, and we felt that we did not have time now to go into these little matters and did not consider them at all.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will say to the gentleman there is a good deal of criticism throughout the country with regard to the clerks tumbling over themselves in the service of the War Risk Bureau. The last Congress, owing to the distress in which it found itself, evidently authorized the employment of a very large number of clerks, and the War Risk Bureau put them on; and it has been charged, generally charged by those who are employees and by some who have gone out of the service, that the work was duplicated, and that there was great waste in the matter of this expenditure. I wanted to know whether the committee had yet taken up the question to ascertain whether we can cut down that force, which seems to have stood in its own way and thus delays the payments to the soldiers and their dependents. I understand that was not taken up at this time?

Mr. GOOD. No; that was not taken up at all.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask this? The gentleman was asked a little while ago, I think, by the gentleman from Ohio, about the change in the head of the War Risk Bureau. Col. Lindsley, who was chief of that bureau and who was brought in to work a great reform, has been recently turned out by the Secretary of the Treasury, has he not?

Mr. GOOD. I think there is some controversy with regard to that. If I understand the correspondence correctly, Col. Lindsley claims that he resigned and the Secretary of the Treasury claims that he was summarily dismissed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But the Secretary of the Treasury was sufficiently belligerent to throw the colonel out. That is the fact, is it not?

Mr. GOOD. I do not know the facts in regard to it except as I have stated.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not true, so long as the gentleman on the other side has raised this question, that Col. Lindsley stated publicly on his retirement, and in the letters which he wrote the Secretary of the Treasury and gave to the newspapers, that if things proceeded as they were going in the War Risk Bureau there would be complete chaos?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is the substance of what the colonel stated?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I hope the gentleman in due course will have his committee investigate the matter, because it might save the Government a great deal of expense on unnecessary clerk hire, and very much hasten the payment of the sums due to the soldiers and their dependents which seem to have been withheld.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Can the gentleman state when the President made this allotment of some $2,000,000 out of the special fund for that purpose?

Mr. GOOD. My understanding is that it was made shortly after the adjournment of Congress.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The reason I asked that is that I understood from the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Sherley, the

former chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that while he could not state accurately there was not probably more than about $4,000,000 left in that fund. If some $3,000,000 is now taken out, how is the President going to get back? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman we have not gone into that question. We find a great many intricate questions confronting us which we can not decide all at once.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. If I understand the practice of the House, we are considering the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and there is no general debate?

The SPEAKER. Yes; this is by unanimous consent.

Mr. MANN. I ask for the reading of the bill by sections.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill by sections for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the payment of military and naval family allowances as authorized by law, $39,615,000.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I was unable to reach Washington until this morning. In view of my unavoidable absence during the consideration of the suffrage resolution, I desire to state that had I been present I would have voted against the resolution, as I did in a previous Congress. I am opposed, as are the people whom I represent, to Federal interference with suffrage, which is essentially and fundamentally a State matter.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether he can give any detailed information with reference to this $195,000 which is appropriated for furniture?

The SPEAKER. The bill is now being read for amendment. Does the gentleman move an amendment?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I move to strike out the last word.

I was about to say, in this connection, I understand that some of the departments are now selling furniture.

Mr. GOOD. The bureau has a right to buy anything of this kind through the General Supply Committee. My understanding of this item is that most of this furniture is of a different class and not of the class the gentleman has in mind. The Secretary of the Treasury says that in order to provide equipment to be used in connection with the issuance of this convertible insurance it is estimated that $195,000 will be required, and that some of this equipment comes under the head of furniture. It is largely for special equipment. It is not of the ordinary kind. About $11,000 is for desks, chairs, and tables. The remainder is for addressograph equipment, filing equipment, safes, and labor-saving devices.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will say to the gentleman it does indeed seem as if this furniture was clearly out of the ordinary in that it should cost that sum. I saw a statement in a paper the other day—one of the New York papers, I think it was—that for every dollar which the bureau has paid out it had cost 20 cents in the way of expense. If it buys furniture $200,000 at a time, I think this rate will be even higher.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It strikes me that there is nothing surprising in the expenditure of $195,000 for furniture if that furniture is to be applied for the fitting up of a $4,000,000 building. The gentleman will recall that the War Risk Bureau was to go into a $4,000,000 building. There was some question as to the price, but it was war time. The President advanced the money for the building, which was subsequently to be refunded. At that time there was nothing to do but to pass any old bill the President wanted passed.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman will remember that we did not even do that. There was never any authorization for taking over that building at all, but, on the contrary, Congress declined to authorize the purchase of a building, whereupon the money was expended, as I understand, out of the special fund granted to the President.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The President came to the rescue of his party and saved the situation at that time by lending $4,000,000 from his $100,000,000 fund, out of which he paid for his "necessary" trip abroad, quoting the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. As I stated, this New York paper contained the charge that there were about 20 cents paid out in the way of expenses for every dollar that went out to our soldiers. I do not know whether that is correct or not, but I do believe that there ought to be some inquiry as to the enormous expenses that are going on in connection with this bureau. Another statement was made that the Pension Bureau had succeeded in disbursing whatever funds it put out for the benefit of our soldiers at a comparatively trifling sum compared to the expenditures of the War Risk Bureau. I suppose the chairman of the committee is satisfied as to the necessity of $195,000 for special equipment, but it seems to me we have had no very satisfactory explanation in reference to it. Two hundred thousand dollars, or very nearly that, in equipment in connection with one of our departments seems to me to be an enormous sum.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is the gentleman suggesting that the Bureau of War Risk Insurance be merged in the Pension Bureau because of the economy established by the Pension Bureau in contrast with the other?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am not making that suggestion, but I am suggesting that some investigation be made in reference to this, and I presume there will be before this session is over. It is time there was some check on this waste. The Republican Party will not be doing its duty unless measures are taken that will check it. It is notorious that notwithstanding the millions spent on this department it is not furnishing insurance cheaper than private concerns. We should turn the light on this department and force it to operate economically and efficiently.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

BUREAU OF PENSIONS.

Army and Navy pensions: For invalids, widows, minor children, and dependent relatives, Army nurses, and all other pensioners who are now borne on the rolls, or who may hereafter be placed thereon, under the provisions of any and all acts of Congress, $3,000,000: *Provided*, That the appropriation aforesaid for Navy pensions shall be paid from the income of the Navy pension fund so far as the same shall be sufficient for that purpose: *Provided further*, That the amount expended under each of the above items shall be accounted for separately.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to say that this proceeding in reporting this bill and asking the House to pass it is exceptional to the ordinary course of procedure. I was not in at the beginning of the consideration of the bill, but was in in time to vote not to adjourn.

It is a very plain matter. This bill, if it becomes a law, must be approved by the President. There is a large amount of certificates not being sent out from the War Risk Bureau, for the simple reason that there is no appropriation available to pay them. I apprehend that that was referred to by the gentleman in charge of the bill. I did not have the pleasure of hearing Mr. GOOD when he explained the bill.

Touching the paragraph just read, there are $3,000,000 necessary to pay the pensions of all the soldiers of all of the wars entitled under the law; that is, the Indian wars, the Spanish-American War, and the Civil War. It lacks a small amount of being sufficient to pay the pensions on the 4th day of June. There are about 25,000 soldiers in the soldiers' homes, including the Spanish War and others, that will be adjudicated between this and that time, as well as what are called the voucher claims—which gentlemen understand, and therefore I will not take time to explain—amounting, in round numbers, to about 25,000 people who can not be paid on the 4th day of June unless this bill is passed.

This will take care of the war-risk matter. This appropriation bill, as I understand it, will do that, and it will also take care of all other pensioners for all the wars who are entitled to care under that legislation.

Now, while this is hasty action, there was no quarrel about it in the consideration before the committee, because I think we all recognize, both Republicans and Democrats, that the bill should be passed, and passed promptly, not for any political capital—because there is no political capital in it that I know of—but for the dependents under the War Risk Bureau, and I suppose that takes in some black people and some white people and some Democrats and some Republicans and some independents. We do not want to be deluged with letters when these pensions are not paid for the want of money available. We have already got a pretty large correspondence. I think this should be avoided, and the people that need the money, when it has been adjudicated to them by the War Risk Bureau and in the Pension Bureau, ought to have it. I think the bill ought to pass to-day. I hope, if it does pass the House to-day, the Senate will take it up to-morrow and pass it by unanimous consent and let it take its flight—if not in an airplane, then in a fast-going steamer—to France, and I have no doubt the President will sign it. That is all I want to say about it. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the situation as to this $3,000,000 for the Pension Bureau is simply this: By reason of the action of the last Congress the Pension Department was called upon to spend money which reduced its funds and brought about this deficit. Under the statement of the representatives of the Pension Bureau they have to-day sufficient funds to pay on June 4 every one of their regular pensions, or what they call their nonvoucher claims, which constitute 95 per cent of the amount paid out by the Pension Bureau. After June 4 they will be called upon to pay what they call voucher claims, which include, among other things, the first-payment pensions, and those pensions could not be paid until the 1st of July unless this bill is passed.

So far as the statement of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] is concerned, and I will add the statement of my good friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], there never was any effort on this side of the House to inject partisanship into the consideration of any appropriation bill, or to indulge in partisan discussion during the consideration of an appropriation bill, while we were in control of the House. It was brought into the consideration of this bill this morning by that side of the House, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] was simply answering statements made by the gentleman from Illinois. The fact is——

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman will pardon me. I was not present, and I do not know as to that; but if the gentleman will allow me, what difference does it make about this "leather and prunella"? We ought to appropriate this money.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. We are going to appropriate it, and we are going to appropriate it one day quicker than your side of the House expected to and would have done, if the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] had not asked unanimous consent to take it up now.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. I know the gentleman wants to be accurate. Can the gentleman tell us what bill failed to pass on the last day of the last session that made this bill necessary? What is the bill he refers to?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I did not catch the title of the pension bill when the chief of the Pension Office was before us, but I heard it stated across the table to the chairman of the committee that it was made necessary by reason of increased pensions provided by a bill in the last Congress.

Mr. GOOD. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that he was practically reading from a restatement of a letter signed by Mr. Lane, referred to as House Document No. 5, and the only thing that was said was that on the hearing upon the pension appropriation bill for the year 1920 the opinion was then expressed that $220,000,000 would be sufficient, and there is no reference to any legislation that would have caused this deficiency or anything like it.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. There was such reference; I beg the gentleman's pardon. As the hearings are not yet printed, we can not settle the difference between us, but my recollection is very clear that that was the statement presented by the bureau chief when he was before us this morning. But I desire to answer the statement of the gentleman from Iowa that, regardless of the passage of the sundry civil bill or any other bill, this $3,000,000 could not have been taken care of. The fact is that if that filibuster had not taken place the appropriation bills would have been passed and the various departments of the Government would not have been forced to call upon the President's emergency fund to take care of the business of the Government for the last 60 days, and the President then could easily have furnished the $3,000,000 provided in this bill.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman refer to any particular item in the appropriation that caused this $3,000,000 deficit?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If the sundry civil bill and deficiency bill had been passed, the President would not have had to draw on his fund, and the President could have supplied $10,000,000 or $20,000,000 if there had been need, and there would have been no trouble in the financial affairs of this Government except for the filibuster on the part of Republican Senators. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman say that the President had at the close of the last session of Congress $10,000,000 or $20,000,000 in addition to what he needed for his mission abroad?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I do not know the exact amount the President had, but he had more than $3,000,000, and the gentleman from Iowa knows he had more than $3,000,000, which is the amount in question here.

Mr. GOOD. I know nothing about it.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman knows that the War Risk Bureau had to get, and did get, more than $2,000,000 from that fund, and if the sundry civil bill had been passed, then the President would not have had to advance that $2,000,000, and he knows that various other departments received money from the President's fund.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does not the gentleman recall the statement made by the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Sherley, that in his judgment there was less than $5,000,000 left in that fund?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; I do not recall that.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I recollect it very distinctly.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I do know that the President has advanced more than $5,000,000, and that was made necessary because of the Republican filibuster in the closing days of the last session of Congress.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. GOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 46.

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations, or such subcommittees as it may designate, shall have leave to sit during sessions of the House during the Sixty-sixth Congress and during the recesses of that Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Friday, May 23, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Navy submitting an estimate of appropriation to pay claims for damages by naval vessels adjusted by the Navy Department (H. Doc. No. 29); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Bureau of Mines for investigations of petroleum and natural gas for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 30); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia submitting supplemental estimates of appropriations required by the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 31); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report showing the number of documents received and distributed by the Treasury Department during the calendar year ended December 31, 1918, together with the number remaining on hand January 1, 1919 (S. Doc. No. 4); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, requesting authority for the disposition as useless papers certain papers having no further interest or historical value (H. Doc. No. 33); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Alaskan Engineering Commission for construction of railroads in Alaska for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 34); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, requesting authority to dispose of certain useless papers in that department having no permanent value or historical interest (H. Doc. No. 35); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Chief Scout Executive of Boy Scouts of America, transmitting report of the proceedings of the Boy Scouts of America for the year ending December 31, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 36); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of bill to authorize the President to present certain ordnance and ammunition to the Portuguese Republic (H. Doc. No. 37); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting draft of amendment to section 2 of the act of February 13, 1893, relating to the healthful condition of vessels clearing or departing for a port in the United States (H. Doc. No. 38); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 2021) to repeal section 904 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2022) vesting in the Bureau of Pensions jurisdiction of all pension claims based upon service in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States subsequent to October 5, 1917; to repeal certain sections of article 3 of the war-risk insurance act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 2023) to create a department of education, to authorize appropriations for the conduct of said department, to authorize the appropriation of money to encourage the States in the promotion and support of education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 2024) to increase rates of pensions for permanent specific disabilities incurred while in the military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2025) providing for the employment by the United States Government of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States and prescribing the preference to be extended to them in filling clerical and other vacancies; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 2026) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Georgetown, in the State of Connecticut, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2027) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to towns in the State of Connecticut German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BEE: A bill (H. R. 2028) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building for the accommodation of the post office at Kenedy, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2029) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building for the accommodation of the post office at San Antonio, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2030) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Seguin, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LANHAM: A bill (H. R. 2031) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Fort Worth, Tex., and for the sale of the present post-office site and building thereon; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2032) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Weatherford, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2033) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Granbury, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2034) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Glen Rose, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2035) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Stephenville, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2036) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cleburne, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2037) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fort Worth, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 2038) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Baton Rouge, East Baton Rouge Parish, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2039) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Covington, St. Tammany Parish, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2040) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Amite, Tangipahoa Parish, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2041) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Plaquemine, Iberville Parish, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2042) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Donaldsonville, Ascension Parish, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2043) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Bogalusa, Washington Parish, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 2044) for the erection of a public building in the city of Marfa, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2045) for the erection of a public building in the city of Midland, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 2046) for the erection of a post-office building at Newton, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2047) for the erection of a post-office building at Albia, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 2048) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Jefferson, Ohio, two captured German cannon with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2049) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Rock Creek, Ohio, one captured German cannon with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2050) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Niles, Ohio, two captured German cannons or fieldpieces with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2051) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Mineral Ridge, Ohio, captured German cannon or fieldpiece with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2052) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Geneva, Ohio, two captured German cannons or fieldpieces with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2053) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ashtabula, Ohio, two captured German cannons or fieldpieces with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2054) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Conneaut, Ohio, two captured German cannons or fieldpieces with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2055) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Youngstown, Ohio, four captured German cannons or fieldpieces with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2056) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Sebring, Ohio, two captured German cannons or fieldpieces with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2057) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Warren, Ohio, two captured German cannons or fieldpieces with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2058) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Windsor, Ohio, one captured German cannon or fieldpiece with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 2059) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Hawley, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2060) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Honesdale, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2061) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Tunkhannock, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2062) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Hallstead, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2063) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Athens, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2064) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Montrose, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2065) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Towanda, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2066) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Susquehanna, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2067) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Forest City, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2068) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Troy, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2069) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Sayre, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2070) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Canton, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 2071) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of National Park, Gloucester County, State of New Jersey, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2072) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Camden, Camden County, State of New Jersey, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2073) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Paulsboro, Gloucester County, State of New Jersey, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2074) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Merchantville, Camden County, State of New Jersey, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2075) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Glassboro, Gloucester County, State of New Jersey, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 2076) for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TINCHER: A bill (H. R. 2077) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Greensburg, Kiowa County, Kans., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2078) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Liberal, Stewart County, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2079) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Meade, Meade County, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2080) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Medicine Lodge, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2081) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Anthony, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2082) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Harper, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2083) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Kingman, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2084) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of St. John, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2085) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Garden City, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2086) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ness City, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2087) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Stafford, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2088) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Syracuse, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2089) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Kinsley, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2090) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Scott, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2091) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Tribune, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2092) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Leoti, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2093) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of La Crosse, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2094) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Elkhart, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2095) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lewis, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2096) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lakin, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2097) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Johnson, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2098) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ulysses, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2099) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cimarron, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2100) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Jetmore, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2101) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Dighton, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2102) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sterling, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2103) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hugoton, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2104) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Coldwater, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2105) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ashland, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2106) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Dodge City, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2107) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Larned, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2108) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Great Bend, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2109) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hutchinson, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2110) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lyons, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2111) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Pratt, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 2112) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Beloit, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2113) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Janesville, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2114) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Racine, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2115) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Waukesha, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2116) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Kenosha, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2117) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Edgerton, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2118) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Elkhorn, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2119) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Delavan, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2120) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lake Geneva, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2121) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Whitewater, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2122) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Evansville, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2123) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Burlington, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2124) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Clinton, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2125) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Somers, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2126) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Corliss, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2127) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of East Troy, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2128) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Eagle, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2129) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Darien, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2130) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Salem, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2131) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Wilmot, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2132) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Bristol, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2133) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Waterford, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2134) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Rochester, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2135) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Union Grove, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2136) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Menomonee Falls, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2137) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Mukwonago, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2138) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Milton Junction, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2139) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Milton, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 2140) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Melrose, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2141) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lexington, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2142) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Medford, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2143) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cambridge, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2144) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Belmont, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2145) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Arlington, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2146) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Winchester, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2147) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Watertown, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2148) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wakefield, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2149) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Stoneham, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 2150) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Washington; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2151) to authorize the establishment of a fisheries experiment station on the coast of Washington; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 2152) conferring public powers on all conductors and motormen on all electric and other street railways in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2153) to provide for universal transfers on all street railway companies, herdic companies, and all other passenger transportation lines within the District of Columbia, and to prescribe penalties and punishments for violating its provisions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2154) to prohibit the intermarriage of persons of the white and negro races within the District of Columbia; to declare such contracts of marriage null and void; to prescribe punishments for violations and attempts to violate its provisions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2155) to extend the franking privilege to literature published by boards of health of States and Territories of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2156) to provide for the purchase of a site upon which to erect a post-office building in the city of Starke, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2157) to provide for the erection of a public building at Lake City, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2158) providing for the purchase of certain land in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2159) to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to call upon such States as received money from the Federal Government under the terms of the act of June 23, 1836, for the repayment of the same as provided in said act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2160) to prohibit the payment of compensation to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress and other officers and employees under certain conditions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2161) to credit and pay to the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia all moneys collected under the direct tax levied by the acts of Congress approved, respectively, July 1, 1862; March 7, 1864; July 13, 1866; and March 2, 1867; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 2162) making provisions for the construction of a canal across the State of New Jersey to connect the Delaware River with New York Harbor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2163) for the erection of a Federal building for the United States post office at Red Bank, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2164) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of ordnance and cannon to the city of South Amboy, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2165) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of ordnance and cannon to the city of New Brunswick, Middlesex County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2166) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of ordnance and cannon to the city of Red Bank, Monmouth County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2167) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of ordnance and cannon to the city of Long Branch, Monmouth County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2168) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of ordnance and cannon to the city of Perth Amboy, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2169) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of ordnance and cannon to the city of Toms River, Ocean County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2170) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of ordnance and cannon to the city of Asbury Park, Monmouth County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2171) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Highlands, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2172) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Englishtown, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2173) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Bradley Beach, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2174) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the township of Sayreville, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2175) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Spottswood, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2176) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Roosevelt, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2177) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Milltown, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2178) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Keyport, Monmouth County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2179) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Tuckerton, Ocean County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2180) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Spring Lake, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2181) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Jamesburg, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2182) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Allentown, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2183) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the township of Cranbury, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2184) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the township of Matawan, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2185) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the township of Shrewsbury, Monmouth County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2186) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Highland Park, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2187) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of South River, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2188) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Metuchen, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2189) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Deal, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2190) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Belmar, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2191) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Farmingdale, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2192) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Belmar, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2193) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the township of Woodbridge, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2194) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Bayhead, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2195) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Seabright, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2196) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Helmetta, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2197) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Dunellen, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2198) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the township of Lakewood, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2199) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Atlantic Highlands, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2200) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Atlantic Highlands, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2201) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Barnegat City, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2202) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Barnegat City, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2203) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the township of Eatontown, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2204) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Rumson, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2205) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Allenhurst, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2206) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Allenhurst, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: A bill (H. R. 2207) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Princeton, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2208) providing for the extension of the post office at Trenton, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2209) to establish a fish-hatchery and fish-culture station at a point in or near the city of Trenton, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2210) donating a captured German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Lambertville, State of New Jersey, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2211) donating a captured German cannon or fieldpiece to the borough of Pennington, State of New Jersey, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2212) donating a captured German cannon or fieldpiece to the borough of Hightstown, State of New Jersey, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2213) donating a captured German cannon or fieldpiece to the borough of Princeton, State of New Jersey, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2214) donating a captured German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Trenton, State of New Jersey, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2215) donating a captured German cannon or fieldpiece to the borough of Flemington, State of New Jersey, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2216) donating a captured German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Somerville, State of New Jersey, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2217) donating a captured German cannon or fieldpiece to the borough of Bound Brook, State of New Jersey, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2218) donating a captured German cannon or fieldpiece to the borough of Bernardsville, State of New Jersey, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2219) donating a captured German cannon or fieldpiece to the borough of Far Hills, State of New Jersey, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARLAND: A bill (H. R. 2220) providing that an imprint shall be placed on all articles manufactured in the United States and becoming the subject of interstate commerce, and providing that no manufactured articles or goods shall be admitted to the United States unless bearing an imprint; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2221) granting pensions to soldiers confined in so-called Confederate prisons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2222) appropriating $50,000 for payment of operating forces of public buildings for services performed; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2223) to provide for the erection of a public building at Jeannette, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2224) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Millvale, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2225) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Edgewood, Pa., one American cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2226) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Mooseheart, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 2227) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Republic, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2228) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Norwalk, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2229) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Berlin Heights, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2230) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Milan, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2231) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Vermilion, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2232) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Huron, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2233) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sandusky, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2234) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bowling Green, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2235) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fostoria, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2236) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Tiffin, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2237) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Gibsonburg, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2238) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Clyde, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2239) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Woodville, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2240) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fremont, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2241) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Greenwich, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2242) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of New London, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2243) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Willard, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2244) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bellevue, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 2245) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at South St. Paul, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2246) for the construction of new lookouts in the post office at Red Wing, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2247) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Northfield, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2248) providing for the local commemoration in the city of Hutchinson, county of McLeod, State of Minnesota, of the soldiers, sailors, marines, and aviators who lost their lives and participated in the service of the United States during the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 2249) to establish a school and home for feeble-minded persons of the District of Columbia, to be known as the Columbia Training School, and providing

for the legal commitment of feeble-minded persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2250) to permit the enlargement of the immigration station at Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 2251) to amend the revenue law of the United States; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2252) to amend the act of February 4, 1887, regulating interstate commerce, to foster and encourage knowledge of American institutions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2253) to grant the survivors of the Civil War and the war with Spain and the war with Germany, or the widows or minor children of such soldiers, a land warrant in lieu of the homestead grant; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2254) providing for increased pension for Civil War veterans whose wives are living; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KRAUS: A bill (H. R. 2255) to enlarge and extend the post-office building at Logansport, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2256) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Fairmont, Ind., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2257) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Miami, Ind., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2258) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of North Manchester, Ind., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2259) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hartford City, Ind., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: A bill (H. R. 2260) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the State of Alabama the cannon, machine guns, or other military equipment captured by the One hundred and sixty-seventh Infantry, American Expeditionary Forces, during its service overseas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 2261) to amend paragraphs C and D of section 216, revenue act of 1919, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 2262) to transfer claims for compensation for death or disability under the war-risk insurance act from the Department of the Treasury to the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 2263) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of East Smithfield, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 2264) for the relief of the St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2265) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Jasper, in the State of Illinois, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 2266) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Scituate, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 2267) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and cannon balls, to the village of Jeromeville, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALTERS: A bill (H. R. 2268) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Patton, County of Cambria, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece, to be placed in the public square; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 2269) to pension soldiers of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 2270) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to adjust certain claims of Treasury Department agents for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 2271) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended by the act approved October 6, 1917; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 2272) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, consider, and adjudicate claims which the Cherokee, Creek, and Seminole Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 2273) to create an additional judge in the southern district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2274) to provide for the construction of a military road from the arsenal at Rock Island, Ill., to the proving grounds for artillery in Carroll and Jo Daviess Counties, Ill., and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WARD: A bill (H. R. 2275) authorizing furloughs to Regular Army Reserve of enlisted men wounded in the present war and certified fit for active service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 2276) repealing sections 904, 905, and 907 of the act to provide revenue, and for other purposes, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY of California: A bill (H. R. 2277) providing for the construction and equipment of an ammunition manufacturing plant at the United States arsenal at Benicia, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2278) for the erection of a public building at Vallejo, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2279) to provide for an addition to the post-office building at the city of Stockton, Calif., for the accommodation of the post office and other Federal offices; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2280) for the erection of a public building at Richmond, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2281) for the erection of a public building at Woodland, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 2282) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Waupaca, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2283) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Shawano, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2284) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Marshfield, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2285) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Grand Rapids, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 2286) amending the act of August 24, 1912, chapter 389, paragraph 1 (37 Stats., p. 550), to include periodical publications of regularly incorporated charitable organizations, admitting such publications to the mail as second-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2287) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Newark, N. J., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2288) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the town of Irvington, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2289) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post office at Montclair, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2290) to provide adequate accommodations for the post office, courts, and other branches of the Government service at Newark, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. REBER: A bill (H. R. 2291) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Shenandoah, county of Schuylkill, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2292) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Orwigsburg, county of Schuylkill, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2293) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Auburn, county of Schuylkill, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2294) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Pine Grove, county of Schuylkill, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2295) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Tower City, county of Schuylkill, State of

Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2296) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Mahanoy City, county of Schuylkill, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2297) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Tamaqua, county of Schuylkill, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2298) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of St. Clair, county of Schuylkill, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2299) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Fort Carbon, county of Schuylkill, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2300) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Pottsville, county of Schuylkill, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2301) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Minersville, county of Schuylkill, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2302) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Tremont, county of Schuylkill, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2303) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Schuylkill Haven, county of Schuylkill, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2304) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Frackville, county of Schuylkill, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2305) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Girardville, county of Schuylkill, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 2306) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate and deliver to Millport Camp, No. 24, Sons of Veterans, Millport, N. Y., 100 olive-drab wool uniforms and 100 Springfield rifles, to be used on patriotic occasions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2307) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Addison, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 2308) authorizing the Secretary of War to make donation of condemned German cannons to Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2309) authorizing the Secretary of War to make donation of condemned German cannons to the city of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY of California: A bill (H. R. 2310) providing for the equipment of the United States arsenal at Benicia, Calif., as a manufacturing arsenal; to the Committtte on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2311) providing for the construction and equipment of a storehouse at Benicia, Calif.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 2312) to amend the act approved March 1, 1911, entitled "An act to protect the dignity and honor of the uniform of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2313) punishing conspiracy to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any alien in the exercise of any right under any treaty of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2314) authorizing the Secretary of War to provide for medical treatment and hospital care of officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees in the Military Establishment while on furlough necessitated by disability originating in the line of duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: A bill (H. R. 2315) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the county of Marengo, State of Alabama; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2316) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate a captured cannon to the county of Mobile, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2317) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate a German or Austrian cannon, howitzer, or other fieldpiece to the county of Washington, State of Alabama; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2318) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German or Austrian cannon, howitzer, or other fieldpiece for patriotic purposes to the county of Clarke, State of Alabama; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2319) authorizing and providing for the erection of monumental memorials in the counties of Monroe, Clarke, Choctaw, Washington, and Mobile, State of Alabama, in honor of persons who lost their lives in the service of the United States in the war against Germany; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2320) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Monroe, State of Alabama, one German or Austrian cannon or other fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2321) to donate to the city of Mobile, Ala., one German or Austrian cannon or other fieldpiece for patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2322) authorizing donation by the Secretary of War of one German or Austrian cannon or fieldpiece to the county of Choctaw, State of Alabama; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 2323) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Dunkirk, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 2324) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to certify certain finding of facts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 2325) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of West Babylon, in the State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 2326) providing for an increase of salary for the United States marshal and district attorney for the western district and for the United States district attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 2327) for the allowance of certain claims for difference in pay growing out of service in the Navy, as reported by the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IRELAND: A bill (H. R. 2328) relating to the title to land to be acquired as a site for a post-office building at Spring Valley, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 2329) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and for the payment of pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919; referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and passed.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 2330) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Malvern, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2331) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Leesville, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2332) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Salineville, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2333) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Leetonia, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2334) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Columbiana, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2335) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of East Palestine, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2336) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Mechanicstown, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2337) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Kilgore, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2338) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Bellaire, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2339) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Barnesville, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2340) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Dellroy, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2341) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Sherodsville, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2342) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Bridgeport, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2343) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Martins Ferry, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2344) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Hendrysburg, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2345) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Bethesda, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2346) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Somerton, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2347) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Shadyside, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2348) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Salem, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2349) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Wellsville, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2350) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of East Liverpool, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2351) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Brilliant, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2352) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Irondale, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2353) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Mount Pleasant, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2354) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Smithfield, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2355) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Bergholz, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2356) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Dillonvale, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2357) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Adena, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2358) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Rayland, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2359) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Mingo Junction, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2360) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Toronto, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2361) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Jewett, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2362) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Bowerston, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2363) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Scio, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2364) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Hopedale, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOODALL: A bill (H. R. 2365) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Sanford, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2366) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Brunswick, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ECHOLS: A bill (H. R. 2367) to donate a cannon or fieldpiece to the town of Madison, Boone County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2368) to donate a cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Charleston, Kanawha County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2369) to donate a captured cannon or fieldpiece to the town of Beckley, Raleigh County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2370) to donate a captured cannon or fieldpiece to the town of Marlington, Pocahontas County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2371) to donate a captured cannon or fieldpiece to the town of Lewisburg, Greenbrier County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2372) to donate a cannon or fieldpiece to the town of Fayetteville, Fayette County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2373) to donate a captured cannon or fieldpiece to the Board of Public Works, State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES: A bill (H. R. 2374) to extend the provisions of the pension act of May 11, 1912, and subsequent acts amendatory thereof, to the officers and enlisted men of all State militia and other State organizations that rendered service to the Union cause during the Civil War for a period of 90 days or more, and providing pensions for their widows, minor children, and dependent parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 2375) to amend section 700 of the revenue act of 1919, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON: Resolution (H. Res. 42) providing for an investigation by the Committee on Agriculture of certain cereals, mineral oils, etc.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolution (H. Res. 43) amending the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 44) making certain inquiries of the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. EMERSON: Resolution (H. Res. 45) directing the Secretary of War to report to Congress the extent to which United States soldiers, sailors, and marines were overcharged while in France; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOOD: Resolution (H. Res. 46) authorizing the Committee on Appropriations to sit during the sessions of the House, agreed to.

By Mr. BLACKMON: Resolution (H. Res. 47) to pay P. W. Burnett one month's salary as clerk to the late John L. Burnett; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BAER: Resolution (H. Res. 48) to allow the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture to appoint an assistant clerk to the said committee; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. MASON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 52) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan quartermaster's and medical supplies to the city of Chicago; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 53) to restore to John B. H. Waring, late a captain in the Medical Corps, the files of which he was deprived and to place him on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MASON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 54) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 55) relating to the printing of speeches in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 56) to appoint a commission to provide a tablet to mark the birthplace of Thomas Jefferson; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MASON: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 8) to withdraw troops from Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RODENBERG: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 9) providing for the printing of 10,000 copies of the Biographical Congressional Directory; to the Committee on Printing.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, requesting the amending of the reclamation act of June 17, 1902, to extend the benefits of said act to the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, relating to the salt-herring industry in Alaska; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, urging Congress to pay soldiers and sailors discharged from the service six months' additional salary; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, protesting against the time limit for guaranteed wheat prices to October 31, 1919; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, urging Congress to enact legislation relative to the conservation of fish and clams in the Mississippi River and its branches in the States of Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, indorsing the McKellar-Keating civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, urging the reconsideration of the order relative to the elevation of certain bridges in the city of Pittsburgh, Pa.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, asking for a $3,000,000 appropriation for the Flathead Indian project in the State of Montana for the years 1919 and 1920; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, asking the speedy withdrawal of the American forces from Russia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to a more strict examination of national banks by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania favoring the retention by returning soldiers, sailors, and marines discharged from further service of their uniforms and clothing as a memento of their services; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNE: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin relating to relinquishment of Federal control of the telephone systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin memorializing Congress to prohibit the purchase of Liberty bonds by the scalpers and providing a penalty therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana in regard to the manganese miners in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana regarding the Battle Mountain Home for soldiers of the Civil and Spanish-American Wars; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana regarding soldiers, sailors, and marines discharged from the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana favoring the self-determination of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, regarding the issuing of patents to homesteaders who have served in the Army or Navy of the present World War; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the construction by the Railroad Administration of a railroad through the county of Carter, Mont.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the passage of the educational bill known as Senate bill 4987; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the continuance of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, protesting against the changing of the time limit for guaranteed wheat prices to October 31, 1919; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the passage of amendments to certain bills now pending in Congress in order to provide a more equitable application of Federal aid for post roads in the sparsely settled States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, asking Congress to appropriate money to build hard-surfaced roads through the northern portion of Yellowstone Park leading from Gardiner, Mont., to Cooke City, Mont.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the restoration of railroads to their owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, asking for $3,000,000 appropriation for the Flathead irrigation project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the deportation of undesirable foreigners; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring Senate bill No. 940; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the Smith-Bankhead Americanization bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the Shafter bill in Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, asking for reduction of homeseekers' rates to Montana from eastern points; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, relating to Government ownership of packing plants; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the passage of legislation recognizing governmental obligations to producers of essential war minerals; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the changing of the grain-standard act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the passage of an act ceding to the State of Montana Fort William Henry Harrison; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, relating to the navigation of the Missouri River; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 2376) granting a pension to Joseph Harbaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2377) granting an increase of pension to William Stanton Fry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2378) granting an increase of pension to Robert Sutor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 2379) for the relief of John P. Chesley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 2380) to correct the military record of Emanuel Klauser; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2381) to correct the military record of Harrison P. Wiltse; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2382) granting a pension to Maggie Stroud; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 2383) granting a pension to Bridget Lillis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 2384) granting a pension to William Wade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 2385) granting a pension to Ann Dolan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2386) granting a pension to Nason B. Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2387) granting a pension to Sarah P. Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2388) granting a pension to Georgiana L. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2389) granting a pension to Chester A. Morang; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2390) granting a pension to Maria Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2391) granting a pension to Mary D. Jenness; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2392) granting a pension to Charles McHugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2393) granting an increase of pension to Henry Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2394) for the relief of Edward D. Black; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2395) for the relief of Preston D. Alden; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2396) for the relief of John A. Gauley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2397) to appropriate the sum of $4,000, to be paid to Alfred Roberts for personal injuries received at the

United States customhouse in Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 2398) granting a pension to Mary A. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2399) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. T. Beall; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2400) for the relief of William E. Jones, of Faribault, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2401) for the relief of Fred Klossner; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2402) for the relief of Edward J. Klossner; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2403) for the relief of J. P. J. Johnston; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2404) for the relief of Anton H. Burg; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 2405) granting a pension to Henry Lebrecht; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2406) for the relief of William Elder; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 2407) granting a pension to Fountain Tankersley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2408) granting a pension to William Shafer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2409) granting a pension to James Skelton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2410) granting a pension to Fred C. Sawin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2411) for the relief of Herman Wagner, alias Henry Burnett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2412) for the relief of Henry C. Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOODALL: A bill (H. R. 2413) for the relief of Leonidas H. Sawyers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 2414) granting a pension to John E. Coleman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2415) granting a pension to Sarah E. Goodwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2416) granting a pension to Peter C. Deardorff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 2417) granting a pension to Grace A. Sweeney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2418) granting a pension to Emanuel Myers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 2419) granting a pension to Annie K. Squier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2420) for the relief of the legal representatives of Samuel Schiffer, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 2421) granting an increase of pension to Clayton E. Blackwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 2422) granting a pension to Nellie Plew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2423) granting a pension to Myrtie I. Arnold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2424) for the relief of Loyal F. Russell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2425) for the relief of the heirs at law of L. L. Bosworth; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2426) for the relief of John F. Kingsley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2427) for the relief of the widow of Lemuel L. Moody; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2428) granting an increase of pension to G. W. Gleason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2429) granting an increase of pension to Clark E. Frear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2430) granting an increase of pension to Andrew M. Dershimer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2431) granting an increase of pension to Rensselaer F. Delmot; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2432) granting an increase of pension to Sidney W. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2433) granting an increase of pension to Katherine H. Califf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 2434) granting an increase of pension to Henry Allison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2435) granting an increase of pension to William T. Preston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2436) granting an increase of pension to William Vincent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2437) granting an increase of pension to William S. Eberman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2438) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth H. Brayton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2439) granting an increase of pension to Emma F. Raymond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2440) granting an increase of pension to James C. Burwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2441) granting an increase of pension to Rollin T. Waller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2442) granting an increase of pension to John A. Benninger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2443) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Duer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2444) granting a pension to Malvina A. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2445) granting a pension to Emma J. De Yoe Bassett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2446) granting a pension to Peter F. Van Auken; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 2447) granting a pension to William McBride; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 2448) granting an increase of pension to Levi M. Dort; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2449) granting an increase of pension to James Buggie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 2450) granting a pension to Emma A. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 2451) granting an increase of pension to David G. Bliss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 2452) for the relief of Charles A. Carey; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2453) granting a pension to Catherine Gardner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2454) granting a pension to William E. Galvin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 2455) for the relief of H. W. Davis Co., of St. Augustine, Fla.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2456) for the relief of Estes Shoe Co., of St. Augustine, Fla.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2457) granting a pension to Wynn M. Mays; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2458) granting a pension to Thomas Kerr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2459) granting a pension to George W. Chandler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2460) granting a pension to Martha Tyler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2461) granting a pension to Bartley Kirkbride; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2462) granting a pension to Robert E. Lee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2463) granting a pension to Ephraim P. Golden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2464) granting a pension to George Gwynne; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2465) granting a pension to Walter Scott McQuaide; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2466) granting a pension to Mary J. Van Denbergh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2467) granting a pension to Joseph Whitney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2468) granting a pension to S. P. Battle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2469) granting an increase of pension to William P. Lynch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2470) granting an increase of pension to Josephine A. Haley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2471) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Schoonmaker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2472) granting an increase of pension to Stephen J. Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2473) granting an increase of pension to Johanna Covert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2474) granting a pension to Narcissa A. Grant; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 2475) granting a pension to Lizzie Eaton Webster; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 2476) granting a pension to Thomas Samuel Garen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 2477) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Slocum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 2478) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas Baggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 2479) to correct the military record of William B. Young; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of citizens of Malden, Mass., protesting against the atrocities inflicted on the Jewish race by Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRIGGS: Simple resolution of the Senate of the State of Texas, favoring the return of the telegraph and telephone lines to their owners at the earliest possible moment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the Texas Industrial Traffic League, favoring the return of railroads to private ownership and operation, and the enactment of a law securing unified system of control of railroad rates, both interstate and intrastate, under the authority of nonpartisan Federal commissions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, simple resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, favoring the return of the railroads to their owners as immediately as it can be accomplished without confusion or losses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, simple resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, urging the passage of such measures by the National Congress as will make the monopoly in the packing industry disgorge unlawful profits and punish those guilty of profiteering in food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, senate concurrent resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Texas, requesting the continuance of the United States Employment Service during the demobilization of the United States Army and until the men now in the service have had every opportunity to secure employment in civil life; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, senate concurrent resolution by the Legislature of the State of Texas, urging the adoption by the Congress of the United States of certain measures relative to soldier settlements; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution adopted by the convention of the eighteenth district of rotary clubs and of the State of Texas, proposing the establishment by Congress of a national bureau or department of mercantile, marine, and overseas transportation; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, house concurrent resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Texas, notifying the Secretary of War of the United States that the people of the State of Texas desire all Texas soldiers in Europe be immediately returned to the United States and discharged as quickly as possible, and for the retirement of such soldiers from road work and other nonmilitary labors in France; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of women of Cambridge and Dorchester, in the State of Massachusetts, favoring woman's suffrage; to the Committee on Woman's Suffrage.

By Mr. DARROW: Resolution of General Assembly of Pennsylvania, petitioning Congress to establish a national system of highways; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: Petition of citizens of Johnson County, Mo., asking for repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of National Garment Retailers' Association, New York, protesting against revenue tax section 904; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: Petition of Railroad Men of Miles City, Mont., favoring national ownership and Government operation of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of 20 citizens of Missoula, Mont., favoring Government operation of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the National Government Retailers' Association, favoring repeal of consumption taxes in the war revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Winnebago County, Ill., favoring repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition of 106 citizens of Coe Township, in the county of Rock Island, in the State of Illinois, that prompt action be taken to repeal the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: Petition of sundry citizens of Muscatine, Iowa, protesting against luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IRELAND: Petition of citizens of Hittle Township, Tazewell County, Ill., asking repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against tax on soda water and ice cream and purchases of less than 10 cents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKENZIE: Petition of certain citizens of Illinois, asking for the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Petition of citizens of the city of Superior, Wis., protesting against the passage of Burnett bill (H. R. 13669); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Sherman & Blum (Inc.), New York City, relating to tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William Jackman's Sons, New York City, urging repeal of tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE: Resolutions adopted by 15,000 citizens of Paterson, N. J., protesting and demanding that the recognition of the peace conference be withheld from the new Polish State until permanent provision for justice and protection of Jews of that country be established; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of citizens of Roseville and Rocklin, Calif., urging the Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Shasta County (Calif.) Promotion & Development Association, protesting against the establishment of a reservoir as contemplated by the survey of the Iron Canyon project; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of San Francisco and North California Fur Dealers' Association, asking the repeal of the tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of certain citizens of California, petitioning for the Government ownership and control of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Local No. 1156, of Fresno, Calif., urging the Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Imperial Irrigation District, California, for lands and homes for returning soldiers; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of Standard Nut Meat Co., of Berkeley, Calif., against the tax on candy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Gimbal Bros., of San Francisco, against tax on candy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Woman's Club of Cucamonga, Calif., indorsing Senate bill 4987; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of E. R. Snyder, commissioner, vocational department, State board of education, of California, urging the passage of House bill 15625; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Riverside Chamber of Commerce, urging the deportation of aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of 32 farmers resident in the vicinity of Le Roy, N. Y., urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Pavilion Grange, with 200 members, urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCULLY: Protest from Federation of Jewish Societies of Perth Amboy, N. J., against outrages perpetrated against the Jews in Poland on account of their religious faith; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Bridgeport Chamber of Commerce to stabilize the dollar; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of citizens of Wallingford, Conn., that the espionage act be repealed, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Putnam, Conn., against the increase of telephone rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *May 23, 1919.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, every page of our national history has been written with a sense of divine obligation and an expression of our recognition of the fact that Thou hast a right to rule. During the tragic days through which we have passed we have fought and sacrificed because we have believed in the divine order in a world of government and of law. Every boy who lies sleeping in the fields of France is a pledge of our belief in God's power to raise the dead. To-day we come still trusting in the divine guidance, seeking Thy blessing, that we may discharge as Christian statesmen the duties that are upon us, and glorify Thy name in the advancement of the civilization that Thou hast given to us. We ask Thy blessing. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday last, when, on request of Mr. LODGE and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

JAMES D. PHELAN, a Senator from the State of California, appeared in his seat to-day.

SENATOR FROM GEORGIA.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Hon. WILLIAM J. HARRIS, the Senator elect from Georgia, is now in the Chamber. His credentials have been duly filed, and I ask that the oath of office be administered to him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator elect will present himself at the Secretary's desk for the purpose of taking the oath of office.

Mr. HARRIS was escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. SMITH of Georgia, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. LODGE and Mr. MARTIN appeared, and

Mr. LODGE said: Mr. President, the committee appointed by the Chair to notify the President that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and ready to receive communications from him received the following reply to the cablegram which they sent:

Please express my appreciation to the Senate committee of its courtesy and say that I have communicated with the Congress in the usual manner through the message presented yesterday, and express the hope that I may soon be present in Washington to communicate to them full information with regard to international affairs.

INVITATION FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to lay before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, which will be read.

The Secretary read the letter, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, May 21, 1919.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I wish to inform you that one of the former German submarines, the *U–117*, which has been brought to America, is now lying at the docks at the foot of O Street, in this city.

Thinking that a close-up view of the interior of this boat might be interesting, I wish to extend an invitation to you and the Senators to visit the boat, and I will be greatly obliged if you will take the necessary action to extend to the Senators the above invitation.

It is requested that visits to the boat be made between the hours of 9 a. m. and 11 a. m. and from 1.30 p. m. to 5 p. m., and that the commanding officer of the boat be informed of the visits, in order that proper arrangements may be made.

The commanding officer can be reached by telephone at Main 7510.

With kindest regards,
Yours, sincerely, JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2329. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and for the payment of pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919; and

H. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I ask, in accordance with subdivision 3 of Rule XIV, that the joint resolution just received from the House of Representatives may be read twice and then be placed upon the calendar.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I understand it requires unanimous consent to have the joint resolution considered without going to the committee. I will say that I have no desire to unduly delay the consideration of the joint resolution at the proper time. It is a well-known fact that I am opposed to it, and I expect to vote against it. It should be considered in an orderly and proper way, and I shall certainly object to its consideration until it has been referred to a committee and properly considered.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It is that it may be considered in an orderly and proper way that the motion is made, and it is made in conformity with subdivision 3, Rule XIV. The desire is not at all to press the matter with any undue haste, but that, in accordance with the rule, the joint resolution may be read twice and then be placed upon the calendar and ultimately may be taken up on motion.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As I understand it——

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is the rule, of course. Without objection, unless the Senate otherwise orders, the first and second reading of a bill may be by title only; and there having been no objection, it will be read the first and second times by title and will go to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women was read twice by its title.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senate has it within its power by order to direct that it shall go to the calendar instead of to the committee, if the question of reference is raised. That, I understand, the Senator from California raises. The rule does not say that it shall go to the committee automatically, but unless otherwise ordered it goes to the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There has to be unanimous consent.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It can not go to the committee without unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has ruled a number of times, and the precedents of the Senate are unvarying upon the proposition, that unless there is unanimous consent a bill or resolution has to go to a committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may go to the calendar, not to be taken up for consideration to-day, but that it go to the calendar.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think I made it clear a moment ago that I am not willing to consent that the joint resolution shall be taken up in the Senate until it has been carefully and fully and deliberately considered by the appropriate committee. Therefore, of course, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution goes to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the bill received from the House be laid before the Senate.

The bill (H. R. 2329) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and for the payment of pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, was read twice by its title.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the bill covers appropriations which were passed upon by our committee at the last session of Congress. All the checks are ready to go out now—some 3,000,000 checks, I am informed—to cover these pension and allotment payments. There is no Committee on Appropriations able at this moment to deal with it. I have asked the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], who was chairman of the committee in the previous Congress, and he agrees with me in the request I am about to make.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN. I desire to say that these items were at the last session carefully considered and reported favorably by the Committee on Appropriations. The money is urgently needed. The Secretary of the Tresury says the checks are made out and the families are very much in need of this money. In my opinion they ought to have it and have it immediately.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and for the payment of pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, namely:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

BUREAU OF WAR RISK INSURANCE.

For salaries of officers and employees, $2,025,613.97; stationery and miscellaneous expenses, $100,000; furniture, equipment, and supplies, $195,000; printing and binding, $100,000; rental of quarters in the

District of Columbia, $3,886.03; and traveling expenses, $5,000; in all, $2,429,500.

For the payment of military and naval family allowances as authorized by law, $39,615,000.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

BUREAU OF PENSIONS.

Army and Navy pensions: For invalids, widows, minor children, and dependent relatives, Army nurses, and all other pensioners who are now borne on the rolls, or who may hereafter be placed thereon, under the provisions of any and all acts of Congress, $3,000,000: *Provided*, That the appropriation aforesaid for Navy pensions shall be paid from the income of the Navy pension fund so far as the same shall be sufficient for that purpose: *Provided further*, That the amount expended under each of the above items shall be accounted for separately.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. KENYON. I wish to inquire what is the amount carried by the bill?

Mr. LODGE. Forty-five million dollars, in round numbers.

Mr. KENYON. Is that the same amount as before?

Mr. LODGE. For invalids, widows, minors, and dependent relatives under the Army and Navy, $3,000,000; for payment of military and naval family allowances as authorized by law, $39,000,000; and for pensions in the Army and Navy, $3,000,000.

Mr. KENYON. That is the identical amount in the bill reported at the last session?

Mr. LODGE. I understand it is the same amount.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, in reference to the joint resolution which came from the House, I wish to call the attention of the Chair to a further provision in Rule XIV. Paragraph 4 of that rule reads as follows:

Every bill and joint resolution introduced on leave and every bill and joint resolution of the House of Representatives which shall have received a first and second reading without being referred to a committee—

This joint resolution has received its first and second readings—

shall, if objection be made to further proceeding thereon, be placed on the calendar.

The matter of reference is a further proceeding on a bill or joint resolution. Objection is made to the reference, and under the rule, it seems to me, it should go to the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair can not change the ruling that has been made at this time. It has to go to the committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I shall not appeal from the decision of the Chair, but I am of a contrary opinion.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, in view of the request made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I think it advisable to make an inquiry of the Chair. The Senator from Massachusetts just stated that there is no Committee on Appropriations to which the bill recently passed by the House could be referred. I take it the Senator meant by that to announce the position that all the committees heretofore existing have ceased to exist. I should like to ask the Chair whether the committees which existed during the last session of Congress would be recognized for the transaction of business?

I desire to state as the reason for the inquiry that the joint resolution which has just come from the House is one which we are all anxious to see passed, and which I am satisfied will be passed as soon as a vote can be had upon it. I have hesitated thus far in proceeding as a member of the Committee on Woman Suffrage and as its chairman at its last session of Congress in taking any action on the joint resolutions which have been heretofore introduced in the Senate upon that subject, and out of deference to my successor, whoever he may be, I should not be disposed to take action at this time were it not for the fact that there seems to be some apprehension that quite a time will elapse before any committees are organized. This joint resolution, it seems to me, should be acted upon without any great delay, and if the old committees are still in existence, and the members feel justified in acting, as far as I am concerned, I do not want to delay action on the joint resolution. However, I am willing as a matter of courtesy to defer action if that is thought best by the members on the other side of the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has some very definite views on this question. Anticipating some controversy about it some sessions ago, the Chair made an examination. The Chair is satisfied that the Senate of the United States is a continuing body, and the Chair is satisfied that the old committees are in full force and effect and have power to proceed with the consideration of business, if they choose, until the new committees are organized by the Senate.

In addition to that, the Chair has a recollection, which he hopes to verify in a moment, that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] presented and there was adopted either on the last day or the day preceding the close of the last session of the former Congress a resolution that all the committees of the Senate should remain in full force and have power to act until the new committees were appointed. The Chair will verify that as soon as he can get the record. I do not think the Senator from Massachusetts said there was no Committee on Appropriations. He said there was not one which could act just now.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I simply desire to say that the Chair is correct. I offered the resolution and was present and saw it adopted. I have a copy of it in my committee room. It was adopted unanimously.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the committees, of course, expire with the Congress which created them, but it has been the custom in the Senate for many years to continue them by special resolution. I want to see the exact wording of the resolution, which, it seems to me, it is difficult to find.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is the resolution:

Resolved, That the standing committees of the Senate as constituted at the end of this session be, and they are hereby, continued until the next session of Congress or until their successors are duly elected.

Mr. LODGE. Ah, that is just as I thought—"until the next session of Congress or until their successors are duly elected." Their successors have not been duly elected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is going to say that this is either a continuing body or it is not. If it is a continuing body, it is a continuing body in all its functions.

Mr. LODGE. I dislike to differ with the Chair, but it does not seem to me to follow that with the Senate a continuing body, the committees, the temporary character of which is recognized every two years by resolution, are also continuous.

The VICE PRESIDENT. We will get rid of it in very short order, and I do not think we will have any trouble about it.

Mr. LODGE. I do not know whether there is a quorum of that committee. I do not know whether there are any vacancies to fill. Certainly the Committee on Appropriations is not yet organized.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. I am a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or at least I was so during the last Congress. I desire to inquire whether that committee now has the power to inquire into the Ford-Newberry contest, which was referred to it a few days ago?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair can only express one opinion; and that is that the committees are in force and have power until they are changed.

Mr. LODGE subsequently said: In connection with the matter of the standing committees of the Senate, I should like to call attention to what was said at the time the subject was under consideration on February 25, 1919:

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 466), as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the standing committees of the Senate as constituted at the end of this session be, and they are hereby, continued until the next session of Congress or until their successors are duly elected."

Mr. LODGE. I am entirely in favor of that resolution. We have always passed a similar resolution. I only wanted to speak to the Senator from Virginia as to his understanding being the same as mine, that none of these committees, with the exception of the Committee on Contingent Expenses, exists by statute, and none of them, of course, would transact any business whatever between the expiration of this Congress and the assembling of the new Congress. The Senator from Virginia agrees with me entirely about that.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do. When this Congress expires all these committees expire, except the vitality given by this resolution. I ask that the resolution may have present consideration.

Mr. LODGE. I will just ask the question. Of course, if there is a special session of the Senate, the committees are reorganized.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Whenever there is a special or a regular session this resolution ends.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President I desire to enter a motion to discharge the Committee on Woman Suffrage from the consideration of the House joint resolution No. 1 that was referred to that committee to-day, and I ask that the motion lie over for one day under the rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts in the chair). That action will be taken.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Merritt, Fla., praying that in the consideration of the league of nations treaty, the sovereignty of God be recognized and that His name be ever before the proposed league of nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Florida East Coast Growers' Association of Miami, Fla., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation prohibiting immigration for a period of four years, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. NUGENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house concurrent resolution No. 5, by Adamson, which was filed in this office on the 25th day of February, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 26th day of February, A. D. 1919, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.] ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

House concurrent resolution 5.

Whereas the people of the State of Idaho desire to honor the soldiers, sailors, and marines who entered the service from this State to fight in the war with Germany by bestowing upon each of them an appropriately designed badge of honor; and

Whereas it is proposed in an act providing for such badge of honor that same shall be made of metal taken from cannon captured from German troops in battle in which Idaho soldiers were engaged: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho (the Senate concurring), That the Senators and Representatives from Idaho in the United States Congress are hereby requested to procure from the War Department as a grant or gift to this State cannon captured from German troops in battle in which Idaho soldiers took part sufficient to manufacture badges of honor for all and every soldier, sailor, and marine who at the time of entering the service was a citizen of Idaho and who has been honorably discharged from such service or who may be now serving therein.

Resolved further, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and hereby is, instructed to forward copies of this resolution to our Senators and Representatives in Congress at Washington.

This house concurrent resolution passed the house on the 14th day of February, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This house concurrent resolution passed the senate on the 14th day of February, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

This house concurrent resolution received by the governor on the 25th day of February, 1919, at 10 o'clock a. m., and approved by him on the 25th day of February, 1919.

D. W. DAVIS, *Governor.*

I hereby certify that the within house concurrent resolution No. 5 originated in the house of representatives during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

DAVID BURRELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. NUGENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of House joint memorial No. 11, by Robertson, which was filed in this office on the 1st day of March, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 4th day of March, A. D. 1919, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.] ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 11.

To the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialists, the members of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully petition that a law be enacted by Congress authorizing the War Department to give to honorably discharged soldiers and sailors the uniforms in which they are permitted to return home.

That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho is hereby instructed to forward this memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, and that copies be sent to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

This house joint memorial passed the house on the 17th day of February, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This house joint memorial passed the senate on the 24th day of February, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

This house joint memorial received by the governor on the 28th day of February, 1919, at 10 o'clock a. m., and approved on the 28th day of February, 1919.

D. W. DAVIS, *Governor.*

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial No. 11 originated in the house of representatives during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

DAVID BURRELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. NUGENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house joint memorial No. 4, by committee on military and Indian affairs, which was filed in this office on the 25th day of January, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 26th day of February, A. D. 1919, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.] ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 4.

A joint memorial urging the Congress of the United States to pursue a constructive policy in reclaiming lands in Idaho for the purpose of employing returned soldiers and sailors and preparing lands for settlement by the same.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas there are thousands of acres of tillable land in the State of Idaho that may be reclaimed by irrigation and development; and

Whereas our soldiers and sailors have served in the Army and Navy of the United States and have offered to sacrifice all that our country and our Commonwealth might be safe from peril and danger, and that we might live in peace and security; and

Whereas a large number of these soldiers and sailors are out of employment and desire to establish homes and obtain farms whereby they may make a livelihood: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, urgently recommend that you pursue a broad and constructive policy in reclaiming lands in our State, and that our returned soldiers and sailors be given employment on such reclamation projects, and we, your memorialists, further urge that you give soldiers and sailors the opportunities to obtain land from areas reclaimed and under easy conditions with long-time payments; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to each of the members of the congressional delegations from the State of Idaho to the Congress of the United States and to each body of said Congress.

This memorial passed the house on the 16th day of January, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This memorial passed the senate on the 21st day of January, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

This memorial received by the governor on the 25th day of January, 1919, at 11.30 o'clock a. m., and approved on the 25th day of January, 1919.

D. W. DAVIS, *Governor.*

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial No. 4 originated in the house during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

DAVID BURRELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. NUGENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house joint memorial No. 8, by committee on irrigation, reservoirs, and reclamation, which was filed in this office on the 8th day of February, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 26th day of February, A. D. 1919, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.] ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 8.

To the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas there is a nation-wide demand to stimulate industry and furnish work to returning soldiers and sailors by encouraging public improvements of all kinds;

Whereas there is also a great demand to make permanent homes available to such soldiers and sailors out of the public lands of the United States;

Whereas there are in the State of Idaho upward of 2,000,000 acres of arid lands capable of being reclaimed by the construction of large irrigation projects, some of which have been surveyed and declared feasible by the United States Reclamation Service;

Whereas the magnitude of such projects is such that only the Federal Government can undertake their construction; and

Whereas the War Department owns large numbers of horses and mules with harness and equipment, tractors, motor trucks, and electric cranes, which can be converted into ditching machinery: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, do hereby recommend that Congress immediately authorize the United States Reclamation Service to proceed with the construction of the feasible irrigation projects in Idaho designed to reclaim public lands and make the necessary appropriation for such reclamation. Also that the above-mentioned equipment be turned over by the War Department to the Reclamation Service for use in said reclamation, and upon completion of said work that it be sold on liberal terms to the settlers on said tracts.

The secretary of state is hereby instructed to forward copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United

States, and copies of the same to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

This house joint memorial passed the house on the 2d day of February, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This house joint memorial passed the senate on the 5th day of February, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

This house joint memorial received by the governor on the 7th day of February, 1919, at 11.55 o'clock p. m., and approved on the 7th day of February, 1919.

D. W. DAVIS, *Governor.*

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial originated in the house during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

DAVID BURRELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. NUGENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of senate joint memorial No. 7, by Pettibone, which was filed in this office on the 11th day of February, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 26th day of February, A. D. 1919, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.] ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 7.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas within the county of Idaho, State of Idaho, there is an area of unsurveyed public land which when surveyed will be approximately the north half of township 26 north, range 6 east; the south half of township 27 north, range 6 east; the southwest quarter of township 27 north, range 7 east; and the northwest quarter of township 26 north, range 7 east, Boise meridian, and which is now entirely surrounded by lands of the United States set aside and withdrawn for national forest purposes under the name of the Nezperce National Forest; and

Whereas said area is rich in timber, water power, minerals, forage, and game, and practically devoid of land having any possible agricultural value; and

Whereas the said area has been subjected repeatedly to the ravages of fire, which imperils the remaining timber land against which under existing conditions it is impossible to guard the area; and

Whereas wild life on said area is being rapidly exterminated and the forage resources destroyed by overgrazing and unregulated use; and

Whereas the development of the mineral resources of the said area is retarded by its present lack of transportation facilities; and

Whereas the inclusion of said area within a national forest would protect the great natural resources of said area from damage by fire and other destructive agencies and make such resources a contributing factor to the development and prosperity of the State of Idaho: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, earnestly request and recommend that your honorable body take such action as may be necessary to make the area first in this memorial described, to wit, approximately the north half of township 26 north, range 6 east; the south half of township 27 north, range 6 east; the southwest quarter of township 27 north, range 7 east; and the northwest quarter of township 26 north, range 7 east, Boise meridian, a part of said Nezperce National Forest and subject to the laws governing the same.

The secretary of state of the State of Idaho is hereby instructed to forward a copy of this memorial to the Senate of the United States, to the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the congressional delegation from the State of Idaho.

This joint memorial passed the senate on the 3d day of February, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

This joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 7th day of February, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within joint memorial No. 7 originated in the senate during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

PAUL DAVIS,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. NUGENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of enrolled house joint memorial 14, which was filed in this office on the 13th day of March, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 28th day of April, A. D. 1919, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.] ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 14.

To the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represents that—

Whereas during the great war the action of certain aliens in surrendering their first papers for the purpose of claiming exemption from military service and of other alien residents of this country who claimed exemption from military service on the ground of noncitizenship was such as to brand them as undesirable residents of this country; and

Whereas many of these same aliens, after having evaded the duties of citizenship, are now seeking its benefits and are continuing to hold positions which should be open to returned soldiers, sailors, and marines; and

Whereas many foreign-born residents, some of whom had become naturalized, have openly shown their disloyalty to this country and been convicted under the espionage act; and

Whereas Congress is considering a bill to restrict immigration, we, your memorialists, respectfully petition that Congress enact the necessary laws to deport all aliens who claimed exemption from military service on the ground of noncitizenship, and to cancel and rescind the naturalization papers of and to deport all foreign-born citizens of this country who have been convicted under the espionage act.

That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho is hereby instructed to forward this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, and that copies be sent to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

This house joint memorial passed the house on the 20th day of February, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speakcr of the House of Representatives.

This house joint memorial passed the senate on the 26th day of February, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

This house joint memorial received by the governor on the 7th day of March, 1919, at 5 o'clock p. m. and approved on the 12th day of March, 1919.

D. W. DAVIS, *Governor.*

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial 14 originated in the house of representatives during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

DAVID BURRELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. NUGENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of enrolled senate joint memorial No. 9, which was filed in this office on the 14th day of March, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 28th day of April, A. D. 1919, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.] ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 9.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, represent that—

Whereas since our Nation has entered the great conflict for the high purpose of preserving throughout the world the blessings of democratic government and to make the world safe from the dangers of autocratic governments, bent on military rule, and victory has blessed our aims; and

Whereas aliens bearing no allegiance to our Government, but sharing its benefits and having every opportunity to labor on terms of equality with our citizens who are bearing arms for its defense, while these aliens risk neither life nor property; and

Whereas, taking advantage of this Nation's peril, many of said aliens have become dangerous and undesirable residents of this country, joining treasonable and seditious organizations of unpatriotic origin, have publicly proclaimed contempt for the flag that shelters and protects them, preaching and practicing sabotage, destruction of property, and the overthrow of our Government, and establishing a government of Bolshevism and red-flag type, and have committed acts resulting in the arrest and conviction of many of this element, together with their disloyal associates, and are growing bolder in their opposition to law and order and our established form of government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Senate of the State of Idaho, and the House of Representatives concurring therein, do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to enact drastic laws for the prompt arrest, detention, punishment, and deportation of all such aliens, and that the citizenship of all naturalized aliens in this country be made to depend on their loyalty and good citizenship, and that no alien be naturalized who cherishes any disloyal sentiments or views or ideals antagonistic to our form of government.

The secretary of state of the State of Idaho is hereby instructed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, and copies of the same to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

This joint memorial passed the senate on the 3d day of March, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

This joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 8th day of March, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within joint memorial No. 9 originated in the Senate during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

PAUL DAVIS,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. NUGENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of enrolled house joint memorial No. 20, which was filed in this office on the 17th day of March, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 28th day of April, A. D. 1919, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.] ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 20.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the House of Representatives and Senate of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas section 2, Article II, of the Constitution of the United States gives the President power to make treaties by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; and

Whereas there is now in progress the greatest peace-negotiating conclave in the history of the world, the United States being one of the members of said convention; and

Whereas the President of the United States has, contrary to the wishes and desires of the majority of the people of the United States of America, and without the advice or consent of the Senate of the United States, attempted to force through said convention and to foist upon the American people as one of the essential elements of the treaties of peace to be promulgated by said convention, a proposition favoring and organizing a so-called league of nations; and

Whereas the substance of the proposed draft of the so-called league of nations is obscure, vague, ambiguous, and tending to bring about greater confusion and distrust and hostility among the various nations of the world; and

Whereas the theory of said league of nations is impracticable, visionary, and subversive of the international principles heretofore controlling in the foreign relationships of the United States of America; and

Whereas the President of the United States has defied Congress and the people of the United States to oppose the organization of such a league of nations; and

Whereas some 37 Senators have pledged themselves to oppose the ratification of a treaty adopting said league of nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, the Senate concurring, do earnestly request and recommend that the Senate of the United States oppose absolutely the theory as indicated by the constitution of the league of nations and oppose said constitution of the league of nations becoming a part of or being in any way included in the peace treaties to be made or entered into by the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That they hereby ratify and give their unqualified approval to, the stand and position taken by the above-mentioned 37 Senators in recording themselves as opposed to said league of nations at the present time; and be it further

Resolved, That they resent the defiant and dictatorial attitude of the President of the United States in his recent statements in which he has attempted to force his personal views and opinions upon the people of the United States, irrespective of their desires in the matter.

The secretary of the State of Idaho is hereby instructed to forward this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, and to send copies of the same to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

This house joint memorial passed the house on the 6th day of March, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The house joint memorial passed the senate on the 8th day of March, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial No. 20 originated in the house of representatives during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

DAVID BURRELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. NUGENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of enrolled senate joint memorial No. 11, which was filed in this office on the 11th day of March, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 28th day of April, A. D. 1919, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.] ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 11.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas there is at the present time need of furnishing employment to our brave soldiers, sailors, and marines who are daily returning from the battle fields of Europe; and

Whereas there is also need of providing arable lands upon which many of them may find homes; and

Whereas the State of Idaho has many acres of lands admirably adapted to farming and to furnishing homes for our soldiery, such land lacking only the water necessary for its irrigation; and

Whereas the Government has already started the Fort Hall project, in Idaho, which project embraces 50,000 acres of land, only 23,000 of which are now irrigated, which irrigated area last year produced over $800,000 worth of foodstuffs; and

Whereas the enlargement and completion of this project would put under cultivation 27,000 acres of land, which enlargement and completion would require no preliminary investigations or surveys, but would require an appropriation of $550,000, as provided in a bill introduced by the late Senator James H. Brady in the Fifty-fifth Congress (Senate No. 3226); and

Whereas there is adjoining said project, between Pocatello and American Falls, Idaho, an area of between 30,000 and 40,000 acres of additional land capable of similar production when properly irrigated; and

Whereas an extension of the Fort Hall project could be made to cover such area at a cost of approximately half a million dollars: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, earnestly recommend that Congress make an appropriation of $1,000,000 to cover the cost of such completion and extension of the Fort Hall project.

The secretary of state of the State of Idaho is hereby instructed to forward this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America and to send copies to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

This joint memorial passed the senate on the 24th day of February, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

This joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 5th day of March, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within joint memorial No. 11 originated in the senate during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

PAUL DAVIS,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. NUGENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of senate joint memorial No. 6, by the State affairs committee, which was filed in this office on the 8th day of February, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 26th day of February, A. D. 1919, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.] ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 6.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas our Nation suffered a sense of bereavement personal to every American when the Maker of Men recalled the intrepid soul of Theodore Roosevelt, the most virile, most brilliant, best-loved, and typical American of his time, whose remarkable career and accomplishments as athlete, plainsman, soldier, author, explorer, President, and apostle of undiluted Americanism have made him a figure to touch and inspire the imagination of youth for generations; and

Whereas one of his many great achievements is represented by the canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, which his constructive and practical genius, brushing aside the bickerings, debates, and delays of 50 years, made possible; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, urgently recommend that the Congress of the United States, by proper enactment, change the name of the Panama Canal from the Panama Canal to the "Roosevelt Canal," so that the same shall stand in name as well as in historical fact an enduring monument to his greatness, a constant reminder that the canal is like the great President who started it—unqualifiedly American; and be it also

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to each of the members of the congressional delegation of the State of Idaho to the Congress of the United States and to each body of said Congress.

This joint memorial passed the senate on the 30th day of January, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

This joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 5th day of February, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within joint memorial No. 6 originated in the senate during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

PAUL DAVIS,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. NUGENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of enrolled senate joint memorial No. 13, which was filed in this office on the 13th day of March, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 28th day of April, A. D. 1919, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.] ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 13.

A joint memorial to Congress requesting reimbursement to citizens of Idaho for sacked grain shipped at the direction of the United States Food Administration Grain Corporation for which no allowance was made for sacks.

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas the United States Food Administration Grain Corporation agreed in the beginning of the season of 1918 to allow a premium of 9 cents per bushel over the bulk price for wheat delivered in sacks to all Pacific coast terminals; and

Whereas at the express direction of the United States Food Administration grain was diverted and shipped to Chicago with the understanding on the part of the shipper that he would receive the same price as at Pacific coast terminals; and

Whereas the United States Food Administration at the Chicago terminal refused to allow a premium for sacks and charged the shipper 2 cents per bushel additional for bulking the grain, offering him the alternative of selling the sacks on the open market for what they would bring or returning them at his expense; and

Whereas such arbitrary action on the part of the Food Administration resulted in substantial loss to a large number of shippers and growers in the State of Idaho.

Now, therefore, your memorialists petition Congress to direct the Food Administration to reimburse growers and shippers for the loss so incurred.

The secretary of state of the State of Idaho is hereby instructed to forward this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, and to forward copies to the President of the United States, the United States Food Administration Grain Corporation, and to the members of the Idaho congressional delegation.

This joint memorial passed the senate on the 8th day of March, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

This joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 8th day of March, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within joint memorial No. 13 originated in the senate during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

PAUL DAVIS,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. NUGENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of enrolled house joint memorial No. 9, which was filed in this office on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 28th day of April, A. D. 1919, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.] ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 9.

A joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to make an appropriation of $25,000 for the improvement of star routes on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation and running through Indian allotment.

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and Senate of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas the improvement of public highways on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation from St. Maries to the Washington State line near Tekoa, Wash., and from the Washington State line to Tensed, thence to the Desmet mission, thence to the Sanders post office, is a public necessity; and

Whereas the two public highways are both star routes, with a mileage of 45 miles; and

Whereas one-half of said roads are through Indian allotments and are not taxable but are farmed by renters, making it necessary for Benewah County to construct roads and maintain schools; and

Whereas the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation is half the area of Benewah County, and the said Indians do not contribute in taxes or otherwise to said roads: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, do recommend that $25,000 be appropriated, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to assist in construction of above-mentioned roads; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to each of the members of the congressional delegation from the State of Idaho to the Congress of the United States and to each body of said Congress.

This house joint memorial passed the house on the 17th day of February, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This house joint memorial passed the senate on the 25th day of February, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

This house joint memorial received by the governor on the 3d day of March, 1919, at 2 o'clock p. m., and approved on the 3d day of March, 1919.

D. W. DAVIS, *Governor.*

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial No. 9 originated in the house of representatives during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

DAVID BURRELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. NUGENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house joint memorial No. 3, by committee on military and Indian affairs by Jones, chairman, which was filed in this office on the 7th day of February, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 26th day of February, A. D. 1919, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.] ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 3.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas it is desirable that each State have a record of all of the persons resident therein who were mustered into any branch of the service of the United States during the war with the German Empire and its allies; and

Whereas the records of the Army and Navy Departments of the United States are the only sources from which such information can be obtained in complete and accessible form: Now, therefore,

Your memorialists urgently request and recommend that Congress enact a law requiring the Departments of the Army and Navy to furnish such information upon requisition therefor to the respective States.

That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho is hereby instructed to forward this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, and that copies be sent to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

This memorial passed the house on the 24th day of January, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This memorial passed the senate on the 31st day of January, 1919.

E. W. WHITCOMB,
President pro tempore of the Senate.

This memorial received by the governor on the 6th day of February, 1919, at 3 o'clock p. m., and approved on the 7th day of February, 1919.

D. W. DAVIS, *Governor.*

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial No. 3 originated in the house during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

DAVID BURRELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. NUGENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of enrolled house joint memorial No. 10, which was filed in this office on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 28th day of April, A. D. 1919, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.] ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 10.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas there are 35,000 acres of meadowland in the Kootenai Valley within Boundary County, in the State of Idaho, subject to annual overflow from the said Kootenai River; and

Whereas there are 60,000 acres of meadowland in Kootenai Valley within British Columbia, Canada, subject to annual overflow from the said Kootenai River, said Kootenai Valley meadowland in British Columbia being contiguous to and adjoining said Kootenai Valley meadowlands in Idaho; and

Whereas the said meadowlands can be made valuable for farming purposes by draining same, and by reason of said overflow said lands are rendered valueless for farming purposes; and

Whereas by reason of a gravel bar having formed at the outlet of the west arm of Kootenai Lake, which outlet is located in British Columbia, thereby causing the waters of Kootenai River to rise to the height of about 25 feet annually, thus overflowing about 95,000 acres of meadowland, 35,000 acres of said overflowed land being in Boundary County, Idaho, and about 60,000 acres of said overflowed lands are in British Columbia, Dominion of Canada; and

Whereas if said gravel bar is removed from the said outlet of Kootenai Lake the water in said lake and river will not rise to a height so as to cause said overflow; and

Whereas the said obstruction of said outlet of said Kootenai Lake and River is wholly within British Columbia, Dominion of Canada, and it is impossible for the State of Idaho to remove said obstruction from said outlet without cooperation of British Columbia; and

Whereas the Government of British Columbia has signified its intentions to assist the United States in removing said obstruction from the outlet of Kootenai River and Lake; and

Whereas the Government of British Columbia proposes to take charge of the removal of said obstruction, and has made a careful and accurate survey of the waters of Kootenai Lake and River, and said Government of British Columbia proposes to do said work, providing the Government of the United States will cooperate and appropriate their proportionate share of the cost of said work of reclamation; and

Whereas the Government of British Columbia, in the Dominion of Canada has already expended in British Columbia for surveys and preliminary work the sum of $60,000, the Government of the United States has expended in making surveys in the Kootenai Valley in Boundary County, Idaho, the sum of about $6,000; and

Whereas it will necessitate the further expenditure of the sum of $1,000,000 as the proportionate part of the total cost of such reclamation on the part of the United States Government; and

Whereas the Government of British Columbia proposes to expend the further sum of $1,000,000 or more as its proportionate part to complete said drainage project; and

Whereas it is desired by your memorialists that the Congress of the United States make the necessary appropriation to complete the proportionate part of the work to be done in British Columbia, Dominion of Canada, on such a drainage project on the part of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby petitioned to appoint a commission to confer with a like commission to be appointed by the Government of Canada, and the said joint commissions to formulate a treaty between the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada in regard to the proposed reclamation work to be done in British Columbia, and to make an appropriation of the amount necessary to complete its proportionate part of said drainage project and to instruct the Secretary of State of the United States to enter into all necessary contracts with the Government of British Columbia to complete such drainage project.

The secretary of state of the State of Idaho is hereby instructed to forward this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and copies thereof to the Secretary of State of the United States and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress immediately upon its passage.

This house joint memorial passed the house on the 17th day of February, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This house joint memorial passed the senate on the 25th day of February, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

This house joint memorial received by the governor on the 3d day of March, 1919, at 2 o'clock p. m., and approved on the 3d day of March, 1919.

D. W. DAVIS, *Governor.*

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial No. 10, by Kent, originated in the house of representatives during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

DAVID BURRELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. NUGENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of enrolled house joint memorial No. 18, which was filed in this office on the 14th day of March, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 28th day of April, A. D. 1919, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.] ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 18.

A joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass Senate bill 313.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the House of Representatives and Senate of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas the people of the State of Idaho have for many years in the past suffered under a most unjust and oppressive discrimination in transcontinental railroad freight rates because the transcontinental railroads have been permitted to charge or assess higher rates upon freight traffic originating in the eastern portion of the United States destined for Idaho than were charged or assessed upon freight traffic originating in the same territory and destined for the more distant cities on the Pacific coast, such as Portland, Oreg., and have also been permitted to charge higher freight rates upon freight traffic originating in the State of Idaho and consigned to the markets in the eastern cities of the United States than was charged on similar shipments from the more distant cities and localities on the Pacific coast; and

Whereas said discriminatory and preferential system of freight charging has been defended upon the theory that the same was forced and compelled because of the presence of water competition at Portland and other Pacific coast terminal points, and such defense has been found to be without merit; and

Whereas said system of charging higher freight rates for a hort haul than is charged for a longer haul can not be predicated upon any principle of just or fair dealing to the people of Idaho and this intermountain country; and

Whereas the effect of said higher charging for the short haul to and from said less-distant points has resulted in retarding the growth and development of Idaho's industrial and commercial prosperity and in restricting the State's growth, population, and wealth; and

Whereas the methods now provided by law for obtaining relief from such an unjust situation before the Interstate Commerce Commission are uncertain, exceedingly slow, expensive, and unsatisfactory; and

Whereas there is now pending in the United States Senate a bill designated Senate bill No. 313, introduced by Senator POINDEXTER, of the State of Washington, designed to prevent said discriminatory and preferential system of freight-rate charging with reference to long and short hauls, and designed to give some measure of relief to the intermountain country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, the Senate concurring, do earnestly request and recommend that the above-mentioned bill be taken up and voted on at the earliest possible date, to the end that said bill may as soon as possible become a law; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Idaho are requested to support said bill and work earnestly for its passage.

The secretary of state of the State of Idaho is hereby instructed to forward this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America and to send copies of the same to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

This house joint memorial passed the house on the 3d day of March, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This house joint memorial passed the senate on the 8th day of March, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

This house joint memorial received by the governor on the 8th day of March, 1919, at 5 o'clock p. m., and approved by him on the 14th day of March, 1919.

D. W. DAVIS, *Governor.*

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial No. 18 originated in the house of representatives during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

DAVID BURRELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. NUGENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house joint memorial No. 17, by committee on military and Indian affairs, which was filed in this office on the 6th day of March, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 7th day of March, A. D. 1919, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.] ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 17.

A joint memorial to the Congress of the United States protesting against the action of the Secretary of War in granting honorable discharges to conscientious objectors.

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas by a recent order of the Secretary of War conscientious objectors, general prisoners at the United States Disciplinary Barracks, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., who refused to wear the uniform of our country, have been honorably discharged from the service with full pay:

Now, therefore, we, your memorialists, do hereby protest, in the name of our loyal sons and in the name of thousands of loyal homes, against this discrimination by our Government against our heroic soldiery.

The issuance of new clothes and the payment of wages to conscientious objectors encourages disloyalty and dishonors patriotism. The action of the Secretary of War in paying the conscientious objectors, who have been snug and safe and well fed, a soldier's wage is an incentive to discontent and is a reflection on every man who wore the uniform. We resent such a policy, for it exalts slackerism and pacifism by making them both safe and profitable. Our soldiers and sailors risked all for the Nation and should be honored. Their wage, though small, should be a wage of honor. An honorable discharge from the United States Army will, under legislation pending both in State legislatures and in Congress, entitle its holder to preferred rights, which should under no circumstances be granted to those who evaded the duties of citizenship.

That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho is hereby instructed to forward this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, and that copies be sent to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

This house joint memorial passed the house on the 24th day of February, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This house joint memorial passed the senate on the 27th day of February, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

This house joint memorial received by the governor on the 5th day of March, 1919, at 4 o'clock p. m., and approved by him on the 6th day of March, 1919.

D. W. DAVIS, *Governor.*

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial No. 17 originated in the house of representatives during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

DAVID BURRELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. NUGENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of enrolled house joint memorial No. 13, which was filed in this office on the 24th day of February, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 28th day of April, A. D. 1919, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.] ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 13.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas the title to lands embraced in allotments to Indians on former Indian reservations in the State of Idaho, under the act of ——— ———, and agreements made with different Indian tribes pursuant to that act, is held in trust by the United States for a term of 25 years from the date of allotment; and

Whereas the State of Idaho, in harmony with the policy of the United States expressed in the Federal aid road act (act of July 11, 1916), has approved the construction of numerous highways of great public importance, appropriated large sums of money therefor, and entered into agreements with the Secretary of Agriculture for the building of said highways in accordance with the cooperative procedure prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture in that regard; and

Whereas such highways so agreed upon, authorized, and appropriated for, when located on most desirable routes and where construction can be most economically effected, will in various localities pass through and across said allotted lands for considerable distances; and

Whereas such highways when completed will confer great and lasting benefits upon the allotted lands through which they pass, and upon the allottees, the wards of the United States; and

Whereas the securing of necessary rights of way for such highways through and across said allotted lands is, because of the paramount title of the United States, exceedingly difficult by ordinary methods and seriously retards the prompt accomplishment of the purposes of said Federal aid road act; and

Whereas said allotted lands, so held in trust by the United States are not subject to taxation during the trust period, and therefore can not be made to contribute toward the construction of such highways in return for or recognition of the direct benefits derived from such construction:

Now, therefore, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, respectfully request and urgently recommend that the Congress take such action as may be deemed fit to cause highways contemplated by the provisions of the Federal aid road act, when such highways pass through and across Indian allotments the title to which is held in trust by the United States, to be built and constructed wholly at the expense of the United States and without charge against the State or other agency cooperating in the general construction of such highways.

This house joint memorial passed the house on the 17th day of February, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This house joint memorial passed the senate on the 18th day of February, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

This house joint memorial received by the governor on the 21st day of February, 1919, at 2 o'clock p. m., and approved by him on the 24th day of February, 1919.

D. W. DAVIS, *Governor.*

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial No. 13 originated in the house of representatives during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

DAVID BURRELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. NUGENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house joint memorial 16, by Carpenter, Hugo, Jones, Browning, and Givens, which was filed in this office on the 6th day of March, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 7th day of March, A. D. 1919, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.] ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 16.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas the course of the Clearwater River and its tributaries traveled by Lewis and Clark in their early explorations of the Pacific Northwest afford a logical water-grade route for a State highway across the north central portion of Idaho; and

Whereas the construction of a suitable wagon road on a water grade over which auto trucks and general travel can be operated up the main Clearwater River in Nez Perce, Clearwater, Lewis, and Idaho Counties, State of Idaho, beginning at the city of Lewiston and extending to the town of Kooskia, and thereby connecting with a proposed road beginning at the town of Kooskia and extending thence up the South Fork of the Clearwater River to the gold-mining districts of Elk City, Dixie, and Buffalo Hump, is a public and national necessity; and

Whereas a suitable wagon road on water grade up the Clearwater River and between the city of Lewiston and the town of Kooskia would be a great convenience to a large section of country devoted to agriculture, lumbering, and mining; and

Whereas such highway would serve the three national forests of Clearwater, Selway, and Nez Perce and render accessible productive but sparsely settled communities in the vicinity thereof; and

Whereas where said route has been designated by the State Highway Commission of the State of Idaho for the location of a State highway, to be known as the Lewis and Clark State highway; and

Whereas such a highway is a necessary link in a thoroughfare extending from Missoula, Mont., to the Pacific coast, on which construction work is now under way at various points; and

Whereas such highway would serve the Nez Perce Indian Reservation and nontaxable lands included therein and now held in trust for the Indians by the Federal Government; and

Whereas said proposed highway on water grade up the main branch of the Clearwater River between the city of Lewiston and the town of Kooskia would serve the towns and communities located around Lapwai, Arrow Junction, Myrtle, Lenore, Agatha, Peck, Ahsahka, and all country lying up the South, Middle, and North Forks of the Clearwater River, in which particular sections there are vast areas of most valuable timberland belonging to the State of Idaho and unpatented lands belonging to the Federal Government, comprising the largest compact body of white pine in the United States; the town of Orofino and all the country located around Weippe, Pierce City, Greer, Pardee, Woodland, Kamiah, and Kooskia, all known to be agricultural, timber, and mining sections, and with transportation yielding a large output of all of these commodities and would furnish added means of employment to our returning soldiers, sailors, and marines; and

Whereas the development of mining, lumbering, and agricultural pursuits along said main Clearwater River requires the construction of a standard highway, and the cost thereof, for the reason aforesaid, would be a heavy burden upon the taxpayers of the several highway districts and counties along said route without State and Federal assistance in the construction thereof; and

Whereas such a highway would not only be a great benefit in the opening up of the several districts mentioned, but would ultimately be extended and be another artery or highway extending into the heart of one of the largest sections of the country in the northern part of the State of Idaho, connecting with the north and south State highway, and would be of great benefit to the Government in its forest protection and operation, and would also open up vast timberlands and would be a great accommodation to thousands of citizens of Idaho along said route or adjacent thereto: Now, therefore, be it hereby

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, do recommend that $500,000 be appropriated by the Congress of the United States, to be expended through the Office of Public Roads, in cooperation with the State highway commission of the State of Idaho, toward the cost of construction of said Lewis and Clark State highway; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to each of the members of the congressional delegation from the State of Idaho to the Congress of the United States and to each body of said Congress.

This house joint memorial passed the house on the 21st day of February, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This house joint memorial passed the senate on the 1st day of March, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

This house joint memorial received by the governor on the 5th day of March, 1919, at 4 o'clock p. m., and approved by him on the 6th day of March, 1919.

D. W. DAVIS, *Governor.*

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial 16 originated in the house of representatives during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

DAVID BURRELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. NUGENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house joint memorial 12, by Mr. Jones, which was filed in this office on the 6th day of March, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 7th day of March, A. D. 1919, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.] ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 12.

To the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas the stock buyers and packers operating in the Pacific Northwest in their purchases from farmers and stockmen before the war made a distinction in the price of cow beef and steer beef from 75 cents to $1 on the hundred in favor of the latter and sold the same to the consuming public without distinction of price, and since the commencement of the war have paid to the producer a difference of $5 per hundred in the two classes of beef, but have continued to sell cow beef to the consumer at the price of steer beef; and

Whereas we condemn this form of profiteering among the many other forms practiced by the packers and stock buyers: Now, therefore,

Your memorialists respectfully petition that Congress authorize an investigation with a view to correcting this evil so that the producer may not be unjustly discriminated against, and that the consumer will not have to pay the top price for inferior grade.

The secretary of state is hereby instructed to forward copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and copies of the same to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

This house joint memorial passed the house on the 17th day of February, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This house joint memorial passed the senate on the 21st day of February, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

This house joint memorial received by the governor on the 5th day of March, 1919, at 4 o'clock p. m., and approved by him on the 6th day of March, 1919.

D. W. DAVIS, *Governor.*

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial No. 12 originated in the house of representatives during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

DAVID BURRELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. NUGENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of enrolled senate joint memorial No. 12, which was filed in this office on the 11th day of March, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 28th day of April, A. D. 1919, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.] ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 12.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United State of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas during the year 1910 N. B. Pettibone entered into a four-year contract with the Government of the United States for the carrying of the mails from Stites, Idaho, to Elk City, Idaho, a distance of approximately 60 miles; and

Whereas sometime after the entering into said contract the parcel-post system was established by the Government, thereby rendering the sending of packages by mail much cheaper than by freight or express for the distance involved; and

Whereas the mails were so increased by reason of the cheap parcel-post rate, the mines even sending out their ores and concentrates by mail and shipping in their supplies in the same way, thus compelling N. B. Pettibone to more than double his equipment and service in order to carry out his contract; and

Whereas in spite of this great financial burden forced upon him by circumstances over which he had no control, a burden so great that it entailed a loss of many thousands of dollars, N. B. Pettibone did not repudiate his contract with the Government, but faithfully carried it out, the Government reaping the benefit of his personal sacrifice:

Now, therefore, your memorialists urgently request that the Congress of the United States pass a relief bill for the benefit of N. B. Pettibone to the amount of the loss sustained by N. B. Pettibone in the carrying out of his contract with the Government.

That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho is hereby instructed to forward this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, and that copies be sent to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

This joint memorial passed the senate on the 3d day of March, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

This joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 5th day of March, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within joint memorial No. 12 originated in the senate during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

PAUL DAVIS,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. NUGENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house joint memorial No. 7, by Givens and Featherstone, which was filed in this office on the 1st day of March, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 4th day of March, A. D. 1919, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.] ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 7.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas postwar and reconstruction conditions have brought these United States of America many problems of great import, and perhaps one of the greatest importance is the question of Government control or ownership of the railways of the United States; and

Whereas our President has turned to Congress for counsel on this momentous subject, admitting his inability to solve the problem; and

Whereas the management of the railroads by the Government under the present arrangement has not been productive of efficient service to the public, and would not be satisfactory in times of peace, and a continuation of the present course would create and continue unsatisfactory economic conditions throughout the United States; and

Whereas we feel that the Congress of the United States will, by being informed by public sentiment, be better able to solve and direct the course of the problem, and recognizing the necessity of relinquishing control of the railroads as quickly as possible, and the certainty of conditions that said release of the railroads by the Federal Government would immediately establish: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, That we favor the return of the railroads to their owners as immediately as it can be accomplished without confusion or losses; be it further

Resolved, That we believe and think private ownership, under strong Government control and regulation, in service, income, and disbursements is desirable, and we do not believe Federal Government ownership of railroads is for the better interests of the people at this time; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho forward properly authenticated copies of this resolution to each United States Senator and Member of Congress for their consideration, and a copy to the chief clerks of the house of representatives and the senate of each State.

This house joint memorial passed the house on the 17th day of February, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This house joint memorial passed the senate on the 24th day of February, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

This house joint memorial received by the governor on the 28th day of February, 1919, at 10 o'clock a. m., and approved on the 28th day of February, 1919.

D. W. DAVIS, *Governor.*

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial No. 7 originated in the house of representatives during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

DAVID BURRELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. NUGENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO.
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house joint memorial 6, by Patterson and Weeks, which was filed in this office on the 18th day of February, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 26th day of February, A. D. 1919, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.] ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 6.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the House of Representatives and Senate of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas the area within the county of Valley, State of Idaho, commonly known as the Thunder Mountain country, consisting of approximately 1,120,000 acres of unreserved and unappropriated public land, of which not to exceed 1 per cent is agricultural in character, the balance being rich in natural resources, consisting of extensive bodies of commercial timber, ore deposits, water-power possibilities, wild game, and grasses and other forage suited to the growing of live stock; and

Whereas nearly 350,000 acres of this area have been swept by forest fires during the past 14 years, destroying approximately 700,000,000 feet of timber; the mineral and water power possibilities of the region are lying dormant and unproductive through lack of transportation facilities and means of communication; the wild life is being exterminated; grazing lands devastated by nomadic herds to the detriment of the property owners and residents of this State, and the area is contributing little or nothing to the support of the county or State government or to the wealth of the surrounding communities; and

Whereas the inclusion of the said area within a national forest would eliminate the annual destruction of timber by forest fire; make it possible for homestead settlers to secure title to their lands under the forest homestead act of June 11, 1906, without expense to them other than entry and final proof fees and without the necessity of awaiting public wagon roads, trails, bridges, and telephone lines; give adequate system of regulated range use, thus conserving and perpetuating the forage resources for the benefit of the local residents and taxpayers; make it possible for the State to realize upon its equity in the lands by relinquishing the unsurveyed school lands (sections 16 and 36) and selecting more valuable lands elsewhere; increase the revenues of the county and State through the receipt of 35 per cent of the gross receipts collected by the Forest Service; enlarge the power of the State to share in the benefits of the Federal aid road act, and otherwise assist in opening to development and use the vast natural resources of the Thunder Mountain region: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, earnestly request and recommend that action be initiated by your honorable body to create a national forest from the following-described area within the county of Valley, State of Idaho, commonly known as the Thunder Mountain region: Beginning at a point where the Middle Fork of the Salmon River crosses the south line of section 29, T. 14 N., R. 10 E., base meridian, unsurveyed, and extending thence west to the southeast corner of section 28, T. 14 N., R. 8 E., base meridian, unsurveyed; thence south 1 mile; thence west on the third standard parallel north, unsurveyed, to the southeast corner of section 33, T. 14 N., R. 7 E., base meridian, unsurveyed; thence north to the township line between Ts. 18 and 19 N.; thence west 3 miles; thence north 6 miles; thence west 3 miles; thence north 12 miles to the fifth standard parallel north; thence east on said parallel to the Middle Fork of Salmon River; thence up the Middle Fork of Salmon River to the place of beginning.

The secretary of state of the State of Idaho is hereby instructed to forward a copy of this memorial to each of the members of the congressional delegation from the State of Idaho to the Congress of the United States.

This house joint memorial passed the house on the 8th day of February, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This house joint memorial passed the senate on the 14th day of February, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

This house joint memorial received by the governor on the 18th day of February, 1919, at 10 o'clock a. m. and approved by him on the 18th day of February, 1919.

D. W. DAVIS, *Governor.*

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial 6 originated in the house of representatives during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

DAVID BURRELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a petition of the Phillips County Teachers' Association, of Arkansas, and a petition of the Commercial Club of Marianna, Ark., praying for the establishment of a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House concurrent resolution 11.

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to cooperate with the Dominion of Canada in the enlarged canalization of the St. Lawrence River for the passage of ocean going vessels into the Great Lakes, thus connecting the heart of the continent with both the coastwise and foreign commerce of the high seas.

Whereas the public's right to have the waterways so improved and so used as to return the fullest benefit to the people, in the reduction of distribution costs, is a natural right that should be developed by the improvement of the waterways systems so far as such improvement is economically wise;

Whereas the connection of the Great Lakes with tide water so as to admit the passage of ocean going vessels to the heart of the continent enabling the empire of the Central West to reach the markets of the world without breaking bulk would in the opinion of this body be of inestimable value and economic importance;

Whereas the extent to which the Great Lakes region and those rich vast sections are to serve the world in ores, grain, butter, meats, live stock and manufactures, depends upon reaching the markets of the world at a minimum cost and her ability to load her products at ports on the Great Lakes and send them to every market of the world without breaking bulk;

Whereas in view of the serious experiences of our country with congestion of traffic upon our railroads and at Atlantic seaports during the stress of war, and now under the strain of peace, any movement to bring the "Atlantic to the heart of the continent" becomes a matter of vital economic importance;

Whereas the Government of Canada has now under construction, and well along toward completion, a ship canal extending from Port Colburn on Lake Erie, a distance of 25 miles, to Port Weller on Lake Ontario, with locks of sufficient capacity to accommodate ships of 30 feet draft, 800 feet in length, and 80 feet wide;

Whereas work on this canal, which was suspended during the war has now been resumed, and will be carried on to completion as rapidly as possible;

Whereas the remaining link in the chain to be completed necessary to admit ocean-going vessels to the ports of the Great Lakes is the enlarged canalization of the St. Lawrence River from Montreal west; and

Whereas the improvement of the St. Lawrence River, as aforesaid, can only be done through cooperation with the Dominion of Canada: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan (the Senate concurring), That we earnestly and urgently petition the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be deemed best and most expeditious looking to the early enlarged canalization of the St. Lawrence River by joint arrangement with the Dominion of Canada, so as to admit the passage of ocean going vessels, thus connecting the Great Lakes with tidewater via the St. Lawrence River and Welland Canal, now being completed by the Government of Canada.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House concurrent resolution 14.

Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation preventing the return to the United States of any German or Austrian who has been engaged in opposition to the United States or its Allies; and that all alien enemies interned in this country be deported and forever debarred from returning.

Whereas many thousands of Germans and Austrians formerly living in the United States, some of whom had already become citizens of this country, returned to Germany and Austria to fight with the armies of those countries against the allied forces, and against the principles and ideals for which our Government stands;

Whereas it is reported, and it is the common belief, that many of these same Germans and Austrians are already planning to return to this country, now that they can no longer fight in those foreign lands in opposition to this Government and its institutions; and

Whereas we believe it to be a gross injustice to our own loyal citizens, and a most serious menace to society, to permit the unrestricted return of men who are alien in thought, in word, and in deed to every good thing for which our Government stands: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby earnestly requested promptly to enact legislation which will effectually prevent the return to the United States, for any purpose whatever, of any German reservist or any other person who has been in any manner engaged in opposition to the United States or to any of its Allies; and be it further

Resolved, That we hereby request also the enactment of legislation providing that all alien enemies interned in this country for pernicious activity against the United States shall, as soon as possible, be deported and forever debarred from returning to this country.

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted to the Senate and to the House of Representatives of the United States and to the Michigan Members of Congress.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House concurrent resolution 16.

Concurrent resolution respectfully urging the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the payment of each discharged soldier, sailor, and marine of a bonus in addition to his regular pay and allowance.

Whereas the soldiers, sailors, and marines now in the service of the United States are being demobilized in large numbers, and large numbers of them are and will be temporarily out of employment, owing to the readjustment of industrial conditions: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to pass, with all possible speed, legislation providing for the payment of each discharged soldier, sailor, and marine now in the service of the Nation of a bonus in addition to his regular pay and allowances; and be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions be transmitted to the respective clerks of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States Congress and also to each of the Members of the Michigan delegation therein.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House concurrent resolution 17.

Concurrent resolution calling upon the Senators and Representatives of the State of Michigan in the Congress of the United States to favor an appropriation sufficiently large to secure the early eradication of the European corn borer in the State of Massachusetts.

Whereas a destructive insect known as the European corn borer has appeared in eastern Massachusetts, where it is confined to an area of some 340 square miles;

Whereas this insect, which is not known to exist in any other section of the United States, attacks not only the corn crop but oats, potatoes, beets, beans, tomatoes, and nearly all of the vegetables, and which, if allowed to spread to the potato, corn, bean, and beet fields of Michigan and other Western States, will cause incalculable damage, there being no effectual way of protecting the same; and

Whereas a commission selected by the Massachusetts State Board of Agriculture has reported that the sum of $500,000 will be required to exterminate this pest, which amount has been approved by the American Plant Pest Committee and by the national conventions of entomologists and of the State commissioners and secretaries of agriculture: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That we respectfully request and urge the Members of Congress from Michigan to favor an appropriation of $500,000, as called for by Senate bill No. 5290, to be used for the purpose of exterminating this insect before it has time to spread from its present limits; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate and the clerk of the house are hereby instructed to transmit to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress a copy of this resolution.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House concurrent resolution 19, memoralizing the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the United States Railroad Administration relative to the matter of freight rates on materials for public works.

Whereas many public improvements for which there is an imperative need have been postponed on account of the existence of a state of war between the United States of America and the Imperial German Government, and in order that the energies of the people might be directed unreservedly toward the winning of the war;

Whereas one of the greatest problems confronting the State and Nation at the present time is the furnishing of immediate employment to a large amount of idle labor released from other activities by the victorious termination of the war;

Whereas the national administration has urgently requested the resumption of the construction of public works on a large scale, the Congress of the United States is proposing to appropriate large sums of money for such purpose, the governors of many States have recommended and are engaged in procuring other large appropriations for the same purpose, and minor political subdivisions are preparing to liberally finance public improvements of great magnitude;

Whereas in the judgment of the Legislature of the State of Michigan the problem of furnishing immediate and profitable employment to idle labor can best be solved by immediately embarking upon the construction of the many much-needed public improvements which have been delayed by war conditions;

Whereas in the judgment of the Legislature of the State of Michigan freight rates on materials designated for use in constructing public works should be immediately reduced, and any increase in the same will defeat its own purposes by forcing a curtailment of shipments, and at the same time, by discouraging the movement for a program of public improvements, render futile all efforts to give employment to idle labor; and

Whereas one of the greatest and most serious obstacles to the immediate resumption of activity in the construction of public work is the present high freight rates on materials, and, more especially, certain proposed revisions and readjustments of such freight rates, which proposed revisions and readjustments create a situation of uncertainty, making it impossible for engineers to intelligently estimate the cost of public works, and making it impossible for contractors to bid thereon: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the United States Railroad Administration be, and they are hereby, memorialized, and respectfully but most urgently requested to take such action as will immediately and effectively prevent any upward revision in the freight rates upon materials entering into the construction of public works; and

Resolved, That if in the judgment of the proper authorities of the National Government charged with the administration of such matters the employment of idle labor in the construction of public improvements is a matter of importance, and if in the judgment of such officials it be not incompatible with the general welfare, there be forthwith made a reduction in the freight rates upon all materials transported over the railroads of the United States for use in connection with the construction of any public improvement carried forward by the Federal Government or any department thereof, or any State, county, township, city, village, school district, or other political subdivision; and

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forthwith forwarded to the President of the United States, the presiding officers, and Members from Michigan of both branches of the Congress of the United States, and the Director General of Railroads.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House concurrent resolution 21.

Concurrent resolution indorsing the McKellar-Keating civil-service retirement bill in the Federal Congress.

Whereas a bill known as the "McKellar-Keating civil-service retirement bill" was pending in Congress at the time of the adjournment of the sixty-fifth session;

Whereas had such bill become a law the United States Government could, in the interest of humanity, provide a retirement system for its faithful employees who have grown feeble from age in the public service;

Whereas we believe that such relief should be afforded those upon whom the weight of a lifetime of arduous service has materially impaired their further usefulness in the public service; and

Whereas the said bill will be reintroduced in the Sixty-sixth Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That we heartily indorse the above-named bill, or one drawn along similar lines, making adequate provisions for the retirement of civil-service employees of the Federal Government; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States Senators and Representatives from Michigan in the Sixty-sixth Congress be, and are hereby, respectfully requested to give such measure their hearty support; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from this State.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of Springwells Lodge, No. 1620, Loyal Order of Moose, of Detroit, Mich., praying for an increase in the salaries of letter carriers, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Illinois, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. NEWBERRY. I present a petition signed by Charles W. Ryan, mayor, and a large number of citizens of Battle Creek, Mich., requesting that the American soldiers in northern Russia be immediately returned to the United States. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COLT presented a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Rhode Island Congregational Conference at Providence, R. I., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the enforcement of the constitutional amendment for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Salem, Cambridge, South Braintree, and Fitchburg, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the self-determination of Ireland, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Pittsfield, Springfield, Mattapan, Milton, Acushnet, Bedford, Greenfield, Buckland, Fall River, Cambridge, and South Yarmouth, all in the State of Massachusetts, and of the New England Labor Conference, praying for the ratification of the league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of sundry citizens of Jamestown, N. Y., praying for the repeal of the so-called luxury tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McLEAN presented petitions of Bridgewater Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of New Milford; Ministers' Alliance of Hartford; Brooks Club of Trinity Church, of New Haven; the First Universalist Church of New Haven; East Hampton Grange, of East Hampton; St. Paul's Rectory, of Willimantic; St. John's Protestant Episcopal Church, of New Haven; congregation of St. John's Church, of Pine Meadow; Bakersville Methodist Episcopal Church, of Bakersville; Mansfield Grange, No. 64, of Storrs; of the Lithuanian Society of Naugatuck; St. Paul's Episcopal Church, of Southington, St. Thomas Parish, of Bethel; congregation of Trinity Episcopal Church, of Collinsville; Higganum Grange, No. 124, Patrons of Husbandry, of Higganum; East Hartford Grange, No. 37, of East Hartford; of Washington Council, No. 7, Order of United American Mechanics, of New Haven; Woman's Club of Windsor; the Civic Federation of New Haven; St. Andrew's Episcopal Society of Thompsonville; Federation of Churches of Middletown; Local Union No. 79, of New Haven; board of directors of the West Haven Chamber of Commerce, of West Haven; Methodist Episcopal Church of Woodbury; council of the Connecticut Federation of Churches, of Middletown; of the Congregational Church of North Woodbury; and of the New Haven Association of Kindergartners, of New Haven, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the ratification of the league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POSTAGE RATES ON NEWSPAPERS.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I have here a copy of resolutions which were adopted by the Publishers' Association of New York City, representing the daily newspapers of New York and Brooklyn. They are very brief, and I ask that they be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions adopted by the Publishers' Association of New York City, representing the daily newspapers of New York and Brooklyn, Wednesday, May 21, 1919.

Resolved, That Congress be urged to repeal the act of October 3, 1917, fixing postage rates on newspapers and other publications. It was advanced as a war measure. The urgency of any revenue-producing measure at the time the bill was considered prevented its careful consideration. Haste was requisite, and in consequence the law is faulty, burdensome, discriminating, and against public welfare.

The act is an injustice to publishers. It is not intelligently framed and does not serve the purpose of the Government or of the people. It is particularly a hardship upon the newspaper industry. The rates and regulations imposed are a burden to newspaper publishers and harass them in the conduct of their business. Many long-standing rules, trade customs, traditions, and precedents of the newspaper business are overridden and opposed by the law. The provision taxing advertising has resulted in what has long been regarded as editorial matter being labeled advertising and taxed. The enforcement of the law has embarrassed the relations between publishers and readers, and constant annoyance has been caused by the decisions of the Post Office Department in this and other respects.

The zoning provision of the law as framed has hampered and embarrassed newspapers in the dissemination of news, the distribution of which should be facilitated in every particular as a matter of public education and welfare. Newspapers published in the larger cities, with their facilities for gathering and printing the news, can adequately meet the demand of the public for important information of the events of the day. The provisions of the law restrict the distribution of daily newspapers of large circulation and shut off from millions of people the news of important events of the world.

The American Expeditionary Forces abroad, under the ruling of the Post Office Department, are placed in the eighth postal zone. As a result newspapers sent to our soldiers in foreign service carry the heaviest postage that can be imposed under the law. Newspapers thus distributed are sent out without profit, and the rate of postage on such newspapers should be at the minimum figure. Publishers make special arrangements for wrapping and dispatching newspapers to soldiers of the American Expeditionary Forces and are glad to do so as an act of patriotism, but the law has imposed a penalty upon publishers, forcing them to pay extra postage on news of home events sent to United States soldiers and sailors.

Resolved, That Congress be asked to appoint a committee to investigate rates, the transportation and distribution of second-class mail matter, the actual cost of the second-class mail service and the proportion which should be charged to newspaper distribution and to transportation, the inefficient space system now in vogue in the Railway Mail Service, the irregularity and late running of newspaper mail trains.

The present system of transportation and distribution is inadequate for the requirements of the newspaper business. It imposes burdens upon publishers and subscribers and involves unnecessary delay in the distribution of newspapers throughout the country. The physical conditions of the Post Office Department prevent prompt and efficient distribution and delivery, the systems prevailing for many years still being in operation, with few and in many cases no improvements.

The late running of mail trains results in dealers not receiving their bundles of newspapers in time for delivery, and as a consequence publishers are forced to allow heavy credits to out-of-town newsdealers for unsold copies because of loss of sales. Subscriptions are discontinued for the same cause. The Publishers' Association suggest a plan similar to parcel-post insurance to protect publishers against this unwarranted loss for which they are not responsible. Newspapers have become

indispensable to the community, and the present inefficiency of the Railway Mail Service in the delivery of newspapers should and can be improved. The use of mail bags for outside mail delivery to newsdealers is suggested. This would save large credits now allowed by publishers to newsdealers for newspapers damaged in transit on postal cars, due frequently to the necessity of hasty work on the part of mail clerks and often to carelessness.

Resolved, That Congress be requested to make a particular investigation of the conditions in the New York territory, where, more than elsewhere in the United States, conditions are greatly congested because of the enormous circulation of New York newspapers and the inadequate machinery provided at railway terminals. The distribution from New York is around but little more than half a circle, owing to the situation of New York on the Atlantic Ocean, being confined to the northeast, north, northwest, west, and southwest.

Resolved, That Congress be asked, after the investigation requested in these resolutions, to enact legislation providing for the postal requirements of newspapers, which have far outgrown the transportation and distributing facilities now provided under the law.

VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURAL SCHOOL.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I present a letter from the president of the board of education of Floyd County, Ga., discussing and making valuable suggestions with reference to the application of our educational training in America to the rural schools. I think the letter will be very useful, and I ask that it be printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection it is so ordered.

INTERVIEW BY HENDRIK CHRISTIAN ANDERSEN.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I present, and ask to have printed in the RECORD without reading, a news dispatch from the New York World of March 17, 1919, with reference to a visit by the President to the Vatican and an interview by Hendrik Christian Andersen following that visit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[New York World, Monday, Mar. 17, 1919. By Beatrice Baskerville, staff correspondent of the World. Copyright, 1919, by Press Publishing Co. Special cable dispatch to the World.]

ROME, *March 16, 1919.*

What passed between the Pope and President Wilson when he was received at the Vatican has been the subject of much speculation. Hendrik Christian Andersen, the famous American sculptor, to-day told me of the impression President Wilson made on the Pope as described by his holiness.

"I was surprised by President Wilson's keen interest in his league of nations," said the Pope to Mr. Andersen. "He was so simple and frank that I liked him immediately. I must say that when I first heard talk about the league of nations I did not feel enthusiastic, but President Wilson put the matter so clearly that my doubts began to melt, and before our interview closed I agreed with him on the main lines of his plan. The President struck me as being far more interested in his league of nations than in fixing the frontiers of the newly created States. He could talk of nothing else and converted me to his ideals."

Mr. Andersen conceived the idea more than 20 years ago of an international city as the nucleus of a league of nations and of world peace. Now he has every detail of the city's plans perfected, even to the heating and lighting. President Wilson, Col. House, and Premier Lloyd-George have expressed great interest in Mr. Andersen's international city, which he proposes should be erected in Belgium. The Pope was anxious to see Mr. Andersen, to whom he presented a gold medal after two and a half hours' talk. The Pope then said:

"This plan of yours interests me more because of my meeting with President Wilson."

CONDITIONS IN PANAMA.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, at the last session of Congress I had printed in the RECORD, through the then Senator from Kansas, Mr. Thompson, a letter from Brig. Gen. R. M. Blatchford, stationed on the Canal Zone, relating to alleged immoral conditions in the city of Panama. This drew from the President of the Republic of Panama a reply directed to former Senator Thompson in relation to the matter, which, in the spirit of justice for which this body stands, and to promote amity, which it is desirable to cultivate with the Republic of Panama, I think should also be inserted in the RECORD. I offer it for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The communication referred to is as follows:

REPUBLICA DE PANAMA,
PRESIDENCIA,
Panama, April 2, 1919.

Senator WILLIAM HOWARD THOMPSON,
Washington, D. C.

MR. SENATOR: The publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of a letter addressed to you by the commanding general of the Canal Zone, Brig. Gen. R. M. Blatchford, and of a statement by Maj. Wells, Judge Advocate General, about alleged immoral conditions in the Canal Zone and in the cities of Panama and Colon has been received by all residents, native and foreign alike in this Republic, as the most unfair insult that this country could possibly receive from any source.

The indignation caused by such action is not principally due to Gen. Blatchford's comments on the morality of the people of Panama, since his remarks on the subject have already merited the protest of the leading bodies, political, social, and commercial, of the places affected, but because those remarks aggravated by Maj. Wells's report have been published at your request in the official organ of the Congress of the United States, placing them on record, and thus giving them a world-wide notoriety. Such action on your part simply means the most humiliating disregard for the position that Panama, although a very small nation, indeed, has assumed as a friend and ally of the United States, placing at that nation's disposition her territory, together with all her resources. The war has taught that nations need not be large nor powerful from the military point of view in order to be treated with the courtesies prevalent in international relations.

However high might be the position in the Government of the United States of Gen. Blatchford and Maj. Wells, their opinion as to the morals of the whole people of my country should have been received with the reserve demanded by the gravity of the imputations. It is, you will admit, no small talk to say that from an investigation made along the main thoroughfare of the capital city of the Republic of Panama only three women declined offers to sell their bodies, one of whom only did so on account of her husband being at home, thus reducing the number of honest women on that street to two. That statement is so stupendous that it can only be taken as another proof of the ignorance of Americans in general with reference to everything related to conditions in Latin America, and to the prejudices of certain high-seated officials whose positions should render them more diplomatic and discreet.

The main street of Panama in the section mentioned by Maj. Wells's report is lined by some of the best buildings in the city, occupied both for residential and commercial purposes. Among the people who occupy those houses are many of the best families of Panama and many foreigners of good standing. That section of the city can not be differentiated from any other main thoroughfare of any large city in the world, and being an artery of traffic in the day and a boulevard in the afternoon and evenings, naturally women of doubtful character frequent it just as they do the fashionable watering places, and the hotels, avenues, and boulevards of the great cities of America and Europe.

To judge by the presence of such women, who keep an orderly conduct, that 98 per cent of the women living along Central Avenue are prostitutes is a very uncalled for insult and shows lack of judgment in those who make such a statement.

Gen. Blatchford is perfectly right in his efforts to surround his soldiers with the most pure environments, but it must be borne in mind that Panama and Colon are two cities where travelers from all parts of the world arrive daily, and that the cosmopolitan population of those cities can not be kept within the bounds and regulations of an army camp. The native residents of these two cities never knew before 1903 what the use of drugs meant, and even with the deplorable sanitary conditions of the time, syphilis was not included in the epidemics that periodically visited them.

I wish to believe that it has only been your zeal for the welfare of the Army of your country that made you accept with such easiness the information that the portion of that Army stationed in the Canal Zone is living in an atmosphere of vice of the lowest sort, produced mainly by the women of Panama and Colon who are 98 per cent prostitutes. That is the only excuse that can be found for your readiness in putting on record communications that are a mark of infamy against a country where vice is found in common with the virtues that characterizes humanity all over the world.

If your motives have not been of an inexplicable hatred against Panama—and I can not possibly believe that this is the case—I am sure that a sentiment of chivalry and generosity will force you to request the Senate that, as a reparation, this letter to you be also placed on record, or that at least some mention should be made of my country's protest against the infamy so lavishly thrown on her.

My action in addressing myself to you is more than justified, and I am confident that my words will merit your impartial consideration.

BELISARIO PORRAS.

JAPANESE CLAIMS IN CHINA, ETC.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD, without reading, certain dispatches which I have received from Chinese students, from certain Italian societies, and from some of our Jewish citizens in regard to massacres in Poland.

There being no objection, the dispatches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *May 18, 1919.*

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE,
Washington, D. C.:

We humbly request that you will use your good offices in the next opening of Congress to urge the United States Government to demand a reconsideration of the Chinese and Japanese claims to the territories of Tsingtau and Kiaochow and the acquisition of valuable privileges in the Province of Shantung. The unjust settlement of the claims to said territories and privileges in favor of Japan by the peace conference was not only a wrongful but also an outrageous act as well. It will tend to cause unending unrest and dissatisfaction in the Far East, which will eventually disturb the peace of all nations. We deeply regret that America was one of those countries who passed such a judgment on China. America has always taken the stand as champion of and guardian of the integrity of China, and has always been China's right-hand friend. Will America, after enjoying for so many years the faithful trust and confidence of the Chinese people, relinquish her hold on the Chinese hearts and repudiate her traditional stand by joining hands with other nations to make presents of Chinese territories? We did not go to war against Germany's militarism in order to help establish Japanese militarism, but to make the world safe for democracy. Will America, the champion of liberty, then, give her sanction to the aggressive wishes of Japan? We humbly ask that you will voice our sentiments before the coming Congress and use your good offices to help us out in this struggle.

SACRAMENTO CHINESE STUDENTS' ASSOCIATION,
By WILLIAM H. FONG, *President.*

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *May 20, 1919.*

Senator HENRY C. LODGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Fifty thousand sons of Italy, residents of Pennsylvania, always faithful to their adopted country, ask the American Senate to recommend the peace conference to recognize Italian Adriatic claims, won with half a million lives given on the battle field for the great cause of justice and freedom. All Italians of America look to the American Congress for justice to their former country.

JOSEPH A. DI SILVESTRO,
Grand Venerable,
Seventh and Christian Streets.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *May 21, 1919.*

Senator HENRY C. LODGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The blood of a million Italians fallen on the battle field for the cause of freedom and justice demands that the peace conference would recognize Italy's Adriatic claims. Will not American countries support a valiant, faithful ally?

ETTORE MARTINI,
President Italia Irredenta,
925 Pine Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

ANN ARBOR, MICH., *May 21, 1919.*

MEMBERS OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We, the undersigned citizens of China, hereby protest against the contemplated disposal of Kiaochow and the rights thereof as expressed in section 5 of the treaty of peace just presented to Germany as a step that commits an outrage against the sovereignty of China and which strikes a vital blow against the interests and national rights of 400,000,000 people. We most earnestly appeal for your concerted opposition to the project in the name of international justice and for the everlasting friendship of our country and the United States.

CHINESE CITIZENS' ALLIANCE OF MICHIGAN AND
CHINESE STUDENTS' CLUB OF UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

BURLINGTON, VT., *May 21, 1919.*

HENRY CABOT LODGE,
Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D. C.

In the name of God, and for the sake of humanity, we beseech you, Mr. LODGE, to say a word of protest that may stop the murderous and savage atrocities of the Polish, Slovaks, and Roumanians against the Jewish people in their land. Will America meet the Governments of these nations on equal basis of fellowship without a word of justice against their—Polish, Slovaks, Roumanians—aiding, permitting, and instigating organized robbery and murder of the Jews?

BETHEL LODGE, K. OF P.,
HENRY BURMAN,
G. GAFINOWITZ, and
F. BAYARSKY,
Committee.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *May 19, 1919.*

Senator LODGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Pursuant to an unanimous resolution passed at a conference of 175 organizations representing 200,000 Jews of Philadelphia, held at the Continental Hotel on Sunday evening, May 18, we appeal to the American Congress upon the beginning of its important labors to protest against the massacres of great numbers of Jews in over 100 cities and villages in Poland. Every day brings harrowing news of fresh massacres. The very existence of the entire Jewish population is threatened. We appeal to the American Congress to voice its protest with the existing Polish Government and the peace conference, so that these outrages cease now and be prevented in the future.

PHILADELPHIA CONFERENCE FOR THE
DEFENSE OF JEWS IN POLAND.
M. KASS, *Chairman.*

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, in connection with the request made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I ask to have printed in the RECORD an interview with Viscount Ishii, the ambassador of Japan to the United States, as published in the Christian Science Monitor on the same subject.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAPAN'S ATTITUDE IN CHINA DEFENDED—VISCOUNT ISHII IN INTERVIEW DECLARES ACTION OF THE PEACE CONFERENCE ACCORDS WITH THE RIGHTS EXISTING BY TREATY.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Viscount Kikujiro Ishii, Japanese ambassador to the United States, capped the flow of opinions and sentiment recently expressed by Baron Goto and other prominent Japanese here and elsewhere in this country by explaining in an interview yesterday why, from the Japanese standpoint, the peace conference had sustained their position, and announcing that Japan is in accord with the United States with regard to the policy of the open door and equal opportunity in China and in Siberia also.

"I am an optimist about the relations between Japan and the United States, whatever may be the tone of the press, because there is no real conflict of interest," said Viscount Ishii. "The only important question now is with regard to China, especially in regard to the so-called Shantung question. The best way to treat this question is to expose before the American public the true facts of the case, as the facts explain themselves.

"In 1898 China granted to Germany a 99-year leasehold of Kiaochow, in the Province of Shantung. The lease included the Bay of Kiaochow and its surrounding district, together with mining concessions along the Tsing-tau-Tsinan Railway, which railway also was granted to Germany. Thus Germany acquired from China two kinds of concessions: First, the territorial leasehold; and, second, some concessions of an economic character.

"After Japan had driven the Germans from the Shantung Peninsula following a two months' siege, Japan took the initiative and offered to surrender to China the German leasehold upon the transfer to Japan, by right of conquest, of the said leased territory, being consented to by Germany in the peace conference. Japan's voluntary offer to restore it to China was, of course, of the greatest advantage to China, as China was entirely powerless to recover by her own means her territorial sovereignty in Shantung for 75 years more.

"The treaty of 1915 placed China in a position to recover this important advantage without sacrificing either blood or treasure. Therefore the treaty of 1915 was not an unfair transaction, but was exceptionally advantageous from China's point of view. So far as the territorial integrity of China is concerned, it is for these reasons entirely in favor of China.

"There remains the second kind of concession—the economic concession, which Japan was to retain in her hands, as in the days of German occupation. Here again Japan's good will toward China went so far as to offer to withdraw her civil and military administration from the railway zone by withdrawing troops and police forces and making the Shantung-Tsinan Railway a joint enterprise of Japan and China, instead of an absolutely foreign administration, as it was under the German occupation.

"That was the purport of the accord of September, 1918. Thus China acquired by the treaty of 1915 the recovery of her entire participation in the administration of the former German railway from Kiaochow to Tsinan.

"When Japan took possession of Kiaochow by force of arms in 1914, China remained neutral. Japan's action in Shantung even met with protest from China Since November, 1914, Japan has occupied Kiaochow and the railway zone from the port to Tsinan, the capital of the Province, by right of conquest. Three years afterwards, that is, in 1917, China declared war against Germany. But the declaration of war could not possibly change the state of things which had existed since 1914. Therefore the Chinese argument that China's declaration of war against Germany had, ipso facto, annulled the leasehold treaty of 1898 had no legal ground, in view of the fact that Japan had three years before China's declaration of war replaced Germany in Shantung. These are the plain facts, and I leave it to the American public to judge from these facts whether there was the least trace of unfairness on Japan's part in this perhaps overgenerous transaction with China.

"With the principle of the open door and equal opportunity, not only in China but in Siberia also, Japan is in hearty accord with the United States, and with the sincere and hearty cooperation of these two powers I can see no possible cause of conflict between them in the affairs of the Orient.

"Many Americans who have been in Korea have testified to the success of the Japanese administration in that country. Of course, in these days of the so-called self-determination of peoples there are some Koreans who aspire to independence. Japan is prepared to continue the good-hearted and benevolent administration in Korea, and with the development of the Koreans they will freely participate in the administration of their own country."

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, in reference to the telegrams presented by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], as I understand, they are telegrams which are signed by foreigners.

Mr. LODGE. Not at all. They are all from citizens of this country——

Mr. JONES of Washington. Are they all from citizens of this country?

Mr. LODGE. They are, with the exception of the Chinese students.

Mr. JONES of Washington. We have a rule that—

No petition or memorial or other paper signed by citizens or subjects of a foreign power shall be received, unless the same be transmitted to the Senate by the President.

I think that that rule ought to be enforced.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was about to call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to that rule, but he supposed the Senator knew of it, and was only presenting the memorials of citizens of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. The rule, of course, applies to the two telegrams from Chinese students in this country; they are not citizens of the United States; but it does not apply to our Italian or Jewish fellow citizens. Those telegrams are from citizens of the country. Of course, the telegrams from Ann Arbor from the Chinese students who are gathered there is obnoxious to the rule, if it is desired to enforce it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the rule would also apply to the printing in the RECORD of the interview with the ambassador from Japan, I think, which was presented by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK].

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; I think not. The rule is against the introduction of a petition from an alien, but I only asked for the publication of a newspaper interview with the ambassador from Japan, resident in the United States, relative to a matter in Japan.

ADDRESS OF JUDGE VON VALKENBERG.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD an address of Judge Arba S. Van Valkenberg, judge of the United States court for the western district of Missouri, in which he discusses the constitutionality of the league of nations.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Address of Judge Arba S. Van Valkenberg, judge of the United States court for the western district of Missouri, delivered before the Kansas City Bar Association on May 17, 1919.

"I am impelled to enter upon this discussion of the cardinal and controlling features of this proposed constitution for a so-called league of nations by what I deem to be the imperative duty of American citizenship that when grave and fundamental changes in our organic law and radical departures from established and accepted policies and traditions of our Government are not only in contemplation but in imminent process of consummation no man should remain passive. No question more fateful, no matter more pregnant with grave consequences for our future has ever been presented for the consideration and determination of the people of this Republic. In such crises we must think for ourselves. We must summon to our aid all

the powers of analysis and discrimination of which we are capable. We may not, if we are sincere in our love of country, if we are devoted to the blessings of liberty, if we are loyal to the sacrifices of the past and mindful of the welfare of the future, yield blind acquiescence to the opinion and judgment of others. No man now living has disclosed such prescience, such prophetic vision, and such infallible judgment that we may rely implicitly upon his decision without the exercise of our own God-given faculties in a matter which concerns us more vitally than anything in this life. Undoubtedly we should not disregard advice and information proffered, but we ourselves must apply the acid test for soundness and accuracy.

"Near the close of the eighteenth century our fathers emerged from the travail of revolution against the unwarranted exercise of arbitrary power. We established upon this continent a Government of free and independent States, absolved from all allegiance to and all political connection with any other government upon the face of the globe. In due time we adopted a Constitution whereby we established a Republic, in which the Government is vested in the people through representatives chosen by them. This was no blind experiment. It was an expression of the mature judgment and experience of the founders of this Nation, experienced in the ills of autocracy as they existed then and now and the opposite and equally objectionable extreme of mass rule undisciplined and unrestrained by legal sanctions and limitations; men imbued with an ardent love of individual freedom, of life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness. And so we imported into our institutions as part of our patrimony religious liberty, freedom of speech, right of petition, right to bear arms, privileges and safeguards of liberty, wrested in past centuries by the English people from unwilling monarchs. We crystallized these blessings in our organic law, and we provided that these fundamental things could not be changed, except under such formalities and restrictions as should preclude hasty and ill-considered judgment.

"In that organic law or Constitution we declared that—

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

"And in furtherance thereof we provided that—

"All legislative powers shall be vested in a Congress, consisting of a Senate and House of Representatives.

"The executive power shall be vested in a President.

"The judicial power shall be vested in a Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish.

"These three departments of government were made distinct and supreme in their several spheres of action.

"We ordained that the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts, and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

"To regulate commerce with foreign nations.

"To establish an uniform rule of naturalization.

"To declare war.

"To raise and support armies.

"To provide and maintain a Navy.

"To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

"To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested in the Government of the United States.

"These powers are exclusive.

"The Executive shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

"It will not be denied that this Constitution was made exclusively for the government of this Republic; that no other people or peoples have either express or implied authority to change or abrogate it, nor to participate in its interpretation or application; nor have the people of the United States themselves, nor any officer thereof, except in the manner prescribed by its terms.

"The first administration of this Government under this organic law was intrusted to the man who has well been called the Father of his Country, because to him, more than to any other man, was due the final establishment of our liberties. He, more than any other, knew from experience and an almost divine inspiration the spirit and scope of our institutions and the need of this infant among the nations of the world. To him fell the duty of interpretation, guidance, and counsel, and under him and through him sprang up sound policies and traditions which have been accepted, treasured, and honored until this hour. If to any man, not of divine origin, may be attributed the gift of prophecy and of inspiration more than human that man is George Washington. We should never cease to return thanks for the care and watchfulness that he has exercised over this Nation, even in the spirit. His portrait should be hung in every American home as a reminder of the principles upon which this Government is founded and the duty of all who would protect their birthright. In his farewell, delivered at a time when he could possibly, as he says, have no personal motive to bias his counsel, he admonished us to support with strict loyalty the form of government created by the Constitution; to correct imperfections, if any, by amendment in the way designated therein; to permit no change by usurpation, although conceived to be the instrument of good, because such is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed, and the precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield. He further counseled us against the insidious wiles of foreign influence; that we should have with foreign nations as little political connection as possible; that we should fulfill with good faith engagements already formed, but should not extend them; that taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

"Under the beneficent guidance of this inspired wisdom this Nation has been governed for more than a century; through it and by it has risen to a plane of unexampled and acknowledged prosperity, power, and happiness. The ocean is not now so wide, our isolation is not so pronounced, the complexities of human life and interests are greater. But the underlying principles of this address, in so far as their application is possible, are as commanding and immutable as on the day when they were declared.

"A few years later, in fact nearly a century ago, there came into being a declaration of national policy, upon which this people have ever since insisted with unyielding tenacity, through all vicissitudes, under all circumstances, and in all negotiations and covenants with foreign Governments. I refer to the Monroe doctrine, first enunciated by President Monroe, December 2, 1823. He said:

"The occasion has been deemed proper for asserting, as a principle in which rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power. * * * We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintain it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

"This policy, obviously adopted to protect us from foreign encroachment, the possibilities and imminence of invasion, the necessity for greater vigilance, and the establishment and maintenance of burdensome armaments and instrumentalities of war, has appealed so strongly to our sense of national security that no administration and no party till now has been inclined to minimize its importance, nor depart from it in letter or in spirit.

"Laying aside for the moment for future consideration the question of the treaty-making power so to do, I think this proposition will go undisputed and unchallenged, that we should not depart from any of these established and approved constitutional guaranties and traditional policies without the strongest reason; that we should abandon no national safeguard except under stress of dire necessity and the practical certainty of compensating benefit. I have purposely stated this proposition so broadly that I believe none who has the true interests of his country at heart can fail to accede to the statement. But we are about to surrender certain constitutional rights, and we are about to depart from cardinal traditional policies. The former I shall presently demonstrate, and the latter is substantially admitted.

"In his Metropolitan Opera House address of March 4 Mr. Taft said:

"Objection is made that the covenant of the league is a departure from the traditional policy of the United States following the advice of Washington in avoiding entangling alliances with European nations. The European war into which we were drawn demonstrates that the policy is no longer possible for the United States.

"Again, in speaking of the Monroe doctrine, he says:

"Objection is made that the covenant destroys the Monroe doctrine. * * * All will probably agree that the sum and substance of the Monroe doctrine is that we do not propose, in our own interest, to allow European nations or Asiatic nations to acquire, beyond what they now have, through war or purchase or intrigue, territory, political power, or strategical opportunity from the countries of this hemisphere.

Article 10 of the constitution of the league is intended to secure this to all signatory nations, except that it does not forbid purchase of territory or power.

"The ex-President makes a very good and comprehensive statement of the practical intendment of the Monroe doctrine, and he admits that the constitution of the league does not safeguard it in a very important particular. He does not add, what is patent upon the face of his own statement, that it does not protect from the acquisition of territory by foreign nations through intrigue, political power, and strategical opportunity. This statement was made preceding the address of President Wilson from the same platform. These and other statements of Mr. Taft received, presumably and actually, the favor and approval of the President. So that we may take these quotations as official utterances of the league sponsors. Other advocates and apologists have treated the Monroe doctrine as a scrap of paper, worthy only of consignment to the international wastebasket. Their utterances may not be accorded the same official significance, but all have the same practical effect. That the doctrine was marked for slaughter at the peace table is further evidenced by dispatches of March 28 that an amendment, inspired by American criticism, and offered to preserve our Monroe doctrine, in substance, if not in name, was not accepted, and that its future incorporation into the league constitution was improbable. Even Mr. Taft, in his practical abandonment of the doctrine, did suggest that he would favor its recognition by specific words in the covenant. If the Monroe doctrine, in its integrity, has been preserved in this proposed instrument, such action will be obviously due to the criticism which the proposal and its advocates have either invited or provoked and the conviction that has resulted therefrom.

"As I have said, our traditional policies, which have made and preserved us a Nation of commanding prosperity and power, should not be surrendered except for compelling, substantial, and unassailable reasons. The same is true of our constitutional guaranties and the power confided to the legislative department of this Government. This further, however, must be said of constitutional provisions: We may legally, even though unwisely, depart from or modify our political policies. We can not, except in the forms prescribed, take liberties with the Constitution. Not only would such action be unwise in principle and unsound in law, but it would be, in effect, an abandonment of the Constitution itself. Washington warned us steadily to discountenance irregular oppositions to its acknowledged authority and to resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretexts. He said:

"One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the Constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system and thus to undermine what can not be directly overthrown.

"He said further:

"But let there be no change by usurpation, for though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

"One of the greatest dangers that can attend us is lightly to set aside a fixed provision of the Constitution at the suggestion of possible, or even probable, temporary advantage. It furnishes a plausible precedent and is the initial step toward a mental attitude which can result only in the ultimate repudiation and destruction of our entire political system.

"I take it that this much will be conceded: If the present plan, or any plan that may be advanced, contains features that are vitally and fatally defective, such features should be entirely removed or rendered harmless by modification and amendment; that if such features are not indispensable to the plan they should under no circumstances be retained; and that if the system can not exist without them, then the system itself must be abandoned, because no plan which offers only a doubtful, visionary, and, at best, meager and partial remedy for existing evils, if otherwise vicious and menacing, should not be allowed to stand.

"Practically all who have given this covenant thought and analysis, and who have approached the subject with a mind open to calm and dispassionate consideration, have agreed that substantial amendment is necessary. It was presented to us practically as an immaculate conception, and the great mass of its advocates have so treated it. I shall attempt merely an informal discussion, touching only upon such matters as seem to me to be determinative of a logical and patriotic attitude toward the entire subject matter. That anyone should approach such a subject in the spirit of dogmatism and intolerance seems inconceivable; and yet such has been the temper of the champions of this league. My own attitude is one of dual constraint. I am deeply sensible of the respect to be accorded to the views of men of undoubted ability and purity of motive, and I am reluctant to advance suggestions which may run counter to the yearnings and aspirations of humanity. Nevertheless he who would subordinate his convictions to such considerations brings nothing of value to the council. The question is in no sense one of political parties. As a distinguished speaker in this city recently said: 'The man who has no argument in favor of this league except that he is a Democrat, and the man who has no argument against it except that he is a Republican, is on the verge of mental bankruptcy.' So, also, the man who places sentiment above reason, and who reaches a conclusion solely upon the judgment of another but poorly discharges the obligations of citizenship.

"First, I wish to dispose of the argument—if it can be called an argument—advanced, perhaps, more than any other by league enthusiasts, namely, that no critic of the league has offered a single constructive suggestion to meet the situation. Mr. Taft states this as a poser. Coming from a lawyer, the suggestion is amusing. Disregarding the burden imposed upon the proponent of a system almost revolutionary in its nature, Mr. Taft would seem to undertake to establish his own title merely by the alleged weakness of his opponent. Of course, I take it, all will agree that the league must stand or fall by the soundness or unsoundness of its own provisions; whether it can accomplish, or is adapted to the accomplishment of, the only object which excuses its existence, and that is the prevention of war without disproportionate sacrifice to its component parts. It is not enough that the whole world hates war, as such, and longs to banish it. For that reason we should not take up with any nostrum or defective formula that may be urged as a remedy. The question is not whether anyone else has found a remedy. The burning query is whether the proponents of the league have found one. A moment's reflection exposes the absurdity of this type of argument.

"But I have no purpose to content myself with a negative position. The crisis to be met, as stated by Mr. Taft and others, is the unsettled conditions resulting from the late war, the establishment and maintenance of new nations carved out of old ones, the threat of Bolshevism and kindred evils, all endangering the present peace of the world and threatening to produce a recurrence of the contest unless some machinery may be invented by which Europe may be steadied and the peace agreed upon in the peace treaty shall be secured. I make no claim to inventive genius nor to extraordinary vision in matters of this nature, but it requires no unusual talent to discover in the situation as it exists and has existed since our entrance into the war that we have now, ready-made to our hand and already in operation, all the machinery we need to deal with the problems presented and to safeguard the present peace of the world quite as well as the proposed league, or any league, of nations could do it. We have already an association of the nations that won this war. That association is as close, as confidential, and as effectual as it could well be. Throughout the war we have persistently referred to England, France, Italy, and so forth, as allies, and to ourselves as an associate. No doubt this was done out of deference to the time-honored suggestion of Washington against alliances, which is now marked for the wastebasket. It matters not, however, by what name the relationship is called. The United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan, among the major powers, are and have been associated, allied, and leagued together to put down our enemies and win this war, and our job is not yet finished and will not be until we have settled terms of peace acceptable to us, deserved by the Central Powers, necessarily acceptable to others incidentally affected, and until we have taken such measures as will insure that those terms of peace will be carried out and duly observed. I am not one who believes that our mission was ended practically when the armistice was signed, and that the only action remaining to us is the repatriation of our troops, the demobilization of our forces, leaving to Europe the settlement of all matters incidental to the establishment of peace. This was our war. We were in it as a primary party. We were fighting for ourselves, not merely to help somebody else. Whatever sentimental reasons may have been assigned to appeal more strongly to the conscience and to the immagination, no matter that we may have welcomed the opportunity to relieve distress and advantage mankind as an incident to the struggle, the fact remains that we entered the war because Germany had invaded our rights and threatened our future safety, and that we would not have entered it otherwise. The preamble to the joint resolution of Congress begins thus: 'Whereas the Imperial German Government has committed repeated acts of war against the Government and the people of the United States of America.' That is the official statement of the grounds upon which we entered the contest. Furthermore, we had been awakened to the fact that the European conflict, as it then existed, was but the first step on the

part of Germany to break through all initial resistance to her program, and ultimately, in defiance to the Monroe doctrine, to colonize South America at will and otherwise to encroach upon our sovereignty and imperil our safety as a nation. We fought in belated self-defense; all other considerations were but corollary to this. Now that the battle has been won, or, at least, was won when the armistice was signed, it remains to reap the fruits of victory, not in the way of aggrandizement in territory and in money, but in compensation for wrongs done and injuries inflicted and in the establishment of safeguards against further unpleasant experiences from the same source. As a first consideration, at the earliest opportunity, we should have made peace, and now, at the earliest opportunity, we should make peace, the terms of which should fix the price which Germany and her allies should pay for the havoc she and they have wrought. The penalty imposed should be so great not only that it will be compensatory to the nations that have suffered, but also that it may operate, and will operate, as a deterrent to all the world against entering upon future like enterprises. So far as we are able to judge from present advices, the terms submitted to Germany and the obligations thereby imposed should accomplish this result.

"The peace treaty is the final judgment, and the armies of the victors are the forces by which that judgment may be rendered tangible and real; so, I say, we have an organization already in existence and in operation. I care not whether it be called an association, an alliance, or a league; but whatever it is, it is tangible, real, and effective. It is builded upon no unsubstantial foundation. It is not a creature of theory or imagination. It has a duty to perform, and it has not discharged its functions until its objects are attained. It violates no constitutional prohibition and no traditional policy of this Government. It falls squarely within the admonitions and directions of Washington when he said:

"Let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than to private affairs that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them.

"Taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

"But this requires no league of nations, no permanent alliance. No league of nations could accomplish more than the league which already exists, and if it should accomplish less it would fall that much short of equal efficacy. But they say, What guaranty have we in this against future wars? More certainty than can be secured from the proposed plan, with none of its compromising features. We have the same mutual interests and the same moral obligations. The proposed league, as we shall presently see, is, in substance, founded only upon such. We shall have demonstrated to the world that no longer may any nation or combination of nations enter upon a war of world conquest and aggression and escape without paying the hard penalty of such infamy. Therein lies the surest guaranty of future good conduct.

"Again, the President is quoted as having said that if Germany had known or believed that England would have entered the war, the war would not have taken place. Assuming this to be true, what more does it prove than that Germany, well knowing England to be a member of the Entente, to be vitally affected by disaster to the other members, and to be bound also by moral obligations to them and to Belgium, still did not believe that England would consult her own welfare and respect her solemn engagements. Is the league which we are now offered more binding and more effective? Has it behind it more physical power, with its contemplated restrictions and reductions, than the Entente had under the then existing system?

"But still further, the President might have added that if Germany had known or believed that the United States would ultimately have entered this conflict, then certainly she would have paused before entering the war. Germany knew that unless we were totally without intelligence we would know, or would speedily ascertain, that our most vital interests, if not our very existence, were threatened in the last analysis. But Germany knew us as a supposedly pacifist Nation, one that would purchase peace at any price, even at dishonor; that we had no Military Establishment worthy of the name; she thought we would not fight under any possible circumstances; and that we could not fight effectively, even if we would. The whole world knows that this country, unless it is invited again to lapse into fatty degeneracy, is keenly alive to its material interests; that it will fight if those interests are threatened or invaded; that it can fight most effectively, because it has the man power and the courage and is richest in resources of all the nations in the world. It knows that it is our traditional policy to stand aloof from all entangling alliances, to embarrass ourselves and our initiative by no association that will abridge our independence of action and commit us, perhaps, to policies in conflict with our ideals; that if a situation arises which threatens its own stability, because it threatens the world's stability generally, this country will be free to and will align itself upon the side of right, justice, and humanity. Thus a new safeguard of peace has arisen upon the ruins caused by this war, and in my opinion no greater bulwark than this can be erected.

"Inasmuch as it is freely conceded that the proposed league constitution will not prevent war, but at most is hoped only to retard and obstruct it, the foregoing considerations certainly afford a remedy quite as constructive in this feature as the plan we are asked to adopt. But Mr. Taft says this is the doctrine of despair, and leads necessarily to the conclusion that our only recourse to avoid war is competitive armament. We are thus charged with being apostles of pessimism as opposed to oracles of optimism. To recognize an acknowledged fact, to admit the inevitable consequences of the operation of natural law, to govern one's self by the teachings of the unvarying experience of mankind in all ages, involves no element of despair. It is but the practice of a rational philosophy of life. We know that we must die; life is sweet, but death is certain. We do not contemplate death with sensations of despair, and this independently of our future hope. But if we are wise we do take all known physical precaution against death. We prepare for it; we put our houses in order and we insure our families against some measure of its bitterness. In our present attitude we are the true exponents of intelligent confidence. We have confidence in this American Nation. If ours be the doctrine of despair, so, undeniably, the league constitution is a declaration of distrust. We do not trust others; we say so by this instrument. We say to the other nations of the world we doubt your motives; we doubt your sincerity; we question your constancy; we distrust your morality and your honesty; your word is not as good as your bond, and so we want your signature to this scrap of paper, that we may have future written evidence of your probable infidelity. No doubt, in the light of past experience, our misconfidence is well placed. Then, does prudence counsel that we should relax our vigilance? Abolish our constabulary, and our faith in humankind would receive the rudest shock and the severest test to which it could be subjected. We should have a veritable orgy of lawlessness and crime, and this though the disbandment should be preceded by universal individual disarmament. For armament is only a relative thing. It may, as in Germany's case, be a symptom; but it is not the disease itself. The malady, if one is present, lies in human perversity, in the undisciplined passions and unbridled ambitions of men. While these remain untamed and unsubdued we shall have battles in this world, whether they be fought with arrows and spears and catapults and war canoes and flame, or with cannon and bombs and airplanes and submarines and poison gas. We had conquest and devastation, enslavement, and slaughter, unparalleled in proportion to numbers engaged, ages before modern devices and instrumentalities of war were even dreamed of. Civilization has been saved by power coupled with purpose, wielded by the most enlightened nations of the globe. If we are still living in a world of barbarians and beasts, let us keep the rifle hanging on the antlers above the fireplace. Unless we can trust the world, let the guardians of peace retain the weapons which alone can insure their supremacy.

"I am aware that these suggestions run counter to a view that has become well nigh a settled conviction in the minds of many people. Nevertheless I state them confidently and emphatically, although they are not essential to the solution of the problem we are discussing. We have accepted as true the proposition that armaments—armies, fleets, and their appurtenances—are provocative of war, and for this reason, chiefly, the necessity for disarmament has been taken for granted as the first and most effective step in the establishment of permanent peace. No doubt this idea was born of supposed conditions existing prior to 1914. We know now that our knowledge and theories respecting that situation were inaccurate and fallacious. We placed all European nations upon the same plane. We ascribed to them the same motives and the same political ambitions. We saw, or thought we saw, that all were supporting top-heavy and burdensome military establishments solely out of national pride and ulterior design; that all alike cherished dreams of imperialism and conquest and were itching to put their untried equipment to the test. So, when the war broke out, we who entertained these conventional notions indulged in much learned speculation as to which had the most of right or the least of wrong on its side and deplored the readiness of kings—all kings being equally disreputable—to

plunge their devoted subjects into the cataclysm of war, all for their own glory and through pride of armament. And so we said again, as many well-meaning people had said all along, that armaments were to blame for the whole wretched business and must be abolished, and straightway certain estimable gentlemen began to invent panaceas and devise remedies and have talked of little else ever since.

"But we soon learned, as we know now, that among these nations Germany had long been nursing her scheme of pan-Germanism and world conquest—that she had formed alliances and made combinations, financial, industrial, and political, for that purpose. We know now that France was compelled to such preparedness as she had by a knowledge of the danger that would ultimately threaten her. We know that Italy, both from her unnatural entanglement in the triple alliance and from distrust of Austria, maintained a military establishment less for aggression than for protection. We find that Great Britain, contrary to accepted belief, was practically unarmed, except for the navy, which she had been compelled to maintain because of her insular existence, the limited area of the kingdom in proportion to population, and the remoteness of her possessions and her sources of supply. We found the Russian military power was a hollow shell, as Germany well knew. We ourselves, with the exception of a navy, admirable in personnel but insufficient in units and equipment, had nothing. It took England practically a year to put an effective force in the field. Even the armament of Belgium, certainly not established for purposes of aggression, proved an indispensable blessing in that it almost certainly enabled France to hold the central powers until England could prepare. Without the protecting dike erected by our European allies we ourselves would have fallen an easy victim to the tidal wave of German invasion both on sea and on land. It required 16 months of protected preparation on our part to get to the beginning of substantial effectiveness. This brief rehearsal of what all men know illustrates the vital distinction between the proper and improper uses of armaments. Not all the allied preparation, such as it was, was sufficient to deter the central empires from launching their war of aggression. All of it put together, increased by what could hastily be supplied through tremendous and greatly enhanced and extravagant expenditure, was scarce enough to withstand the onslaught. Had it been less, the invitation and temptation to attack would have been correspondingly greater. Had there been none at all, the conquest would have been easy. The lesson is that no nation which values its safety and its independence should ever permit its power of defense to fall below the demand of prudence, and that no nation can safely commit to others the determination of this vital question.

"But, of course, the ready rejoinder is that universal disarmament does away with the necessity for individual armament and that the league constitution contemplates that each government shall retain what military equipment and armament is fair and reasonable in proportion to the scale of forces laid down in the program of disarmament. As I said before, armament is only a relative thing, and any plan of disarmament which does not in fact disarm down to the point of negative effectiveness is a misnomer. The dominant nations have maintained themselves by the superiority of their equipment and resources. Disarm all alike, and they are weakened equally with those whom they fear; not only so, but the balance is shifted to the other side, because the physical power of more populous nations becomes increasingly threatening. I have said before that all the elements of aggression, conquest, slaughter, and devastation have been present in the past, before the advent of modern instruments of war. History may readily repeat itself, and we now have added reason to expect such a happening. All our preconceived notions respecting the progress of civilization, the influence of religion, and the growth of international intercourse and good will as guaranties against war were overturned and destroyed in the summer of 1914. None of us believed that wars of this nature could come again to the world, but they did come, with greater fury and greater savagery than ever known before. There is nothing in international psychology to promise better things for the future. We have had experience, it is true, but it is the experience that points to greater national vigilance and preparedness, rather than to a still blinder faith in the good intentions of mankind. I do not by any means counsel abandonment of striving for all that is best and noblest in human nature. I believe, however, in taking that human nature as we find it and adapting our needs in vital things to known conditions.

"Suppose we have a league of nations such as is contemplated, with disarmament which is disarmament in a concrete sense, and suppose we find growing up in future years—not at first, probably—such renewed ambitions, with their accompanying combinations and associations, as threaten the peace of the world? With the relative means then available it would be impossible to check the progress of the enterprise and ultimately to thwart it with the necessary speed and effectiveness. We have seen what time is necessary to supply the equipment for such purposes, what means of transportation, what ships of convoy are required, what a problem of supplies is presented before such world forces can be called into being and dispatched to their remote destination. Even a pastoral nation with natural weapons, if strong enough in man power, can overrun its neighbors and accomplish its designs. May Germany in ensuing years reorganize and control Russia, at least through mutual understanding, if not by force? May present elements of the former Central Powers lean toward such an association? May such a combined influence creep gradually and almost imperceptibly into and through parts of Asia, including Siberia and China? May intrigues and disaffection arise even in the ranks of the dominant nations of the present league plan? If so, what would be the relative man power and resources of such a combination, and what instrumentalities and facilities would be necessary to deal with such a situation? But it is said armament may be increased at any time. Yes; after once established, only by permission of the executive council, which may itself have become changed in sentiment and susceptible to like influences and intrigues as the years go by. Shall we feel safe if we have committed our unqualified guardianship to such a body, from which we can withdraw, if at all, only upon notice for a period within which our undoing may be made complete or by summary action tantamount to an act of war?

"But to what extent can practical disarmament be insured? As this war has demonstrated, future offensive and defensive equipment will not be confined to warships and high-power cannon. These, however, are essential, and they take a long time in manufacture, as recent experience has shown. A distinguished naval authority states:

> "During the next 30 years the use of chemicals and aircraft, not only separately but also jointly (especially jointly), is going to alter the whole face of war. They will alter also the matter of preparation for war, because preparation can be made with practical secrecy, since both are agencies of peace but can instantly be made into agencies of war.

"This is in part confirmed, if we can trust the news dispatches to any extent, by the expressed opinion of French aviation experts, who are agreed that it is impossible to prevent Germany or any other nation from building commercial airplanes in time of peace which can be used as bombing planes in case of war. The difference between a bombing plane and a commercial plane is so slight at the present time as to be practically negligible. Germany can be forbidden to manufacture bombs and explosives, say the experts, but she can hardly be forbidden to make airplanes. It is even doubtful, adds one French engineer, if such prohibition is desirable. The true means of avoiding danger is, therefore, said to be not forbidding the Germans to manufacture airplanes, but developing this industry to such an extent in France, England, and America that if the Germans should ever again be tempted to bomb French towns they would be deterred by fear of truly terrible reprisals. This is a very forceful statement of the value of effective preparation as a deterrent from war. But a deeper significance lies in the fact that if airplanes effective for war can be developed and manufactured without restriction—as, of course, they can and will be—then, even though the making of aerial bombs be prohibited, their necessary parts can be prepared for ready combination with comparative expedition when the time for their use arrives. And who can prevent invention and manufacture in the field of chemistry? We have already seen what destructive chemical agencies may be devised and how little men have scrupled to use them. Can we exercise such supervision over the world's laboratories as to render them appreciably harmless? Manifestly not. Maj. Reed Landis, a distinguished American ace, in a recent address before the Knife and Fork Club in this city, pointed out the future obvious importance of airplanes in world wars. Their present development justifies expectation that the Atlantic Ocean may now be crossed and recrossed without stopping; that high-power engines, already in process of manufacture, will enable increased tons of explosives to be carried by a single plane. Thus equipped, multitudes of planes, with almost unlimited radius of flight, would neutralize the effectiveness of fleets and jeopardize the convoy of troops by sea. Great Britain, appreciating the potentialities of the air service, has added a secretary of aviation to her cabinet. In the light of human ingenuity and of invention already existing and indicated for the future, what practical substance remains to our dream of disarmament?

"Article 8 provides that the members of the league shall interchange full and frank information as to the scale of their armaments, their military and naval programs, and the condition of such of their industries as are adaptable to warlike purposes. No provision is made for inspection. Reliance is placed upon the good faith of nations, which have so little respect for each other's moral responsibility that they insist upon this covenant for assumed mutual protection. No provision is made even for voluntary information from those outside the league. Obviously, effective supervision would be impracticable, even if possible. The army of inspectors necessary to uncover secret activities and hidden places of concealment would involve an expenditure in salaries and expenses alone more than sufficient to maintain any necessary scale of armament. Any attempt to demand or enforce such supervision would provoke resentment and hostility and could produce no dependable result, and without certainty we could not afford to relax our own attitude of preparation. It will not do to say that confidence must be reposed somewhere. By the very act of creating this league, with its provisions of disarmament, the nations have declared that they repose confidence nowhere.

"One of the tragic dangers of this proposed league is that it is calculated to lull us into the sense of false security; that by reliance upon the league for protection against war we may neglect to keep ourselves in a proper defensive posture. The great lesson of this war which we thought was learned, and which was learned until the advent of this league plan with its deceptive allurements, is that war can and will come even when thought impossible, and that this Nation never again should present such a spectacle of pitiful unpreparedness as it did in 1917. Up to six months ago all but a negligible few of our people proclaimed this obvious truth. Now, in this more plausible guise, we find the same old pacifist heresy, peace at any price, even with dishonor and national ruin, anything whatsoever so it be labeled peace—a doctrine which it was supposed the experience of this war had discredited for all time—we find this heresy, I say, creeping forth into the light again to threaten our future safety.

"In the nature of things, a war of great magnitude is not to be expected for a generation at least, league or no league. It would take that long to gather the strength and resources and to make the necessary alignments essential to such a struggle, just as William of Germany himself took about 30 years to make ready, all the time pointing to the long reign of peace as proof that he was at heart a peace-loving monarch. But in the end war will come. No one has the temerity to deny it. We may not then have a strong battle line of allies behind which to make our tardy preparation. It seems incredible, after the events of the past five years, that we should deliberately enter upon a policy of suicidal unconcern. But such is the policy to which this league invites us.

"The other members of the league are obviously placing little or no reliance upon its protection. That Britain will maintain her full naval establishment is universally accepted. Her standing army will be increased, it is said, approximately to 900,000 men. France retains her original military establishment with two army corps added, one for each of the recovered lost Provinces. Besides, France further discloses and emphasizes her distrust by seeking the creation of a buffer area between herself and Germany, and by demanding, and it would seem obtaining, guaranties from Britain and the United States of specific aid in case of invasion and attack from the north and east. Italy, confronted by the menace of the Jugo-Slavs, will increase rather than decrease her defensive posture, and has demanded and practically secured protective ports and territory on the eastern shore of the Adriatic. Japan is launching the greatest naval program in her history. War threatens or is in active operation in many fields, involving Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, the Ukraine, Roumania, Hungary, and others, not to speak of the eruptive condition throughout Germany and Russia as a whole. A high official of the Jugo-Slavs is reported to have declared recently that his country would fight Italy within 10 years unless all its demands were granted. Serbia announces that she did not enter the war to become the slave of greater powers, and if her rights are not fully recognized she will resist with arms. The old intolerable Balkan situation instead of being relieved is more threatening than ever before. According to Mr. Taft, we are attempting to hem in the Bolshevism of Russia and the revolutionary tendencies of Germany by newly created nations, most of which are at the point of starvation, all of which are reputed to be too weak to stand alone, and all of which cherish an undying hatred toward most, if not all, of their colleagues. Surely this is an inauspicious time to entertain thoughts of disarmament, but manifestly disarmament is not seriously considered outside of this country. It is a talking argument addressed to the imagination and the susceptibilities of philanthropy and humanitarianism.

"What is this league anyway? Examination discloses that it is not in reality a league at all, but, in effect, a proposed permanent alliance between the five major powers which won the war. Speaking for the present only, no serious objection could be made to such an association if temporary and confined only to the solution of present war problems, which I have shown already exist and are essential. This, however, is not the avowed object of the so-called league. But it is apparent from article 4 of the covenant, as now said to be amended, that the executive council, which is in reality the governing body of the league, shall consist of nine members irrespective of the number of States which may ultimately become members of the league, unless, by unanimous consent of the council and a majority of the body of delegates, the number of powers of each class represented in the council be increased; and of these nine, five, or a majority, shall always be representatives of the United States of America, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan. Even in the body of delegates, of course, the league will start off with a membership dominated by these five powers, and admission thereafter requires the assent of not less than two-thirds of the States already members. It has been pointed out that this country is in overwhelming minority in both council and body of delegates. It has but one vote in each. No amendment to this covenant can take effect until ratified by all the States whose representatives compose the executive council and in addition by a majority of the States whose representatives compose the body of delegates. So that one State represented in the council can block all amendment or change in this covenant. Before we rush into such an ironclad agreement we should at least pause and consider.

"A league which is not universal, or approximately so, in its application, which by its organic law, subject to amendment only by unanimous consent of the powers dominating it, retains control in five out of all the nations in the world, admits to membership only those whom it chooses, and then only by a two-thirds vote, is, as I say, not a league at all, but an alliance masquerading as a league, and by its terms not only an alliance but a permanent alliance. In addition to its autonomy within its own organization, it assumes in many particulars to exercise control and supervision over all nonmembers. Such an organization can exist ultimately, if at all, only by the maintenance and at times the exercise of superior physical power. It is not within the bounds of human nature that the rest of the world, when it has passed through its present stages of political sickness and succeeding convalescence, when the horror of the present situation has become dim, when it has been restored to comparative health and feels again the impulses of ambition, self-confidence, and self-respect, will submit tamely to the exercise of such a feudal condition. Mind you, I do not say this in condemnation of the present association for temporary purposes and to wind up the business in which it is now engaged. I am addressing myself solely to its character as a proposed permanent organization. If it were all embracing, when we consider the divergent interests involved, the races and nationalities incapable of assimilation and amalgamation of which it is composed, we could not hope for harmony and agreement for any extended period. Thereupon the very provisions of the covenant would provoke uneasiness, distrust, jealousies, intrigues, and secret understandings which must ultimately lead to secession, dissolution, and war. The widely differing peoples of this world with irreconcilable antagonism of race, religions, aspirations, and political conceptions, were never meant to dwell together practically as one family, and it is undesirable that they should. I for one desire no closer relationship with many of these peoples, and I am sure the people of this country do not. I want no united states of the world of which this Nation occupies the position of a mere subordinate State. We want no partnership with Bolshevists any more than with imperialists. Nothing but ill can result from such unnatural political marriages.

"But suppose a considerable and substantial part of the world shall not be invited to membership; we know that certain ones will not be for some time to come. Or suppose, although invited, they do not choose to join; then ultimately, if not at once, jealousy, distrust, and hostility will spring up between the members of the league and those on the outside. The latter will inevitably be drawn closer together through sympathy, environment, and common interests, developed and encouraged by calculation and design. We shall soon have two hostile camps; perhaps not at first with equal power and resources, but ultimately such a situation will be presented that a clash will be unavoidable. Suppose, further, that such local conditions, such special in-

terests, and such internal dissensions and estrangements, all probable rather than possible, should spring up between the league members themselves, and suppose secret understandings, arrangements, and agreements, whether in the form of prohibited treaties or not, shall be formed between some league member or members and those beyond its inclosure, what then would be the result should the league seek to enforce some of the irritating provisions of its assumed guardianship? Does it not appear, beyond cavil or dispute, that this entire arrangement is provocative of future discord rather than of permanent quietude and peace? Meantime the individual nation, such as the United States, instead of preserving that uncompromising and uncompromised position which leaves it a free moral agent to act according to the dictates of its own best judgment, unaffected by the distrust and hostility created, rather than dissipated, by the chafing and distasteful bonds of this union, must be drawn into the general maelstrom of conflict against its interests and contrary to its choice.

"Oh, it is said this is nothing more than an international partnership, and partnerships are familiar things in our everyday life. We are also familiar with the traditional partnership between the man with money and the man with experience. At its close the one who had the experience has the money and the one who had the money has the experience. What more attractive candidate for world partnership could be found than a great big, rich, unmilitary nation, with practically no experience in world politics? We are told that Europe is sitting on the verge of despair and hysteria, fearing lest the United States may break faith with her and disappoint her hopes and aspirations for the universal brotherhood of man. I apprehend Europe's emotions are of a far more practical and material kind. She wants our money, she wants our resources, and she wants our men to assist her in policing her own estate. I say this in no spirit of unfriendliness. Her attitude is entirely natural and reasonable from her standpoint. The only question is whether with no corresponding interests of our own to subserve we shall make the sacrifices, governmental and individual, that are demanded. Again, we are reminded that our attitude is a selfish one. This is a matter of definition. It would be selfish were we to withhold our wealth, our moral influence, and all other wholesome aid and good offices which are consistent with humane impulses and independence of thought and action; but does a true measure of generosity and good will demand that we should place an entire nation, its lifeblood, and its material resources at the disposal of those with whom we have no intimate relationship and no community of interests? That would be carrying philanthropy beyond the bounds of rational self-preservation.

"We are reminded that we have reached a point where we must assume our share of world responsibilities, and to that end that we must surrender some powers incidental to sovereignty. We do not object to the surrender of nominal powers of sovereignty. We are sticklers not for the letter but for the substance. Our criticisms are neither capricious nor technical. So long as no principle of independent government is involved, no restriction of absolute control over internal affairs, no abandonment of our organic law and of our traditional policies, evolved for the safety of our national existence, we shall not complain if we are asked to refrain from the exercise of various powers which otherwise might inhere in sovereignty. We have no disposition to shirk our world responsibilities. They are relatively no greater than they have always been. They do not demand that we should intermeddle in the affairs of others, nor permit others to intermeddle in affairs peculiar to ourselves, with the necessary result of creating, rather than abating, international friction and unrest. Again, we are told that we must choose between this league and war. Of course, this is a glaring misstatement of the issue, intended to appeal to emotion and sentiment and to befog and confuse the judgment. If the allied powers now impose and enforce the terms of peace demanded and expected, no world war threatens. There is ample time within which to make calm survey of the situation before hasty and ill-advised action is taken, after more stable conditions have been secured, and after the minds of men, now more or less affected by the hysteria of war, by the shock and revulsion of feeling produced by its horrors, shall have resumed their normal functions. In the very nature of things, from the standpoint of experience and reason, we shall be confronted by no war with which this league should be concerned, perhaps, for another generation, unless, indeed, civilization is compelled to fight for existence against the forces of Bolshevism, anarchy, and social chaos; and if this is, indeed, the issue, the sooner that conflict comes and is decided the better for the future of the world. We want no covenant with such elements nor with any nation dominated by them. If we fought to make the world safe for democracy, it was a democracy of sanity and morality. We did not fight merely to create new democracies that might embrace the tenets of social heresy, nor to permit ourselves to cooperate with or become subject to evils worse than the autocracy which we have overthrown. Virulent and destructive agencies such as these are not successfully combated by compromise, concession, recognition, or affiliation. The slightest indulgence is an advantage seized and held, and the propaganda, well defined and systematic, proceeds with augmented power and influence from the new coign of vantage. We can fight this monster which threatens to destroy and abolish all social order, the principles of religion, the sacredness of the marriage relation, rights of property, the very pillars upon which rests the structure of society, if we fight it localized, isolated, and concentrated as a distinct national entity. The task will be more difficult if by pacifism and indecision we allow it to invade our own body politic.

"This leads to another consideration. This device of a league of nations is based upon the assumption that the elimination of war will accomplish the practical banishment of evil from the world. But war, bad as it is, is not the worst thing with which we have to contend. It is, after all, but a manifestation and a symptom. Wars of aggression indicate national malevolence in the aggressor, and against such wars the face of civilization is set in fixed determintion; but war in itself is only the exercise of national force. When employed to compel obedience to just demands it is but the enforcement of police regulations on a large scale. At the beginning of this world conflict we often heard expressions like this: 'I do not see why they could not find some other way of settling their disputes.' But Germany did not wish to find another way, and France had no alternative. In such case, as in many cases that may arise, no other way will be found than a resort to force to prevent injustice and compel peace; and that ultimate resort is nothing less than war. Those who would have prevented the supply of munitions to the nations assailed by Germany's war machine might thereby have stopped the war, but the result would have been the triumph of Germany and wrong. Such a course would have put a premium upon war-like tendencies and unworthy ambitions. It was as right for the Allies to defend as it was wrong for Germany to attack. When all peaceful means have failed, when no alternative remains, wars must always come unless we counsel abject surrender to unscrupulous ambition coupled with superior power. We gained our independence through war. We banished the tyranny of Spain from this continent by war. History is filled with examples of peoples who have achieved liberty and thrown off the yoke of oppression through the righteous exercise of that force which we call war. No nation and no combination of nations should ever knowingly and willingly surrender their freedom of action when questions of this character come up for determination. War is always better than meek submission to intolerable and dishonorable conditions.

"But, in any view, this league of nations will not prevent war. That seems indisputable from considerations already presented. But we do not have to rely upon theory to sustain this proposition, because it is admitted. At his dinner to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate upon his return from Paris, the President is said to have stated with finality:

"1. The league of nations will not prevent war.

"2. The United States must surrender vital points of sovereignty.

"3. Ireland is to be left to the mercy of England.

"4. Chinese and Japanese exclusion go out of American control into the hands of the league council.

"5. The Monroe doctrine will be extended to the whole world.

"6. The present constitution is British made, the French, American, and Italian drafts having been rejected.

"7. American troops could be compelled at need to participate in purely European wars.

"8. The United States could withdraw from the league at any time.

"Those who attended the dinner are said to have agreed unanimously that the foregoing statements or admissions were made. The report was given nation-wide currency and provoked discussion. But one of the foregoing statements was denied, and that was the third, to wit: That Ireland would be left to the mercy of England. We may therefore accept the first statement as admitted beyond dispute. Other apologists for this covenant have made similar admissions. No one, to my knowledge, has contended to the contrary. If the contention has been made, it is of course unworthy of consideration. If, then, the league will not accomplish the only thing that justifies its existence, it seems hardly worth while, in view of its manifold objectionable features, to give it serious countenance. But its friends urge that it is hoped it will postpone and dis-

courage war, and is therefore worthy of trial. But so, we confidently assert, will the various considerations that I have already presented more effectively and with less provocation to a multitude, at least, of lesser wars in remote quarters of the globe where our interests do not lie. It would seem that the burden of suggesting some more constructive method rests upon Mr. Taft and his associates rather than upon those who criticize and oppose.

"I believe I have considered and answered all the arguments that are advanced in favor of this league. They are all of the same tenor. They admit imperfections, omissions, and ambiguities; they ask us to accept, before such are remedied, supplied, or classified, a solemn international covenant from which we can escape only by broken pledges involving charges of bad faith and national perfidy, and leading possibly to war itself—a covenant which can be subsequently amended practically only by unanimous consent. We are regaled with constant and conflicting apology, demurrer, disclaimer, and explanation which does not explain, by exhortation and appeal to the yearnings of humanity, from which they solicit blind acceptance without resource to reason or logic.

"Recurring again to this constitution, we find, as I have said, that it is a mere alliance between five controlling nations, and not a proper league at all; that it fixes no time limit for its existence, and is therefore on its face permanent. In the opinion of Mr. Taft, a period of about 10 years should have been fixed, but this has not been done; instead, his suggestion of permission to any member to withdraw by giving a reasonable notice of from one to two years has been accepted by providing a two years' notice. Until such two years shall have elapsed after notice given the member wishing to retire is bound by all the obligations of its covenant. During such two years it may be placed at a prohibitive disadvantage if its associates, or even outsiders, so elect. The very giving of the notice will tend to isolate it from the others and to make it an object of suspicion. As I have said, the terms of the covenant are admittedly vague and indefinite. This renders it susceptible to construction according to the varied interests of the several contracting parties, and is in itself a menace to continued good relations. Mr. Root, in his admirable analysis, draws the distinction between the treatment of questions of legal right and questions of political policy. The former may well be submitted to some international court or tribunal of equal dignity and power; the latter must be reserved to the individual nation and abandoned, if at all, only upon full satisfaction that a sufficiently affirmative reason exists for setting such policies aside. Under this constitution the executive council or body of delegates undertakes to bring about settlement upon terms of what they deem to be international expediency instead of terms of right. A concrete illustration of this may be seen in the matter of immigration. No country is so much interested in this subject as the United States. It is a matter vital to the integrity of the Nation in the administration of its internal affairs. It is a matter which we never intended to leave to foreign arbitrament. It is contended by the advocates of this amended covenant that it does not affect our internal affairs.

"Article 11 provides:

"Any war, or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the members of the league or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole league, and the league shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations. * * *

"It is declared and agreed to be the friendly right of each of the high contracting parties to draw the attention of the body of delegates or of the executive council to any circumstance affecting international intercourse which threatens to disturb international peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends.

"Article 15 declares that:

"If the dispute between the parties is claimed by one of them and is found by the council to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the council shall so report and shall make no recommendation as to its settlement.

"But the council is given the right to make this finding, and, in any event, it is further provided that:

"The members of the league reserve to themselves the right to take such action as they shall consider necessary for the maintenance of right and justice.

"This reserved right is supreme and unaffected by any failure of arbitration or conciliation, no matter what the nature of the controversy may be.

"These are very broad and comprehensive sections. They embrace practically every sort of disagreement or contention which could arise between nations. Article 17 relates to similar disputes between members and nonmembers of the league. Vague provisions are made for enforcement of settlement through league agencies, which may be construed to have greater or less efficacy and binding power, according to the interests involved. We are conscious that the matter of foreign immigration is one of the most vital questions affecting the welfare of this Nation, now more than ever before in its history. We have decided with finality that certain peoples shall be admitted, if at all, only under drastic restrictions and regulations. We reserve the sovereign right to control this purely political policy; nor does the difficulty lie with oriental races alone. We have lately been submerged by the refuse and offscourings of certain European nations. We find ourselves at this moment with a large alien population without eligibility to naturalization nor intending to seek naturalization, many of whom are in open defiance of our laws and system of government, and all of whom are a menace to our national safety. We have declared our intention to expel undesirables and to restrict future admission within our boundaries. This may be resented. It may readily be construed as action within the purview of the articles of this covenant. We can not trust to the unofficial opinion of the sponsors of this league. We want no uncertainty and no quibbling about the matter. If reference of such a question to league tribunals be insisted upon by other parties, those tribunals, in the interest of expediency, might take cognizance of them, and in the further interest of expediency might decide against us. Then nothing would remain to us but open resistance, with its accompanying threat of war or passive submission, which would involve the abandonment of vital national interests. This very question is not remote in our past experience nor absent in more recent discussion.

"Our national policy has ever been consistently in favor of a rational system of arbitration. This leads to a brief consideration of the true principle of any such system. Matters involving strictly legal rights under international law are the legitimate subjects of arbitration, and should, of course, be arbitrated in lieu of war. Matters of a purely political nature, involving the fundamental and inherent rights of national sovereignty, essential to its existence and safety as such, can never be subjects of arbitration nor of disposition by other powers, whether operating in combination or otherwise. To illustrate: Two nations have undoubted legal rights to certain territories, but the boundaries between such territories are not defined or are in dispute, much as in the case of boundaries between the lands of individuals in our own country. A survey must be made and the documentary evidences of title must be examined. Each nation claims only what legally belongs to it, but the facts may be obscure or the interpretation of some treaty or other muniment of title may be in dispute. A strictly legal question is presented. So also questions may arise respecting rights of fishing in waters adjacent to international boundaries, respecting trade and commerce, all commercial in their nature and involving international law only in its application to commercial law. When such disputes arise they are manifestly legal questions which are the legitimate subject of arbitration and which never justify a resort to arms in the first instance. I have not attempted by this statement to cover the entire field of matters within the cognizance of arbitration tribunals. I have pointed to obvious examples as distinctive of a class.

"On the other hand, questions of vital importance to national integrity, national safety, and internal government can never be subjects of arbitration—at least, as to final decision. I refer now to such purely political matters as the Monroe doctrine, immigration and naturalization, and provisions for the national defense and measures affecting the form of government. Here again I have confined myself to the suggestion of distinctive illustrations. We can not delegate to others the right, express or implied, to pass upon such matters so vital to our existence as an independent sovereign people. But this constitution, by its general terms, except where expressly modified, leaves all such matters to the consideration of the league as a political body, with provisions so vague and indefinite as to invite dispute and contention under the most favorable construction that can be placed upon them.

"Reference has already been made to the Monroe doctrine. In view of the reported later action in Paris it may, perhaps, be deemed academic and superfluous to consume time in further discussion upon this point. However, the importance of this question is so great, and the general misunderstanding regarding it so widespread, that the subject should not be dismissed without full appreciation of the tremendous significance to us of what is spoken of as a trivial and almost unimportant concession to league criticism, made not because it was necessary and reasonable, but in order to disarm opposition. The impression has been studiously created that the sole practical function of the Monroe doctrine is to prevent European powers from interfering with governments and nations already established in this hemisphere for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling their destiny in any other manner. It is generally

understood that the entire doctrine is summed up in our guardianship of these smaller nations solely to protect them from European encroachment. It is argued that article 10 of the constitution of the league undertakes 'to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all States members of the league,' and that this secures all the benefits of the Monroe doctrine and extends it to all the nations of the league. If, as is deceptively implied, the primary object of the Monroe doctrine is to guarantee the territorial integrity of these American States, the argument would have in it something of plausibility, although there is a wide distinction between the physical protection of the United States and a mere paper promise to respect on the part of the very powers against which the Monroe doctrine was raised in the first instance. But the fact is that this argument entirely misstates the fundamental principle of the Monroe doctrine, which is involved in the following language:

"We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those (European) powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

"Our peace and safety, mind you, not the safety of other States upon the American Continent. We undertook to protect and preserve the integrity of such States merely as an incident to our own peace and safety, and to that end we declare that not only shall European powers not secure further foothold upon this continent, but that we shall regard any attempt on their part so to do as an unfriendly act.

"We have no desire to assume gratuitous burdens of guardianship and protection over the sovereign States of the American Continent. In the absence of the danger that would otherwise confront us, we should be glad to leave them to the dictates of their own fancy with respect to submission to, or acquisition by, foreign powers if they did not wish us to intervene in their affairs. We have given sufficient proof to our own people, and to the world, in our policies announced at the close of the Spanish-American War and adhered to through decades that we have neither the desire nor the purpose ourselves to encroach upon the territory of any other nation nor to interfere in the administration of its internal affairs.

"But we knew that unless we were willing to interpose our power between these States and European aggression a pronouncement against the extension of the systems of Europe to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety would be an empty phrase; and so we undertook this responsibility, not as a primary object, but as a pure incident to the protection of our own national life. And this danger which we feared is not imaginary. It is real and substantial. There can be little doubt that insistence upon this doctrine has preserved South America from wholesale German colonization, if not from conquest and absorption. The reason for the Monroe doctrine is disclosed in the apprehension of France to-day over the settlement of boundaries between herself and Germany. She knows what it is to have but an imaginary line between herself and a powerful, hostile, and ambitious neighbor. The whole world has seen in the devastation of northern France the possibilities that exist for effective and destructive invasion when frontiers join, although protected with all the skill and all the extravagant outlay known to military science. Suppose Germany had been permitted to absorb or control Mexico or the States of Central America; suppose she had had well-established submarine bases even across the Carribean Sea, how many of our cities might have shared the fate of the industrial centers of northern France? Our people, individually, need fully to understand and appreciate the underlying principle of the Monroe doctrine, and when they do they will never listen even to the suggestion of its abandonment. It was practically abandoned in the first draft of this league plan, and its subsequent incorporation has been brought about only by tremendous effort upon the part of those who have ventured to express their criticism. How many more important American safeguards are exposed to similar peril?

"We do know that this proposed plan sets aside and runs counter to important provisions of the Constitution of the United States. All argument to the contrary is disingenuous and sophistical. It begs the question. First, with respect to the matter of disarmament. Here article 8 of the covenant provides that—

"The executive council shall also determine for the consideration and action of the several governments what military equipment and armament is fair and reasonable in proportion to the scale of forces laid down in the program of disarmament, and these limits, when adopted, shall not be exceeded without the permission of the executive council.

"And now, by amendment, it is said that the action of the executive council must be unanimous. Heretofore it might have acted by majority vote. This takes away the exclusive constitutional right and power of Congress to provide for the common defense, and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces incidental to raising and supporting armies and providing and maintaining a navy. The feeble answer to this is that although determined by the executive council for the consideration and action of the several Governments, such determination is not binding until adopted, presumably by the Congress. But this answer leaves out of consideration the further provision that 'when adopted it shall not be exceeded without the permission of the executive council.' In the last analysis the judgment and determination of the executive council is supreme. No matter what changed situations may arise, succeeding Congresses are sought to be deprived of their exclusive constitutional power and duty to provide for the common defense by increasing the military equipment and armament of the Nation, if deemed necessary. No Congress has power to bind succeeding Congresses in this respect, nor is there any constitutional power to delegate this prerogative to any other body, such as this executive council; and in that council the vote of one member State is sufficient to block action on the part of the United States. It is no answer to say that such obstructive tactics are improbable; it is enough that they are possible, if we are to adhere to the covenant; and, should the emergency arise, it is obvious that objection to increase would probably be interposed.

"In an attempt to meet this criticism Mr. Taft, in his Convention Hall speech, referred for precedent to what he termed a 'treaty' between this country and Great Britain in 1817, by which it was agreed to put no warships on the Great Lakes, forming part of the boundary between Canada and the United States. I find this so-called treaty to occupy an inconspicuous position in volume 8 of the United States Statutes at Large, where it is called merely an 'arrangement,' put into effect by proclamation of the President April 28, 1918. If we are to judge by the formalities attending the publication of treaties generally in the same volume, this arrangement does not arise to the dignity of a treaty, nor does it appear to have been placed before the Senate in the usual manner. It is subject to discontinuance upon notice, and, of course, affects only the two nations involved. Whatever may have been the circumstances attending its adoption, and whatever may be said of its validity, if it were assailed it is obvious that it bears no analogy to the point under discussion. Great Britain and the United States simply arranged to regard that portion of the boundary between the two countries as a sort of neutral or noncombatant area; but this arrangement did not restrict the power of Congress in the provision of a single ship for the Navy or a single man for the Army of this Nation. It had no effect whatever upon the size or quality of our military and naval establishments.

"Again, the proposed constitution contemplates that we may automatically under its terms be placed in a state of war against some other nation without the action of the Congress, to which is confided the exclusive power of determination. This is provided by article 16 in case of disregard by any contracting party of the provisions of articles 12, 13, or 15. Article 16, aforesaid, if adopted by us, is a delegation to the league of the power to declare that a state of war exists. Substantive elements of war, to wit, the severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between nationals, and the prevention of all financial, commercial, or personal intercourse between nationals, become effective at once. It is next provided that 'it shall be the duty of the council in such case to recommend to the several Governments concerned what effective military or naval forces the members of the league shall severally contribute to the armaments of forces to be used to protect the covenants of the league.' In the summary of these amendments sent out in advance of publication, presumably under the authority or, at least, with the acquiescence of the peace conference, it was stated 'the council is to recommend what amount of force, if any, should be supplied by the several Governments concerned, but the approval of the latter is necessary.' If that was not true under the original draft, it is difficult to understand what different meaning has been added by the amended section. Mr. Taft vociferates that 'recommend' does not mean 'command,' and strictly, by the dictionary, he is unquestionably right. Equally, also, 'shall' is not the equivalent of 'should.' Article 16, as I have said, automatically throws us into war and provides for the immediate application of substantial preliminaries. It apparently then delegates to the council, as the executive body, the 'power' of the league, as Mr. Taft calls it, the administrative function of designating the quotas which the several members of the league 'shall' severally contribute. This is followed and strengthened by the undertaking that the members of the league 'will mutually

support one another in resisting any special measures aimed at one of their number' and will afford passage through their territory, etc. Significantly the following new paragraph is added:

"Any member of the league which has violated any covenant of the league may be declared to be no longer a member of the league by a vote of the council, concurred in by the representatives of all the other members of the league represented thereon.

"Even a penalty clause is present. Reading this section in its entirety and in the light of the spirit and purpose of the league organization, can we reasonably escape the conclusion that this section is intended to impose upon the various league members the obligation to respond, as to a command, to the recommendation of the council respecting contributions of military and naval forces? Of course, the article contemplates that such forces will be employed and will be sent to the various quarters of the earth whenever the league and its governing body so recommends; and whether or not this be the unavoidable construction from a legal standpoint, we know it will be so construed when occasion arises. Any contention that this does not constitute a suspension of the constitutional powers of Congress and a delegation of the power to declare war is special pleading and a palpable fallacy. The vice in these two attempted evasions of the letter and spirit of our Constitution is dual in its nature. On the other hand, it impairs our capacity for self-defense, and may involve us in war against the dictates of our individual judgment; and, on the other, it is a step in the process of undermining our strict adhesion to the mandates of the Constitution by countenancing departure and modification by indirect methods. It establishes a most unwholesome precedent and weakens the respect in which our organic law has always been held.

"The fact that this covenant may be incorporated in the peace treaty adds nothing whatever to its validity. Even Mr. Taft admits that no treaty rises above the Constitution. The Supreme Court has said that—

"It would not be contended that it extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the Government, or in that of one of the States, or a cession of any portion of the territory of the latter, without its consent.

"The courts, however, uniformly leave such considerations to the political powers of the Government. It would, of course, be competent for such political powers to abrogate the treaty, and it would be possible for Congress to enact legislation in conflict with the terms and provisions of such a treaty. In such case the courts would accept the judgment of Congress. In the absence of such congressional action it is rare that a justiciable question is presented to the courts. It is pointed out by the advocates of this league that the Supreme Court has never yet declared a treaty invalid, and that it is unlikely that any question would arise within the cognizance of the courts. This is almost equivalent to saying that if the courts can find no opportunity to invalidate this treaty, no valid objection is urged to its adoption, although it may contravene the terms of the Constitution. That again means that the political powers of the Government are at liberty at any time to disregard the Constitution and its prohibitions, provided they do so in such manner as to prevent judicial review of their action. No stronger demonstration could be presented of the wisdom which ordinarily lodges such power of construction in the courts. To say that any department of the Government is permitted thus arbitrarily to ignore the Constitution of the United States upon any pretext whatsoever is a practical and fatal abandonment of our form of government. It is an almost unthinkable recognition of political infidelity and disloyalty. Its advocates do not mean that, of course, and yet such is the ultimate result of this novel doctrine.

"We have become accustomed to regard imperialism as the only enemy of republican government to be feared. We are now confronted by a menace, if anything, more imminent and grave. The result of this war and the theory upon which it has been waged has practically removed, for the present at least, the danger to be apprehended from emperors and kings. But an autocracy quite as threatening, quite as destructive, and more insidious lurks in the irresponsible form of so-called democracy which has succeeded it. Bolshevism and anarchy, which is but another degree of socialism and communism, is not democracy, although it parades itself as such. It is administered by irresponsible committees, self-established and maintained by armed forces. They issue decrees which differ in no respect from imperial edicts. Attempts at popular expression are suppressed by the military arm of these committees if they are not in accord with the action of such committees. The stable government guaranteed by our Constitution stands as the one dependable safeguard against the encroachment of this new autocracy and imperialism masquerading in the guise of democracy and popular government. Any departure from its prohibitions and its sanctions but paves the way for the breaking down of organized government and stable social conditions. This alone ought to deter us from any step manifestly hasty, unnecessary, and ill-advised which would tend in this direction. Such will be the ultimate effect of this indirect but no less significant surrender of our constitutional guaranties. These constitutional objections have been sought to be ridiculed and evaded, but they have never, to my knowledge, been squarely met.

"It may then be asked why we object so strenuously to the adoption of this covenant if, as we say, it is unconstitutional, and the political agencies of our Government may so declare. Because to enter solemnly upon any international agreement which we know to be illegal, and with the mental reservation that we may and will break it at will, is political dishonesty; because the engagements thus made will have and are intended to have a moral binding force, which can be disregarded only at the expense of the charge of repudiating our moral obligations as a sovereign nation; because thereby not only do we incur in the eyes of the world the obloquy which must result from such a course, but we imperil our own peace and safety as well as the peace and safety of the world. If we assume no such obligations in the first instance, we can not be placed in this unenviable position. The fact is that the attempt is being made in an excess of zeal, while excitement runs high, while peace, ardently desired and woefully delayed, hangs in the balance, while the wounds of war are still unhealed, to railroad this devoted and sincere people into a solemn compact which their sober judgment would reject and which they will never cease to regret. The exigency for such unseemly haste does not exist. The very method employed should arouse our suspicions and cause us to look before we leap. I can conceive of no suggestion more remarkable than that made by Mr. Taft in his New York speech, when he says:

"Well may the President, therefore, decline to comply with the suggestions of the proposed resolution (of the Senate). Well may he say when he returns with the treaty, of which the covenant shall be a most important and indispensable part, 'If you would postpone peace, if you would defeat it, you can refuse to ratify the treaty. Amend it by striking out the covenant and you will leave confusion worse confounded, with the objects of the war unattained and sacrificed, and Europe and the world in dangerous chaos.'

"No such alternative is necessary. No legitimate reason exists for the incorporation of this league plan in the peace treaty as an indispensable part thereof, except to embarrass the Senate in the exercise of its constitutional functions by compelling it to accept this league without consideration or to incur the obloquy of deferring the establishment of peace so earnestly desired by the entire world. We are reminded in this of the objectionable practice of attaching an unsavory rider to an appropriation bill, which must be accepted under pain of arresting the vital operations of government.

"In his recent speech in this city Mr. Taft said:

"But it is said, 'Why should we not have this league of nations after we have got the peace treaty? Let's take that in a leisurely way.' That means we would not have it at all.

"When we consider that Europe is represented to be on the verge of despair, unless we come to her assistance with this covenant, we must infer that Mr. Taft believes this country would not accept it if it had opportunity to weigh and consider. If that is true, I protest that to fasten it upon us in this summary manner is an invasion of the most sacred rights and interests of the American people.

"But it is said that the best minds and the smartest men in all the world have met at this peace table and formulated this instrument, and that it is impudence on our part to question or reject it. I have no disposition to question the commanding ability of the representatives of the several nations at the peace table. I would, however, respectfully and in all humility, point to the fact that this proposed league is confessed to be of foreign manufacture, and that, with the exception of those from this country, no man there can be presumed to have had the special interests of this nation at heart, nor to have been hampered by any considerations touching our own peculiar institutions and traditions. None of them, presumably, could have had any conscientious scruples in the adoption of any policy, however conflicting in principle with the provisions of our Constitution. All, outside of our own delegates, had interests of their own to subserve. Those interests are in no means necessarily in harmony with ours. As Mr. Root well says:

"We are not asking, and do not need, any help from the nations of the whole world for the preservation of peace in America, nor is any American nation asking for such help. The difficulties, the disturbing conditions, and the dangers that threaten, are all in the affairs of Europe and the Near East. The real reason for creating a league of nations is to deal with those difficulties and dangers—not with American affairs.

It is, therefore, wholly unnecessary, for the purpose of this league, that purely American affairs should be included within the scope of the agreement.

"It hardly seems reasonable that under these circumstances the United States should be penalized for complying with the request of its friends in Europe to join them in the preservation of peace primarily for their benefit, and not for ours, by giving up our right to self-protection, when that is wholly unnecessary to accomplish the object of the agreement.

"I have said that in the matter of armament and in the matter of engaging in war we should be guided by the dictates of our own sound judgment and the conditions as they may be found to exist. I make no argument for extended armament. I have sought to show only that we should preserve and maintain such instrumentalities of defense as circumstances may require, and that these should be left to our own decision and not confided to any tribunal dominated by foreign influence. That the United States should ever adopt a policy of over-preparedness is amusing in the light of our practice and traditions, and in the face of recent experience. Any agreement in this respect must result in the disadvantage of that nation most scrupulous in observing its covenants and undertakings. We know that no nation will observe its obligations more scrupulously than we. In his last utterances Theodore Roosevelt earnestly warned us against entering into a world-wide career of disinterested violence for the right, because where both the lands and the issues involved are remote we would not know with certainty where the right lay; that nothing should be done that would interfere with our preparing for our own defense; and that each nation should reserve to itself, for its own decision, questions involving its honor and the preservation of its national existence.

"It has been insisted by advocates of this league that the covenant does not create a superstate. I agree with Dr. David Jayne Hill, who says:

"Between free self-governing nations on the one hand and super-government on the other there is no intermediate condition. It is a choice between free and not free.

"The league proposes to bind its members to united action, and it is in the next breath pretended that there is nothing binding about it. The choice must be made, and it is important that it should be clearly understood. Does the league invite, or does it command? If it only invites, it is not a league. If it commands, it is a supergovernment.

"However, we are not compelled to rely upon interpretation to establish the charge that a supergovernment is aimed at if not in fact created. Mr. Samuel J. Graham, Assistant Attorney General, in a series of addresses entitled, 'Some Reflections on the League of Nations as Related to the History of the United States,' in which he advocates 'collective instead of individual nationalism,' among many things of like nature, says:

"The Constitution (of the United States) was finally adopted by the States, though its adoption was not by all of them at once. By its adoption individual nationalism was abandoned and refuge and safety sought and found in the ark of collective nationalism and a league of nations.

"The league-of-nations job has been done once successfully, why can it not be done again?

"The same idea is being expressed openly in the inspired press.

"What they (the American Colonies) did do we can now do, and by the grace of God we will do!

"This shocking and unblushing avowal is almost beyond belief. A few years ago the audacious proposal to surrender our national independence and reduce us to the position of a subordinate State in a federation composed of all the heterogeneous races of the world would have been buried beneath an avalanche of obloquy and scorn. It is my belief that, if brought before the people now in its true light and with opportunity for their expression, it would meet the same fate. If this is not true, then the virtue of American citizenship has departed and the days of the Republic are numbered.

"I oppose this covenant in its present and proposed form because it conclusively appears that it will not accomplish the only thing which excuses its creation, and that is the prevention of war, but, on the contrary, invites innumerable complications and disturbances destructive of permanent peace; because it is unnecessary at this time, other obvious means for the establishment of peace and the preservation of order being already at hand and in active operation; because it departs from time-honored and substantial American policies and traditions; because it is violative of the spirit and letter of our Constitution; because it involves us in engagements dangerous to our national safety, which we can avoid, if at all, only by acts in contravention of our express agreements, exposing us to the charge of international bad faith; because it introduces the element of internationalism, breaks down the safeguards of national patriotism, and embarrasses the exercise of our sovereignty in the control of our internal affairs."

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 547) authorizing the enlistment of non-English-speaking citizens and aliens (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 548) providing for the relief of retired enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps who served in the military service during the Civil War (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 549) to encourage the community milling of wheat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

A bill (S. 550) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Tonopah, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 551) for the relief of the Copper River & Northwestern Railway Co.; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 552) to reimburse W. B. Graham, late postmaster at Ely, Nev., for money expended for clerical assistance; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 553) authorizing the President to appoint commissioners to an international monetary conference; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(By request.) A bill (S. 554) granting an increase of pension to Mary H. Doherty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 555) to prohibit the liquor traffic and to provide for the enforcement of such prohibition and the war-prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 556) to provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of free zones in ports of entry of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 557) for the relief of Oscar C. Guessaz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 559) to provide for the protection and preservation of the United States bird preservation on Passage Key, at the entrance of Tampa Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

A bill (S. 560) for the relief of W. H. Overocker; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 561) to establish a national conservatory of music and art for the education of advanced pupils in music in all its branches, vocal and instrumental, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 562) for the relief of occupants of certain premises within the naval station at Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 563) to amend an act entitled "An act to appoint Joseph Y. Porter a lieutenant colonel and deputy surgeon general and to place him on the retired list of the Army"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 564) to appropriate $95,000 for the relief of Henry W. Cook, Arthur G. Cummer, and Waldo E. Cummer, trading as Cook-Cummer Steamship Co., copartnership, for the loss of schooner barges *South West* and *North West;*

A bill (S. 565) for the relief of Frank A. Kopp;

A bill (S. 566) for the relief of Edward J. Fisher;

A bill (S. 567) for the relief of Mrs. Nellie E. Stockton;

A bill (S. 568) for the relief of the heirs of Paul Norton;

A bill (S. 569) for the relief of the legal or equitable owners or claimants of the United States steamship *Nueces;*

A bill (S. 570) for the relief of the Estes Shoe Co., of St. Augustine, Fla.;

A bill (S. 571) for the relief of the H. W. Davis Co., of St. Augustine, Fla.;

A bill (S. 572) for the relief of Mary E. Boyd; and

A bill (S. 573) for the relief of Luanna Ross; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 574) to amend section 4433 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to working steam pressure allowable on boilers in steam vessels, and section 4418 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to hydrostatic test of steam boilers; and

A bill (S. 575) to establish load lines for certain vessels; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 576) for releasing and quitclaiming of all claims of the United States to arpent lot No. 28 in the old city of Pensacola, Fla.;

A bill (S. 577) for the relief of the Southern States Lumber Co.; and

A bill (S. 578) providing for the survey of public lands remaining unsurveyed in the State of Florida, with a view of satisfying the grant in aid of schools made to said State under the act of March 3, 1845, and other acts amendatory thereof; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 579) to protect Government documents by copyright; and

A bill (S. 580) to give effect to certain provisions of the convention for the protection of trade-marks and commercial names, made and signed in the city of Buenos Aires, in the Argentine Republic, August 20, 1910, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

A bill (S. 581) for the relief of William G. Welles;

A bill (S. 582) to authorize the Federal courts of the United States to render declaratory judgments; and

A bill (S. 583) to provide for the incorporation of certain companies engaged in foreign trade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 584) providing for a site and building at Arcadia, Fla.;

A bill (S. 585) to increase the cost of the public building at Marianna, Fla.;

A bill (S. 586) for the erection of a post-office building at De Funiak Springs, Fla.;

A bill (S. 587) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Quincy, Fla.; and

A bill (S. 588) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Apalachicola, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 589) granting a pension to Sallie Hardwick;

A bill (S. 590) granting an increase of pension to Elvina Adams;

A bill (S. 591) granting a pension to Isabel Romero Rockwell;

A bill (S. 592) granting a pension to Rebecca A. Beery;

A bill (S. 593) granting an increase of pension to Mollie Thompson; and

A bill (S. 594) granting a pension to Fleming R. Moodie; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 595) to repeal that part of section 1 of an act of Congress approved November 21, 1918, giving the President power to declare by proclamation nation-wide prohibition after June 30, 1919; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. NUGENT:

A bill (S. 596) adding certain lands to the Idaho National Forest and the Payette National Forest in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 597) fixing salaries for marshal and district attorney in western district of Louisiana, and for district attorney of the eastern district of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 598) for the relief of the legal representatives of Lapene and Ferre;

A bill (S. 599) for the relief of the legal representative of George E. Payne, deceased;

A bill (S. 600) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Susan A. Nicholas; and

A bill (S. 601) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Alphonse Desmare, deceased, and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 602) to extend the time for cutting timber on the Coconino and Tusayan National Forest, Arizona; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 603) to increase the limit of cost of public building at Great Falls, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 604) for the relief of Delilah Siebenaler; and

A bill (S. 605) granting to the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Bowdoin, Mont., for the benefit of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Bowdoin, Mont., lots 12 and 13, in block 21, town site of Bowdoin, State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 606) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Havre, in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 607) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Havre, Mont., two German cannons or fieldpieces;

A bill (S. 608) for the relief of Orion Mathews;

A bill (S. 609) for the relief of James Duffy; and

A bill (S. 610) for the relief of Henry J. Davis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 611) to prohibit the liquor traffic and to provide for the enforcement of such prohibition and the war-prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 612) to recognize the patriotic services of members of the district and local draft boards of the United States;

A bill (S. 613) authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to deliver to each of the several county seats in the State of Washington captured German cannon, cannon balls or shells, and gun carriages, condemned United States cannon, cannon balls and shells, or gun carriages;

A bill (S. 614) to increase the efficiency of Army and Navy bands; and

A bill (S. 615) to survey and locate a military and post road from St. Louis, Mo., to Olympia, Wash.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 616) to increase the limit of cost for the construction of the United States public building authorized at Juneau, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 617) to authorize the payment of certain taxes to Stevens and Ferry Counties, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 618) to provide for the care and relief of destitute Indians in the State of Washington, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 619) validating and confirming conveyances of lands made by allottees on the Yakima Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington; and

A bill (S. 620) authorizing the issuance of patent to the Pioneer Educational Society and its successors for certain lands in the diminished Colville Indian Reservation, State of Washington; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 621) relating to commutation proof in homestead entries;

A bill (S. 622) prohibiting the issuance of patent under lieu selection serial 2904, Seattle 03476, Washington;

A bill (S. 623) to create the Yakima National Park in the State of Washington;

A bill (S. 624) granting to the State of Washington public lands to aid in the construction and maintenance of public roads, to promote the study of forestry, to promote the study and development of horticulture, and to promote vocational education in the State of Washington;

A bill (S. 625) making timberlands available for homestead settlement, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 626) to establish the Mount Baker National Park in the State of Washington; and

A bill (S. 627) to establish the Grand Coulee National Park in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 628) authorizing the Indian tribes and individual Indians, or any of them, residing in the State of Washington and west of the summit of the Cascade Mountains to submit to the Court of Claims certain claims growing out of treaties and otherwise;

A bill (S. 629) for the relief of the Alaska Steamship Co.;

A bill (S. 630) repealing certain provisions contained in the urgent deficiency act approved December 22, 1911; and

A bill (S. 631) repealing certain provisions contained in the urgent deficiency act approved December 22, 1911; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 632) prohibiting trespassing upon the cars or trains of carriers by rail engaged in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 633) extending the provisions for the regulation of steam vessels to vessels owned or operated by the United States Shipping Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 634) to provide for the inspection of fruits, vegetables, and other farm products at point of shipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 635) for the proper observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia; and

A bill (S. 636) for the division of general or special taxes assessed against any parcel or parcels of land in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 637) to aid in the erection of a monument to Indian Timothy at his grave near Alpowa, Asotin County, Washington; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 638) to provide compensation for employees of the United States separated from the service on account of injuries received while in the performance of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 639) authorizing clerks of State and Territorial courts and courts of the District of Columbia to use franked penalty envelopes in carrying on correspondence relating to naturalization of aliens; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 640) granting increased pensions to surviving widows of soldiers of the various Indian wars; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 641) to amend section 10 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 642) for the relief of Mary C. Mayers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 643) to provide for the equitable distribution of captured war devices and trophies to the States and Territories of the United States and to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 644) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Arthur E. Colgate, administrator of the estate of Clinton G. Colgate, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 645) to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 646) to provide for the retirement of police matrons of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 649) for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated, mislabeled, or misbranded linseed oil, turpentine, or paint; to the Committee on Manufactures.

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 650) granting an increase of pension to Daniel L. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIELDS:

A bill (S. 652) to establish an additional fish-cultural station in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 653) to provide for the erection of a public building at Newport, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 654) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Erwin, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 655) to provide for the erection of a public building at Dayton, Tenn.; and

A bill (S. 656) to provide for the erection of a public building at Knoxville, Knox County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 657) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the State of Tennessee two brass cannons, with carriages; and

A bill (S. 658) to provide for the preparation and report to Congress by the Chief of Engineers of the Army, under the direction and through the Secretary of War, of a preliminary plan for a system of improved national highways, and to provide for the payment of the expenses of said report; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 659) to fix the salary of the assistant United States district attorney for the western district of Tennessee;

A bill (S. 660) to suppress the sale of pistols, revolvers, and other firearms of like form, size, and description, commonly used in the commission of felonious homicides and assaults, and to provide punishment for violation of the provisions of the same;

A bill (S. 661) to provide for the appointment of a district judge in the middle judicial district of the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 662) to amend section 107 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, as heretofore amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of New Mexico:

A bill (S. 663) fixing the term of service of Elijah C. Putman during the Civil War;

A bill (S. 664) granting to the State of New Mexico 300,000 acres of land in said State for the use and benefit of the military institutions of New Mexico; and

A bill (S. 665) for the relief of Sarah H. Mitchell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 666) creating the National Park of the Cliff Cities;

A bill (S. 667) limiting the creation or extension of forest reserves in New Mexico;

A bill (S. 668) granting to certain States public lands for the construction, repair, and maintenance of public roads;

A bill (S. 669) to extend the rights of stock-raising homesteaders;

A bill (S. 670) for the relief of Grant County, Luna County, and the town of Silver City, N. Mex.;

A bill (S. 671) granting lands to the village of Hot Springs, N. Mex., and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 672) to authorize the consolidation and exchange of certain Government lands and privately owned lands in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 673) for the relief of Bernard S. Rodey;

A bill (S. 674) for the relief of Capt. H. C. Smith;

A bill (S. 675) for the relief of Nicolas Gallegos;

A bill (S. 676) for the relief of Reuben R. Hunter;

A bill (S. 677) for the relief of J. L. Campbell and others;

A bill (S. 678) for the relief of Ellen B. Walker; and

A bill (S. 679) for the relief of Sigmund Lindauer; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 680) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Tucumcari, N. Mex.;

A bill (S. 681) to amend an act approved March 4, 1913, entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings; to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings; to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings; to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, and for other purposes"; and

A bill (S. 682) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Clovis, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 683) providing for an additional judge for the district of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 684) for the payment of certain money to Albert H. Raynolds; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 685) granting a pension to Arthur H. Loomis; and

A bill (S. 686) granting an increase of pension to Homer T. Ragsdale; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 687) to reimburse Horace A. Choumard, chaplain in Twenty-third Infantry, for loss of certain personal property; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 688) to provide for a national employment system; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 689) to amend section 5200 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by act of June 22, 1906; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 690) repealing Public, No. 106, Sixty-fifth Congress, "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States"; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 691) to donate a gun or howitzer to the town of Winchester, in the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 692) regulating the production of wares which enter into interstate commerce; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 693) granting an increase of pension to Mary Helen Grant; and

A bill (S. 694) granting an increase of pension to John J. Duke; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 695) for the relief of Frank Vumbaca; and

A bill (S. 696) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Frank S. Bowker; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 697) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Gray, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 698) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Belfast, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 699) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Harrison, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 700) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Winthrop, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 701) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Eastport, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 702) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Portland, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 703) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Westbrook, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; and

A bill (S. 704) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Auburn, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEYES:

A bill (S. 705) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Berlin, N. H., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 706) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Plymouth, N. H., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 707) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lebanon, N. H., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 708) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wolfboro, N. H., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 709) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Littleton, N. H., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 710) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lancaster, N. H., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 711) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Haverhill, N. H., one German cannon or fieldpiece; and

A bill (S. 712) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Claremont, N. H., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLOGG:

A bill (S. 713) to provide for the purchase of a site for and the construction of a public building at Rochester, Minn.; and

A bill (S. 714) to provide for the purchase of a site for and the construction of a public building at Ely, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 715) for the relief of the Atlas Lumber Co., Babcock & Willcox, Johnson, Jackson & Corning Co., and the C. H. Klein Brick Co., each of which companies furnished to Silas N. Opdahl, a failing Government contractor, certain building materials which were used in the construction of Burke Hall, at the Pierre Indian School, in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 716) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant leases or licenses for the use of the water power created by the Government dam on the Hudson River at Troy, N. Y.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 717) for the relief of certain officers and members of the crew of the U. S. S. *San Diego;* to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COLT:

A bill (S. 718) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Richmond, R. I., two German cannons or fieldpieces;

A bill (S. 719) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Providence, R. I., two German cannons or fieldpieces; and

A bill (S. 720) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Bristol, R. I., two German cannons or fieldpieces, to be placed on the grounds of the armory of the Bristol Train of Artillery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 721) granting a pension to Sarah C. Hale; and

A bill (S. 722) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Guile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 723) to provide for election contests in the Senate of the United States; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

A bill (S. 724) to supplement existing legislation relative to the United States Court for China and to increase the serviceability thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 725) to extend the provisions of the act of May 11, 1912, to the officers and enlisted men of all State militia and other State organizations that rendered service to the Union cause during the Civil War for a period of 90 days or more, and providing pensions for their widows, minor children, and dependent parents, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 726) granting a pension to John H. Helser; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 727) for the relief of J. H. Livingston; and

A bill (S. 728) for the relief of the Buffalo River Zinc Mining Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 729) to amend section 217 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 730) to amend chapter 559 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, approved March 3, 1891; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan tents and other material to the State of Wisconsin for a National Army encampment to be held at Milwaukee, Wis.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. POMERENE. I introduce by request a joint resolution. I want to have it understood that I do not by the presentation approve of it.

By Mr. POMERENE (by request):

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 22) proposing an initiative and referendum amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of its citizens when they so desire to vote upon constitutional amendments and laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 23) authorizing an investigation of the feasibility of the construction of a canal navigable for ocean-going vessels between the Georgian Bay in Lake Huron and the St. Lawrence River; to the Committee on Commerce.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 24) to repeal sections 630, 900, and 904 of the act entitled "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes," approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 25) directing a survey for a military road along the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 26) directing the United States Coast Guard to resume its operations under the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WATSON:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 27) to convey the thanks of Congress to Evangeline Booth, and through her to the officers and members of the Salvation Army, for invaluable services rendered to American troops in France by the Salvation Army, and to confer the honorary title of brevet colonel on Evangeline Booth (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. JONES of Washington submitted an amendment proposing that not more than $60,000 of the appropriation of $325,000 to further promote and develop foreign and domestic commerce of the United States shall be used for the expenses of branch offices, of which $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be used for maintaining branch offices at Puget Sound, State of Washington, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMOOT submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $252,900.58 for the relief of Prof. William H. H. Hart, principal of the Hart Farm School and Junior Republic for Dependent Children, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DEVELOPMENT OF WATER POWER.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, at the last session of the Senate I introduced a bill (S. 220) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce. The bill is in relation to power sites on navigable streams and upon the public lands. It is identical with the report made by the conference committee upon this subject at the last session of Congress; and, although the bill does not by any means express my own ideas as to legislation that we ought to have upon this important question, I have deemed it advisable to start off the subject in this session at the point at which it was concluded in the last session. In this form I introduced the bill. It was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, evidently erroneously. I now ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to a special committee consisting of three members of the Committee on Public Lands, to be chosen by that committee, and three members of the Committee on Commerce, to be chosen by the members of that committee. It will be recalled that the report of the conference committee came from Members of this body so constituted by resolution of the body, namely, three members of the Committee on Public Lands and three from the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I object to the unanimous-consent request to appoint a special committee.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I also object to the request.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, then I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will allow me to make a suggestion, I do not believe the Senator from Montana means to select a special committee, except in the sense that it is to be composed of the members of two standing committees. It is not to be a special committee other than that it is to be composed of members of each of two standing committees. That was the arrangement made at the last session. The conferees on the bill were three members of the Commerce Committee and three members of the Public Lands Committee, as the Senator from Montana has stated; but it was not a special committee in the sense the Senator from Washington has in view. It is to be a committee to be composed of three members of the Public Lands Committee and three members of the Commerce Committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That would be a special committee. I desire to say that a bill covering the subject has already been introduced and referred to the Commerce Committee, which had charge of the matter at the last session.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators may understand this matter, but the Chair does not think he quite understands it. As near as the Chair can get it now, the Senator from Montana is moving to refer the bill to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I made that suggestion because I knew of no other disposition to make of it. However, I will ask leave to amend that motion, and move to refer the bill to the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Public Lands to act jointly in relation to it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Does the Senator mean that to be taken as an instruction to the committees to act jointly or as a suggestion? I would have no objection to having it referred to both of the committees, and personally I should like to see the committees act together; but I do object at this time to the Senate directing them to act together.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let me inquire of the Senator from Washington, who is interested, as I am, in promoting this legislation, whether it would be advisable to refer it to both committees and have each committee return possibly a radically different report upon it?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will say to the Senator that substantially the same bill that the Senator proposes has already been introduced and has been referred to the Committee on Commerce; and that committee, no doubt, whenever it is organized, will take the matter up. So it seems to me it would complicate matters to have the measure referred to two different committees. I wish to assure the Senator that I am satisfied that the Commerce Committee, after it is organized, will take the matter up very quickly.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have no doubt that that is the case; but I submit to the Senator from Washington whether it is quite fair to have these very important questions in relation to the public lands, which he knows are a feature of the bill, dealt with by the Committee on Commerce?

Mr. JONES of Washington. This bill also relates to dams upon navigable waters.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I recognize that.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I concede that legitimately it could be referred to either committee.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I recognize that; and I agree that it would be quite as inappropriate to have the bill referred as a whole to the Committee on Public Lands to deal with the important questions in relation to the navigable waters of the country. I think that in fairness the two committees ought to act in reference to the subject.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator's bill, as I understand, covers navigable waters as well as the waters upon public lands?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I concede that it can be properly referred to either committee.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But will the Senator concede that it ought to be referred to both?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest to the Senator from Montana that he divide the subjects matter into two bills, one having reference to water powers within the arid States and the other to water powers upon navigable streams. The Senator knows that that is the way this legislation was acted upon until the last session of Congress, when, in the House, a special committee was appointed to take up the subject matter. That committee combined both propositions into one bill and sent it over to the Senate. I believe it went to the Commerce Committee, and then the conference committee was composed of three members of the Commerce Committee and three members of the Public Lands Committee of this body; but there was no final action on the measure. It does seem to me that the two subjects are entirely different and ought to be treated as entirely different. They ought to be considered by the proper committees, and the provisions referring to water powers upon public lands ought to go to the Committee on Public Lands and those referring to the navigable streams in the country ought to go to the Committee on Commerce. I think that would be the best way out of the difficulty.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I thank the Senator from Utah for his suggestion, but I can not possibly accept it. I can not accept it in view of the difficulties of the past and the history of this legislation. That is the way these matters have been handled heretofore, with the result that we have been unable to get anywhere, the Committee on Public Lands of one or the other House having certain views with respect to the matter and the Committee on Commerce having diametrically opposite views with respect to it. We never were able to make any progress at all until we recognized that in many particulars and in many features the same principles are applicable to both bills, and they ought to be dealt with together, by one and the same committee. The matter was then taken up, and we eventually arrived at the stage of legislation when the last act to be performed was the adoption or rejection of the conference report.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator from Montana that I was a member of that conference committee, and I have not any doubt in my mind but that they would have had a conference on the part of the House and the Senate by members of the Public Lands Committees of the two Houses and would have arrived at a solution of this question affecting the Western States—that is, water powers in the Western States, where no navigation is involved—in a much better and quicker and more satisfactory way than was reached with the conference report with the two joined.

Now, I have no doubt but that there will be legislation, as far as the Public Lands Committee can bring about that legislation, at this session of Congress affecting water powers in the Western States. I believe that it will be better for the Commerce Committee to handle the navigable streams.

I will say to the Senator that I recall that in that conference it would have been very much easier to arrive at a full agreement if the members of the Commerce Committee of the House and the Senate had had only the question of navigable streams to consider. I believe that it would hasten the legislation if this course were followed, rather than to try to bring two questions so different in their nature and character under the one committee and try to get a unanimous agreement from that one committee.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I dislike to interrupt, but this question now seems to have formed itself into an argument of the merits of the bill. I think the reference should be made as the Senator from Montana desires, but just now I am more concerned about the order of business, and I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is in order for the Senator from Montana to do what he is trying to do—withdraw this bill from the Interstate Commerce Committee and have it referred to some other committee.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand that objection has been made. Does not that dispose of it for the time being?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; no objection has been made to the withdrawal.

Mr. THOMAS. I understood that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] objected.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I certainly did interpose an objection to any unanimous consent with respect to that legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has a right to move that that be done.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Public Lands and to the Committee on Commerce, the two committees to act upon it conjointly.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I feel satisfied that no matter what committee this bill is referred to we are going to get together upon it before very long; and as one member—if I should be a member—of the Committee on Commerce I should be glad to confer with members of the Committee on Public Lands. A similar bill has already been referred to the Committee on Commerce, which has charge of it, and, so far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the Senator's bill being referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and should like to have that done. As far as I am concerned, I assure him that as a member of the Committee on Commerce I

shall be glad to confer with the members of the Committee on Public Lands to see if we can not arrive at a common basis, because I want to get legislation on this proposition just as early as possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall this bill be taken from——

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I merely rise to inquire if that motion is in order at this stage, before the conclusion of the morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Well, it is a unique proposition to refer a bill to two committees, but a motion to refer a bill to a committee is always in order.

Mr. LODGE. The question of reference is always in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I send to the desk a bill authorizing the Secretary of War to loan certain machines, tools, and equipments now unused by the War Department to the Federal Board for Vocational Education, to be used in connection with the rehabilitation of soldiers, and for other purposes. It is short, and I ask that it be printed in full in the RECORD. I suggest that it be referred to the Military Affairs Committee, because, though the Committee on Education and Labor desires its passage, it is continuing something now under the control of the War Department.

The bill (S. 558) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the Federal Board for Vocational Education, and to trade and technical schools, universities, and other recognized institutions, machines, tools, equipment, and other supplies under the control of the War Department was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to lend, in his discretion, to the Federal Board for Vocational Education, to be used by it in providing vocational rehabilitation to disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to trade and technical schools, universities, and other recognized educational institutions, preference being given in all cases to such schools, universities, and institutions as are in receipt of Federal aid for educational purposes, such machines, tools, equipment, and other supplies as may be under the control of the War Department and not immediately required for official purposes: *Provided, however*, That such equipment shall be loaned subject to such regulations as may be deemed necessary by the said Secretary of War for the proper care and safe return of the same when demanded.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE BILLS.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I assume that one of the most important matters that comes before the Congress will be that relating to revenue. A gentleman in whose ability and experience I have great confidence has prepared two bills, one providing for the Federal incorporation of railroads, and the other for amending or substituting an act for the present interstate commerce law. While I have not studied them carefully and do not present them as my views, I do think they contain many very valuable suggestions which the Interstate Commerce Committee ought to have. Therefore I introduce, by request, these two bills, and ask that they be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The bill (S. 647) to provide for the incorporation of common carriers by railway, and the bill (S. 648) to regulate carriage and transmission in interstate and foreign commerce, were read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

DEVELOPMENT OF WATER POWER.

Mr. SHIELDS. I introduce a bill to provide for the construction of dams across the navigable waterways of the United States, and for other purposes.

The bill (S. 651) to provide for the construction of dams across the navigable waterways of the United States and for the improvement and development of such waterways for the use of interstate and foreign commerce, and to provide for the lease and use of public lands of the United States in the development and utilization of water power in streams running through or adjacent to them, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title.

Mr. SHIELDS. I suggest that the bill which has just been read be referred to the Committee on Commerce and to the Committee on Public Lands. It is in all respects like the one offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. I ask that the same reference be made of this bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I thought the bill of the Senator from Montana was referred to the Committee on Public Lands. I do not know of any rule under which a bill can be referred to two committees at the same time.

Mr. SHIELDS. Then I made my request under a misapprehension. I asked the Senator from Montana in regard to the matter, having come into the Senate Chamber while the subject was under discussion and not fully understanding it; and I understood from him that his bill was referred to both committees.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I did not so understand, and I did not know that it could be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was.

Mr. SHIELDS. If I was mistaken, I withdraw the suggestion I made.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It probably goes nowhere, then.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, when I asked the attention of the Chair, it was on the question of making a motion to change the reference at that time. I had not been following the discussion, and I did not understand that the motion was to refer the bill to two committees. It seems to me that is an impossibility. I mean, it seems to me, it would be impossible to conduct business on that basis.

Mr. SHIELDS. I was somewhat confused about it, Mr. President, and I wanted to understand it; and I should like to know what the Senator from Montana understood was done.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to enter a motion to reconsider that vote.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana understood what action was taken by the Senate. There can be no doubt about it. My motion was that the bill be referred to a committee consisting of those two committees.

Mr. LODGE. Would they not have to be constituted a new committee together first?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. To act conjointly. I see no physical or moral objection to that.

Mr. LODGE. I see no moral objection, certainly; but I see a great many practical objections, and I think the matter had better receive more mature consideration. It seems to me it ends in absolute confusion of all committee jurisdictions.

Mr. SHIELDS. I understand that the Senate adopted the motion of the Senator from Montana, and referred the bill to a committee of both committees.

Mr. LODGE. I understand now that it was referred to both committees.

Mr. SHIELDS. The Senator from Massachusetts suggested that it go over, and my suggestion was that it had already been disposed of.

Mr. LODGE. My suggestion was that the vote by which the reference was changed from the Interstate Commerce Committee be reconsidered. I enter that motion to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator want to take it up now?

Mr. LODGE. No; I think it would be well to conclude the morning business, if I might make that suggestion.

Mr. SHIELDS. Then, Mr. President, I ask that the bill I introduced be referred to the Commerce Committee, subject, of course, to change in the event that the Senate reconsiders its action on the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. LODGE. I do not seem to have cleared the subject. I am perfectly willing to ask for a reconsideration now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the vote be reconsidered whereby the bill introduced by the Senator from Montana, bill 220, was taken from the Interstate Commerce Committee and referred to a joint special committee composed of the Committees on Public Lands and of Commerce of the Senate?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I object to its consideration at this time and call for the regular order.

Mr. LODGE. I have entered the motion. Of course it can only be considered now by unanimous consent, but the motion to reconsider stands.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY EXCHANGE COMMISSION.

Mr. THOMAS. I introduce a joint resolution authorizing the establishment of an international monetary exchange commission. It is very brief, and I ask that it be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) authorizing the appointment of an international monetary exchange commission was read the first time by its title and the second time at length and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That a commission consisting of seven members, not less than two of whom shall be members of the Senate and two of the House of Representatives, and known as the international monetary exchange commission, shall be appointed by the President of the United States.

This commission shall be authorized and instructed to inquire into and ascertain what methods and legislation are essential to the establishment and continuance of a fixed ratio of currency exchange between and among the nations; to confer and cooperate with commissions which may be created by Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, and other countries, and charged with the same or similar duties, and to report the results of their inquiries and investigations to the President and the Congress not later than the first Monday of December, A. D. 1919.

For the purpose of defraying the expenses of said commission necessarily incurred in the discharge of its duties the sum of $50,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the same to be paid out upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the commission.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I merely wish to add a word to the joint resolution which has just been read. It is copied bodily from a bill which was introduced in the Senate in 1897 by Senator Chandler, of New Hampshire, and which was afterwards enacted into law. I have introduced a bill with reference to the general subject of foreign exchange. Both of these subjects are at present of immense importance; and I shall take occasion in the near future to address the Senate regarding the subject matter, and the need for early action, if any action at all is to be taken upon them.

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE.

Mr. SHERMAN. I introduce a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment. It refers to there being no discrimination on account of sex, and contains an educational feature. I ask that it go to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 21) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting universal suffrage, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. LODGE. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on next Monday upon the convening of the Senate, at the earliest convenience of the Senate, I shall ask the privilege of addressing the Senate upon one phase of the so-called league of nations.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I desire to state that following the address of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] I shall address the Senate upon the league of nations.

AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES.

Mr. LODGE. I submit three resolutions carrying amendments to the rules, of which I give notice, as required by the rule. I shall call them up at the earliest possible opportunity. In the meantime, I ask that the resolutions be referred to the Committee on Rules and be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think they should be read.

Mr. LODGE. I think the rule requires that they shall be read.

Mr. PENROSE. Let them be read.

The resolutions were read and referred to the Committee on Rules, as follows:

Senate resolution 35.

Resolved, That Rule XXV of the standing rules of the Senate be, and is hereby, amended by adding a new paragraph, as follows:

"The membership of no standing committee of the Senate shall exceed 17 in number."

Senate resolution 36.

Resolved, That Rule XXV of the standing rules of the Senate be, and is hereby, amended by adding thereto a new paragraph, as follows:

"111. After March 4, 1919, no Senator shall be a member of more than two of the following standing committees of the Senate, viz: Appropriations, Agriculture and Forestry, Commerce, Finance, Foreign Relations, Interstate Commerce, Judiciary, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, and Post Offices and Post Roads. No Senator being chairman of either of the foregoing committees shall be appointed on a conference committee upon any bill reported by either of said standing committees unless it is reported by the committee of which he is chairman."

Senate resolution 37.

Resolved, That Rule XVI of the standing rules of the Senate be, and is hereby, amended, as follows:

After the words "to the Committee on Military Affairs" insert "the Diplomatic and Consular Service bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations."

Mr. POMERENE. I understand it is the purpose of that amendment to refer the appropriation bill relating to the Diplomatic and Consular Service to the Committee on Foreign Relations instead of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; that is the purpose.

ARMENIANS, SYRIANS, AND GREEKS OF ASIA MINOR.

Mr. LODGE. I submit a Senate resolution to be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and beg leave to file with it a petition signed by 20,000 Protestant rectors and ministers and Catholic priests, and a petition signed by 85 bishops of the American church, 40 governors of States of the Union, and 50 presidents of colleges and universities in the United States in favor of the independence of integral Armenia.

The resolution (S. Res. 38) was, with the accompanying petitions, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations as follows:

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Senate, Armenia (including the six vilayets of Turkish Armenia and Silecia), Russian Armenia, and the northern part of the Province of Azerbaijan, Persian Armenia, should be independent, and that it is the hope of the Senate that the peace conference will make arrangements for helping Armenia to establish an independent republic.

It is also the opinion of the Senate that provision should be made for the Syrians and other Christian populations of Asia Minor, and that those portions of Asia Minor where the Greeks are predominant should be placed under the control of the Government of Greece.

PEACE TREATY AND LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. SHERMAN. I offer a resolution, and ask that it be read and lie over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 28) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that it is desirable that the treaty terminating the condition of war between the United States of America and the German Government be separated from the covenant of the league of nations so that each may be acted upon by the Senate severally in the procedure leading to their final disposition, and a vote thereon ratifying or rejecting the same.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over and be printed.

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ON AVIATION.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, on Tuesday last I gave notice that at to-day's session I would offer a resolution amending Standing Rule XXV. Pursuant to that notice, I send the resolution to the desk and ask that it be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 39) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate be amended by adding thereto a new paragraph, as follows:

"A Committee on Aviation, to consist of 12 Senators."

Mr. NEW. I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I think it would be proper to have the resolution referred to the Committee on Rules. It does not define the jurisdiction of the proposed committee. It does not specify whether the subject of naval aviation shall go to the committee. There is conflict between the Military Committee and the Naval Committee as to the jurisdiction of aviation. It seems to me the proper course to pursue would be to refer the resolution to the Committee on Rules to determine, if the new committee is to be created, to what extent it shall have jurisdiction of aviation. It seems to me, as the resolution proposes the creation of a new committee, and naval aviation and military aviation have heretofore been referred to those respective committees, the proper course would be to refer it to the Committee on Rules and let that committee consider it and hear from those two committees and also from others interested as to what jurisdiction should be given to this new committee.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Virginia, I will say that I can see no reason for delay in the consideration of the resolution. It carries with it on its face the purposes of a committee on aviation whose duty and function it shall be to consider generally the subject of aviation. I ask for the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. SWANSON. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Rules for consideration.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 30), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That Rule XXII of the standing rules of the Senate be, and hereby is, amended as follows: After the word "debate," where it first occurs in said rule, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided, however*, That any motion or resolution proposing an adjournment or recess of either or both Houses of Congress for a greater interval of time than three days shall be debatable."

RETURN FROM FRANCE OF DISABLED SOLDIERS.

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 31), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to have brought home from France at the earliest possible moment all sick and wounded soldiers, officers, and men who may be able to travel without risk, and such sick and wounded soldiers shall have prior rights to be shipped home in all cases.

REPORT ON AMMONIA, NITROGEN, ETC.

Mr. SHIELDS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 32), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That 1,500 copies of the report of the Secretary of Agriculture concerning ammonia, nitrogen, and nitrogenous materials manufactured, imported, and used in the United States in pursuance of Senate resolution 137 of the first session of the Sixty-fifth Congress be printed for the use of the Senate.

RUSSIAN SOVIET BUREAU IN NEW YORK.

Mr. KING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 33), which was referred to the Committee on Immigration:

Whereas one L. C. A. K. Martens, together with a number of other aliens, maintains in the city of New York a so-called Russian Soviet bureau, which pretends to represent the so-called Soviet or Bolshevist organization dominated by Nicolai Lenin, which has by force usurped the public authority, and has destroyed public order in Moscow, Petrograd, and other parts of Russia; and

Whereas said bureau is supported by funds obtained from said Russian Bolshevist organization and is seeking to obtain possession and control of the several Russian consulates in the United States and to become recognized as the official representative of the Russian Government in the United States; and

Whereas said Martens and said Russian Soviet bureau pretend to be seeking, on behalf of said Bolshevist organization, trade relations with the United States; and

Whereas said Bolshevist organization under the domination of Lenine has pretended to abrogate the legal institution of private property, without which contracts of sale and exchange and commercial relations are impossible; and

Whereas the institution of property is an essential part of human liberty and is the fundamental concept of law; and

Whereas no government is fit to exist or to be recognized by the United States which does not acknowledge and legalize the institution of property and provide legal process for the vindication of trespasses against property and for the enforcement of contracts with respect thereto; and

Whereas commercial and political relations are impossible with a government which does not recognize the institution of property and the legality of contracts for trade and exchange, and which does not give legal sanction to credits which arise in transactions of trade; and

Whereas the Bolshevist organization of Russia under the domination of said Lenine professes principles which are inconsistent with the liberty and law of the United States and which are essentially anarchistic and despotic, and without the pale of the law of nations; and

Whereas it is inimical to the interests of the United States that aliens professing such principles and propagating the same be permitted to be in the country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Labor be, and is hereby, directed to institute proceedings under existing law for the deportation from the United States of said Martens and other aliens employed with said so-called Russian Soviet bureau in the city of New York, and all other aliens who are known to adhere to said so-called Soviet or Bolshevist organization.

GOVERNMENT AT OMSK, RUSSIA.

Mr. KING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 34), which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas diplomatic relations between the United States and Russia have been suspended de facto since the abdication of the Czar and the fall of the provisional government of Kerensky; and

Whereas the relations between the United States and Russia have always been characterized by sincere cordiality and reciprocal good will; and

Whereas the Government and the people of the United States desire to resume proper and cordial relations with the government and people of Russia and to assist in every way possible the establishment of liberty and law in the public order of Russia under a republican form of government; and

Whereas the government of Omsk has for its purpose the establishment of these principles and is loyal to the policies of the United States and the powers associated with the United States in the war against Germany and is in harmony with the international policy of the United States and is worthy to be recognized and enter into diplomatic relations with the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the government at Omsk, Russia, be recognized as the de facto government of Russia and that steps be taken to establish diplomatic relations with said Omsk government.

Resolved further, That the United States assist said government at Omsk in establishing its authority in Russia, and that measures be taken to advance to said Omsk government credits and ordnance supplies for the overthrow of Bolshevist tyranny and anarchy, to provide food and other material assistance to the people, to afford facilities for the convocation of the constituent assembly to determine and establish the future government of Russia, and to assist the Russian people in bringing their country into a state of economic order and progress as a sound basis for the prosperity and independence of the new federal republic of Russia.

TREATY OF PEACE.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I call up Senate resolution No. 12, submitted by me on the 20th instant. I ask that it be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the following resolution coming over from a previous day.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the peace treaty has been completed and has been delivered to the representatives of Germany; and

Whereas a synopsis only of the treaty has been given publicity in the United States, and our people are entitled to know its full contents, and to what, if any, engagements they have been committed; and

Whereas it is reported in the press that the entire treaty has been cabled to the State Department and is now in the possession of the State Department: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested forthwith to transmit to the Senate the full text of the treaty of peace completed at the Paris conference and delivered to the representatives of Germany.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, just a word in explanation, please, of the reasons why I have presented this particular resolution.

It seems obvious that the American people should be entitled to any particular matter which has been determined at the Paris peace conference which may affect the future of America or may in any way involve in subsequent years American participation. Indeed, it has been in days gone by wholly axiomatic that the people of the United States should be afforded frank and complete information about anything which directly concerned them in the present or which might in the future affect them.

I say in the past this would have been axiomatic. To-day when we believe in "open covenants openly arrived at," no longer is it axiomatic, and to-day, therefore, I find to my surprise and astonishment that a resolution asking simply that the American people know what they are entitled to know meets with some degree of opposition perhaps upon the floor of the Senate, and a considerable degree of opposition from the press which represents the present administration.

Mr. President, fundamentally we are entitled to know, fundamentally in this democracy our people are entitled to know, what the treaty is. If it be answered, as it is answered by the administration press, that we are not entitled to know anything about what is transpiring at Paris until the administration sees fit to inform us, the irrefutable response is that the administration has already informed us in part; and if we are entitled to know in part what the treaty is that is being completed at Paris, we are entitled to know the whole of that treaty.

I hold in my hand the semiofficial summary of the treaty of peace given out and distributed by the Department of State. I observe that it is printed in the official printing office. It is designated and characterized "Semiofficial summary of the treaty of peace." It begins with this particular paragraph:

The treaty of peace. Semiofficial summary of the peace treaty as cabled from Paris to the Committee on Public Information at New York, and subject to minor corrections.

Then follows:

The treaty of peace between the 27 allied and associated powers on the one hand and Germany on the other was handed to the German plenipotentiaries at Versailles to-day.

Handed to the German plenipotentiaries at Versailles 15 days ago, published in Germany by the conquered people in this war, perhaps denied now to the American people, the victors in this war. If denied, upon what theory is it denied?

Mr. President, if the American people and the American Congress are entitled to a synopsis prepared by this administration, reciting what this administration sees fit to recite, then the American people and the American Congress are entitled to the entire document, in order that the American people and the American Congress may themselves determine whether they approve, whether they wish to amend, or what they wish to do with the particular document. The instant that the State Department, 15 days ago, gave to the people of this Nation a synopsis of this treaty, written by certain individuals, we know not who, in Paris, that very instant—I do not care what your diplomatic procedure has been in the past—the American people and the American Congress became entitled to the whole treaty.

In some of the press of the Nation to-day are published terms of the treaty which do not appear, even by reference, in this synopsis that is given to us thus officially. Mr. President, I ask why, in a synopsis which is said to be complete and full, and subject only to minor corrections, are important parts of the treaty omitted? If there are any parts omitted, why should there be the slightest objection in this body to permitting the entire treaty to be given to this body and to be given to our people?

I read—the language is not mine; and, perhaps, I would not in thus fashion have spoken—an editorial published this morning in the Washington Post. The title of the editorial is "The mockery of free government." One paragraph refers to this matter, as follows:

It is evidently the purpose of the so-called peacemakers at Paris to keep the treaty secret from their own masters until the enemy signs it. Then the allied peoples will be informed that they must take the arrangement as it stands, good or bad, acceptable or intolerable, with all its imperfections and injustices, because the enemy has accepted it! That plan is nothing less than a trap, to be sprung upon the allied peoples, to shut their mouths, tie their hands, and bind their wills to an arrangement that disposes of their destiny without their previous knowledge and consent.

What a hideous blunder has been made by the peoples' representatives at Paris in thus presuming that they can control the will of the allied nations and curtail the extent of the victory which the allied peoples have won by their own blood!

So, Mr. President, because we have been given a part of this treaty, I ask that we be given all of it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I inquire of the Senator from California if he is informed whether this treaty has been published in full in any of the allied countries?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not know; I am utterly unable to answer.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Can the Senator advise us——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Senator from California will permit me, I can say very definitely that the treaty has not been published in any country, but that refusal has been made to consent to its publication by those who must be considered.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Then I want to inquire, further, from the Senator from California—I dare say it has been answered by the Senator from Nebraska—if he can advise us as to whether there is an agreement among the representatives at the peace conference that the treaty shall not be published?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not know, and I do not care. If there were such an agreement among the Allies, then you violate it when you give to us a synopsis of the treaty, and when you give us a synopsis of the treaty you ought to give us an honest synopsis of the treaty.

Mr. TOWNSEND and Mr. WALSH of Montana addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I understood the Senator earlier in his remarks to state that the treaty had been published in Germany.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Two newspapers have stated the fact that the treaty has been published in Germany. Of course, I do not know anything about its publication; but there have been meetings held, if you will observe, in various places concerning this treaty, and I remember it was published only three or four days ago that at a meeting of women, in which Jane Addams was present, a letter sent by the President to that particular organization concerning the treaty was read. Whether they had before them the particular treaty—the whole of it—I am utterly unable to say. I can not tell whether the whole treaty has been handed to any parliamentary body; I can not say; but I do say that we have been handed a synopsis of the treaty, and when you grant us a synopsis of the treaty, any rule as to silence respecting the treaty necessarily you abrogate.

Now, I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I merely desire to make a further inquiry of the Senator. I assume that this synopsis was given out by a concerted agreement among the representatives at Paris. Can the Senator advise us as to that?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not know, and I do not care. It is a synopsis; presumably it is a synopsis that tells the truth; and the only reason that there can be on the face of the earth for not giving us the whole treaty when you give us a synopsis is that you have something to conceal and that you want to conceal it for an indefinite period. I am not referring, of course, individually to the Senator from Montana, but I am using the personal pronoun in its generic sense.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I understood perfectly well the Senator was doing so; but I desire to ask the Senator to whom he does refer by the personal pronoun?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I refer to those who have given to the American people this synopsis—presumably the present administration.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But I understand the Senator to assume that the treaty has been given out by agreement among all of the representatives of the allied nations?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not assume anything of the sort. I say I do not care whether it has been given out by agreement with one country or agreement with twenty countries. It has been given out to the American people, and having been given out to the American people they are entitled to all of it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let me ask the Senator just one more question: If there was an agreement among the representatives at Versailles not to give out the full treaty, but to give out only a synopsis, would the Senator then insist that that agreement ought to be violated by the administration and the entire treaty be given out?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I would insist, if the administration gave to the American people a synopsis, that it shall give the whole treaty.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Even though it had been agreed that it should not be given out?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not propose to discuss any agreement of that sort, and I can not assume—I will not for an instant assume—that any American, or any representative of free America, has entered into an agreement with any other nation that it will give out only a part of the treaty under the pretense that it is giving all of the present peace treaty. I indulge in no such assumption respecting this administration or the Government under which we now live, and I assume, of course, that a request such as is made in this resolution ought instanter to be complied with by the administration, and I trust that it will be, and that we shall find no opposition whatsoever upon this floor to the present resolution.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the resolution presented by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is seriously defective in form in the first place. It should not call upon the Secretary of State, but upon the President of the United States, if the request is proper. In that event, it should ask him to give the information, "if not incompatible with the public interest." It does neither of those things, but merely calls upon the Secretary of State to do something which he has no right to do.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the Senator if he proposes to offer an amendment to the resolution meeting the objection he has just stated? My reason for asking the question is that I had prepared an amendment which I had intended to offer, but I am perfectly willing that the Senator from Nebraska should do it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I had not considered offering any amendment to the resolution, because, in my opinion, there is only one proper treatment for this resolution. It is one of vast importance; it involves international relations; and it should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations for consideration before it is seriously considered by the Senate. I do not therefore contemplate doing anything more in this particular than to call to the attention of the Senator the very serious breach in form and propriety in asking the Secretary of State for information which can only be called for from the President of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I take in good part the suggestions of the Senator, but I wish to point him the obvious answers. He says we should ask the President. There [exhibiting] is the document that is presented by the Secretary of State to the people. It is stated that the Secretary of State has the full document. He presents us a part that he says correctly states the whole document. Therefore, there is no impropriety; on the contrary, it is a natural thing to ask the Secretary of State to give us the full document, as he has given us a synopsis of it.

The second objection the Senator raises is that the resolution should make the request "if it is not incompatible with the public interest." Think for a moment! Here [exhibiting] is the treaty; and the officials say to us that it is the full treaty, subject only to minor corrections. So, how can it be incompatible with the public interest to ask that we may see all that has been given? The suggestions of the Senator might be relevant if they were made in the first instance before we had received any information or any official document.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I trust the Senator will not interfere with me further in my reply to him. What I am bringing up first is a mere minor matter. I was calling his attention to a very evident breach of the proprieties and customs of the Senate in dealing with the Executive in relation to international matters; but I am not stressing that point; I pass it over, simply calling the attention of the Senator to it while passing on the further violation of the proprieties of the case in presenting this resolution and asking the Senate to act upon it at all.

Mr. President, the Constitution is very plain and explicit in vesting the power of negotiating and making treaties in the President of the United States. The only power and the only function given to the Senate of the United States is the power to advise and consent to a treaty negotiated by the President. In the whole history of the United States, so far as I know, the Senate has never called upon the President of the United States to supply to the Senate the copy of a treaty which he had under negotiation. Under the power of the Constitution and according to the custom of over a hundred years the President undoubtedly has the power after the treaty has been

negotiated in its tentative form, as this one has been, to tear it in pieces and refuse to send it to the Senate or publish it at all. It is his duty and his function, not our duty nor our function, to negotiate a treaty. Not only that, but after the President has sent a treaty to the Senate and after the Senate shall have ratified it, he still has the power to refuse to exchange ratifications or put it in operation. It is the Executive duty, and not the senatorial duty, to negotiate a treaty or to exchange ratifications of it.

If this were a treaty between the United States and one other country the President would undoubtedly have the power, if he willed it and if the Senate requested it, to supply the Senate full information and an accurate but tentative copy of the treaty in advance of its signing; but the United States is not the only country negotiating this treaty with Germany. The United States is only one of some fifteen or more belligerents which are endeavoring at this time to come to an agreement with Germany on this treaty. Up to the present time they have agreed among themselves tentatively; they have submitted the proposed treaty to Germany; they have given Germany a certain length of time to present objections and to request changes, and the press tells us this morning that one of the changes requested by Germany in some detail of the reparations provision has already been conceded. Other changes may be conceded; they will undoubtedly be asked. It is preposterous, in my opinion, for the Senate to interfere with the negotiation and demand the right to publish a document to which the other party has not yet agreed.

The President is not the only negotiator; the United States is not the only Nation involved. As the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] has suggested, it is almost certain that there exists an agreement among the nations associated with us in the war that the only publicity given to this document shall be the publicity given to it in the authorized summary which has been published in all countries. As I understand, and as I am informed, Germany is under the same pledge of secrecy, and in Germany the only publication which has been made is the publication of the synopsis or summary to which the Senator from California calls attention.

There is a further consideration. The suggestion that the full treaty be published has already been made in other countries and already denied by the representatives of those countries. I do not know that I am going too far, but I feel justified in saying that the President of the United States would have no objection, so far as the United States and the people of the United States are concerned, to the full publication of this document, but it can not be published in the United States without getting back to other countries.

We have few complications in this matter. We are not much interested in the details of this treaty with Germany; but when it comes to France, a neighbor of Germany, a victim of Germany, her interests are great, vital, and if France objects—and I understand France does object at this time to publicity, and England also, for Lloyd-George has gone on record as objecting—if France objects and Great Britain objects, it would be absolutely indecent for the Senate of the United States to demand the publication and embarrass our associates in this negotiation.

There can not be any possible reason for insisting upon it at this time. No possible good can come from it. It simply means meddlesome interference with the legitimate powers of the Executive; it simply means embarrassment to the representatives of Great Britain, France, and Italy; and it simply means the throwing of a monkey wrench into the machinery and rendering more difficult still a problem already infinitely difficult. I think the Senate of the United States would commit a gross breach not only of the customs of this country but of international proprieties as well even to call upon the President to answer such a question. It would be an indication that the Senate of the United States distrusts him; it would be an indication that the Senate of the United States proposes to interfere with him; it would be an indication that the Senate of the United States wants to render more difficult the settlement of the peace, which we all hope is close at hand on the other side.

As I say, I hesitate to go too far in stating things that I believe I know; but I do know that it would be a cause of infinite embarrassment, particularly in France, to make public at this time the present terms of the demands being made on Germany, some of which may be subject to modification, and one of which already has been modified.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the resolution of the Senator from California be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, just a moment in response.

I listened with some astonishment to the very emphatic utterances of the Senator from Nebraska and to the extravagant adjectives that he used during that discussion. I am utterly unable to comprehend the mental strabismus that can arrive at a conclusion such as he has suggested here. It is the veriest tommyrot for any man to say that we interfere with the peace conference, that we are doing something that is reprehensible, or that it is indecent to ask that that which has been given to us shall be given to us in full. On the contrary, it is the very essence of cowardice to be afraid to ask for that to which we are entitled, and which has been given to us as a synopsis.

The argument that is made by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska is an argument addressed to a particular condition of affairs which does not exist here at all. He is not speaking to the question of whether a full document, of which we have a synopsis, should be accorded us. Does the Senator mean to say that it was indecent to give to the American people what purported to be the full treaty that was made at Paris, and to give it in the form of a synopsis? Will it be contended that the whole wheels of the Paris conference must cease revolving, and that a monkey wrench is thrown into the entire peace formula because we have been given in America a synopsis of the treaty?

When we were given the synopsis of the treaty, everything that has been said by the Senator from Nebraska was answered fully, completely, and unequivocally. If there rests in the archives of the State Department a full document, of which this is a synopsis, the Senate ought to have it; but beyond the Senate the American people ought to have it.

This idea that representatives of the American people may go abroad, may sit in Paris, and in secrecy may deal as they see fit with American treasure and American blood, is a doctrine to which I will not subscribe for a single instant. This is the first time in the history of America when it has been contended that any man representing this great democracy could deal with a hundred million people in secret and tie them and their generations succeeding in secret into Europe's turmoils and Asia's and Africa's wars; and I will not, as an American, for a single instant subscribe to any such doctrine as that.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I desire to offer two amendments to the pending resolution.

I ask that the words "Secretary of State" be stricken out of the resolution and the word "President" substituted.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question? A motion has been made to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. THOMAS. I am quite aware of that fact. I think the Senator will not object to my suggestion when I have completed it.

Also, after the word "forthwith," I ask to insert the words "if not incompatible with the public interest."

In the event that the motion of the Senator from Nebraska does not prevail, I shall ask that the resolution be considered in connection with the proposed amendments.

Now, Mr. President, if I understand the situation correctly, the draft of the treaty, either in whole or in part, has never been submitted to the Senate of the United States by the Secretary of State or anyone else; but a synopsis, a very considerable synopsis, has been given to the American public. We are not, therefore, in the attitude which seems to be assumed by the Senator from California. There can be no question but that if the State Department had submitted to the Senate an incomplete document or a document although seemingly complete was not so in fact, we would have the right to demand forthwith from the President, through the Secretary of State, a complete text of the proposed document. We are proceeding, so far as this resolution is concerned, upon a public statement which, however official, is not officially made to the Senate of the United States.

I do not think I am mistaken, but if I am I am sure the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] will correct me, when I assert that no treaty has been submitted in the past by the President to the Senate of the United States until completed to the satisfaction of the executive department. If, therefore, this resolution is to prevail, it must prevail in the face of established customs and precedents heretofore set by our predecessors in this body. There would seem to be excellent reasons why the Executive should decline or fail to transmit a draft of a treaty to the Senate until it had been drafted and considered to his satisfaction; for, if I understand the province of the Senate—and I think I do—our functions begin only when a full text of the treaty is submitted. They do not begin until that period is reached, although the President may ask and frequently has asked the advice and opinion of the Senate with reference to pending international questions immediately or remotely important. So that I do not believe, Mr.

President, that there is either precedent or reason for the consideration of this motion, much less for its adoption, at the present time.

I am opposed to the doctrine of secret negotiation quite as sincerely as the Senator from California; but I have always recognized, Mr. President, the necessity in public as in private negotiations of conducting affairs with regard to superimportant propositions with more or less secrecy until a final tentative agreement has been reached between the parties; and I am satisfied that in this instance—the greatest in the history of international negotiation, covering more subjects of transcendent importance, perhaps, than those confronting other previous peace conferences combined—many score of important questions and problems will present themselves which in the very nature of things must be considered in private. If it were not so, Mr. President, there would be, there could be, no successful negotiation when crises in world affairs present themselves; and although the President is committed, and justly so, to open covenants, openly arrived at, he must subject himself to those universal exceptions which arise in the attempted application of all general principles in life, whether they affect statecraft, economics, or morality. Hence, Mr. President, I am not disposed to believe for one moment that there has been undue secrecy in the solution of the mighty problems which are confronting this peace conference, and which they must determine in advance of the commencement of our deliberations.

So the proposition presented by this resolution is, Shall the Senate require the Secretary of State to present to it forthwith a complete copy of a document in his possession, the substance of which he says he has given to the American public, before it comes to us in the proper and well-recognized official channels? I do not think so. Moreover, I am satisfied, as the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] has stated, that there must be some understanding between the parties to this negotiation; that for the present the world should be informed of what it has already received, and that until the German plenipotentiaries shall finally act, and the German nation accept or reject this treaty, no further disclosures should for the present be made. If that be so, then we would be recreant to the understanding thus arrived at by the American representatives if this resolution should now be adopted.

Now, whether this is so or whether it is not so, I, of course, am not able to say. I do not pretend to say; but certainly if this resolution goes to the Committee on Foreign Relations, where it belongs, that committee, through its chairman, will at once put itself in touch with the Acting Secretary of State and be informed of conditions without any reservations. It will then be in a position to report upon this, as it should be in position to report upon all other subjects of concern submitted to its jurisdiction.

Why the haste imported by this resolution? Do we expect to begin a discussion of the treaty before it gets here, before it has been accepted or rejected by the German plenipotentiaries and the German nation? Is it possible that the Congress has been called into extra session for the purpose of taking up this business at once? I deny it. The last Congress adjourned with an enormous Senate Calendar before it. It was filibustered to death—and in the course of the next few days it is my purpose, if consistent with the Senate's business, to speak upon that subject at some length—in consequence of which this extra session was called for the immediate purpose of considering and passing the great supply bills, upon which, if I am correctly informed, the House of Representatives is at present engaged.

Now, Mr. President, with all due respect to my distinguished friend, the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], it seems to me that he imagines a specter which does not exist—that the Senate of the United States will be called upon to consider and ratify a treaty without being fully informed of its contents, and that unless this resolution passes, and passes at once, we shall be deprived of that knowledge which is essential to the consideration of any subject, whether important or otherwise. This will all come in due time and in due season, and for my part I am willing to await the action of those who are charged with this supreme duty, believing that however they may be mistaken in the discharge of it, they are, as sincere patriots and Americans, endeavoring at all times to subserve the interests and promote the welfare of this great Republic.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I beg the Senator not to think that I am conjuring up a particular specter with respect to this treaty about which he has just inveighed—not that at all. We are all, however, now engaged in studying to the best of our ability everything pertaining to our foreign relations, to the league of nations, and to the treaty. All of us want such data, historical and otherwise, as we may obtain. A part of the data has been freely accorded us without our asking for it at all. It has been given to the American people.

Mr. THOMAS. Is not that enough to keep the Senator busy for a while?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No, sir; because there must be something else, or we would be given the entire treaty; and if that be inaccurate, or if it be an assumption that is unjustified, then in any event no careful man who studies a subject wishes to have it by piecemeal; and if a part is given to us that is an honest synopsis, there can not be any objection in morals or in good faith or in diplomatic usage or in any other process of ratiocination by which you deny the document itself of which you say you give us a good-faith synopsis.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am very glad that my apprehension regarding the Senator's attitude is not strictly correct. I have no question of the sincerity and earnestness of purpose of my friend, the Senator from California, with regard to this or any other proposition which he advocates. I know he is discharging his duty to his conscience and his country as he understands it. I am sure the Senator believes, as I believe, that the statement of the Secretary of State that he has given the most important features of the proposed treaty to the public is correct. Of course, there are reasons why some portions of the treaty are withheld. There must be some reasons. But the Senator does not by the form of his resolution propose to give the Secretary of State any opportunity to present those reasons for our consideration. It may be incompatible with the public interest, but whether it is or not this resolution requires that he shall respond forthwith. I believe they are good reasons, and I know that the Committee on Foreign Relations will be informed of those reasons just as soon as they are authorized by the Senate of the United States to take charge of this resolution. I might imagine what those reasons are. I might be able to make a shrewd guess concerning them. On the other hand, I might be mistaken. I feel very sure that they have relation to the negotiations now pending with the German plenipotentiaries. Whether I am correct or not, if it is true, as the Senator from Nebraska has intimated very strongly, that only the portions of the treaty have been given to the public everywhere which by common agreement among the several representatives of the nations should at this time be given, then regardless of any other circumstances or propositions we should defeat this resolution, if we do not, on the other hand, adopt the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, I am also spending some time in a consideration of this tremendous proposition. I do not pretend to be as efficient and as capable, either physically or intellectually, as the distinguished Senator from California, but I find I have been given possession of enough of the proposed treaty to keep me busy day and night. I can not imagine how an individual, however eminent he may be nor however omniverous in the quest of knowledge, can be otherwise than satisfied with the morsel of the treaty which he now has before him. It is the large outline of the most tremendous international covenant that has ever confronted the world, and as a consequence, Mr. President, it is one to which we must give a great portion and if necessary all our time for its consideration before final action is taken, if we are to act intelligently and with a proper conception of our great responsibilities.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. Surely if the Senator from Colorado has given to the document the careful study which he says he has, he must take notice that the summary on its face is incorrect. There are words that make nonsense. There are words which are obviously misprinted. It is a very imperfect summary. If you take the part in which it summarizes the league of nations, because there we have what purports to be the full text, you will get a very imperfect idea of what the real draft of the league of nations is from reading the summary. In other words, the summary to my mind is almost worthless. I should not dare take anything as being so on the authority of the summary.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think the criticism of the Senator from Massachusetts is correct in part, but I do not admit by any means it applies to the entire document. There are some portions of it which are seemingly obscure, and if this resolution were designed to secure a more clear and definite statement of the summary itself I could conceive why we should consider it.

Mr. LODGE. In addition, Mr. President, I have seen printed in our newspapers here, and also other articles printed in newspapers abroad, containing textual provisions of the German treaty which are not included in the summary at all.

Mr. THOMAS. I have no doubt of it.

Mr. LODGE. It is given out piecemeal. As a summary it is worthless to predicate anything as regards the treaty.

Mr. THOMAS. Conceding that, for the sake of argument, let me ask the Senator, who has been in public life for many years, and who has adorned the Committee on Foreign Relations during the entire time of his service, and who is soon to become its distinguished chairman, and as such has doubtless perhaps a greater responsibility than ever rested on the shoulders of any of his predecessors, does he not think this resolution should be addressed to the President of the United States instead of to the Secretary of State; that it should ask for this information "if not incompatible with the public interest," and should it not go, as similar resolutions generally do, to the Committee on Foreign Relations, in order that that committee may take up the subject with the Acting Secretary of State, and then report to the Senate?

Mr. LODGE. I think it should be drafted in the usual form which is always the practice in regard to any inquiry relating to international matters. It has never been the practice of the Senate to address any inquiry to the Secretary of State. That department has been differentiated from all others. It has been the practice to address the President, and invariably in addressing the President the words "if not incompatible with the public interest" have been used. But I can see no reason whatever for sending this particular inquiry to the Committee on Foreign Relations. A great many inquiries which relate to foreign matters are not sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations——

Mr. THOMAS. That is true of unimportant ones.

Mr. LODGE. And many are, of course. Important ones are, if good reasons can be given for sending them there. In this particular case I can see no reason for sending the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is an inquiry simply asking the President to give us the text of the treaty with Germany. He can reply perfectly well that it would be incompatible with the public interest to do so, which will protect him. In fact, we shall not get it anyway. So we are debating an academic question.

Mr. THOMAS. Then we are wasting the Senate's time here.

Mr. LODGE. No; we are not wasting our time, because we are calling attention to the new method of "open covenants openly arrived at," and that is desirable. When the treaty comes here, if I have anything to do with the charge of the treaty, I shall not invite the Senate to adopt the method of "open covenants openly arrived at," because they have presented to the world the most furtive negotiation and the most secret one almost which history can record in modern times. I shall simply ask the Senate to treat this treaty and all connected with it with plain and, if you like, with pitiless publicity.

Mr. THOMAS. I shall join the Senator from Massachusetts in asking for that.

Mr. LODGE. I shall want it laid before the country without any secrecy. We are now asking for one of the documents. In the case of that document we have had a synopsis—a bad one, but still we have had it. Other portions of the treaty have been textually printed abroad and here. I saw quoted textually from foreign newspapers the other day three clauses which I do not think appear in the summary at all, relating to what they call the "proces verbal," and when the treaty should take effect. Also here texts have appeared not alluded to in this summary. If it is proper to put in the press fragments, I can see no impropriety in our having the whole of it.

The President brought over here a draft of a league and handed it to us; that is, he handed it to the press. The general understanding was that we were to take that first draft. That is what was expected of us. It was a tentative draft submitted to the criticism of the world. Then he took it back and they amended it. They made it much worse than it was before. Then they published it again, the whole of it, in the midst of the negotiations, and now they say we must not have the text of the German treaty which every German shopkeeper is reading to-day.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Senator from Colorado will permit an interruption, the Senator from Massachusetts is entirely mistaken. Nothing has been published in Germany except——

Mr. LODGE. I do not think the Senator from Massachusetts is mistaken.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I affirm that he is mistaken, and I have a reason.

Mr. LODGE. On what authority?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. On the highest authority now in Washington.

Mr. LODGE. By the President?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have stated it is by the highest authority now in Washington.

Mr. LODGE. The highest authority now in Washington is worth no more than what we have here.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There has been published in the United States everything that has been published in any other country, Germany included.

Mr. LODGE. It does not appear so.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I am on the floor only by courtesy of the Senator from Colorado, and I have trespassed too long on his time.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey for a question.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. In connection with the discussion I send to the desk a clipping taken from the Washington Post, purporting to be a cablegram from a special correspondent, and ask that it be read.

Mr. THOMAS. That is hardly a question; but I do not object to it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. It is an answer if it is not a question.

Mr. THOMAS. Possibly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

WILSON PREVENTS PUBLICATION NOW OF TREATY TERMS.

(By John O'Brien, special cable to the Washington Post and Public Ledger.)

PARIS, *May 18.*

Owing to the publication in German papers of certain parts of the text of the peace treaty transmitted by the German delegates, it was decided to permit the French press to do likewise, and it was semi-officially announced yesterday afternoon that a publication would begin this morning.

At a late hour last night, however, it is learned that President Wilson interposed a vetc on the procedure, which thereupon was abandoned.

It is impossible to discover the reason for this attitude, in view of the fact that the Germans know more of the text of the treaty than the allied peoples, but it is assumed that President Wilson was unwilling to face the criticism of the French, and perhaps the American press when the exact wording of certain clauses, notably that pertaining to reparations, becomes known.

Sharp criticism of the French Government by socialists and conservatives alike is expected to result from the decision not to publish the treaty text as demanded formally by the socialist group, as well as the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado will proceed.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if the President has countermanded or vetoed or in any other manner interfered with the publication of the text of the treaty, I assert positively and unequivocally that he must have had, and did have, the best of reasons for it, and that, to my mind, instead of militating against, supports the attitude of the Senator from Nebraska. The Senator from Massachusetts has informed us that this resolution will not be complied with; that we will not get a copy of the treaty; and that all we are doing is debating an academic proposition. I suggested, and I now assert, that if such is to be the result, we are wasting time here. Candidly I do not think the Senate of the United States, in view of the business before it, has any time to waste. I hold in my hand the congressional output of the last 15 days of the expiring Senate of the last Congress. Physically it is a tremendous output. Intellectually the subject might be one of controversy. It embraces 1,973 pages, or 131 pages per day by the average. Water when evaporated into steam is said to expand seven hundred and seventy-five times. Congressional oratory when compressed into type is diminished in far greater proportion, yet we have this huge volume as the result. We are wasting time, and precious time, if that is so.

I do not believe, Mr. President, that this is one of the trivial resolutions which the Senate considers, and should consider, without referring it to an appropriate committee. I do not think the Senator who is the author of the resolution so considers it. It is one of the most important resolutions that has been introduced in the Senate since I have had the honor of being a Member of it. It is therefore, independent of other reasons, because of its vast importance imperative that it should take the usual course and be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as suggested by the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. THOMAS. I was about to yield the floor.

Mr. POMERENE. I desire to ask a question.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator from Nebraska has given assurance to the Senate that there are very important reasons why, in his judgment, this treaty should not be given to the public at this particular time. Other objections have been made. I rise to ask the Senator from Colorado this question: Within his experience in the Senate has any resolution been presented to the Senate calling upon the President for information relating to our international affairs which was not, upon objection to its present consideration, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. THOMAS. So far as my memory goes, I do not recall any instance in which the procedure was not as suggested.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from Colorado yield for a further question?

Mr. THOMAS. I may add that the precedents should in this instance be particularly insisted upon, because the resolution asks for the first time, I think, in our history for the text of a treaty before the President sees fit to transmit it for our consideration. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON. Does the Senator from Colorado recall an instance during the administration of former President Roosevelt when some resolution of inquiry was presented to the Senate touching negotiations that were in progress respecting a treaty, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the present leader of the majority, took the floor and contended with great force and sincerity that it was improper for the Senate to make an inquiry of this character during the progress of negotiations affecting a treaty? Does the Senator recall that the Senator from Massachusetts then insisted that the conduct of negotiations was purely an Executive function, in which the Senate should not concern itself, and that any attempt to do so would operate as an interference with the negotiations? Does not the Senator think that the argument then made by the Senator from Massachusetts is equally applicable at this time, and applicable with great force?

I will ask the Senator from Colorado another question: Did he see press reports published widely throughout the United States during the last 10 days that the Senator from Massachusetts, as leader of the majority, and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], as whip of the majority, had sent a telegram to every Member of the present majority urging them to refrain from discussing the proposed league of nations treaty until a partisan conference, a Republican conference, could be held, and the Republicans in the Senate should be thereby afforded an opportunity to reach a conclusion whether or not they would stand for a league of nations in the treaty or oppose it; and did the Senator see in connection with that the refusal of a number of Senators to be bound by such influences to refrain from discussing the league of nations treaty?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, it is difficult for me to remember, much less to answer, all the questions which have just been propounded. I saw the published announcement and request of the Senators from Massachusetts and Kansas a few days ago. I was not a Member of this body during the reign of Theodore Roosevelt, and therefore my knowledge of what occurred is purely historical. I did, however, have occasion in January last to address the Senate on the treaty-making power of this body, and at that time quoted very copiously from one of the most masterly addresses on the subject to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, delivered by Senator Spooner, of Wisconsin, during that period, in which he took the position emphatically that the treaty-making province and power of the Senate began and ended with the consideration of a treaty when the President saw fit to transmit it to this body for that purpose; and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], in a short but admirable speech, expressed his assent to and approval of Senator Spooner's contention. That is undoubtedly the rule. It should not be departed from except in cases of most extraordinary emergency, and I trust the Senate will not be led to do it at this time.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Colorado has referred to me, may I say one word?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Colorado certainly did not read any statement of mine which in the least resembled that which the Senator from Arkansas has stated. The request made by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] and myself was that they would refrain from interviews or making statements until they had an opportunity to consult with their colleagues. There was no suggestion of any partisanship in it. We are as nonpartisan as anyone could be.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course the Senator meant his Republican colleagues?

Mr. LODGE. I did not say that.

Mr. THOMAS. I know the Senator did not say it, but no other Senators were honored by the request.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield for a further question? I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator from Massachusetts will receive a question from the Senator from Arkansas, I am willing he should ask it.

Mr. LODGE. I am glad the Senator referred to that debate upon which former Senator Spooner made the very able speech he just quoted, and my assent to it. I have not changed my views at all.

Mr. THOMAS. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. LODGE. The Senate is not part of the negotiating power, but Presidents have frequently consulted the Senate during the pendency of negotiations and before negotiations. I collected and gave the instances, which appear in a public document here.

Mr. THOMAS. That was voluntary but not obligatory.

Mr. LODGE. Entirely. I never suggested that it was obligatory. On the contrary, I think it is not obligatory, but it has been wisely done by such Presidents as Washington, Lincoln, and Grant, and I think it might have been wisely done by others. But it is not obligatory. The President is distinctly not obliged to consult the Senate at any stage of the negotiations. This has nothing to do with consulting the Senate during the negotiations. It is to ask for the complete publication of a document already partially published. I do not understand that we are allies or that we are bound by any treaty to allies. The President is always careful to say "Nations with which we are associated." We have no treaty binding us not to have that information, and I think we ought to have the right to ask the President for the draft of the treaty which he has submitted to Germany.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from Massachusetts, by the courtesy of the Senator from Colorado, yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas for that purpose.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Massachusetts has stated the action of himself and his colleague, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], in telegraphing their associates the request already referred to—that they not discuss the league of nations treaty until a conference could be had—was nonpartisan. I should like to be informed whether the Senator from Massachusetts was speaking humorously or in all seriousness?

Mr. LODGE. I was speaking in all seriousness. We have not said a word about it. Not one word has been said in any conference held by the Republicans.

Mr. ROBINSON. I will ask the Senator from Massachusetts another question. Is it a fact that no one but Members on that side of the Chamber were requested to refrain from discussing the treaty until a conference could be held?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly. Our request was addressed only to Senators to whom we had a right to address such a request.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator saw, of course, the statement in the press of a number of Senators on that side of the Chamber to the effect that they refused to be a party to making the league of nations treaty a partisan issue and that they regarded his action in submitting that request as a partisan act. He saw that statement, of course?

Mr. LODGE. No; I did not see it.

Mr. ROBINSON. You did not see the statement imputed to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], and three other Senators, stating that they refused to be controlled by such influences? The statement was imputed to the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] that he did not see how it could be made into a party question. I do not know whether that implied that he was willing it should be made such, if it were possible to do so.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, only yesterday, in speaking to the State chairmen from all the States of the Union of the Republican Party, I distinctly stated that I could not discuss with them the league of nations, because I did not regard it as a party question and never have.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield for another and further question?

Mr. LODGE. I did not see the statement to which the Senator from Arkansas refers.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas will permit me, with reference to myself I will say that I did not see, or at least I do not recollect seeing, a published statement purporting to quote me about this matter.

But if there was any statement to that effect it was an erroneous statement. I never made any such statement as that to which the Senator from Arkansas has referred. I did make the statement—and I do not know whether it was published in the newspapers or not—that if the bulk of the Republican Members of the Senate were opposed to this covenant of the league of nations and a majority of the Democrats were in favor of it, it would automatically become a party question, and that my view of the question of partisanship was that it was not a question which could be artificially determined, but was simply a question of the attitude taken by the members of the various parties. Since the Senator from Arkansas has quoted a statement purporting to come from me, I beg leave to say that, entertaining the views and having the profound convictions that I have on that part of the treaty of peace that is denominated a covenant of a league of nations, I shall be perfectly delighted to see it made a party question by the opposition of Republicans, because my idea of the functions of a great political party is that a party in the service of the Nation should take a position, and should take a correct position, upon issues which affect the Nation, and I believe that would be the correct position.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield further to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. THOMAS. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON. The action of the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Kansas in sending out the telegrams to which I have referred has been taken and accepted by the entire press of the Nation as an attempt to make the league of nations treaty a party question, and that construction is the logical consequence, I respecfully submit, of that action itself.

Now, with reference to the statement just made by the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] that he would be glad to see the subject made a party question, permit me to say that I think it is regrettable that a subject of this character and importance should take that course. There are some subjects which should be discussed and determined free of the ordinary influences which control partisan action; and if in all the history of the United States a question has ever arisen which should be determined without partisanship, in which the representatives of the people should express as best they can the will of the American people, it is a question of the character of the one which we are now discussing.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I agree entirely with what the Senator from Arkansas has just said.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado still yield?

Mr. ROBINSON. I should like to make just one further brief statement. I shall conclude in a moment.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield for a moment.

Mr. ROBINSON. It will be remembered that when the first draft of the league of nations treaty was published the President issued a statement to the effect that he expected to hold a conference with members of the Commitee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the similar committee of the House of Representatives, and members of the committees were respectfully requested to refrain from discussing the matter until after that conference. I speak concerning a matter of current history when I say that a bitter protest was made by the Senator from Massachusetts and those associated with him against the action of the President in that particular as an effort to stifle debate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. Just a moment, and I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. I trust the Senator from Arkansas will allow me to interrupt him there. I observed that request religiously. I never said one word about the league until after the White House conference.

Mr. ROBINSON. The statement of the Senator from Massachusetts is entirely correct, as I recall it. He did not discuss the league of nations treaty until after the conference at the White House. But we all recall that his party associates took offense at the request of the President and expressed it on the floor of the Senate. It was published in the newspapers and other periodicals throughout the Nation as an effort upon the part of the President to stifle debate; but now, after that has been published and the revised draft has been published, we are confronted with the very singular request of the Senator from Massachusetts and his associates on the Republican side that Republican Senators refrain from discussing the revised draft—the very thing the President requested in the first instance of all Senators, but the request of the Senator from Massachusetts was for the purpose of holding a conference with Republicans only and deciding what they should do in regard to it. I submit that that is conclusive evidence of an attempt to make the question a partisan issue.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] has the floor.

Mr. LODGE. I observed the President's request religiously, and so, I think, did every member of the Committee on Foreign Relations except one Senator, who refused the invitation; but the President, after having made that request, landed in the city of Boston, and while we were silent made an ardent speech for the league.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Colorado had yielded to the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. THOMAS. In just a moment I will yield to the Senator from Florida.

The President did make an ardent speech in Boston in favor of the league, but it was provoked by a number of violently ardent speeches in opposition upon this floor, delivered previous to his landing.

I shall now yield to the Senator from Florida, but let me say, before he begins, that I have been trying to yield the floor for some time, and I will yield it as soon as the Senator concludes.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I was merely going to ask the Senator from Colorado, who is disposed to treat the resolution as a serious and important proposal—and I am inclined to treat it likewise, in justice to the Senator from California and because it seems to me it ought to be so treated—whether or not if the resolution is agreed to now or is referred to the committee and reported from the committee and then favorably acted upon after the committee reports it, and the document is laid before the Senate, the Senator thinks it would be in order then to discuss the proposed treaty? In other words, the situation is that the peace terms have been agreed upon by the Allies and submitted to Germany, but Germany has not yet signed the treaty. There are suggestions that there may be changes and alterations yet made. Consequently, it is not a completed document; and would it be in order, would it be the proper thing for the Senate to enter upon a discussion of that sort of a document in that situation, in view of the fact that later on the President is to submit to the Senate whatever is finally agreed upon in the nature of a treaty?

Of course, I will say to the Senator that the remarks offered in support of the resolution by the Senator from California directing criticisms as to methods pursued around the peace table was an argument directed against the constitutional provision which empowers the President to negotiate treaties, it seems to me, and is confined to that, because the President has only been doing precisely what the Constitution authorizes and empowers him to do.

The suggestion by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that the resolution is worth while, because it gives an opportunity to sneer at the President or to criticize the administration may perhaps justify it in his view. I do not think so, and I take it that the President will take care of himself so far as that is concerned, and when the time comes the American people will take care of those who sneer at the President; but outside of that, what would be accomplished if the resolution were adopted and the document laid before us admittedly in its incomplete state? Would it be in order, I again ask the Senator by way of presenting the question again, in his judgment, to discuss it if it were before the Senate now? Until the negotiations are concluded and the terms are agreed upon by all the parties and are finally settled it would create confusion, be misleading the public to have brought here and published an incomplete and unfinished document, and it would be premature to discuss it. There will be ample opportunity to criticize and sneer, as well as for legitimate discussion and well advised consideration, after the completed work is laid before us.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, that is a question which I think must adjust itself to the individual judgment and conscience of every Senator. For my part I hesitate to express my view of what should be the conduct of Members of this body under the conditions described by the Senator. Each will settle the subject for himself and settle it according to his own judgment and to his own conscience. My personal opinion is, however, that it would not be proper to discuss the subject of the treaty if we had a certified copy before us of the draft as it was submitted to the German plenipotentiaries, for I believe that our

function will not begin until that document is officially laid before us by the President of the United States, for until then we can not know the form of recitals or the substance of its provisions.

It is impossible, Mr. President, for any Executive to encounter the responsibilities and seek to discharge the great duties that confront him, and escape misrepresentation, severe criticism, abuse, and contumely. No generation ever lived fair enough or free enough from its prejudices and its environment to properly survey and to pass judgment upon the character and career of its great contemporaries. We have never had a President upon whose shoulders was placed a burden of undue responsibility who has not paid the penalty of misrepresentation, of misconstruction, whose motives have not been arraigned and suspected, and who has not been reproached or maligned for imbecility, for faithlessness to his duty, for lack of patriotism. We need but call to mind the careers of George Washington, of Thomas Jefferson, of Andrew Jackson, of Abraham Lincoln. The martyr was abused and reviled more bitterly, more cruelly, and more unjustly than any man who ever adorned the great office of President of the United States. So with Woodrow Wilson. Yet I firmly believe after this generation shall have passed away, after the heat and bitterness engendered by the tremendous controversies which confront and arouse us shall have ended, when we now here shall have retired from the scene of action and our successors shall occupy our seats upon this floor, they will do the same justice and pay the same tribute to the memory of Woodrow Wilson that we all, whatever our party creed, so sincerely offer at the shrines of those great Americans who dared and suffered that America might live, that free institutions might survive, that the great Republic might endure as a monument and an inspiration to all the children of men.

Mr. SHERMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from Illinois yield to me for just a moment to complete a statement? It will take, I think, only a moment.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do so, providing I shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois yields to the Senator from Arkansas with the understanding that he does not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I stated a few moments ago that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], in the year 1906, during President Roosevelt's administration, had taken the position that the Senate ought not to interfere with negotiations by inquiries as to what the President was doing. Since the negotiations concerning this treaty have not been completed, the effect of the pending resolution is an inquiry as to the progress and result of the negotiations, and the only result of it will be to advance debate upon the question, and to interfere with or influence the negotiations, to bring influences to bear to eliminate or to modify the contemplated provisions of the treaty. I want now to put into the RECORD the language that the Senator from Massachusetts then used; and I want to say that I think it is absolutely applicable to the question at issue, the only difference being that at that time the Senator from Massachusetts was the spokesman of the majority who had a Republican Executive to conduct the negotiations, while at this time he is spokesman of the majority, the President belonging to a different party. The language which the Senator from Massachusetts then used is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 24, 1906, on page 1440, and is as follows:

> No one, I think, can doubt the absolute power of the President to initiate and carry on all negotiations; and after a treaty has been returned to him with the ratification of the Senate, to withhold it from ratification if he sees fit so to do. There is no doubt that the Senate can by resolution advise the President to enter upon a negotiation, or advise the President to refrain from a negotiation; but those resolutions have no binding force whatsoever, and the action of the Senate becomes operative and actually effective only when a treaty is actually submitted to it. We have no possible right to break suddenly into the middle of a negotiation and demand from the President what instructions he has given to his representative.

If we have no power to make that demand, we have no right to make a demand as to what negotiations have occurred or as to the results of the negotiations until the President is ready to submit them.

Further, the Senator from Massachusetts, in the same speech, said:

> From the foundation of the Government it has been conceded in practice and in theory that the Constitution vests the power of negotiation and the various phases—and they are multifarious—of the conduct of our foreign relations exclusively in the President. He does not exercise that constitutional power, nor can he be made to do it, under the tutelage or guardianship of the Senate or of the House, or of the Senate and House combined. * * *
>
> When he shall have negotiated and sent his proposed treaty to the Senate the jurisdiction of that body attaches and its powers begin. It may advise and consent or it may refuse. And in the exercise of this function it is as independent of the Executive as he is independent of it in the matter of negotiation.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I do not wish to invade particularly the territory occupied by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], but I wish to read from the President's views on the subject of his exclusive treaty-making power. I quote from him as follows:

> But there is another course which the President may follow, and which one or two Presidents of unusual political sagacity have followed, with the satisfactory results that were to have been expected. He may himself be less stiff and offish, may himself act in the true spirit of the Constitution and establish intimate relations of confidence with the Senate on his own initiative, not carrying his plans to completion, and then laying them in final form before the Senate, to be accepted or rejected, but keeping himself in confidential communication with the leaders of the Senate while his plans are in course, when their advice will be of service to him and his information of the greatest service to them, in order that there may be veritable counsel and real accommodation of views instead of a final challenge and contest. The policy which has made rivals of the President and Senate has shown itself in the President as often as in the Senate, and if the Constitution did intend that the Senate should in such matters be an executive council it is not only the privilege of the President to treat it as such, it is also his best policy and his plain duty.

That, together with the context, I respectfully commend to the Senator from Arkansas for meditation and future reflection.

I also refer to an address made on the 24th of February, 1919, at Boston, Mass. This was on the occasion of the President's return from his first trip abroad. He had from midocean by wireless communicated not to the Senate, who are his advisers in treaty-making matters, but had communicated to the public the first draft of the league of nations. I might parenthetically say also that he requested the Senate not to discuss the league of nations in its original form as he communicated it to the American people, but to abstain sedulously from any discussion until he had told us how it had been negotiated and its provisions framed. He said in the course of his address, referring to the original draft of the league of nations which was imperatively to be accepted without change, that if there were some narrow minds who were not inclined to take it in its form as presented—

> I should welcome no sweeter challenge than that. I have fighting blood in me, and it is sometimes a delight to let it have scope, but if it is a challenge on this occasion it will be an indulgence.

If that language were used last February in the demand that we were to take the original form of the covenant of the league of nations, or the constitution of the league of nations, as it was called then, without amendment, if that was the reply to the respectful request of the Senate that they be informed and allowed to discuss it, that was a challenge to parliamentary and political combat. Was that the calm counsel contemplated by the Constitution—to inform not only the public but in fact talking to the Senate that there was fighting blood in him and he accepted it not as a challenge to fight, but as an "indulgence." Therefore, any contest that may be instituted in this body is not a contest, but is a parliamentary indulgence, and in that I shall now engage.

Mr. President, the covenant of the league of nations is a revolutionary document. The principal articles, either in the original or the amended draft of the league, are in violent conflict with our national system of government. The original document was called "the constitution of the league of nations." Criticism was made by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] and others in this Chamber that it created a new world power; that the member nations thereby became subject to this supersovereignty; and the amended draft contains language describing it as the "covenant of the league of nations," substituting the word "covenant" for "constitution." There is, however, no difference in the necessary effect, because the word "covenant" implies a promise made of binding validity. So it is of no consequence which word we use in the preamble or if the amended draft be considered in its entirety. The league remains a supersovereignty created and set above every member nation and government that enters into that league. It is beyond our Federal Constitution, beyond the 48 States, and beyond any mandates of the American people. Under our Constitution, if such articles are effective, it must be by virtue of war powers beyond its provisions and vested in the sword wielded by a military dictatorship.

It is of little immediate consequence whether the treaty be communicated to us or not. We, either with or without it, can as well digest the wisdom of the Senate's refusal to adopt the previous question or gag law in the Senate last winter. We were told by many wise men, including the Executive himself, that the open forum in the Senate was an anomaly in legislation; that it was a menace to the deliberate conduct of free government. Certain willful Senators some time before that had incurred his criticism. There was an amendment made of the rules of the Senate, but not one that closes the open forum in the Senate under ordinary conditions.

The league of nations is interlocked with the peace treaty, designedly for an ulterior purpose. If it can be welded upon the peace treaty, it is supposed to procure votes otherwise impossible. Therefore, under the resolution of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] or the amendments of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], it is not of so much consequence whether we get the form of the peace treaty to-day or to-morrow, but that we get it in adequate time for discussion.

The peculiar value of the motion of the Senator from California consists in the fact that it develops that the Executive denies legitimate parliamentary information to this body. The joining of these two documents is a confessed case of log-rolling. According to the synopsis, the league of nations covenant and the other provisions of the treaty have been so interwoven that it would require long deliberation by a skilled committee to separate them in the present form we have them. If the league be ratified while the Government is at war, the vast and unknown domain known as war powers of undefined extent will be invoked not only in this Chamber, but in judicial tribunals, to declare the treaty and the league of nations valid and binding obligations upon this Government. All the powers delegated to the President by Congress or seized and exercised by him as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy can be drawn upon to support all those vast unknown, implied powers, the league, and whatever provisions of the treaty may be in conflict with the chartered laws of the land. This stamps the league as revolution and not as ratification or diplomacy. If peace can be first concluded, those extensive and undefined war powers disappear upon the instant at the end of the condition of war between this country and the Central Powers or Germany. The enumerated and implied peace powers now found in the Constitution of the Republic measure the heights and depths of human authority in binding our people in their established relations with the other nations of the world.

The United States Government commands the supreme allegiance of its citizens. No earthly power exercises greater authority over American citizens than does the Federal Government. I yield to it my allegiance under all conditions. I recognize the right not of the Senate, not of the members of the peace conference, not of the 14 or more nations that sit at the table in Paris, not of any European Government, for no authority on earth can command me, my life, and my fortune except the Federal Government framed by the fathers, and by virtue of which we sit in this Chamber. Temporal power, Mr. President, can go no further in human government than the power of this Government over us. That power finds its source in the American Constitution. In peace civil powers are construed and interpreted by peace tribunals.

War powers are interpreted, defined, or created by the military authority which exercises them. Its jurisdiction is of the camp and field. It is arbitrary and dictatorial of necessity. Free government can not survive on such a foundation. It always enlarges and increases its jurisdiction, for it never rests. This is human history from its earliest dawn to the recent governments that went down in the dusty death of yesterday. Let this Senate first ratify a treaty of peace; then we may well consider under civil procedure and civil authority, unawed by Executive war powers, the colossal, vital changes proposed in our form of government.

The revolutionary experiments bristling from this league may then be submitted to the people whose lives and fortunes are proposed to be cast into the bloody pool of the whole world's quarrels. Such changes as may be deemed proper may then be had through the established channels of constitutional amendment and parliamentary government. Alleged reforms will not then rest in the arbitrary edicts of the Executive, nor will the diplomacy of a free government find the Commander in Chief of its Army and Navy its only fit representative at the peace table of nations. By virtue of what authority does he sit in Paris? Is it because he is President, or does he wield his power and his influence because he is the military representative of a free government?

It is a singular spectacle indeed for a Republic's great elemental powers to be revised, curbed, and made subordinate to an alien creation in which it holds but a single vote by an elective civil magistrate, clothed in war powers and confessedly impatient of the traditional precedents of our country and the obligations of the laws of the land. Discussion which precedes understanding will be by a free press and free speech if peace be first concluded, and free speech will be possible once more in this country.

Now, a hundred million people must calmly talk, outside of the Senate Chamber and the House of Representatives, under the espionage act, in public and private, of the infamous, criminal insanity of the attempt to barter them and their posterity to the Old World to shed their blood in every dispute around the globe, whether it threatens or concerns their peace and safety or not. Altruism never before rose so far above human nature and common sense, nor idealism so deluded its visionary worshipers.

The twentieth century does not call us to reenact the crusades, and devote ourselves and our future generations to an endless combat with evil wherever found, as defined by this league, until it shall be driven everywhere from the earth. What a miserable delusion of man's attempt so to anticipate the results of the millennium! The ideal exists nowhere save in art and letters. Toward it the mind and spirit turn when unfettered with the material limits of our perishable habitations on earth. It is the goal never reached by mortal man, nor is human life ever destined to see or know the artist's dream or the poet's elysium of a sinless world. The misguided imagination of intellectual perverts, who have more sympathy for their impossible mental creations than for living human flesh and blood, has wrought more evil among mankind than the vicious propensities of the criminal and the distorted images of the insane. Their dogma is a narrow but, to them, an infallible creed. Who will not worship at their shrine is worthy of exile or the halter. Their league of nations is based on a state of civilization that does not exist.

Beware of him who unlooses his unbridled fancy to roam unchecked at will, to rearrange and remake all the public and private relations and activities of life. It degenerates at last into a pernicious, meddling interference that eats out and destroys like a cancer every sane, practical institution wrought out by the common experience of nations to safeguard the great elemental rights of mankind.

The man who writes a book to portray a new and perfect government he assures us he has invented, sufficient for the salvation of the entire earth, is more dangerous to his country than the anarchist who seeks to usher in the rule of dynamite as a cure for every ill.

Col. House foreshadowed the destruction of constitutional government in the United States in his work of fiction published in 1912. It is a text book for the peace conference in Paris. This novel exhibits his disregard of law and his belief in revolution. It throws a steady light upon his acts in the Paris conference, and explains why President Wilson chooses him as his chief adviser in navigating the uncharted seas.

George D. Herron, lately the President's envoy to the Bolshevist government in Russia, says of the President in his recent book, in 1917:

> He is revolutionary beyond anything his words reveal, beyond anything his contemporaries have discerned. As contrasted with America's President, the parliamentary leaders of German socialism are medieval reactionaries.

I caught him at it a year ago, but it did not seem to attract much public attention. I knew of Mr. Herron in Chicago some 22 years ago. He attracted some attention there by his peculiar ideas of the social relations in Chicago. It is enough to say that he emigrated. He went to the State of Iowa finally—not that their morals are more lax there, but there was less gossip.

Five members of the President's Cabinet are tainted with socialism. I am keeping close to the earth, Mr. President. I am not a poet or a sculptor. I do not deal in rare marbles or canvasses. Mine is very ordinary clay. A vast swarm of his appointees, too, in departments, boards, and bureaus, are known to be open and avowed socialists, single-taxers, apostles of government ownership, and hostile to the whole institution of private property. This atmosphere accounts for the eager grasp of private enterprise ostensibly for war purposes. It explains, too, the reluctant grudging release of those undertakings when the war emergency has long passed. It indicates with precision the vicious tendencies now apparent that lurk about the administration and its satellites. Under such conditions the powers of this league become doubly dangerous, and menace every legitimate enterprise of private life, as well as our form of government.

A government set up above the constitution and laws of the country and operated by Executive discretion is a despotism. Administered by alien nations, it is a call to action and resistance by every means God and nature have given America and American hands.

The administration of Woodrow Wilson, even under constitutional forms of government, is a hybrid between a French revolution and an oriental despotism. History would forget the reign of Caligula in the excesses and follies of the American Government operated under the league of nations, interpreted by President Wilson and Col. Edward M. House. It is now Jack Cade at one end, and Abdul Hamid at the other.

The ghost of Carl Marx squeaks and gibbers in one department, while across the way, when he is home at the seat of government, stalks the menacing shade of the Commander in Chief, wrapped in the mantle of undefined war powers about the presidential office. A more sinister assembly of men never threatened the peace and safety of our country than now demand that unlimited powers over the lives and fortunes of the American people be surrendered into their keeping.

Let no one forget, while admiring the mediations of dogmatic intellectuals, the ultimate purpose of their devotions. The head of the administration may be immersed in esoteric philosophy concerning the universal abolition of evil at one moment, but the next the lust of battle mounts in his blood, and he speaks of a challenge to combat as an indulgence; and again, before he closes, as at the end of the last session, he speaks of hanging those who cross his purposes or refuse to do his will. There will be a considerable entertainment when he starts on the latter process. The Bolshevists will be jealous of the commotion in this country. It will invite them to return, such of them as hatched the trouble in Russia, to the East Side in New York City. On a certain occasion we are advised that the millennium awaits on the 14 points, and soon after we gather, even from censored cables, that the aforesaid points are a mass of ruins. Again, I say, never was unbridled power asked to be trusted to so dangerous hands.

The revised draft of the league of nations extends over every government the scepter of an international sovereign. There is no difference between the amended league, the covenant, and the constitution of last February. We were told to take it last February without change; that it was the grossest sacrilege to discuss it even. This league in either form creates a new power and imposes a new obedience upon all the countries of the world. It thrusts its hands into the affairs of all governments. From it nothing is protected, nothing is secure. The amendments are widely heralded as an abandonment of the principle of supersovereignty. It is alleged that a mere league or pledge of good faith is substituted, leaving all the elemental sovereign faculties of the several member States unimpaired. This is a basic error.

A certain very genial and capable Senator said that nobody objected to the league of nations but lawyers. It does not hurt the lawyers any. They are a hardy, capable lot of men, who will survive any kind of treatment. There is scarcely a lawyer in the United States of any standing at the bar who does not regard the league of nations as the creation of a new world power that sits in judgment upon the member nations, their governments, and their peoples.

The thing created in the original league still endures. It rises in the affairs of men as a vast structure, endowed with all the vital organs of an independent State. Its potential grip upon the world is as universal as it is amazing, if it be carried into execution. Elemental powers that sweep the entire field of human action and appertain only to sovereignty are vested in this political organism. Appropriate instruments are provided to execute these powers and construe, interpret, and extend them everywhere in practical operation. The term "sovereign" does not need to be written upon a creation that so visibly possesses all the attributes of absolutism and finality in the rights and duties of the several nations of the world.

Note its framework, powers, and instrumentalities. The member nations of the league are represented in an assembly which meets as occasion may require. It may—

deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the league or affecting the peace of the world.

Each member nation has one vote in so dealing with such subjects. These powers are found in article 3. This article is jurisdictional. It is likewise so comprehensive as to leave nothing it may not deal with. Every terrestrial act and thing is included. The only limit is found in the law of gravitation. All the equipment, powers, and indicia of a legislative body appear in this assembly. It is an attempted parliament of nations controlled by an oligarchy. The oligarchy is found in article 4, where it is provided that the council is the executive branch of this creation. It names five members of the council, one each from the British Empire, France, Italy, Japan, and the United States, as the first five permanent members. The temporary members represent Spain, Greece, Brazil, and Belgium for the other four of the full membership of nine. The four permanent members shall be selected by the assembly. Each council member shall have one vote. Annual meetings or oftener are authorized, and the council may—

deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the league or affecting the peace of the world.

It will be observed that the jurisdiction of the council and the assembly is conferred in identical words. Neither human language nor physical laws admit of further enlarging the scope of the powers of either. Each member of the council is given one vote on this extensive range of subjects. Greece, Spain, and Brazil each have the same vote as the United States. These three nations, to illustrate, will exercise three times the voting power of our Government in the council. They will be member nations whose representatives sit in the assembly. There they will vote in the appointment of the four permanent members of the council, three times to our once.

The council in article 14 is ordered and empowered to submit to the members of the league for adoption plans for a permanent court of international justice, competent to hear and determine any dispute of an international character the parties may submit to it. That court may give an advisory opinion on any question or dispute referred to it by the council or the assembly.

There is an ex-President of the United States who is quite active in promoting the league, both the original and the amended league. He says that pygmies and old ladies are the only ones who are opposing either form of the league, that he would not trust Senators opposed to the league over night. If he were to put on a kimono and shave off his moustache, Mr. President, he would be the prize dowager of the whole beauteous sisterhood. I am excessively weary of his lucubrations. He has not had an original thought since he left the presidency. He takes his inspiration from this administration. Being second hand, it is stale before he ever reaches the public with it.

I ought here parenthetically to remark that when the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] hears of what has been said, I have no doubt it will shock his parliamentary sensibilities. I offered a letter here at the last session that met with his sturdy disapproval. I say what I do, and offer what I do, because one can meet certain of the ex-President's remarks, such as I have referred to, only by ridicule: "Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit," saith Solomon of old. Not that the distinguished gentleman is so classified, but the argument named is.

A permanent secretariat, comprising a secretary general and necessary assistants, is provided in article 6. This is an administrative instrument, appointed by the council with the approval of the assembly. It becomes the custodian and keeper of all the records and papers of the several instruments of the league probably. It serves as the clerical force, the espionage branch, and the instrument of investigation. In practice the assembly, the council, and the permanent court of international justice compose the three great departments—legislative, executive, and judicial—that characterize the separation of sovercign power in all modern times. The identification of the new organism as a permanent and independent government is complete. Time will develop and strengthen its hold upon the several nations who submit to its membership or are brought under its sway.

I shall therefore submit my views on the assumption that this covenant of the league of nations, as well as the original covenant, is not an assembly of existing governments united by a friendly treaty for self-defense against one or more aggressive outlaw nations. I regard it as, and I believe it is, a new sovereign power proposed, assuming to assert dominion over governments and nations, to sit in judgment on the American people, and frame new laws to order their lives and seize their property. Its decrees, if effective, bind the United States Government, abrogate its Constitution, and rule our people by laws made in Geneva, Switzerland, or whatever other capital may be selected by the council as the seat of this new creation and government. The sovereignty of this Nation passes from the territorial limits of our country to a foreign capital. Dominion is transferred from American to alien soil. Congress can not legislate, it can not pass appropriation bills nor collect revenues, it can not enact labor legislation nor exercise the usual police power belonging to an independent State until the decrees of the latest orders of the Geneva council or measures in the assembly shall first have been studied and understood. War can not be declared nor peace concluded, armies raised and supported, navies provided and maintained, nor the National Guard of the several States mustered and equipped even for domestic duty within the limits of the State until this alien power wielded by the nations of the Old World shall have advised us of the limits of our national sovereignty.

If these fetters can not be bound upon us under civil law, under the constitutional powers now existing, by executive officers or the United States Senate, the exigencies of war or apprehended war and undefined military power will be invoked

irrevocably to fasten them upon the United States Government and our people.

The reserved rights of the 48 constituent States of the Union which lie as a substructure beneath the Republic are utterly destroyed by this league. These great local training grounds for the practical duties of the citizen are obliterated. The internationalism of Col. House and President Wilson is proposed to be substituted for the American nationalism of Washington and Lincoln, and the troubles of the world are to be undertaken instead of our own. This league casts in the inflexible mold of their omniscience the fortunes and the fate of our country. Do our wide walls encompass but this pair, the master of us all? Is the "breed of noble bloods" yoked so beneath their usurping hand they bear the palm and rule alone? So asked Cassius of Brutus when he observed the power of the mighty Julius.

The question constantly arises, as one contemplates their conduct, from whom or what instrument they obtain their authority, what warrant have they, from what source do they trace their power to frame and impose upon their Government and the people of the United States such a creation? Do they believe and do the advocates of this league believe the Federal Government is preserved and sustained by this remarkable document of the league of nations in its amended form, as printed by the association urging its adoption? Does this grant of arbitrary power to an alien body sustain our Government?

The President qualified on each occasion of his inauguration by taking the following oath of office:

I do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and will to the best of my ability preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

The President is now endeavoring to subvert and destroy the fundamental laws of the Republic. Does he believe he is preserving and defending that Constitution by creating and ratifying powers which, if effective, impair or abrogate its fundamental and sovereign powers?

The league fixes in unchangeable limits the present boundaries of every member nation. Its frontiers are final. Shantung, with its 40,000,000 of Chinese, is transferred to Japan without a plebiscite.

We have heard much of self-determination of peoples in territory to be transferred. That is given a dignified and diplomatic name by calling it plebiscite. China would like its application, but sees no hope.

If China appeals to arms for redress, we pledge ourselves to send our armies and navies to confirm and perpetuate the robbery of a trusting friend. The inevitable controversies on European territory have already sowed the seeds of distrust and suspicion. What the future world peace will be requires an international optimist of large proportions. Fiume and Danzig are the fertile spots for future international strife. Only the novice and the idealist undertake to know the uncharted future of such problems. To the European of affairs they present the explosive material ready for war on a moment's notice.

Mr. Morganthau, former ambassador to Turkey, addressed the soldiers of the American Expeditionary Force comprising the army of occupation at Coblenz, and told them not to be optimistic about universal peace; that the next 15 or 20 years would probably see another war growing out of the rivalries, the jealousies, and the mistakes of this controversy.

No statesman assumes to anticipate all the wisdom of the ages. Yet if this league is sound in its articles it undertakes to settle what only time can develop. It leaves no discretion to posterity.

Article 10 binds the members of the league, as in the original draft—

to preserve as against external aggressions the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression the council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

We undertake to defend and preserve the borders of every member nation as fixed at the time of the adoption of the league and the peace treaty. When France joined with the American colonies in the Revolution, if this league had existed it would have forbidden the sword of Lafayette to be drawn with Washington's, and would have crushed the infant Republic beneath the armies of George III and Louis XVI. It announces in substance to mankind that the period of successful revolution has drawn to a close in the world's history. It has closed the book of human experience and written the last chapter in the evolution of human government. It is the knell of revolt against arbitrary power. It offers a premium on bad government, however intolerable, by shutting the door of hope on the oppressed and warning external powers to leave the tyrant alone with his victim, sanctified by the holy covenants of this eternal league. May not the future mothers of mankind gaze in mute despair upon the starless night of races bound for ages in the changeless dominion forged in these mighty powers! Might they not pray to be smitten with a sterile curse that their offspring might escape the doom of perpetual bondage pronounced in this infamous covenant, malign and sinister to all the future sons of men!

It obligates the United States to take up arms, to draft its men, and tax its people to support the boundary lines of Great Britain, France, or any other member country possessed of colonial dependencies wherever found. The press reports recently carried information of the invasion of the East Indian frontier by the Afghans. It may or may not be of significance. Its meaning in the interpretation of article 10 is that it is our controversy. American lives may be sent to Khyber Pass to perish in a dispute with which we have not the remotest concern. We were not consulted when the elder Pitt and his parliamentary associates laid the foundation of England's East Indian empire a century and a half ago. I will consent to concern my country now only when the invasion of that distant colony threatens our own safety.

Article 11 enlarges our obligations under article 10 It declares:

Any war or threat of war whether immediately affecting any of the members of the league or not is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole league, and the league shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations.

This league thereby becomes the police officer of the world. The United States consents to form a part of the league's posse comitatus. Every member of the league is here given the right to bring the attention of the assembly or of the council to any circumstances which threaten to disturb either the peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends. We are made parties not only to war and threats of war, but to every complaint made by member nations. There is small need to consider ourselves at peace after we have ratified the treaty with Germany if this league be adopted. Under these articles it will be of short duration. As the wealthiest nation in the league, with its man power unimpaired, with great taxable resources, the heavy burden will continually fall upon the American people as we are constantly more and more made the high constable of the habitable globe.

Article 16 adds to the continuing condition of the war not covered by articles 10 and 11. Article 16 provides:

Should any member of the league resort to war in disregard of its covenant under articles 12, 13, or 15, it shall ipso facto be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other members of the league, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their nations and the nations of the covenant-breaking State and the prevention of all financial, commercial, or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking States and the nationals of any other State whether a member of a league or not.

It shall be the duty of the council in such case to recommend to the several governments concerned what effective military or naval forces the members of the league shall severally contribute to the armaments of forces to be used to protect the covenants of the league.

The members of the league agree further that they will mutually support one another in the financial and economic measures which are taken under this article in order to minimize the loss and inconvenience resulting from the above measures, and that they will mutually support one another in resisting any special measures aimed at one of their number by the covenant-breaking State.

The Constitution of the United States and article 16 can not both endure within the same territory. They are of that irreconcilable and repugnant character as to be wholly impossible of concurrent operation. This article marks the parting of the ways definitely and finally.

The first clause of article 16 declares if any member of the league resort to war in disregard of its covenants under articles 12, 13, or 15, it shall of itself be deemed an act of war against all other members. This creates a condition of war without a declaration by Congress. With no act on the part of any public authority representing this Government or its people we are at war with the offending State. We are at once subject to invasion and our merchant shipping exposed to a hostile navy wherever found. We covenant thereby immediately to lay an embargo on all commercial and financial relations with the covenant-breaking State. This again is a power exercised in this country by Congress and by no other authority. This engagement is imposed on us not by our voluntary act but by the misconduct of a State in its relation to some other State. It may not remotely concern our peace and safety, but we pledge ourselves to engage in the matter in whatever part of the world it may have occurred.

The members of the league further agree that they will support one another in the financial and economic measures taken under this article, and will resist any special measures aimed at one of their numbers by the offending state. This pledges absolutely the power and resources of our country in advance. It

removes from Congress any discretion. Embargoes laid under war conditions, financial and economic relations severed, are the inevitable instrumentalities of war. The support of such measures bind our Government in anticipation to sustain the course adopted whatever it may be by every means known to the power of our Government. This, therefore, pledges the United States, when ratified, to declare war, and to employ every necessary step to wage it because some alien and distant member of the league has broken its covenants. How, we know not, and why, we know not, Congress becomes a perfunctory body, a mere debating club like the German Reichstag under the late Kaiser. If this article, therefore, does not deprive Congress of all voluntary power or discretion on this vital subject, it is idle to employ language in an attempt to do so.

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution enumerates, among other powers expressly conferred upon Congress, the following:

To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water.

This power is an empty form if article 16 of the league is effective. War is declared or not declared under its provisions as a nation keeps or breaks the covenant it has engaged to observe. I do not believe if the President negotiates and approves and the Senate ratifies such an article it abrogates this sovereign power constitutionally vested in Congress. It would be a most anomalous method of amending the Constitution and is of no binding validity in case it be ratified.

Why, then, urge a void article in what I believe would at best be but a mere treaty?

It is quite outside the established channel provided for amendments in that charter itself. It is astonishingly like the method of making treaties and enacting a code of international law described in Col. House's novel to which I have frequently referred. There is a singular coincidence in this book and the opinion of President Wilson on the inconsequential character of constitutional powers and limitations. It may be mere chance, but the close parallel followed by the equally close association resulting in the contemptuous disregard of the Constitution by virtue of which both of them sit at the peace table is so remarkable as to arouse inquiry.

Another clause of Article I, section 8, provides that Congress shall have the power—

To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years; to provide and maintain navies; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

No greater sovereign power is exercised by government than that of peace and war and the creation of the necessary forces for waging it. Coupled with these powers is section 7 of Article I, which provides—

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.

And read with this is the provision, in section 9 of Article I, that—

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law, and a regular statement and account of receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time. Neither shall any person holding any office of trust or confidence under the United States, without the consent of Congress, accept of any presents, emolument, offer, or title of any kind whatever from any king, prince, or foreign State.

The difficulty or impossibility of executing the powers of the amended league without action by Congress therefore becomes apparent. The tax power is concerned.

In the English-speaking race the taxing power has led to some of the most historic struggles in the development of free government. Our Constitution was framed and the powers quoted vested in Congress with the full knowledge of the past. These powers were conferred with deliberation and purpose agreeably to the safeguards of free government wrought out by parliamentary experience and established on the field of battle. England and the Netherlands bequeathed to us the wealth of their constitutional experience in the tax powers administered by a self-governing people. The low countries rose in renewed revolt against the Spanish crown when unjust taxes were laid upon the people. Englishmen secured the right of parliamentary taxation at Naseby and Marston Moor, and guaranteed it against invasion by the forfeited life of the first Charles. No written constitution preserved this enduring right of the British subject, as in our constitutional history. It is recorded, however, in the imperishable language of Cromwell's Parliament, of the abdication of James II, and of the immortal documents that reach from A. D. 1215 to the unquestioned supremacy of the House of Commons and their great supply bills in 1914–1918 that supported the allied cause against Germany. Our Republic does no more than adopt the experience of centuries on the right of the people in all free government to control and fix the money bills under which they pay their taxes. These sovereign powers of the American Constitution are of the gravest concern.

Let no one forget that the articles of the amended league will impose upon us financial burdens by a government sitting and operating at Geneva, Switzerland. These powers rank next to the great headlands that secure the rights of person against the rushing tides of arbitrary power in every age. They must be kept inviolable against violation by domestic usurpation or invasion of foreign powers.

When article 16 undertakes to pledge the financial power of the United States without the intervention of the great constitutional authority of Congress, in which it alone is vested, it is an attack upon constitutional government as flagrant and unjustifiable as the ship money of Charles I, or the suspending and dispensing power of statutes claimed by James II.

There is a limit to Executive authority in this country. That limit is found in the Constitution. If there be an Executive who disregards the Constitution the power of its enforcement against him and the power of revolution remain in the hands of the people. No Executive can destroy it sitting in Paris or elsewhere with his associates. It is now time to remember it. It may be time to impose salutary restraints later.

The members of the conference representing Great Britain, sitting at the peace table, undoubtedly have constantly in mind the fact that the United Kingdom of Great Britain has no written constitution. Her charter is a series of compacts and agreements, elemental principles confirmed by usage, petitions, acts of Parliament, and decisions of her courts.

Her Parliament exercises supreme and uncontrollable temporal power. Its acts constitute the highest authority in the British Empire. Its acts can not be unconstitutional because they import sovereignty in themselves. They exceed in their binding obligations the power of the British King, of his cabinet, and every subordinate that represents the kingly power. There is in practice no royal veto power in that country.

Our country is builded upon the supremacy of a written Constitution, of enumerated grants, of powers and limitations upon the Government created under it and prohibited by it to the States by the authority of whose people the present Government is created. The Constitution, not Congress, nor the Executive, is sovereign, and by it the validity of our legislation must be tested. It is the American system, and the time is not far distant when its wisdom will be demonstrated. Great Britain's representatives at the peace conference may not fully appreciate the importance of the constitutional differences in the character of the two Governments. I assume they represent and guard the interests of Great Britain. It is the duty of our representatives to safeguard the United States. They have yielded too much to Great Britain now. The more reason is this why the Senate should have the information called for by the resolution of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and why the Senate should in every lawful way defend the country now.

The league assails our constitutional Republic so as to arouse the profoundest apprehension. What Great Britain may do through Parliament is no test of what may be done through the President of the United States. What is lawful by the British Parliament or foreign diplomacy is the most flagrant usurpation in the United States. This is our Government and our country. If it be abandoned and deserted at Paris in its hour of peril, shall we not protect it at Washington if we are worthy of our birthright of old?

The support pledged in article 16 invades the congressional power to raise and support armies and provide and maintain navies. This great governmental power is not vested in the President. He commands only such forces as Congress sends him. If none be sent, he is a commander without a soldier. This power is exclusive in Congress. Our Government's representatives at the peace conference, appointed by the President, including the appointment of himself by himself, possess no such power. The agents of this Government having no such power can not create an institution that will possess that power. The offspring of an agent's act can exercise no greater power than is delegated to the agent himself. This is axiomatic, of course. The President is Commander in Chief only of the armies and navies provided and supported by Congress.

Money bills are an essential part of waging war. Neither the President nor the Senate could conduct war unless the House of Representatives levied the necessary taxes and made the required appropriation. In the double sense, therefore, the President and his appointees have no ability to bind by drafting article 16 either the Government, the people, or the taxpayer to support its covenants. That power rests exclu-

sively in Congress. It is a complement of the war-making powers, and relates back for its exercise to the people in frequent elections held under the laws of the land. Such exercise of sovereign power is an indispensable attribute of free government. That power exercised or attempted to be exercised by the President is the distinguishing feature of lawless and arbitrary government. If it be undertaken to be exercised by a government created under the league of nations, it is equally lawless and arbitrary.

Article 17 enlarges the opportunity for controversy, purely family quarrels confined to league members seeming to be insufficient to absorb the attention and exhaust the talents of the league. It authorizes the council to invite member States and nonmember States in controversy to accept the obligations of membership to enable the council to settle the dispute. Disputes wholly between nonmember States authorize the council to assume jurisdiction and conduct an inquiry. The invitation of the council is in the nature of an international process or summons, and is to be deemed adequate to confer jurisdiction. A nonmember nation which shall resort to war against the member nation having been so summoned shall be deemed to have committed an act of war against all the members of the league, pursuant to article 16. If a member or nonmember nation decline the inquisitive offices of the council, it may thereupon take such measures as will prevent hostilities and result in the settlement of the dispute. It may even anticipate war and promote universal peace by getting into the fight ahead of the potential belligerents. This will make disarmament easier under article 8. If this be of any virtue, it is a general roving commission to the council to meddle in the affairs of the whole world. In the council the United States has one out of nine votes to protect itself against a universal entanglement with all nations. It is an international grand jury in perpetual session to embroil the earth in chronic strife.

The incurable propensity of mankind, growing out of curiosity and a belief by most people that they can do any given act vastly better than the ones then engaged in making the effort, leads multitudes to interfere in the affairs of others. This inveterate disposition is greatly strengthened and improved by making the interference compulsory upon the council. The language of article 17 is mandatory. The council, no doubt, would be far from reluctant to engage in the affairs of everybody, but in the interpretation of language when the word "shall" is applied to a public duty it makes that duty obligatory upon the officer. Article 17 thereby becomes a competent handmaid of article 16 in universal international commotion.

Article 20 requires all league members to abrogate all treaties or conventions inconsistent with the terms of the league. It sets an example likely to be followed in breaking faith with the solemn covenant between nations. So far as it applies to unexecuted secret treaties operative after a conclusion of peace, no objection could properly be made.

The Monroe doctrine, in article 21, is declared to be a regional understanding. It is defined as a policy to secure the maintenance of peace. This article is declared by English authority—it is declared by an editorial in the London Times and by other British publications—to be subject to the interpretation of the league or the council. It is intimated that no difficulty will be experienced in handling this doctrine by interpretation if it should prove an embarrassment.

Article 22 covers the subject of mandatory tutelage of colonies and backward races. The Government which undertakes to care for any such a people does so as its voluntary act under the amended league article. The executive power, however, in mandatories is in the council. In that body the United States has one vote. It has the largest population, the greatest wealth and production of foodstuffs, and the most numerous man power for military purposes of any of its nine members. Its indebtedness growing out of this war measured by its private taxable wealth is less than any other belligerent. What would be the natural consequence in a voting power of eight to one? The eight with heavy war debts, a diminished man power, taxes far above our per capita, their production of food and manufactures below this country, would present not only eight votes against us but would insist upon our superior resources and ability to undertake the guardianship of the newly created nation and the protection of ancient races from long continued abuses and oppression. The United States would become the good samaritan of the Old World. Voluntarily or involuntarily we would embark upon a crusade surpassing Peter the Hermit or adventures that would consign Don Quixote to deserved oblivion. It is well for us to consider now the impropriety and danger of placing ourselves where we may be coerced by foreign influences into the assumption of stupendous undertakings.

The Turk is a foreign body in Europe. He is a relic of fanaticism and Moslem conquest. When Constantinople fell in 1453 his crescent rose above its shattered walls, yielding to gunpowder used for the first time in siege, and has ever since remained a menace to all not professing the Mohammedan faith. The fairest shores and waters in Europe and Western Asia have been by him turned into shambles for centuries. In every age Turkish oppression has written its bloody chapter.

The Russian Czars, Nicholas and Alexander, sought in 1853 to protect their subjects—Greek Christians—resident in Turkish territory from the slaughter of fanatical hordes. They repeated then what we know of the assassination of Armenian and Jew in our generation. Russia asked a protectorate over her defenseless subjects. It was denied and the Crimean War followed. It threatened to disturb the division of territory in Europe and interfere with the balance of power. England, France, and Sardinia joined with Turkey, defeated Russia, and the Turk has remained in Europe to this day. If Russia had been permitted to discipline him he would have returned to Asia, whence he originally came. The selfish ambitions of statesmen who thought more of territory and trade than human life are therefore the cause of present conditions in Europe relating to the Turk. England and France being responsible for his presence now, it is fit that they undertake the task of disposing of him and his possessions.

France already has colonies in northern Africa; England, military posts in the Mediterranean and oriental waters; her armies are in Asia, her colors are floating above the walls of ancient Jerusalem, and the Holy Land is under her dominion. In these circumstances it is unwise for the United States to permit herself to be placed where the eight powers on the council may impose the Turk on the United States as his part of the white man's burden. England and France likewise have great material interests in Africa. They are territorially many thousand miles nearer the Dark Continent than we are. This is also true of the European countries. Therefore let the allies assume the responsibility of the Balkan Provinces, Poland, the Jugoslavs, and Slavic peoples with those named as peculiarly appropriate to the exercise of their powers.

Mexico and the Western Hemisphere are our problem. The Western Hemisphere is territorially a part of our undertaking, and we properly ought to assume under the Monroe doctrine the resulting burdens. The protection of alien person and property, the restoration of stable government, the preservation of peace, all are the performance of international obligations we may undertake to guarantee.

Article 26 concerns an amendment to the league. It requires a unanimous vote of the council and a majority of the members of the assembly. This makes amendment very difficult. A single vote on the council can block any amendment. As an unchangeable document it is qualified to rank with John Locke's Grand Model.

The argument is presented for the league as a preventive of war. We are asked if we are not opposed to war. Every right-minded person is. We are also opposed to fire, bloodshed, famine, and pestilence, but this does not argue that we therefore are for the President's original or amended league, because we have no assurance that it will prevent any one or all of them. It does not end those scourges. It is assumed this instrument is a conclusive insurance policy against all the calamities to which humanity is subject. Aside from the destructive effect on the Government of the United States and the institutional liberty which is our common birthright, the league itself is a gigantic firebrand for a world conflagration. It is no more than a coalition. It is no more than the combination created by the sovereign powers in the congress of Vienna. It is the signal for a great preparation for the next war. It depends for its success on military and naval force. If it shall prevail it will be because of the rule of force; the coalition opposed to it will set up different standards and insist upon a system of ethics denied by the Latin and Anglo-Saxon races of the world.

We are continually met with the statement that this document will end all wars. Who would not fervently pray this might be so? Who does not know—unless he be a dreamer, a novice, or a vain pretender seeking power for himself—that all any league can do, be it treaty, covenant, or sovereign charter, is to reduce war to a minimum. Nothing penned by the human hand or written on parchment will ever subdue the unholy passions of human nature. The tables of stone graven with the ancient commandments delivered to Moses for a historic race have exerted their influence through many thousand years. The laws of Leviticus and the Pentateuch administered justice through many centuries. Christ was born, delivered His Sermon on the Mount, gave a new code of morals to the world, suffered

crucifixion, and left His disciples inspired by His example and sacrifice to convey His teachings to posterity. These are Hebrew and Christian documents and teachings, human and divine.

Through the long years great historic secular charters appear. The English barons wrested the Magna Charta of 1215 from an arbitrary king. It has been confirmed by subsequent sovereigns more than 30 times. The Petition of Rights presented by rebellious taxpayers represented in Parliament to Charles I in 1628, the habeas corpus act of 1679, the Bill of Rights presented to and confirmed by William and Mary in 1688, the illuminating decisions of English courts on search warrants, the verdicts of courageous English juries on criminal libel, great elemental acts of Parliament safeguarding human rights, the constitutions written by France following the despotism of her Bourbon kings, the heroic devotion of the Netherlands blazing the way for a constitutional union of States, and the calm wisdom of Grotius in international law, our own Declaration of Independence and Federal Constitution have all been contributive through the ages to promote justice and prevent war. Still in that time, in spite of immortal documents, human and divine, the sacrifices of heroes and martyrs, and the devotion of generations of just men, war has continued by Christian, pagan, Jew, and gentile. It has not even been mitigated when conducted by many races. Science and art, mechanical knowledge, and the ability to enlist the forces of nations have done but little save to contribute to the fearful destruction of civilized nations when grappling in war. If these tremendous agencies for good working through the genius of every generation have been unable to accomplish universal peace, how will a document written in Paris by President Wilson and Col. House end the wars of the world and usher in the millennium?

The President has impressed upon Europe the belief that the American people are ruled by the ideals he has so frequently expressed. Peace based on these ideals must, in turn, differ from peace based on the practical relations that have heretofore subsisted among mankind and the several nations of the world. If those practical relations no longer exist, world conditions and men's natures must have materially changed. I do not believe they have; I am skeptical. They have not changed in the United States. I know that; I require no cablegrams from Europe to give me that information.

If the allied governments had written peace terms on their own understanding, it would not have been the peace we will have presented to us. That peace is based on the covenant of the league of nations. Europe expects the United States to assume the major part of the burdens created by it. The league reorganizes the world, and especially Europe and Asia, on a new basis.

We must accept mandatories under the league in Asia and Africa, and contribute both men and money to the undertakings of the allied nations in Europe. One million American soldiers will be required to meet the responsibilities and duties of the United States in foreign lands. There is little use for the President's message of a few days ago, transmitted from Paris, to discuss the reduction of taxes. War taxes will continue for many years, and the taxes to administer mandatories under the league will endure longer still. The call for 8,000 men to serve in Siberia and those now in northern Russia are the first levies to empty American homes and embark us on the Wilson ideals. Parents of sons of military age must prepare for the sacrifice at the shrine of the Old World's preservation under the league of nations.

The voluntary acceptance of the tutelage of colonies and backward races is no defense against our assuming the burdens. Once the treaty of peace is made on the President's league as a basis we will be told it is our treaty and our league, that both are idealistic, that they do not fit the actual conditions in Europe, its territory, its races, or its Governments. But the United States has insisted, it will be said, on applying its theories to a condition of human excellence and perfection that does not exist. We therefore must be prepared to supply the deficiencies between mere ideal hopes and aspirations and the unideal actual situation by our Army and Treasury. Having placed ourselves in this situation, the eight other members of the council representing European nations will in all probability proceed to define our duty. With the league ratified and President Wilson in control, the burdens of three continents will be liberally apportioned to us. We will be so placed we can not escape the responsibilities we have morally placed upon ourselves, and they will be riveted upon us and our posterity in perpetuity.

Armenia and the Jews in western Asia will be allotted us. The curbing of the Turk will be our task. We must conclude a treaty to guarantee the safety of the French frontier against Germany. We must help confine the Bolshevist conflagration within the borders of Russia, even if we do not intervene to quench it, if its fanatical disciples insist on being world incendiaries. No one living will ever see our soldiers absent from the Old World under this league. The American people will be inextricably tangled with the rivalries, feuds, and wars of Europe and Asia.

The President has assumed to set aside the treaties made by the allies to gather the strength of unprepared nations against the deadly assault of prepared Germany. He was writing messages declaring we were too proud to fight, demanding peace without victory and no annexations and no indemnities, while Great Britain, France, and Italy joined their strength and fought for self-preservation. Their treaties were not open treaties, it is true, because they were made against the savage and treacherous foe whose clandestine intrigues had endangered the world. It was then no time for homilies and scholastic platitudes, however well they sound now in paper leagues and paper covenants.

If Italy were promised the return of territory of which she had been despoiled as compensation to enter the war, it was justified, even though it was done by a secret treaty. If Russia were promised Constantinople and access to the Mediterranean, it, too, was justified. They were necessary means of defense against Germany. In a deadly world crisis methods can not be scrupulously weighed in metaphysical balances. Both are now condemned by the President because they were not open covenants openly arrived at. How poor such casuistry when all Europe shook under the measured tread of military Germany!

The calm judgment of history will approve the diplomacy of Great Britain and France, even if not openly published to a listening world when the cannonade of German guns was heard in Paris and on the English Channel. Our President dallies with the abstractions of the closet while criticizing such treaties.

The great Republic of China sought to join the Allies. She had suffered from German spoliation in 1897. Japan has expelled Germany and seized the Chinese territory and concessions taken by the latter. Japan exacted from China a treaty confirming the former's rights to hold the country and concessions of which China had been plundered by Germany as the price of Japan's consent for China to join with the Allies against Germany. This, too, was a secret treaty.

At the time we were about to declare war against Germany, Japan secured from the Allies assurances of their approval of all her holdings in Shantung. These proceedings were none of them open covenants openly arrived at.

Italy's secret treaty for the return of Dalmatia is condemned by the President. The self-determination of the people in the transferred territory is invoked to attach it to the Jugo-Slav nation. Italy under this loses the benefits of her treaty with the Allies. Fiume, then a part of Austria-Hungary, three-fourths Italian, is not permitted the right of self-determination on returning to the country of its own blood and language.

The 40,000,000 Chinese in Shantung are denied the right of self-determination and delivered to Japan. They are our Allies. We assist in their plunder. The peace-conference nations are the accomplices in delivering stolen goods to the receiver thereof knowing them to be stolen, and, following the well-known rule of criminal jurisprudence, all are equally guilty with Germany, the original thief.

There are many pawnbrokers in the penitentiaries of the different States of this Republic, put there on less evidence than could be adduced in the case of the delegates to the peace conference. They received stolen goods in circumstances that would have led any prudent man to know they were stolen and that fasten upon them guilty knowledge, and so they become equally guilty with the thief. Here is a great league, comprising many Christian nations. Most of those that lead in the bad arts of war are Christian races. They present to the descendants of Confucius the net result of Christian civilization in the robbery of 40,000,000 of their people and their delivery to an alien power. May we not hang our heads in penitential shame at such abasement?

Poland is given a mere approach and easement of shipping instead of sovereignty on the sea, according to the 14 points. Her access to it is through an alley on alien soil, flanked with German bayonets from the time she leaves her own territory until she crosses the city limits of Danzig. A more prolific source of constant trouble could not have been devised in Europe if the prince of darkness and the whole satanic school of demons had sat at the conference where the treaty has been framed.

A league of nations founded on such a betrayal of Poland, on the robbery of China, our own ally, on the abrogation of the treaty made with Italy in an hour of deadly peril, a base pal-

tering with the principle of self-determination doubly interpreted with a duplicity unrivaled in even the congress of Vienna, so as to desert our ally in war in the day of peace, is doomed with the curse of broken faith and shameless perfidy that marks it from the time of its inception and birth. If this be our Republic's contribution to the league, our President's idealistic vision drawn from the ethereal regions of sublimated messages and scholastic reveries down to Mother Earth and the affairs of men, again I say let us hang our heads in shame and confess we are giants in words and lilliputians in good faith and practical action.

He hath stripped the people of their glory and taken the crown of righteousness from their heads.

It may not be known to the public, but I repeat that the draft of the peace treaty to-day is known in every capital in Europe and its communication blocked to this Senate by the deliberate act of the Executive. Thus we have in practical operation "open covenants of peace openly arrived at." So, too, we have a like freedom of navigation upon the seas in the 14 points, and access given in accordance with Executive declaration. They are purely theoretical. They will never sail ships or assemble commerce on the piers of those port cities. The removal of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance will open every customhouse restriction there is in this Republic, and it is intended to do so. What practical form national armaments will assume when reduced to the lowest point for us is unknown. What is consistent with our domestic safety will not be decided by us, but will be decided by a sovereign sitting in Geneva. A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining questions of sovereignty the interests of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the government whose title is to be determined, has utterly failed in actual application to the affairs of men and the settlement of boundary questions and the dispositions of peoples in Europe.

The 14 points given to the world January 8, 1918, as an instrument of justice are a byword and a derision in all Europe to-day. We do not get this by cable. You get it from returning travelers who have talked, from Jerusalem to London, with philosophers and soldiers and statesmen. The 14 points are the jest of the ages in the three continents of the Old World and in the British Isles. They are now quoted only by the German delegates to save them from the penalties of their barbaric cruelty and murderous treachery. The points have long since ceased to be a factor in diplomacy, or more than an international embarrassment to all concerned.

Mr. President, these are some opening remarks which I wish to submit on the league of nations. I shall go into the subject in detail and with a great variety of illustrations at some later time.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 2329) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and for the payment of pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

TREATY OF PEACE.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the proponent of this resolution whether it would be agreeable to him to have an adjournment at this time?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, that is quite agreeable to me.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I move, then, that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Pardon me just one moment. Before we take an adjournment, do I understand that this particular resolution will be the unfinished business on Monday? Is that the understanding of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That would be my impression. I am not familiar with the rules more than to say that that is my personal judgment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEWBERRY in the chair). The resolution will come up as the unfinished business at 2 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I renew my motion that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 26, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *May 23, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, Infinite Spirit, our Heavenly Father, for the man who, by dint of his own efforts and the gifts Thou hast bestowed upon him, reaches the goal; and we bless Thee for the man who, by dint of his own efforts, through the gifts Thou hast bestowed upon him, goes down in the battle of life, wounded and maimed, yet rises again with undaunted courage and strives for perfection.

Truth crushed to earth shall rise again,—
The eternal years of God are hers;
But Error, wounded, writhes with pain,
And dies among his worshippers.

The death of Christ on the Hill of Calvary seemed to close His remarkable career. But to-day His name lives in millions of hearts and inspires to larger life and happiness; and so may He continue to live until God's purposes shall be accomplished. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

The SPEAKER. If there are any Members present who have not taken the oath, they will now present themselves and be sworn.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho and Mr. KAHN of California presented themselves at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, administered by the Speaker.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. STEELE, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of Edward F. Stewart (H. R. 9703, 65th Cong.), no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. MORIN, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for five days on account of absence in France.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 1235 be rereferred from the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service to the Committee on Labor.

Mr. GARNER. If the gentleman will permit, on yesterday morning the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] gave notice that he would not agree to any change of reference until the committees were made up. I ask the gentleman to let it go over until the committees are filled.

Mr. NOLAN. I consulted with the chairman of the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service and also with the chairman of the Committee on Labor, and it is the unanimous request that the reference be changed.

Mr. GARNER. The minority members of the committee have not been elected, and it is only a matter of one day, and I think the gentleman had better let it go over.

Mr. NOLAN. Very well.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I nominate for election to the Indian Affairs Committee the following-named gentlemen.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN of Arizona, Mr. SEARS of Florida, Mr. TILLMAN of Arkansas, Mr. GANDY of South Dakota, Mr. HASTINGS of Oklahoma, Mr. WEAVER of North Carolina, and Mr. MCKINLEY of New York.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MONDELL. Can the gentleman from North Carolina inform us when he expects to be able to submit the remainder of the minority members of the committees?

Mr. KITCHIN. On Monday next. We thought we might do it to-morrow, but we are unable to do so until Monday.

Mr. MONDELL. We are very anxious to get to work.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the indefinite leave of absence of my colleague, Mr. BRUMBAUGH, who has for some time been in a sanitarium.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SNYDER, chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, by direction of that committee, reported the bill (H. R. 2480) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses

of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CARTER reserved all points of order.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Indian appropriation bill; and pending that motion I desire to see if we can not come to an agreement as to division of time for general debate on the bill.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Is the bill substantially in the form that it was presented in the last Congress? I understand the bill has not been printed.

Mr. SNYDER. The bill is printed in its new form and a limited number of copies are ready for distribution to the Members of the House. It is a composite bill. It is the bill as it was agreed upon by a conference committee in the last Congress and which failed on the last day of the session. It is presented approximately in that form after careful consideration by the members of the committee as it is now constituted, by both the majority and minority members, with practically a full attendance, and after consideration by the subcommittee, after listening to various parties who desired to have changes made in the bill.

Mr. TILSON. Then, I understand it is possible for Members of the House to now get printed copies of the bill which is to be considered?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. It is substantially the bill which was agreed upon in conference at the last session.

Mr. SNYDER. It is the same bill.

Mr. CARTER. It is the bill agreed to in conference.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the gentleman from New York that, if unanimous consent be granted, I understand it is the purpose to use the time to-day for general debate and take the bill up to-morrow under the five-minute rule.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the first thing to do is to get unanimous consent for its consideration.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I made that statement.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. CARTER. May I suggest that the request of the gentleman from New York be separated?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can move to go into Committee of the Whole. There is no rule which requires the bill to be printed.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to go into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill, and, pending that, asks for agreement as to the time for general debate.

Mr. SNYDER. I do not ask for that now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws the request. The question is, Is there objection?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to say that so far as the minority Members are concerned we have no objection to going ahead with the reading of the bill to-day after general debate has been finished.

Mr. SNYDER. It is perfectly agreeable to me. I am willing to go ahead with the reading of the bill as soon as general debate is closed.

Mr. MANN. I think the House ought to know whether it is intended to proceed with the reading of the bill to-day. The gentleman ought to make up his mind now what he intends to do before the unanimous consent is requested. There might be objection to reading the bill to-day when printed copies are not accessible, but there is no objection to general debate on the bill.

Mr. CARTER. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that is why I made the suggestion; I have not any objection to it.

Mr. MANN. But while the Committee on Indian Affairs, both the minority and majority, have had the bill in their possession I have learned through long experience in the House that the Committee on Indian Affairs very often includes items in the Indian bill which I thought ought not to be included; and of course while they are in favor of passing the bill at once, which they have reported unanimously, it does not mean the House ought not to have a chance to consider the items in the bill intelligently.

Mr. CARTER. That is evident; everybody understands that.

Mr. SNYDER. It is clearly the intention of the chairman of the committee at least to have only general debate on this bill to-day.

Mr. MANN. If the chairman of the committee will make the statement that he does not intend to ask for the reading of the bill to-day for amendment, why, that settles that question.

Mr. SNYDER. I am very pleased to make that statement. I do not intend to ask for the reading of the bill to-day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to going into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of this bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair appoints——

Mr. SNYDER. And pending that motion I wish to see if we can arrange upon a period of time for general debate on both sides.

Mr. CARTER. As far as this side is concerned, I think we can get along with one hour.

Mr. SNYDER. As far as any requests over on this side——

Mr. CARTER. I mean an hour on this side.

Mr. SNYDER. Suppose we go along and see how long we can run and have an understanding that we close general debate before 5 o'clock this afternoon?

Mr. GARNER. Let us have an agreement something like this. If you are going to have all day's debate, some might want to go to the departments and may not care to hear it. I think the older Members understand that when we start in on general debate they may take the opportunity to go somewhere else to do work, and if we have an agreement that the bill shall not be read under the five-minute rule, whether it is two hours or five hours, we will have that understanding and all know it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has stated the reading of the bill will not be begun to-day.

Mr. SNYDER. I am perfectly willing, and I think this side will be willing for debate to run along until it runs out.

Mr. DYER. As I understand it, when the House adjourns to-day general debate upon the pending bill will be closed?

The SPEAKER. That is the request.

Mr. SNYDER. I ask unanimous consent that when general debate closes to-day it close for good.

Mr. CARTER. Can not we come to some understanding as to how long that will be?

Mr. SNYDER. I should say until it runs out.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that general debate be closed to-day. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Reserving the right to object, had we not better arrange as to the control of time?

Mr. SNYDER. Of course, it is agreeable to this side to have the time equally divided.

Mr. CARTER. One half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York and the other by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the time be equally divided between the two sides, half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York and half by the gentleman from Oklahoma. Is there objection?

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think we ought to fix some time. If there is going to be two hours' general debate, let us make it; and if there is to be four hours' general debate, let us make that; and, of course, when general debate is exhausted the House can adjourn. We ought to have some definite understanding as to how much debate there shall be. I suggest the gentleman make it two hours on each side; that will be ample.

Mr. SNYDER. How would it do to have the debate close in four hours—say not exceeding four hours—the time to be equally divided?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that general debate proceed for four hours, two hours to be controlled by the gentleman from New York and two hours by the gentleman from Oklahoma. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that is with the understanding that the bill will not be taken up for consideration under the five-minute rule to-day.

The SPEAKER. That has been stated. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] whether it is anticipated any other business will be taken up to-day after this bill is laid aside?

Mr. MONDELL. It is impossible to say at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2480) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for

fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indians tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, with Mr. LONGWORTH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2480) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield for a question? Is this bill the same bill——

Mr. SNYDER. I expect to make a statement in a minute.

Mr. DYER. Is this the same bill that was passed before?

Mr. SNYDER. It is, in a sense.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to dispensing with the first reading of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in presenting this bill for consideration to-day, I desire to say that after careful consideration for four days on the part of the committee as a whole and further consideration by the subcommittee, we have decided to present to the House this measure in the form of a composite bill, which is the measure passed by the House, accompanied by such additions as were inserted by the Senate and as finally agreed upon by the conferees. We have made no changes in the bill that affect it in any way whatever; so you have before you approximately the bill passed by the House, the Senate provisions and the conferees' report included, all of which failed in the Senate on the very last minute of the very last day.

This bill approximates in appropriations which are directly drawn from the Treasury about $11,600,000, which is about $600,000 more than the amount contained in the bill when it originally left the House. It is $200,000 more than the present law, due to the committee's belief that conditions have so changed, expenses having increased to such an extent, that the various activities for which the Government furnished money were entitled to a reasonable amount to compensate them for those increases.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman kindly make those statements again—there was so much disorder here I could not catch them clearly—with reference to the difference in the amounts in the bill?

Mr. SNYDER. I said that in the present law the amounts actually appropriated from the Treasury for gratuities and in reimbursable items amount to about $600,000 more than the present law, and were conceded by the committee on account of the actual increased cost of supplies, and so forth, which it is necessary for the bureau to furnish to the various schools and activities throughout the country; and we agreed as a committee that they were entitled to a certain per cent of increase to compensate for the difference in cost this year as against two years ago when that bill was made.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman distinguish between the part of the increase that comes under the reimbursable items and the part of it that is not reimbursable?

Mr. SNYDER. Well, there have been no increases in any of these items, I think, that are not reimbursable. If the gentleman will notice, the appropriations are made up in four sections; first, the treaty items, amounting to something over $800,000; then the tribal-fund items, amounting to about $3,700,000; the strictly gratuitous items, amounting to about $5,600,000; and the reimbursable items, amounting to about the same sum. Now, of course, the Government must furnish the money for the reimbursable items, but eventually it is all supposed to come back into the Treasury from some source, either from the sale of land or sale of timber or from products off the soil or under the ground. But the actual amount of this bill that is paid from the Treasury of the United States, and of which there is never any possibility of return and which is supposed to be spent wholly in the interest of the Indians by this bill, amounts to about $5,500,000, or a trifle over.

I think I said a few moments ago that there was no increase in the strictly gratuitous items, but there is, and that is due to the fact that last year and the year before, on account of the war, and in order to enable the department to put some of our returning soldiers or other people at work, we thought it advisable to let them go ahead and start up some of those activities again. And that is one of the reasons for the increase in the gratuity items.

Now, it is, of course, the policy of this committee to endeavor in every way to curtail the expense of the Government in the care of the Indians, and we are endeavoring every year to reduce the cost of handling the Indians' business. But it is a very difficult proposition, and this committee expects this year to make careful investigations with regard to the handling of the business in the department in this city and see whether it is not possible to cut out some of the things that look, to the chairman, at least, like unnecessary expense in the handling of the moneys which belong to the Indians and the handling of the activities which are created by the moneys that are handed to the Indians as a gratuity. It has always seemed to me that out of the millions that we appropriate for the benefit of the Indians a very large portion of it gets into the hands of the people who handle it rather than going actually out into the field and for the benefit of the Indian himself, and we want to try to correct that if possible. I am convinced myself that we are spending too much money in trying to show the Indians how to sew, trying to educate an Indian woman to do things she is not even capable of doing or will be capable of doing for some time to come. We are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars trying to educate Indians to be farmers, and it is a very small percentage of them, from my observation, who have ever been able, or ever will be able, to acquire sufficient knowledge to teach them to be good farmers.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a moment?

Mr. SNYDER. I will, gladly.

Mr. HICKS. What is the gentleman's opinion in regard to the beneficial results of all this philanthropic effort that has been made on the part of the Government to educate Indians in various phases of industrial life?

Mr. SNYDER. Well, so far as educating the Indians in the schools provided by the Government or by tribal funds is concerned, I think a great work is being done. But as to the farmers and the nurses and the instructors we send out to these reservations, to show the Indians how to become farmers, I have very little faith in anything approximating a great success coming from that work. I had brought to my attention a case this morning where they are trying to create herds of sheep in a certain territory for the benefit of a certain tribe of Indians. There are probably 115 Indian farmers who ought to be involved in that work of caring for those sheep, but the fact is that there are only 10 or 15 of them actually working on the range, and the Government, having furnished the sheep, now has to furnish cowboys and men to go down there and actually do that work. After getting the profit from that transaction the money goes into the Treasury, and possibly the Indians some day may get a few dollars for having sat quietly at home and done nothing to assist in any way in this proposition of raising sheep, from which they have made money and from which they have money in the Treasury now, no part of which they have created or earned themselves.

Now, the point I am trying to make, although perhaps I do not get at it as quickly as I might, is that if you could stimulate those Indians to handle these sheep themselves by dividing the herds up and making each fellow take so many of them, and either let them produce from these sheep or get out of the business entirely, the Indians themselves would be a great deal better off.

Mr. HICKS. The statement of the gentleman is interesting and largely bears out my own observations in traveling over the Indian reservations. What is the gentleman's solution of that problem? We train these Indians, and yet they fail afterwards to perform the functions naturally to be expected from that training.

Mr. SNYDER. My idea is that where the Indian has some thousands or millions of dollars belonging to him, I would take that money and give the Indian a section of land and put him on it, and put him to work there, and let him work his way through. That is the only way I believe you will get rid of this Indian problem. We have in the last few years taken back under the fold of the Government's protection Indian tribes who had been discharged from the guardianship of the Government a hundred years ago, and we have done it because they have become shiftless and the States have not cared for them as they should have done. Now, in the goodness of the hearts of some of the people who are interested, they are endeavoring to get those people back under the guardianship of the Government. One of the things I have discovered since I have been

connected with Indian affairs is that the most difficult thing on earth to do is to get an Indian who is under the control of the Indian Bureau away from it under any form or by any pretext.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Gladly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. As I understand, it is still the purpose of the Government to keep under its supervision Indians who are well educated, well informed, who have served in the Army of the United States and entitled to citizenship, and sometimes even when they have thousands of dollars in the banks they can not draw a single cent of it. Am I correct in that?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes. The gentleman is quite correct, and the gentleman might go further. It is my understanding that there are civilized Indians who are doing business in certain sections of this country who are just as competent to do business as the gentleman himself or myself, who have purchased Liberty bonds, and who are unable to collect the income from the coupons of the Liberty bonds without having them passed through the department here at Washington.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SNYDER. Certainly.

Mr. HICKS. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman, but he has made a specialty of the bill, and he has made his statement very interesting. In my travels in the western country, particularly in New Mexico and Arizona, I came upon cases of Indians, graduates from an Indian school, very highly educated, either at Carlisle or some other Indian school, and apparently fitted for the best citizenship of the country, and yet 99 per cent of those people were back again in their tribal life. I was just wondering whether that is an inherent weakness in the Indian himself or an inherent weakness in our policy in the treatment of the Indian. I would like to have the gentleman's opinion on that if he is prepared to give it.

Mr. SNYDER. I am not very well prepared to give an opinion on that, but I do know of cases where Indians have been educated at Carlisle even who have gone back to their tribal relations and in a short time lost interest entirely in the education that they had received. But I do not think my investigations would lead me to say that that was the prevailing rule. I think in the main that the Indians who are educated at either reservation schools or boarding schools come out of them with a great deal of credit and advantage to themselves. I would not want to say that I would in any way desire to limit the boarding school activities or the reservation school activities, but I would like to see them handled on an entirely different basis from what they are.

We have attempted in this bill to put a restriction on the management of these schools, so that the money will be expended in such a way that we shall know it is being expended wholly upon the number of pupils who are in attendance. In other words, previous to last year, the appropriations made were based upon the enrollment at these boarding schools at a certain amount per annum per pupil.

Now, in this bill the appropriation is based upon the average attendance for the year; so that in a school where there are 90 pupils who actually attend, although there may be 190 enrolled, they can draw the per capita for the average number in attendance only. This, I think, is a big move in the right direction, and that eventually it will have the effect of building up these schools. We are perfectly willing to give them for the education of every pupil in attendance whatever is necessary for them to have in order to conduct the school properly; but the other system permitted a good many lax methods, and a good deal of indiscretion crept into the handling of the business of the schools.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. In case there should be an epidemic in a boarding school and the per capita attendance should be cut down very materially, what provision would be made to take care of an exigency like that?

Mr. SNYDER. We have always in the bill a sufficient number of emergency appropriations to care for any epidemic that may occur, and that is one of the reasons why it is necessary to get this measure enacted into law promptly. It was stated that Indians are suffering because appropriations provided for in this measure are now being held up, and it is absolutely necessary that the bill pass and become a law before the 1st of July or the department can not continue to function. That is one reason why, the instant that Congress convened, before the committees were regularly elected, we went to work on this measure; and that was the prime reason why we did not begin the perfecting of a new measure, because during the time that we have from now until the 1st of July it would have been utterly impossible for us to have framed a new bill. So we decided to present this bill, which, if it is promptly passed, will enable the Interior Department and the Indian Bureau to care for the urgent needs of the Indians.

Unless some one desires further information, which I will be glad to give to the best of my ability, I will conclude my statement.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Certainly.

Mr. FERRIS. Has the chairman of the committee any objection to answering, for the record, a few elementary questions?

Mr. SNYDER. I shall be glad to answer them to the best of my ability.

Mr. FERRIS. What is the total number of Indians cared for by the Interior Department?

Mr. SNYDER. My understanding is that there are about 300,000.

Mr. FERRIS. And what is the exact amount of money carried in this bill?

Mr. SNYDER. The exact amount of money carried in this bill, including the tribal funds, is $15,008,000.

Mr. FERRIS. How much of that comes out of the Treasury and how much of the Indians' funds?

Mr. SNYDER. Eleven million six hundred thousand dollars come out of the Treasury of the United States, but only $5,800,000 of that sum is actually chargeable to the Government without any possibility of future reimbursement.

Mr. FERRIS. Some of it will come back from the sale of land?

Mr. SNYDER. None of the $5,800,000.

Mr. FERRIS. But I am speaking of the larger sum, the $11,000,000.

Mr. SNYDER. More than $5,000,000 is reimbursable.

Mr. FERRIS. How many tribes of Indians are there altogether in the United States?

Mr. SNYDER. I can not tell the gentleman that.

Mr. FERRIS. There are about 300,000 Indians?

Mr. SNYDER. About 300,000.

Mr. FERRIS. What per cent, what number out of the total 300,000, have had their restrictions removed in whole or in part for administrative purposes?

Mr. SNYDER. Since I have been a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs a very small per cent have been separated from the care of the Indian Bureau; I should think not 5 per cent.

Mr. FERRIS. Of the 300,000 not over 5 per cent have been?

Mr. SNYDER. I do not think there have been 5 per cent.

Mr. FERRIS. Does the gentleman mean altogether?

Mr. SNYDER. I mean in the four years that I have been connected with the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. FERRIS. But I am speaking of the aggregate all told. What part of the 300,000 Indians have had their restrictions removed either in whole or in part? Has the gentleman any figures on that?

Mr. SNYDER. No; I have not.

Mr. FERRIS. Is it not true that a very large per cent of these 300,000 Indians are, in fact, entirely capable of administering their own affairs?

Mr. SNYDER. My observations and investigations lead me to believe that at least 60 per cent of these Indians could be discharged from the care of the Indian Bureau and have the money to which they are entitled turned over to them, and that they could well take their chances in this country along with the average American citizen.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to pursue that one question further, if I may. What will be the policy of the gentleman who will be in charge of the committee—and I think his policy follows along the same line as my own would, if I were the chairman—with reference to liberating, emancipating those Indians, that are really white Indians, that have all of their faculties, who are educated, and have that equipment the same as anyone else? What is going to be the policy of the gentleman with reference to cutting that class of Indians loose from the Federal administration?

Mr. SNYDER. In order to tell exactly what that is I desire to refer to some remarks that I made in presenting this bill before. I think I made a statement at that time, and I have not any idea of changing it now.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not wish to embarrass the gentleman in the course of his remarks at all.

Mr. SNYDER. I do not find the remarks that I refer to, but I am willing to state now just what it is.

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, the gentleman may withhold it, if he desires, but I will be very glad to have him state it in the RECORD.

Mr. SNYDER. My policy as chairman of this committee will be to endeavor in every possible way to get discharged from the care of the bureau, from the care of the Government, so far as it is possible, the Indians, so that they will be no different from any other American citizens. My policy will be to get a man discharged from the care of anybody, except in so far as he owes a duty to the Government of the United States, the State in which he resides, or the municipality in which he belongs, so that he may get all of the money to which he is entitled, that it may be turned over to him at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. FERRIS. And to have a complete divorcement of the real or so-called white Indians from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. SNYDER. I want the Indian to be a full citizen of the United States at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a suggestion right there?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. SEARS. During the past two years, at least, has it not been the policy of the entire committee to follow just the line suggested by the chairman?

Mr. SNYDER. Absolutely.

Mr. FERRIS. I have felt that to be true.

Mr. SNYDER. There is no difference of opinion in the committee upon that, and there has not been for two years.

Mr. FERRIS. I wanted to state to the gentleman the obstacles that will confront him, having served on the Committee on Indian Affairs in years gone by. I want to urge the gentleman to maintain a strong determination in doing that very thing. There will be all sorts of obstacles thrown in his path, as there have been in the paths of preceding chairmen, by people who have esthetic notions, notions that are not well grounded in facts, that the Indian ought to have constant and unbounded supervision of some sort administered to him by the Federal Government.

Mr. SNYDER. I would like to say to the gentleman that my education in things esthetic, ephemeral, and idealistic was sadly neglected in my early life.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Along that same line, will the gentleman go a little further, in regard to Indians who have been dependent upon the Government? Suppose that, having received their portion, they go out and spend it in riotous living or otherwise, and eventually becoming bankrupt, as many other citizens of the country do, is the gentleman willing to say that the Government shall not take them back under its wing or assume responsibility for them again?

Mr. SNYDER. I thought I made that fairly clear in my previous statement.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman stated that there were some Indians who had been made free a hundred years ago, and that some of them had been taken back under governmental care. Are we going to do anything of that kind? Does the gentleman mean it when he says that they should be cut loose entirely, and that they will be given the same chance as other American citizens, and no more?

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to make any promise which I might not be able to live up to, but I am opposed to taking back an Indian just the same as I would be to taking back a white man if he had once had his property and failed to exercise reasonable judgment in taking care of it.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Some reference has been made to the teaching of farming. May I ask whether there is any assistance given to the Indians, except in the tribal relation, in stock raising and farming?

Mr. SNYDER. The difficulty about the instruction is that the Indian is given too much instruction, too much attention—to such an extent that he has made up his mind that all he has to do is to sit still and the instructors will do the work. We want to cut out about 90 per cent of the instruction, the care and treatment the Indians are receiving, and let them get to work themselves. If they will not work and till the soil and mind the sheep, then I would let them live on coyotes and herbs until they got used to working. [Laughter.]

Mr. FAIRFIELD. The idea is to reduce the superintendents of farming and stock raising?

Mr. SNYDER. The idea is to get it into the mind of the Indian that he has got to exercise some force of character and energy in order to preserve himself.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Has the gentleman segregated the figures so that he can tell us what part of this $15,000,000 goes for schools and what for salaries, and so forth?

Mr. SNYDER. I could if I had the report here, but that will be in the report which will be printed and ready for distribution to-morrow morning.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I will.

Mr. EMERSON. Can the gentleman from New York tell us what are the obstacles that are in the way of emancipating the Indian? After 100 years of civilization, when we came here and found the Indian self-sustaining—after 100 years of civilization he is now dependent upon the Government. What are the obstacles to emancipating him now?

Mr. SNYDER. There are many obstacles. For instance, take the Five Civilized Tribes in the State of Oklahoma. Some of them are very wealthy men. I understand that the Osages are the richest people in the world. There are about 4,800 of them, and the average income is $4,000 per capita. These men have been here for years endeavoring to get this House to grant them the privilege of having an attorney, for which they will themselves pay, to look after their interests as between the tribes and the Government. They have been unable by reason of obstacles put in the way to get a man, to whom they are willing to pay a good, round sum, to look after their interests.

Mr. CARTER. Is it not the fact that in the last appropriation bill there was carried an item allowing the Osages to have an attorney, but that it was stricken out on a point of order on the floor of the House?

Mr. SNYDER. Those are the obstacles, and they are difficult to overcome. The reason is this: While the committee is perfectly willing and anxious to grant improvements in the administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, they will have some friend on the floor here in time to object and make points of order to items which are not only for the benefit of the Government but for the benefit of the Indian himself, but to the disadvantage perhaps of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. EMERSON. Congress ought to be larger than any branch of the Government. I do not know how it is, but I have been a believer that in this country we should Americanize everybody, the Indians as well as everybody else. We emancipated the Negro, and we do not do anything for him; if he gets hard up he has to suffer and perhaps starve. Why can not the Indians be treated the same way?

Mr. SNYDER. I have stated to the gentleman the principal obstacle to the improvement in Indian affairs, and that is the Bureau of Indian Affairs itself.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Oklahoma stated that these matters were stricken out of appropriation bills on a point of order. I would like to ask if the committee is dependent absolutely on the appropriation bills to bring about wholesome legislation concerning Indians. Why could not proper legislation be brought into the House, against which a point of order would not lie, and over which the Indian Department would have no control whatever?

Mr. SNYDER. The committee would be glad to consider any measure that the gentleman from Texas may present to overcome those difficulties.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. How does the total carried in this bill compare with the total carried in the bill which failed of passage in the last session?

Mr. SNYDER. I have stated that the money actually appropriated by the Government in the bill will be about $600,000 above the present law, due to the belief of the committee that the items which the Government has to purchase will cost more, and that the various activities in the way of profit will be more, and that that much more will be needed to carry on these activities in the same way that they have been carried on in previous years.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. That is compared with the present law, but how about the bill that failed of passage in the last session?

Mr. SNYDER. It is practically the same.

Mr. HASTINGS. It is exactly the same amount that was agreed to in conference.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, my interest in the Indian has led me to go into the questions as to what can be

done for his betterment. That the Indian has been taken advantage of by the white man there is no question; that the Indian is not getting as much for the money that is being spent in his behalf to-day as he should get, there is no question in my mind. We have fallen into a rut in our dealings with the Indian. There is much the same thing being done to-day for him that was done a hundred years ago, 80 years ago, 60 years ago, 40 years ago. We have changed some, but we have not kept pace with the progress that we have made in other things, in our dealing with the Indians. We can eliminate a great deal of the supervision that we are having over them. There is no question in my mind but that there are as many as 20 agencies provided for in this bill that could be eliminated from it and save thousands of dollars to the Indians and to the Treasury of the United States. Just as soon as an effort is made to eliminate one of these agencies, however, somebody from the State in which the agency is located gets the idea that they are going to lose the opportunity for having some Government money spent in the State or lose a little patronage. And a great fight is made in behalf of the Indians, but really to retain the agency. They say, "This is an outrage on the Indian. What are you going to do? Turn them loose to become a prey to the wiles of the white man?" Tears will be shed, and bureaus, established in New York and Boston that never saw a blanket Indian in the world, will send telegrams and petitions to Congress to restore the agency at Podunk; and the agency is restored, and the expenditure goes on. And the Indian is dealt with in very much the same way to-day that he was half a century or a century ago.

I want, therefore, to speak about a matter that I think we can undertake that will materially benefit the Indians, and I am led to make the statement because of the statement made by the chairman of the committee about the Indian's failure as a farmer. I refer to the advantages that can come to the Indian by teaching him agriculture. I do not mean that he should be taught agriculture by a broken-down farmer who made a failure at farming himself and is willing to take $50 a month to sit down in an Indian agency listed on the pay roll as "farmer" at the Podunk agency. A man who will take $50 a month and go and sit at an Indian agency is not worth two whoops in Podunk.

Mr. UPSHAW. I would like to ask a question just as a matter of information. I am a new man here. I would like to have the gentleman please give us the geographical position of Podunk. [Laughter.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I think it is down in Georgia, if you have any Indians down there. [Laughter.]

Mr. UPSHAW. I deny the allegation, but I do not defy the "allegator."

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I will tell you where Podunk is located. It is located at most any place where they have an Indian agency.

Mr. UPSHAW. That is clear.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. This man that I have referred to is, of course, a total failure as a farmer. He does not know, in the first place, how to feed or milk a cow. He does not know how to take care of half a dozen shoats. He does not know how to take care of a pair of mules. He knows absolutely nothing about farming, and therefore can teach nothing to the Indians, and yet he is the farmer at the agency, and the money that is paid to him and the money that is expended under his direction results in no good to the Indians.

The future welfare of the Indian makes it necessary, however, that he shall be taught farming. Almost every Indian of every degree of blood can be located upon some land. If the Indian does not already own it, and it has not been allotted, it can be allotted to him. The land is available for the Indians for agricultural purposes.

The trouble with the Indian is that he has not been taught how to use the land or what to do with it. He has not been taught how to take care of hogs and cattle and sheep; how to till the soil, or what to put in, and how to take care of it, or what to do with stock or grain or hay.

He knows nothing about those things, because he is dependent upon this so-called "farmer" at the agency, who does not know as much about it as he does. We are spending a great deal of money upon the education of the Indian. The average Indian who makes a success, if he makes success at all, will make it as a farmer. It is wasting the Indians' time to take a course in higher mathematics, in astronomy, and all that sort of thing without the study of agriculture in connection with them.

We should provide somewhere in this country a great agricultural school for Indians, where Indians can be taught scientifically how to farm, what to do with land, what to do with stock, what to do with the products of the soil, and how to take care of them. Such a school can be established in this country in which Indians can be taught to farm and become self-supporting, self-respecting, and good citizens. You can not make a farmer out of an Indian as it has been attempted in the past by putting an alleged "farmer" on the pay roll at the Indian agency and having him sit around loafing among the Indians all summer and winter and not raising enough hay to feed the horses that are maintained on the place. I have been to an Indian agency where they bought grain to feed the horses that were used upon the place. The farmer did not have the enterprise or the intelligence to raise enough grain to feed the teams that were maintained on the place, and large amounts of money were expended every year for purchasing feed for farmers' horses and hogs on the farm at the Podunk Agency.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. SHREVE. I desire to ask the gentleman what crops were raised upon the farm?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Crops of worthless weeds. Nothing was done. The farmer was there to serve the Indians. He was to give instructions to the Indians. He was to go out on the Indian farm and show the Indians what to do. But instead of being an example to the Indians for good he sat around and did nothing, and was an example for evil.

That thing must be done away with. We should give these young Indians, bright, energetic, able fellows, with plenty of money as members of their tribe to start them on a farm—give them an education in an agricultural school, and then they will go out on their own farms and become good farmers. They can teach others how to farm. I hope Congress will, in the interest of the Indian, at an early day cooperate with members of the Committee on Indian Affairs and with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and urge that this be done in the interest of the Indians.

We must change and enlarge our policy. We must do something that will give to the Indian something really worth while for the money that is spent for the benefit of the Indian. In my judgment the way to get real results for the Indian is to send him to an agricultural school where he can be taught every study that is connected with a liberal education and at the same time be taught the use of the soil. And in that same connection the same school can well be enlarged so as to include manual training for men and women, so that the young women who are attending such a school may go upon the farm and become good housewives upon the farm and know how to put up fruit and know how to render lard and know how to take care of everything that is raised upon the farm and help to make a farm home.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Why should there not be an arrangement whereby an Indian, taught up to a certain standard, upon graduation from that place, would graduate into citizenship and be taken out from under the bureau?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is a happy suggestion. I see no reason on earth why that should not be done. I see no reason why in many instances graduates of our best Indian schools are still held under the palm of the Indian Office.

Mr. FESS. That is not right.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. When an Indian graduates from an agricultural school and goes out upon his allotment with a team and a cow and a pair of shoats and a dozen chickens, he has started in life; he is independent with his little annuity that comes to him. Then I would relieve him and all like him of supervision by the white man. [Applause.] I would relieve him then of the expense and the annoyance and the humiliation of having everything that he does and every movement that he makes supervised. [Applause.]

That is the suggestion that I want to make to the Members of the House, that we find somewhere a place in this country where we can establish a great agricultural school for Indians. Oklahoma is a great agricultural State, with wonderfully rich land and plenty of it. There are Indian agencies there, there are Indian lands there, there are places in that State to-day, in the great mid-continent country, where such a school, suitable to the Indians climatically and in every other way, can well be established or enlarged. Some of the schools are already provided in a small way for the instruction of Indians in agriculture, but it is only in a small way, as a mere incident to the schools. What I am insisting on is that this school that I have in mind should become a real agricultural school for Indians and be known as such throughout the country, so that Indians might attend there from every section of the country.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. In taking the restrictions off the Indians the gentleman does not contend that they should be given the right to dispose of their allotments, does he?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I do not know why not. If a white man has 160 acres of land, he has a right to sell it or mortgage it or do as he pleases with it; and if an Indian, who is better educated and a better farmer and in every way as good a citizen as the white man, has the same kind of land, why should we keep any restrictions upon what he does with his land?

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the gentleman contend that the mere fact that the Indian has an education is an indication that he has the brains and the ability to meet the white man on an equal footing and deal with him and not get the short end of the deal?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am not afraid of the average Indian in the average trade with a white man. I know Indians. I have examined Indians before committees of this House who were as shrewd as any white man. I have examined Indians who were under the supervision of the Indian Office who were presidents of national banks, vice presidents of interurban railroads, who were worth a quarter of a million dollars.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; but they are the exceptions. We have to take them collectively, not individually.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Of course, there are Indians who need guardians, as there are white men who need guardians.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Kansas would not want to have a repetition of the history that was enacted at White Earth, Minn., seven or eight years ago?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No; and white men were responsible for a good deal of what happened there.

Mr. KNUTSON. That happened because all restrictions were taken off. And what was the average price obtained for the land at the White Earth Reservation?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. There are isolated cases, but I contend that the policy should be to eliminate, as far as practicable, the supervision that the Indian is now under. My judgment is that the hope of the Indian is on the farm. The future of the Indian is as a farmer. I speak of the average. There are good lawyers, there are good doctors, there are good United States Senators, and Members of Congress who are Indians; but the hope of the average Indian is as a farmer. But the Indian must be taught in modern farming, the modern scientific use of the soil, just as it is taught to the white man. The Indian can not be expected to succeed as a farmer after he has been tutored a few years at an Indian agency by a man who made a failure of farming when the Indian must compete with young men who have graduated from our agricultural colleges as farmers. We should establish an Indian agricultural school where Indians can be taught scientific farming as white men are taught and give them the same start as scientific farmers that young white men have. I repeat that I am hoping Congress will at an early date have an opportunity to consider this proposition.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 2329) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and for the payment of pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

Mr. FERRIS. Gentlemen, I am not a member of the Indian Committee now. I have had service on this committee in the past. I have lived practically all of my life among the Indians or very near the Indians. I was born and raised within 16 miles of the Indian Territory when it was quite an Indian country. When I was a member of the Indian Committee I studied this question a good deal. You can debate it from an academic standpoint without end, and probably it will be debated in that way long after those of us now here are gone, but I want to submit two or three practical observations on the subject, based on my observations in the years that I have studied the question.

It has been stated by our chairman [Mr. SNYDER] that there are 300,000 Indians in the United States. I do not mean 300,000 people wearing red blankets and with paint on their faces and feathers in their hair, but there are on the Indian rolls 300,000 people, some of them as white as we are, some of them with golden hair, some of them presidents of banks, some United States Senators, some Members of this House, one of them Register of the Treasury of the United States, some of them worth more than a million dollars which they have earned themselves.

Now, the difficulty as I see it is to get the real Indians separated from these so-called Indians. There are in my own State, roughly, 100,000 Indians; I do not mean wild Indians, I do not mean they are even real Indians, but Indians on the rolls in my State, which is one of the 48 States of this Union. The Indian Territory, which comprises one-half of our State, was for 50 years the assembling place for Indians. If Indians were not needed in North Carolina, or South Carolina, or Mississippi, or Georgia, or any of the Eastern States, the Government proceeded to move them west and put them in the then Indian Territory. It has been a kind of pot pourri for the assembling of Indians from all those States. They came from every section of the country. They were the original occupants. Some of them were eastern Indians, from Virginia and along the Atlantic seaboard, and they were brought there together. They came there with different ideas. But they have been blended together. They have been made citizens. Most of them are making good citizens. There is no race trouble on. They vote for us; we vote for them. The only test applied is "Is this man a good man," and the Indian blood makes no difference. Oklahoma selected as her first citizen to be placed in Statuary Hall an Indian—Sequoyah, the Indian who invented the Cherokee alphabet.

I mention this to show how well the white and Indian races have acted in the development of the great new State of Oklahoma.

The one problem that the Indian Committee and the Interior Department and Congress has to get into their heads is that they ought to separate the Indians into classes so the incompetent ones would be cared for and the competent ones given their affairs into their own hands. In my State it was worth ten or twelve thousand dollars for a man to get his name on the Indian roll, because it gave him land and a share in the tribal estate. It was considered an ambitious thing, a worthy thing, for a man to get on the rolls. When a man was enrolled and became an Indian he got an allotment of land and a share in the money and the tribal affairs of the State. Now, these men want to get out from under the restrictions and have their land and money and transact their own affairs. For example, I know men in my State that have traces of Indian blood who have made in the last two years millions of dollars by their own exertion, their own hands, and by their own ingenuity. It is tremendously galling and irritating to a man of that character to have to come to Washington, or have his attorney come to Washington, and hang around the doors of his Congressman or the Indian Commissioner and try to get some trivial right that ought to be given to him in the abstract. These are irritating things—trying to administer the affairs from Washington at long-distance range by the Government over men who know much more than does the administration.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Certainly.

Mr. EMERSON. Are these men who have made the money the gentleman speaks of permitted to handle their own affairs?

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, yes; if a man goes out and buys deeded lands other than Indian lands and drills for oil and it brings in oil. But if he develops oil on Indian land, then he must proceed through the department with all the details of their procedure.

I don't wish to be misunderstood. There are many instances where supervision is necessary, but it ought to be simplified and reduced to the minimum.

Mr. EMERSON. Are Indians permitted to vote in Oklahoma?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes, in Oklahoma; but not in every State in the Union. There are Indians in every State of the Union, as I am advised, including the District of Columbia, which has a few Indians. We have a large number of Indians in our State, of course, but happily for all concerned we have journeyed along well together. We are living in peace together; there is absolutely good-fellowship among us; we are all friends.

That is because, as the ex-chairman of the Indian Committee [Mr. CARTER] has so well put it, that in our State the Indians are permitted to participate in politics and hold office and perform every function of a citizen, save and except the handling of his property. For example, we have two Congressmen now who have Indian blood in their veins, Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma and Mr. HASTINGS of Oklahoma. There are two United States Senators, Senator CURTIS and Senator OWEN, with Indian blood.

The Register of the Treasury, Houston B. Teehee, has Indian blood, and many of the county officers in my State, everywhere you go, are Indians. There are presidents of banks; and then at the very top of affairs members of chambers of commerce, and so forth, an honor to their State and an honor to their tribe.

Now, I do not want to mislead the House. There are Indians who I have no doubt would, if restrictions were removed, fool away their money and their land and be penniless and poverty stricken. I do not advocate that; they need some supervision. But what I do say is that some of these competency commissions that have been appointed ought to get busy and separate the real Indians from the so-called Indians. Just as long as some man sits in a swivel chair in Washington, drawing $1,200 to $1,500 a year, telling a man in Oklahoma who can make a million dollars how to administer some trivial matter, just that long you will have irritation and trouble.

A few years ago I was on the Indian Committee, and following my strong belief I felt the administration should be cut down and some of the clerks dispensed with. Well, you can imagine the hornet's nest I got into. I tried the best I could as a member of the committee to cut out some of the appropriations and get rid of them; but what did they do? They would go out and find some poor old, pitiful, blind, face-painted, feather-haired Indian who had squandered his money and hold him out as ghastly skeleton of what was being done to the Indians in Oklahoma.

Then his picture, together with the propaganda concerning it, would be put forth in the New York and Boston papers, and Congress would be confronted with the statement that by cutting off these clerks, by cutting off this superfluous administration, it was trying to divest the Indian of some of his property and protection. This was not the fact. No member of the Oklahoma delegation wants to divest any Indian of his protection if he needs it, but we, and the Indian, do not want to be administered from Washington when administration is no longer necessary. The Indian wants his money and his land, and he wants to pay his taxes, and he wants to be free from this fourteen or fifteen million dollars worth of supervision.

Mr. Chairman, I want now to congratulate the Committee on Ways and Means, at the beginning of the administration of the Democratic side, upon its appointment of my colleague, Mr. CHARLES CARTER, as a member of that committee. I think in doing so they pay a very great compliment to the 300,000 Indians in this country. Mr. CARTER has been chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs for six years. His appointment by the Ways and Means Committee is a compliment to his administration of the affairs of the Indian Affairs Committee, which he conducted with dignity and decorum and honesty. If anyone ever heard of any graft or any charges against the administration of those affairs while he has been chairman I have failed to hear of it. I want also to congratulate the Republican side of the House in selecting a man of very broad vision as chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, in the person of the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. SNYDER. I have watched him here, without being active about it, and I have observed the viewpoint of the new chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] is, first, a practical man. Next he is an honest man; third, he is a brave man; and, fourth, I think he has the nerve and the courage and the ability to do his duty and do what ought to be done in respect to these Indians. [Applause.] He will have pitfalls. If he tries to abolish the agency to which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] referred, he will have telegrams and the hip hurrah that comes with such a thing. If he tries to lay off one clerk in an outlying reservation, he will be held up to scorn and the statement made that the chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee is allowing the Indians to be robbed. That will not be the fact, however. The men who live with these Indians, the Indians themselves, want an honest, straight administration of the more unfortunate, uneducated Indians, but at the same time they want the Government to save its money and let the so-called white Indian alone. [Applause.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss immigration and naturalization. I shall begin by calling attention to the statement by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] that 10,000 American Indians entered the service of the United States Army during the war. A good showing for the Indians. But, Mr. Chairman, putting on the uniform did not make them citizens, and when they took off the uniform they again became wards of Uncle Sam. That strikes me as extremely unfair, and I hope that the chairman of this committee will find a place in this bill to insert an amendment giving full United States citizenship to all Indians who served the United States in the late war. [Applause.] We did that for all of the aliens in the United States who went into the military service of the United States. When they entered the Army their citizenship was made complete. That was fair and right. Can not the Indian soldiers be as well treated?

Mr. Chairman, everyone knows that many thousands of aliens in the United States with their first papers—and thousands without papers—accepted the provisions of the draft act and went into the service of the United States, fought valiantly, and acquitted themselves nobly. But we also well know that there were some who, in order to evade the draft, withdrew their first papers, called back their declarations of intention to become citizens of the United States. What shall we do with them? They are in the United States without much chance of becoming citizens of the United States. People are against them. Those men, mostly from neutral countries, are finding it difficult to secure employment; they are complaining to their Governments, and those Governments are complaining to our State Department. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, these men, having withdrawn their declaration of intention, having said, in effect, "We do not wish to be American citizens," that it becomes our plain duty to provide that they shall not at any later date become citizens of the United States. Further, we should see to it that they are deported and sent out of the United States not to return. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, in an effort to ascertain something of the laws and regulations in regard to immigration and naturalization, I have sought to find out just what various bureaus and departments of the Government have to do with these two subjects. I have here a list of immigration and naturalization subjects, running to various bureaus and departments of the Government. The analysis was prepared by Mr. Arthur H. Fleming, of California. As I look at the sheet, I do not wonder that lawyers, Members of Congress, and citizens generally have difficulty in finding out just what immigration and naturalization laws mean and what are the regulations now in effect with relation thereto. I ask unanimous consent to insert this analysis in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. A large number of the paragraphs on this sheet refer to bureaus or administrative organizations which came into being on account of the war. One would think that no reference need be made now to those establishments, upon the ground that, the war being practically over, they will fade away and not be needed, but I doubt if many of them will fade away without protest. A Government bureau, no matter how useless, hangs on to life with a tenacity that is remarkable. I regret that I can not refer to all the departments which have to do with aliens. I shall mention only one or two. We find the Department of Labor with seven or eight bureaus dealing with aliens, about half of them statutory and the other half administrative. The Department of the Interior has two, and the problem of which department shall handle the education of the alien is an acute one.

The Department of State has one administrative bureau and two statutory bureaus dealing with aliens. Passport matters go to these bureaus. We made emergency laws during the war concerning passports, and the emergency laws developed a great array of passport regulations. That emergency act should be revised and reenacted before a treaty of peace is finally signed. Otherwise we shall have trouble, probably, with the arrival of great hordes of aliens from various broken and disturbed countries, which I am positive the United States does not care to receive. I need not specify in detail—Germany and Austria, perhaps.

Our passport business, it sometimes seems to me, is run on a desire to oblige other countries rather than to accommodate the desires of our own citizens. It is very hard for a citizen to secure a passport just now to England or France, but very easy to secure permits by the hundreds for Greeks and Italians to leave for their native lands. You know our war act regulated the departure of all aliens, and we could hold these departing hordes if we desired, which we do not, in my opinion. They came not to stay, but to earn good money and take it home with them. But it strikes me that we might well pass a law barring them from returning to the United States. Let them learn that the United States is not a plum tree, rich and fruitful for those outside.

For a while our State Department encouraged the admission of persons from Russia. Not now. But does it not strike the average American citizen that we would do well to suspend by law the coming of Russians and all others until we ascertain what kind of an underground railway or means of communication the revolutionists of that country have with the revolutionists of this country?

Yes, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, we have revolutionists in the United States, great numbers of them—all "red," too—although many will deny that they want anything but a ballot-box revolution. In fact, the most virulent preacher of bloody revolution right here in the United States denies, when he is arrested, that he means any such thing. But read their stuff! Listen to their talks! And remember that many of the most virulent are not citizens at all. And yet when we demand not only their deportation but that no more of them shall come in either as preachers, teachers, students, or what not, we are about to be met with a lot of argument that aliens are going from and not coming to the United States; that aliens who have been here earning good money are now going back with it, and that we will need more aliens. But do not let that frighten you. The people of the United States know that it is highly desirable to still further restrict immigration or perhaps suspend it absolutely and entirely for a year or two, until our house can be cleaned. [Applause.]

New York holds its Soviet meetings, and the revolutionists of other countries have their headquarters there. Must they be permitted to remain? The preaching of the revolution, the breeding of hatred for the United States and its institutions, goes steadily on day and night here among us in all languages and jargons and printed in all types.

I received to-day a letter which might be of interest to those who are worried for fear too many aliens are going out of the country. It describes a meeting—mostly of aliens—held in New York night before last to protest against the treatment of their coreligionists abroad, and it is said to have been a remarkable meeting. No one could have studied the mass of wolfish faces or have seen the stunted humanity, the writer says, without a shock. He says if the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization could have seen that meeting, if Members of Congress could have seen it there would be no doubt whatever of the immediate passage of a bill radically restricting immigration. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I ask for five minutes additional.

Mr. SNYDER. I am pleased to yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am using this time for the purpose of calling attention to the fact, in my opinion, it is necessary to secure action this summer on a bill to suspend immigration temporarily, notwithstanding the hue and cry that will be raised that labor is going out of the country; a bill to register all aliens now here, and to carry in that bill a clause providing for the deportation of those who withdrew their first papers in order to avoid the draft. [Applause.] Save Americanism in the United States. [Applause.] Some day it may be too late. This is a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people. My colleagues, the time has come to declare that this is a Government of the American people, by the American people, and for the American people. [Applause.] That says nothing against any man now here and of us who have completed the process of naturalization or are completing it. But we have about all we can assimilate for a while, and the time has come to put a check to those who are coming here meaning ill to this country.

Mr. UPSHAW. Good.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Further, the time has come to make the incoming alien prove his desirability, rather than continue the plan that the United States prove his undesirability.

Mr. Chairman, I received yesterday a vicious revolutionary newspaper published in Boston which has not received the privileges of the mail, I understand. I think it is called the Revolutionist. It is being circulated in all parts of the United States, even in the agricultural districts. It has a list of seven or eight names as editors and coeditors, and I will lay a bet that half of them are not citizens of the United States. I doubt if one of them was born here, and I know that all of them are set on destroying this Government. They would bring on a revolution of blood and iron, and I would like to ask how much longer the people of the United States will be blind and let that thing go on? What of our oaths to defend this country against enemies, foreign and domestic?

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Can the gentleman give the name of the paper, and also the names of the editors?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have not it at this moment, but I can put the names in the RECORD.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman put it in the RECORD?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. At some later date. I am sending to Boston to ascertain if they are citizens of the United States. If they are, then it is proof positive that we made a woeful mistake in letting them and their kind come in to claim the false right under the guise of a free press to preach a blood-and-iron revolution. If they are not citizens, then we are in poor business to let them come here and take part in the affairs of our Government. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Can the gentleman tell us through what agency or agencies this paper is being distributed?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have no way of knowing. Perhaps it is sent broadcast through some underground method.

Mr. BLANTON. In what way did it reach the gentleman?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It was mailed to me by a farmer living in an agricultural section of the State of Washington.

Mr. BLANTON. Then it did go through the mail when it was denied the privileges of the mail?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I do not know that it was denied. It prints no permit. It should be denied.

Mr. BLANTON. I am in sympathy with the gentleman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Is the cure for the condition you mention now a prohibition of immigration?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think so.

Mr. GALLAGHER. And is that the only remedy?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It is a preventative, at least, for the future, because when the President himself comes here and says what he did in his speech at Boston, we know what he means. Suspend immigration unless——

Mr. GALLAGHER. These men are here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If they are not citizens of the United States, they must be sent out at once, and if they are citizens they should be put in jail. [Applause.]

Mr. GALLAGHER. Then you propose a method of deportation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We have some deportation clauses. We want more. We are deporting some.

Mr. GALLAGHER. But that has nothing to do with immigration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. All immigrants should be subject to deportation for a long period of years. I would like to know why all of these aliens who are cursing and damning the United States squeal when we come to deport them? Why do they hire lawyers, start habeas corpus proceedings, and try to stay in the United States? Why do they do it?

A MEMBER. They do not want to lose a good thing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is it. They know that liberty, that freedom, that opportunity is here, in spite of their mouthings. Gentlemen, the time has come for the United States to clean house, and while we are cleaning house we should shut the doors entirely. [Applause.]

The table presented by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington follows:

Analysis of Federal departmental relations to the alien.

Department.	Bureau.	Authority.	Contact with alien.
Labor	Immigration	Statutory	Administers immigration act regulating the admission, exclusion, and deportation of aliens and the Chinese-exclusion law.
		Administrative	Assists in internment of alien enemies in the country unlawfully but not technically prisoners of war.
	Naturalization	Statutory	Administers Federal naturalization laws and examines applicants for citizenship.
		Administrative	Stimulates educational preparation of declarants and petitioners by cooperation with public schools and local agencies.

Analysis of Federal departmental relations to the alien—Continued.

Department.	Bureau.	Authority.	Contact with alien.
Labor	Employment Service	Administrative; special appropriation.	Conducts public employment exchanges for men and women, including aliens; cooperates with State and municipal bureaus; publishes clearing-house bulletins; and mobilizes labor supply for Government activities, war industries, and agricultural work.
	Information	Statutory	Publishes information for arriving aliens regarding agricultural opportunities (now combined with Employment Service).
	Public Service Reserve	Administrative; private contributions.	Enrolls adult males, including friendly aliens, who volunteer for work in war industries and registers those already employed to stabilize labor supply.
	Mediation	Statutory	Reaches workmen, including aliens, in adjustments of industrial disputes.
	Children's	....do	Conserves standards of life and labor of women and children, including aliens.
	Labor Statistics	....do	Conducts investigations and research and publishes bulletins on labor conditions, including those largely affecting aliens.
Interior	Education	Administrative; private contributions.	Gathers data, prepares and publishes standards and methods, and stimulates establishment of additional facilities for the education of adult immigrants through the Division of Immigrant Education.
		Statutory	Promotes establishment of community forums in public schools as an agency for Americanization—through Division of Community Organization. Reaches immigrant mothers in the home—through the Division of Home Economics.
	General Land Office	....do	Permits filing of homestead entries by aliens who have made declaration of intention.
Commerce	Census	....do	Conducts decennial census, with sections on characteristics of foreign-born population.
	Navigation	....do	Enforces provisions of seamen's act including provisions regarding employment of alien and non-English-speaking seamen.
State	Citizenship	....do	Examines applicants for and issues passports.
	Department	Administrative	Determines status of resident aliens and naturalized citizens under treaty relationships.
		Statutory	Issues licenses to transport into or from the United States citizens of "enemy" or "ally of enemy" countries.
Post Office	Postal Savings	....do	Accepts for deposit the savings of foreign-born wage earners.
	Foreign language newspapers	....do	Licenses newspapers printed in foreign languages and requires those unlicensed to file translations of articles concerning the war.
	Inspection	Administrative; cooperative.	Prohibits the transmission through mails of seditious printed matter in cooperation with Department of Justice for enforcement of espionage act.
	Department	....do	Supplies application blanks for employment for those out of work, including aliens, in cooperation with Department of Labor.
Justice	Attorney General	Statutory proclamation	Registers alien enemies—males over 14 years—through police officers and postmasters. Investigates arrests of alien enemies, orders those found dangerous interned as war prisoners and releases others for probationary periods to supervisors.
	Investigation	Statutory	Investigates complaints relating to alien-enemy activities violating espionage act.
	District attorneys	....do	Prosecute aliens—friendly as well as enemy—for violations of law and regulations.
	Marshals	Administrative	Enforce police provisions of alien regulations and issue permits to alien enemies to reside, pass through, or come within forbidden areas.
War	Provost Marshal	Statutory	Conscripts in National Army male alien declarants between 21 and 30 years of age.
	Military information	Administrative	Collects information on alien activities for protection of Army. Determines need of military protection of war industries against alien enemy activities. Inspects plants working on war contracts for safety against fire and explosion and to remove causes of discontent and guard against enemies within.
	Department	....do	Guards dangerous alien enemies ordered interned as war prisoners by Department of Justice.
Navy	Naval intelligence	....do	Protects naval operations against alien enemy activities. Enforces proclamation declaring water front a restricted zone. Investigates occasionally alien activities in plants to determine the cause of delay in naval contracts.
	Naval Reserve	Statutory	Enrolls friendly alien declarants who may become citizens after one year's honorable service.
Treasury	Secret Service	....do	Initiates investigations of alien anti-Government activities.
	Public Health Service	....do	Conducts physical and metal examinations of alien arrivals.
	Liberty loan	Administrative	Solicits cooperation of foreign-language societies, clubs, and newspapers.
Censorship Board	Department	Statutory	Censors communications to or from foreign countries by mail, cable, radio, and telegraph.
Alien Property Custodian	....do	....do	Has custody and control of "enemy" or "ally of enemy" property within the United States.
Committee on Public Information (created by presidential proclamation without congressional action).	Foreign-language publications.	Administrative	Disseminates press material on war matters to foreign-language newspapers.
	Civic and educational	....do	Prepares and distributes in English and foreign languages bulletins and pamphlets on the war.
	Four Minute Men	....do	Provides speakers on war matters for moving-picture theaters, including those in immigrant districts.
	Speakers	....do	Organizes war conferences and furnishes material to speakers to promote loyalty of aliens.
Council of National Defense	State Councils	....do	Outlines and recommends Americanization activities to State councils to promote loyalty of aliens.
	Women's Divisions	....do	Disseminates information regarding Americanization activities for alien women. Instructs foreign-born working women in English and in industrial and social standards.
Shipping Board	Industrial Service	....do	Trains men, including friendly aliens, for work on sea-going steamers and assures them employment. Also secures and trains such men for work in shipbuilding plants.
	Wage Adjustments	....do	Sets wage standards for workmen, including aliens, in shipbuilding plants to stabilize labor supply.
Food Administration	Vernacular Press	....do	Prepares bulletins and disseminates information to foreign-language press.
	Conservation	....do	Registers alien women to pledge food conservation.
Agriculture	County Agents	....do	Assist women, including aliens, in production and conservation through home canning. Studies farm labor conditions and organizes supply, including aliens, in rural districts.
Labor Adjustments Commission. (Created by presidential proclamation without congressional action.)			Investigates and adjusts industrial disputes among employees, including aliens, in basic war industries.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCKEOWN].

Mr. MCKEOWN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to take a few minutes to talk about home conditions in the Indian Territory portion of the State of Oklahoma. I discussed that question here before when the Indian bill was up for consideration, and I am still interested, as every man in the eastern part of Oklahoma is interested, in the question of the purchase of homes among the Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes.

Now, here are the conditions as they exist: In 1908 the Congress of the United States passed an act by which it removed the restrictions from the Indians having certain quantum of Indian blood. Since that time those Indians, who are restricted Indians, can only lease their surplus lands for a period of five years for agricultural purposes and their homesteads for one

year for agricultural purposes without the approval of the Indian Department. That has resulted in this, for example: A member of the Choctaw tribe of Indians was allotted 320 acres of average land for himself, 320 acres for his wife, and 320 acres for each one of his children. A man with eight children would have approximately 3,000 acres of land. He could only lease the surplus lands for five years; that is, about one-half. Out of each 320 acres there were 160 reserved as homesteads, and this could be rented only for one year at the time. Now, he can not make any sales of his surplus land. He finds himself land poor. The people who live in the State pay all the taxes. They pay for road improvements and school facilities. The tenant farmer who plows the cotton and the corn and reaps the grain pays taxes on his mules and machinery and on all of his property, while his landlord has no taxes to pay. Many Indian citizens do not desire this situation, and many of them paid taxes on lands that were not taxable.

The Indian wants some relief. The men who go there want homes. There are men in the eastern part of the State of Oklahoma who came there from Illinois, Ohio, Arkansas, and Texas, and from other States, 20 years ago, with the hope of obtaining a home and buying homes where they could settle and give their children an opportunity in life. But what has happened to them? They have waited there in vain. They have waited all these years and have had no opportunity to obtain that home for which they have longed. What has been the result? There are thousands of tenant farmers who have had to chase from one part of the country to another to farm, move out this year and move in next year. They had no home in which to live. The Indian who owns the land is losing by reason of the land being worn away by wrong methods of farming. What else do we find? It is under these conditions that dissatisfaction is so easily aroused against the Government. It was in such places and under such conditions that we had our antagonism to the draft laws and where we have our radical element.

Here is what ought to be done: The department ought to remove all the restrictions from the lands, except 40 or 80 acres to be used as a home. This should be selected and made tax free and inalienable for all time, as long as he will live there with his descendants and make it a home.

The other land ought to be put up at auction to the highest bidder on terms of from 5 to 20 years, such as to permit actual bona fide farmers who live in or who come to the State to buy and own homes. I want to say to you gentlemen who live in the large centers of population, and who appreciate conditions there, that you can realize what it is to have a tenant population of discontented men. I say to you, it is like having a bomb ready to explode on every adverse change of conditions, and it is people of that kind who are likely to be radically inclined. If you make a home owner you make a patriotic defender of the flag of the country, and nothing could be better done by this country than to give every worthy man an opportunity to acquire a home in city or country. I agree with gentlemen who urge that there ought to be a more strict regulation of immigration of men coming to this country, but there is another thing to be considered, and that is that there are men already in this country who have not had an opportunity to acquire homes. When you make this country a land of home owners, both in the city and in the country, you will have a country that will always respond to every patriotic demand. [Applause.]

The Secretary of the Interior is now advocating the purchase of homes for returned soldiers. I favor legislation of that character. There is no better field to-day than eastern Oklahoma to put his program into effect. Remove the restrictions on the lands as indicated. Then let him advertise the lands in Oklahoma at public auction, and let the soldiers who want to buy land for a home come in and buy it on long terms and low interest rates, and let the resident tenant farmers buy homes for their families. The Secretary of the Interior can put this plan into practical operation in Oklahoma now, without waiting for a dollar to be appropriated from the Treasury of the United States. I urged it upon his attention, and I will offer an amendment to this bill to put into effect this project now and try it out practically and see what the result will be. I am sure we would have a land of home owners in Oklahoma; and the Indian will be protected, because he can not spend his money until it is due and paid.

As was stated by the chairman of this committee [Mr. SNYDER], the Indians of Oklahoma have bought Liberty bonds. I know of one Indian in my district who bought $60,000 of Liberty bonds and paid the cash, and the Secretary will not let him have the interest on his bonds to spend or invest. That is the condition. That condition ought to be corrected. I expect, gentlemen, at the proper time to offer an amendment to this bill requiring the Indian Bureau to open the lands of Oklahoma for sale at public auction, and take off these Indian restrictions and give the Indian and the white man a chance. [Applause.]

I thank you, gentlemen, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma yields back the remainder of his time.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York withhold that for a minute?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCKEOWN] made a very remarkable statement, but he probably can explain it. Why would the Secretary of the Treasury deny to a holder of $60,000 worth of Liberty bonds the interest due on those bonds?

Mr. McKEOWN. I said "the Secretary of the Interior," or intended so to say. If I said "Secretary of the Treasury" I made a misstatement. The Secretary of the Interior supervises the Indian's money. He collects it in his department as individual Indian funds, but he does not pay it all out to the Indian himself.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I may have erred as to the Secretary of the Treasury; but no matter who the Secretary was, the suggestion was so startling that I thought the gentleman from Oklahoma would like to explain it. Surely, the Indian who was patriotic enough to buy $60,000 of bonds, or any other amount, should receive the interest on those bonds, should he not?

Mr. McKEOWN. I will explain the situation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The individual Indian money was collected from oil lands and held in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior to the credit of this particular Indian. This Indian asked the Secretary to buy Liberty bonds out of those funds. The Secretary bought the bonds, but when the interest coupons were due the Secretary collected the money on the coupons and placed it to the credit of the Indian; but he will not pay it out to the Indian because he says the Indian is not competent to handle the money.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. He says the Indian is not competent to handle the money, and therefore he holds it in trust?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Certainly.

Mr. SEARS. That condition has prevailed for years, as stated by the former chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs [Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma], who served in the past two years, and as stated by the present chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs [Mr. SNYDER], and the committee has tried to break up that system.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Suppose that Indian should die. What would become of his estate?

Mr. McKEOWN. It would go to his heirs and they would proceed to spend it, and some of them in riotous living, in all probability.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Who would collect it?

Mr. McKEOWN. His heirs would collect it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Suppose they were not competent?

Mr. McKEOWN. On the death of the Indian the restrictions would be removed, descend unrestricted to the heirs, which would receive the money which the poor old Indian did not get a chance at.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask unanimous consent to revise and correct the remarks I made a little while ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I secured this time in order to read an anonymous letter that was sent to me, but before I do that I want to do a little congratulating also. I want to congratulate the present occupant of the chair [Mr. LONGWORTH]. I hope it is a good sign that Ohio is coming back. It used to be said in the good old days of President McKinley and Mark Hanna that it was "the United States of Ohio." But Ohio has fallen behind of late, and there-

fore I was happy to see my friend and colleague occupying the chair, because it seemed to be a sign that Ohio is coming back. [Laughter.]

I wish also to congratulate the chairman of the committee [Mr. SNYDER] and the former chairman of the committee [Mr. CARTER]. They are both able men. I have watched them closely. They ought to be on more important committees than the Indian Affairs Committee. It might be a good idea to select men for their worth instead of for the amount of noise they can make.

I want to say, further, that I coincide with what the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] has said about what should be done to the alien. There were many aliens in the city of Cleveland who claimed their exemption, remained at home, and earned $5, $10, $15, and $20 a day while your boy and mine went to the front. That is absolutely wrong, and it should be corrected. It was an advantage to be an alien. I believe the time has arrived in this country when men should not vote as hyphens, but they should vote as American. [Applause.] There is too much of this voting the way your class votes.

I believe in educational preparedness to the limit. If this country had had that in 1916 you would not have had to go to war with Germany, and we would not be paying the interest upon $25,000,000,000 worth of bonds; 70,000 American boys would not be sleeping in Flanders fields, and 200,000 more would not be maimed and wounded. Nothing that this Congress could do would be better for this Government than to start a program whereby every citizen of this country should learn the rights and duties of citizenship; and while we welcome the alien at our door, he must leave his propaganda at the seashore and not bring it any further. I would tell that alien, "You may come here, but you must study your rights and your duties as a citizen, and if within a certain period of time you can not learn them and become a citizen, we will send you back home." I agree with the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] that every alien who claimed his exemption from military service because of his alienage should be started back now to the place from which he came. [Applause.] That is what I believe in and that is what this country must do.

On the 1st day of May in the city of Cleveland I witnessed a riot on the public square. A few thousand people in that city got the notion that this is a government of minorities and not of majorities. They marched to the public square of that city with their red flags. They took possession of the public square. They thought they were going to take possession of the city hall and the post office. They proceeded to deliver their utterances there, but the citizens of the city of Cleveland arose, tore down the red flags, and made them kiss the Stars and Stripes. Two hundred of the followers of the red flag were beaten up, and some of them more seriously wounded.

We taught them a lesson. The people of Cleveland went to the headquarters of the Bolshevists and there destroyed the furniture; and now instead of trying to overturn the Government, the Bolsheviki of Cleveland are seeking the protection of the Government which they so much dislike and are trying to overturn. [Applause.] That is one reason why I believe that this Government should enter upon a campaign of education. I am in favor of preparedness, and I want to say that if this country had been prepared in 1916 the *Lusitania* would never have been sunk and you would never have had to go to war, and you would have been at peace with all the world. It was simply because the Kaiser did not believe we would fight. If he had known that we would send 2,000,000 men to France in about a year and a half the *Lusitania* would never have been sunk.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. EMERSON. I believe in industrial preparedness, whereby we will raise and manufacture everything we need. I believe in commercial preparedness, whereby we will carry our American products in American ships—and we have been manufacturing ships—manned by American sailors and flying the American flag. As I said, I believe in educational preparedness, and if you will give us educational preparedness you can throw aside all the rest. But the time has arrived in this country when people must be taught to respect, love, protect, and defend the country in which they live, where their families live, where their children are being educated, where they are to spend the remainder of their natural lives.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have received an anonymous letter which is very interesting and which I want to read. It says:

Gen. March has announced he will keep the Army up to a strength of 500,000 even if he has to hold conscripted men in the army of occupation.

Now, all I have to say is he will do no such thing. The President, Secretary of War, Congress, and the big generals themselves are our servants, and we, the people, pay the bills. Those boys are our boys, and we, their people, say they are coming home. The big lights must not go too far, and try to run things to suit themselves without the consent of the people, or they will find themselves in a mighty bad mess. The sooner Congress uses its influence to get the boys home, the better it will be for all concerned. We, their countrymen, including the boys so far discharged, will back those boys and their people if the boys demand return to this country immediately after peace is signed. And if there is to be a national row about the matter we will all get into it. It is up to Congress to get the boys home. Now, show us who of you we wisely put into office.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman spoke of being in favor of education as a means of getting rid of Bolshevism.

Mr. EMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that here in the District of Columbia, when the school board found that a teacher in the public schools of this city was teaching Bolshevism in the schools, they suspended her for a week, and now there is an effort on foot right here in the Nation's Capital to override the action of the school board and have the teacher fully reinstated, though the board merely imposed a sentence of one week's suspension for teaching Bolshevism in the schools. I agree with the gentleman that education is needed, but it is the proper kind of education that we need.

Mr. EMERSON. The gentleman might add that you can do a great many things in Washington that you can not do in other parts of the United States. I do not approve of everything that is done in Washington. If I were to take two or three hours' time, I might find fault with some conditions that I do not approve of. In the first place, I do not approve of the necessity, when I want to go to some department of the Government, of having to take a taxicab to go to some office connected with that department, located away off in the northwestern part of the city, and then after I get there find that I must take another taxicab to get to some other office connected with the same department located in the northeastern part of the city. They ought not to be scattered around in that way. But I will not take any further time in making that criticism now. You may be able to teach Bolshevism in the city of Washington, but you can not do it in the city of Cleveland. The people of Cleveland, on the 1st day of May, instantly arose and said the notions of Bolshevism could not be proclaimed there for a minute. That was the action taken by the people of the city of Cleveland. We can have anything we want in this country if a majority of the people are in favor of it. If the majority want Bolshevism, they can have it. However, I do not believe they want it if they obtain it by the process of a fair election. We elect our public officials in this country. We elect the President, and if we do not like him we remove him. We elect our Congressmen and Senators and governors and mayors. We can have whatever kind of officials we choose to elect, and if they are not the kind of officials we want it is our own fault, because we put them in office. This is for the action of the majority and not for the minority, and therefore I say to you that it is up to the majority of the people in this country, if they want to preserve the interests of this country, if they want to preserve the interests of this Nation, to provide, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has said, a proper kind of education, to preserve their rights and duties as citizens of this country. [Applause.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has used one hour and one-half and the gentleman from Oklahoma 1 hour and 17 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON], who preceded me, and the newly selected chairman of the Immigration Committee [Mr. JOHNSON] seem, I feel, unwillingly impressed the House and the country that all of the foreign-born people are Bolshevists and opposed to all form of Government. However, I feel satisfied that that was not their intention, as I know both will agree with me that those who may have asked for exemption on account of alienage or those who might have been found to be taking part in disloyal movements are only a very few. Personally I wish there were none. I also regret that some of them are to be found, as has been stated by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], as editors of newspapers which find fault with our institutions and tend to create discord and disobedience to our laws. This, of course, I greatly regret, and none of these misguided gentlemen are entitled to any special consideration at the hands of our country and surely will not receive any from me.

The newly selected chairman of the Committee on Immigration a few moments ago gave an outline of proposed legislation, which he believes is necessary, namely, a wholesale deportation and also immediate restriction of all immigration. I feel that, due to what has transpired in his section of the country and the article appearing in the paper which he has received, unduly excites him. I feel that it is not necessary to enact such stringent measures as he suggests. For years, with others, he has advocated the educational test in our immigration laws. I have frequently pointed out that the educational test would not prevent the coming of some of the most objectionable persons, and surely the educational test will not and can not prohibit the coming of those which he points out are guilty of writing these disloyal, unpatriotic articles.

However, if he will examine the names of men found guilty of disloyalty during the war he will find that the percentage of the foreign born is nil. I am of the opinion that the great majority of the foreign-born people have demonstrated their loyalty, patriotism, and love for this their adopted country, and I am satisfied that on thorough investigation we will find that the foreign-born people will excel in percentage in proportion to population of the native born who enlisted during this war. Those who have abused the privilege of our hospitality and freedom of our country and who have refused to serve the Nation, and all those who in any way showed any sign of disloyalty, I agree with the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] should be deported. I maintain, however, that wholesale condemnation of foreign-born people is unjustifiable. No doubt you all have heard of the splendid services rendered by the people of the various nationalities, and, of course, there are some gentlemen who at all times will withhold credit where credit is due. Only this morning I had the pleasure of reading an article which I know may surprise many of you. It is written by Mr. Justin McGrath, which I desire to insert as part of my remarks for the purpose of enlightening some who at all times endeavor to belittle the services of the Jews of America in this war. This article shows, notwithstanding the fact that the Jewish population of this country is only about 2½ to 3 per cent, that 5 per cent of our Army and Navy was composed of Jews. It also shows that the casualties suffered so far listed number 7,200, but the final count will show from ten to twelve thousand, making it nearly 5, yes, close to 6, per cent. It also shows that over 400 of the Jewish soldiers have already been cited for bravery. Time does not permit me to give other extracts from this article, but I request unanimous consent that I may insert same as part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by the publication of this article referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I think it is manifestly unfair that we should place all foreign-born people in an unfavorable light before the people of our country. It is easy to charge people with being Bolshevists and it is easy to attack their patriotism. We should give credit where credit is due and to appreciate the splendid services that these people have rendered and not to charge all for the wrongdoings of a few.

RECORDS PROVE JEWISH TROOPS AMONG BRAVEST—MEMBERS OF RACE WIN 400 CITATIONS FOR VALOR DURING WAR—CASUALTIES MAY REACH 12,000.

(By Justin McGrath, editorial correspondent Universal Service.)

WASHINGTON, *May 20.*

Jokes on the pacifist tendencies of the Jews will have no appeal to excite laughter when the statistics of Jewish participation in the great war, now being compiled by the American Jewish War Records Committee, are completed.

This committee has 120,000 records of Jewish soldiers in its files. When all the returns are in it expects to have the records of 200,000 Jews who saw service.

If this expectation is met, the record will show that the Jews supplied about 5 per cent of the military and naval forces of the United States.

This can be appreciated when it is understood the proportion of Jews in the United States to the total population is only about 3 per cent.

JEWISH CASUALTIES HEAVY.

The Jewish casualties, so far listed, number 7,200. It is expected the final count will show from 10,000 to 12,000.

Four hundred citations for bravery already have been listed.

The largest centers of Jewish population, of course, supplied the greatest number of Jews to the service. New York State and city supplied more than one-third of all of those listed up to the present time, the total for the State standing now at 26,866, of which 22,210 were from New York City.

Illinois is credited with 3,459, of which 2,670 were from Chicago, and Massachusetts with 3,777, of which 830 were from Boston.

Nine hundred and twelve answered the call to the colors from San Francisco.

PROVED THEIR METTLE.

The famous 77th Division, of which Col. Whittlesey commanded a battalion, was largely Jewish. When Col. Whittlesey was surrounded by the Germans and called upon to surrender, his reply to the German courier was, "Tell 'em to go to hell." He and his men, many of whom were Jewish, fought on until they were rescued by other American forces.

Although the Infantry branch of the American Army constituted but 20.66 per cent of the entire Army, the Jews attached to the Infantry branch constituted 51.07 per cent of the total number of Jews in the service.

The Marine Corps is essentially a fighting organization. Every man who enlisted in this corps did so with the expectation that he would be sent where the fighting was the thickest. Of the 60,000 marines, 1,700, or 3 per cent, were Jewish, according to the records already listed.

FIRED BY CHATEAU-THIERRY.

Of the 1,700 Jewish Marines, fully 30 per cent enlisted immediately after June 5, 1918, the day after it was published to the world that the marines were the "shock troops" at Chateau-Thierry.

The total of all the Jewish casualties thus far listed is about 10,000. The total number of deaths is 882, or 4.01 per cent of the total in the American Expeditionary Forces.

The total wounded is 1,397, or 3.08 per cent of the total.

Of the Infantry branch the Jews had 1,060 commissioned officers and 1,678 noncommissioned officers.

In the Field Artillery they had 225 commissioned officers and 373 noncommissioned officers.

In the Infantry they had 6 colonels and lieutenant colonels, 31 majors, 174 captains, 228 first lieutenants, 369 second lieutenants, and 244 lieutenants not designated.

In the Field Artillery they had 6 colonels and lieutenant colonels, 6 majors, 29 captains, 59 first lieutenants, 80 second lieutenants, and 42 lieutenants not designated.

The record is one in which Jews may take justifiable pride.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, at the outset I wish to congratulate the Republican majority on the splendid progress it is making in passing necessary legislation. The Members on that side of the Hall are meeting the country's expectations in a most commendable manner, and while I have no disposition to inject partisan politics, I can not refrain from commenting upon the splendid manner in which the Republican majority is taking hold of and passing legislation vital to the country's welfare.

To-morrow, when the Indian bill is brought up under the five-minute rule, I am going to offer an amendment to appropriate $10,000 for the construction of a road across the Red Lake Reservation, in Minnesota, and in order to expedite the matter I deem it advisable to explain the amendment at this time.

The State of Minnesota is going to construct up to the south end of the Red Lake Reservation a State road that will conform to all Federal requirements. This road will start in again at the north end of the reservation and continue on up to the Canadian line. At the present time there are nothing but trails on the Red Lake Reservation, and the Indians and the settlers living to the north and west of Red Lake are absolutely handicapped for the want of a highway that will be passable at all seasons of the year. This bill already carries an amendment of $3,000 for the construction of a bridge across the Red Lake River, near the outlet of the lake, in connection with this proposed road.

It has been estimated by the Indian Bureau and also by the Beltrami County engineer that $10,000 will build a road that will meet all needs and at the same time put in the missing link between the two State roads above referred to.

Mr. EAGLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I will.

Mr. EAGLE. How many acres are there in this reservation, and how many Indians are there?

Mr. KNUTSON. I am not positive as to the exact size of the Red Lake Reservation, but would say offhand that it contains something like 18 townships, in which several thousand Indians have their homes, a large number of whom will derive great benefit from the proposed road, as well as give them direct communication with the agency, something they do not have at all seasons of the year at the present time. There is not a decent highway on the reservation. The Indians living northwest of the lake have asked for this road, and the Indian Bureau is satisfied with the proposed amendment.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. How many miles long will it be?

Mr. KNUTSON. Some 35 or 40 miles. It is proposed to follow some gravel ridges, so the cost of building the road will not be nearly so great as it otherwise would be. We do not propose to follow any well-defined line to the north of the Red Lake. It will run diagonally with a gravel ridge that surmounts the watershed in that section. Between the ridges, where the land is somewhat low and wet, there are sections that are impassable in the spring of the year. These low places will be filled in and graded up. Under the present arrangement the so-called Cross Lake Indians use the lake in traveling between their homes and the agency. I will say for the information of the committee that there are thousands of acres of fertile agricultural land to the north of Red Lake that are lying idle at the present time for the want of communication

with market. There are a large number of settlers living to the north of the Red Lake Reservation who will be greatly benefited by the proposed road, and I sincerely hope that there will be no objection to the amendment as it is offered, and I am sure there will be none if every member of this committee understands the real situation.

The amendment will provide that the work is to be done by Indians so far as practicable, and as the money to be expended for the construction of the road across the reservation will come from the tribal funds the greater share of such expenditure will remain right on the reservation, which is proper and right.

The State of Minnesota is making plans to adopt an extensive road-building program during the next three years. While we already have an excellent system of highways, I believe that when we have completed our plans our State will have one of the best and most extensive systems of highways in the entire country. Money judiciously expended on road building is money well spent, and the Indians of Minnesota are just as keen for good roads as anyone, and I know that when I ask for the adoption of this amendment I will be serving them equally with the whites.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HOWARD].

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am about to undergo an experience that each of you has had in this House, and I hope that I will have your sympathy. I have been a Member of this body now for only five days and have not had opportunity to thoroughly go into the matter of this bill, nor have I had an opportunity to learn all that I might in respect to the operations of Congress. In my limited experience, however, I have learned that the old Biblical saying that the last shall be first is not entirely applicable to the membership of this House.

I want to commend both the majority members and the minority members of this committee for their industry in bringing forth and reporting this bill so shortly after the meeting of this session. I am delighted with my first few days' experience in this body, and I am more than pleased with the fact that I had an opportunity to cast my first vote in Congress for the resolution giving the mothers of our land a right to vote, and am pleased that the second one I shall be permitted to cast will be to provide appropriations for caring for the Indians of this country immediately, so that there shall be no suffering among them. I represent in this body the greatest Indian district in the United States. Combined within that population is the great Osage Nation, the richest nation of people upon the globe; the Pawnees, the Otoes, the Quapaws, Senecas, a large number of Cherokees, and a considerable population of Creeks. I commend this bill to the Congress as having been properly drawn to care for the interests of these people and as the Representative of that district I ask its immediate passage.

Mr. Chairman, Oklahoma is proud of her Indians. In the past few months, when the clouds of war were over us, no one responded more quickly or liberally to the appeals of war, the Red Cross, the Salvation Army, or to patriotism than did our Indian citizens. We think so much of the Indians of Oklahoma that we not only give them, in our constitution and through our laws, every privilege the whites enjoy but in many instances we look to them for leadership. We point with pride to the kind of leadership furnished to us through our senior Senator from Oklahoma, ROBERT L. OWEN, who is of Indian extraction. Coming to this body, we point with pride to the representation given us by our Indian Members, Mr. CARTER and Mr. HASTINGS, of Oklahoma. [Applause.] I might add, my friends, that there are thousands of other Indian citizens in Oklahoma who are just as capable of that kind of representation; but may I not add, parenthetically, that I am going to try for the next two years to persuade the people of the first Oklahoma district that, even though these Indians are so enlightened and such great leaders, they are not more competent to represent that district than am I. [Laughter and applause.]

Much has been said with reference to the removal of restrictions on Indian lands. I want to say to the Congress that the united voice of Oklahoma appeals to this body and our sister body to as soon as possible remove the restrictions from Indian lands in our great State. The Indians want them removed, and the necessities of the State of Oklahoma demand it. May I for a moment point out one of the injustices? Oklahoma has an area as large as that of the neighboring State of Kansas, and has as many trunk-line railroads. Yet, with all of our oil interests, with a population exceeding that of the State of Kansas, our assessable valuation for taxation purposes runs only $1,400,000,000, as against over $2,000,000,000 in the State of Kansas.

This condition exists because of the failure to remove these restrictions in order that we may get those Indian lands, which the Indian himself desires to alienate, into the hands of real home owners and on the tax rolls, to help keep up our schools, build our roads, and pay the expenses of our State government. For this reason, if for no other, I appeal to Congress during this session to give us as much relief as is possible along these lines.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. HOWARD. With respect to the matter of supervision of Indian affairs, which has been referred to on several occasions to-day, permit me to say that so far as I know at present the policies, to at least a considerable extent, now being pursued by the department are the same as have been in vogue in past administrations, owing, perhaps, to existing legislation, and if that be the case I would suggest that the way to remedy it is by changing our policy through legislation. For my part I am always ready to commend any department or official for a strict enforcement of law. But, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, conditions have changed in respect to many things in the past few months. We see many questions through different eyes now, and along with many other matters we must deal with the Indian in the future in a spirit of progressiveness; remedies must be provided where they are needed. The record of the Indian in the recent great conflict, where he gave of himself great account, whether in the trench or battle field, or wherever he was called upon to render a patriotic duty, should awaken in us a new interest in him.

I urge upon you that he be given all his rights as a defender of our flag, and pray that before this Congress ends its labors that we shall have enacted legislation that will give to the Indians the exact justice, equality, and rights which the white man enjoys.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, there is now functioning in this city a joint congressional commission for the purpose of reclassifying the salaries of Government clerks. As I understand it, it will be the duty of this commission to report back to Congress conditions which exist relative to the clerks of this Government that will enable the membership of this Congress to properly reclassify and readjust salaries. I do not know whether you gentlemen have noticed the substance of the questionnaire which has been prepared by this joint congressional commission and which is to be propounded to the clerks for answer.

I have carefully looked over it, and I can not find one question in it that would bring out the particular information that some of us would like to have when we come to pass upon this question. I have noticed in the newspapers excerpts from the speeches of one member of this commission in speaking at banquets and meetings of the clerks over the city that they need have no uneasiness whatever about the position or action of that commission; that they will be cared for all right; that the action of the commission will be an action of help and advantage to them rather than a disadvantage. If they are entitled to help, and if advantage should be given to them by this Congress justly and rightly, I am with you to help them, but if some of them are presumably working seven hours a day for this Government on big salaries, and if after 5 o'clock p. m. they are working for big private individuals and big business firms and big corporations of this country on big salaries, making more a day from outside parties than from this Government, and coming back to their offices the next morning tired out and worn out and not able to do proper service for this Government, then I am in favor of properly knowing those facts and having those facts brought before this Congress when the reclassification and readjustment takes place.

I wrote to this joint congressional commission and called their attention to the fact that their questionnaire in many respects was absolutely worthless; that if the clerks themselves had drawn it they could not have drawn it more in favor of the clerks themselves than it was drawn, and I presented to the joint congressional commission a carefully prepared supplemental questionnaire that would bring out the very facts that some Members of this Congress would like to know, and I asked that the committee, in all justice to the country, in all justice to the people, the tax-burdened people of this country, that their representatives should know these facts, and I asked that this joint congressional commission should submit this supplemental questionnaire along with the other for answer. For the

benefit of my colleagues I now insert in the RECORD the supplemental questionnaire prepared by me embraced in House joint resolution 5, namely:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 5) directing additional questionnaire for employees of the United States Government.

Resolved, etc., That the Congressional Joint Commission on Reclassification of Salaries be, and it is hereby, directed to have propounded to all Government employees, in addition to the questionnaire already prepared, the following supplemental questionnaire:

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

Name ———. Organization unit ———. Pay-roll title ———. Basic salary ———. No. ———.

QUESTIONS.

1. Outside of your position with the Government, are you employed by any person, firm, or corporation? ———. If yea: (a) Give name of such employer. ———. (b) Location where work is performed. ———. (c) Hours of work, beginning and quitting. ———. (d) Compensation paid you for same per month. ———.

2. Are you married? ———. If yea: (a) Is your spouse (wife or husband) employed by the Government in any capacity? ———. (b) If yea, then in what department? ———. (c) Amount of compensation received by such spouse per month. ———. (d) Have you any children? ———. If yea: (e) Have you any sons employed by the Government? ———. (f) If so, give names, ages, departments in which employed, compensation they each receive. ———. (g) Have you any daughters employed by the Government? ———. (h) If so, give names, ages, departments in which employed, and compensation they each receive per month. ———.

3. Is your father employed by the Government in any capacity? ———. If yea: (a) In what department? ———. (b) Hours of service? ———. (c) Amount of compensation paid him per month. ———.

4. Is your mother employed by the Government in any capacity? ———. If yea: (a) In what department? ———. (b) Hours of service? ———. (c) Amount of compensation paid her per month? ———.

5. Have you any sisters employed by the Government in any capacity? ———. If yea: (a) In what department? ———. (b) Hours of service? ———. (c) Compensation paid to each of them, giving names and addresses of each? ———.

6. Have you any brothers employed by the Government? ———. If yea: (a) Give their names and addresses? ———. (b) In what departments? ———. (c) Hours of service of each? ———. (d) Compensation paid to each? ———. (Sign your full name and address.)

——— ———.

SEC. 2. That in submitting its report to Congress said Congressional Joint Commission on Reclassification of Salaries shall report in detail:

(1) The names of all employees who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of such service, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, child, sister, or brother is in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month, respectively, received by such spouse, father, mother, child, sister, or brother.

Certain members of this joint commission intimated that they could not submit the supplemental questionnaire proposed by me; that they did not have power to do it; that they did not know that they had any right to be concerned with what the clerks did after 5 o'clock, though one member of the committee kindly wrote me that he would consider my suggestions, and another member of the committee kindly called at my office and promised consideration of my suggestion, but could not give me any assurance whatever that it would be submitted. I hope that every Member present—this magnificent majority of the Republican Members on the Republican side and this magnificent majority of the Democratic membership on the Democratic side present now—I hope each Member of us will get a copy of that supplemental questionnaire, House joint resolution No. 5, and see if there is a single question I have proposed there that is not a proper one to be answered by the clerks and employees of the Government.

We have not been hard on the clerks. We have not been hard on the employees of this Government. While our boys have been fighting in France, in trenches cootie infected, knee deep in mud for $33 a month and keep, these clerks not only have drawn their usual salaries but have had granted to them, first, a $120 bonus and then a $240 bonus in their behalf. I want to say that some of them are excellent clerks, some of them are most deserving, some of them are entitled to larger salaries, some of them have an interest in the work they do, some of them have an interest in the affairs of this Government, some of them are loyal and patriotic to the core; but I am sorry to see that after they have been granted first a $120 bonus and then a $240 bonus and permitted during war to continue to work only seven hours a day, yet when the Zone Finance Office of the War Department a few weeks ago requested some clerks, in behalf of the soldier boys, to work a little overtime in order more speedily to mail out the little $60 bonus checks allowed soldiers, what did they do? Some of them walked out and struck against the Government—walked out and said, "We will no longer function because you ask us to work over seven hours a day to mail out little $60 bonus checks to the soldier boys who have lately come back from fighting in France." That is the kind of patriotism some of them exhibited, and I want to find out through this reclassification just how many of that stripe we have working for the Government here in Washington.

I hope that my good colleagues will help me. I am going to appeal to the other side of the House—we did not have to do it before, but we have to do it now—to help me get this joint resolution up, because these questionnaires are to be propounded now and to get proper action this supplemental questionnaire should be propounded along with this other questionnaire that our joint committee has prepared, and I hope that my good Republican colleagues—because the country will hold you responsible—will help me find a way to get it up and have it submitted and passed so that we may have light on this question, and let us be informed, and let us be prepared to meet it properly when it comes before this House under that congressional committee report. Gentlemen, I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER].

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, for the last four years since I have been a Member of this House and have heard the annual Indian appropriation bills discussed and the general policy of dealing with the Indians considered I have come to the conclusion, as has been intimated to-day, that the reason why these Indians are not given full rights of citizenship and allowed to have the ownership and control of their own property is very largely due to opposition on the part of the Indian Bureau for the very plain reason that when the time comes that all the Indians are given full citizenship and have control of their own property the Indian Bureau and all its employees will cease to exist. Moreover, the Indian Bureau is not the only department of the Government in which a similar condition of affairs exists.

I desire to speak for just a few minutes this afternoon on a matter of very vital interest to every Member of this House and to the constituents of Members of this House, and that is the question of the return home of the soldiers who enlisted for the war. There have come to my attention a number of cases of very great hardship where a division has been returned from France and in every regiment, and sometimes in every company, one or more men, who expected to go home with the rest of their division and whose families expected them to come home, have been detailed to clerical work in some other unit and kept in France. To my mind such action on the part of the authorities is an outrageous injustice not only to the soldiers themselves but also to their families.

It will be remembered that the Twenty-sixth Division, commonly known as the New England or "Yankee" Division, went over to France at the beginning of the war. That division should have been sent home among the very first. As a matter of fact we Congressmen from New England had to work for months to get it ordered home at all. And when the division started for home some of the boys who expected to go home with their division were arbitrarily transferred to other units and are still kept in France doing clerical work for $33 per month when many of them could be earning $100 and even $200 per month here at home. These boys have filed their applications for discharge supported by the necessary affidavits, but they can get no satisfaction.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that it is a long and difficult task to bring all our boys home from France. We are limited by the number of vessels at our disposal, and all that. But I do think that the administration might show a little more expedition and not encourage or permit these cases of particular hardship to which I have referred.

Whatever the facts are in regard to the return home of the boys over there in France, there is not the slightest question about the boys over here. We have an immense Army of boys that are being kept in the service in this country at an enormous expense to the taxpayers—boys that are needed at home, boys that have dependents, boys that wish to finish their education, boys that have good positions that are being kept for them and which can not be kept for them much longer. Now, both the boys themselves and their parents who have visited the camps say that the soldiers are doing practically nothing, and that the only reason on earth why the thousands of men now in the service in this country are not discharged is because the officers want to keep their jobs. [Applause.] There are lots of reserve officers who are earning more money now than they ever earned in their lives before or will ever earn again, and, naturally, they would like to keep their positions. They are having the time of their lives, now that the war is over. Moreover, there are lots of Regular Army officers who are now enjoying the rank of colonel or major who, if the privates under their several commands are discharged, will have to go down to the rank of captain or lieutenant. And so they say that they "can not spare the boys," although in

some cases all the boys are doing is to take the officers out in Government automobiles for joy rides at the Government's expense.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is an outrage to unnecessarily keep hundreds of thousands of American boys in the military service who ought to be at home, at an immense expense to the taxpayers, simply to keep a lot of officers in their high-salaried positions. And the remedy is in the hand of the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of this House. When those committees commence to prepare the appropriation bills for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1919, they should see to it that the appropriations for the payment of officers' salaries are so cut down that the boys will have to be discharged. And the bills ought to be so itemized that the administration will not have any excuse for not paying the boys their back pay.

The Members of the House will recall that yesterday there was before the House a deficiency appropriation bill, made necessary because the Bureau of War Risk Insurance had used so much of the money Congress had given it to pay a horde of unnecessary and incompetent clerks, some of whom are unpatriotic like those to whom the gentleman from Texas refers.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. I quite agree with the gentleman, but he has overlooked one other reason why these boys are held in camps. The gentleman will doubtless recall the statement of the president of the American Federation of Labor made in Texas and elsewhere. He said that he would never stand for the slightest reduction on any war-wage schedule. Thus the great president of the American Federation of Labor was against speedy demobilization. And that is one of the reasons why the boys are kept in the camps in this country.

Mr. DALLINGER. I wish to say in reply to the gentleman from Texas that if the policy of the administration had been consistent from the start there would be no necessity for overcrowding the labor market. The Members of the House were told shortly after the signing of the armistice that boys who had positions waiting for them, those who wished to complete their education, and those that had dependent families would be granted discharges. As a matter of fact, they have refused tens of thousands of boys who have met these requirements and are still doing it, and at the same time they are letting boys out of the Army who have no positions waiting for them and have no dependent families and who to-day are seeking employment. If the War Department had carried out the promises it made to this House at the time the armistice was signed, and let the boys out who had positions waiting for them, who had dependent families and had an education to complete, you would not have the feeling in this country that exists to-day against the War Department. [Applause.]

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that when the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of this House prepare the appropriation bills this month they will so prepare those bills that a speedy demobilization of the boys in the service, both abroad and at home, may at once take place, so that this discontent with the Government throughout the country may cease. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. HERNANDEZ].

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in New Mexico we have a total Indian population of 20,819. Of these 8,535 are what are called Pueblo Indians. These Pueblo Indians live in villages and are a farming people, a frugal, a self-supporting people. They were declared to be citizens of the United States by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1872. Nevertheless, they do not exercise the rights of citizenship and they do not pay any taxes. They do not take any part in any of the activities engaged in by other American citizens. About 10 or 15 years ago the Department of the Interior saw fit to take over these Indians; at least the department has had more or less supervision over them for 10 years. What I mean is that from time to time the Indian Office has seen fit to exercise more and more authority over these citizens of the United States than it had formerly exercised.

The Indian Office has done a good deal of good work, we must admit, in connection with the education of the Pueblo Indians. They are a people that take well, as far as education is concerned. They are receptive. They have always been a semi-civilized people, living in towns and villages.

There are 9,207 Navajo Indians in the State of New Mexico. The major portion of that tribe live in Arizona. The Navajo Indians in 1867 or 1868, or along there, made a treaty with the United States wherein it is provided that we must help them in education. At present the Government is doing a great deal for those Indians along that line. They also are a self-supporting people; they are an industrious people, but they are not citizens of the United States.

I want to address myself, Mr. Chairman, particularly to one Indian tribe in New Mexico which at present needs particular care and attention. That is a small Indian tribe, the Jicarilla Apaches, that live in the northwestern part of New Mexico, in the county in which I live; in other words, they are my neighbors. At the present time and under the bill now being discussed all the activities in connection with the administration of their reservation are now being conducted out of the Indian funds, so that they are of no expense to the Government. However, they are in great distress.

This is the situation: About 80 per cent of that small tribe of Indians are suffering from what is called tuberculosis.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman five minutes more, if he would like to have it.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise temporarily. If the gentleman from New Mexico desires to make a request, all right.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. I want to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman five minutes more if he desires it.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. I simply want to make a short statement in regard to this particular tribe of Indians.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise temporarily.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves that the committee do now rise. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has determined to rise.

Thereupon the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LONGWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 2480, the Indian appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

MILEAGE.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 1200.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks for the immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 1200, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa if this is the usual resolution in regard to mileage?

Mr. GOOD. It is the usual measure in regard to mileage.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is this the usual bill about mileage?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; it is the usual bill in regard to mileage, and also in regard to the pages, except that this resolution calls for 44 pages instead of 46, and three telephone operators are additional, because they were not provided for out of the contingent fund of the House. Otherwise, it is the same as former resolutions at extra sessions of Congress.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the special hurry about passing a bill for mileage? Can it not go over until to-morrow? Is everybody broke, or what is the trouble?

Mr. GOOD. It is customary to bring such a bill up early in the session.

Mr. MADDEN. It seems to me like undue haste in passing a mileage bill.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Why does not the committee pass an appropriation bill appropriating for mileage at this session of Congress, instead of making available the mileage already appropriated for the next session, so as not to bring up that question again later on?

Mr. GOOD. I am simply following the usual precedent.

Mr. GARNER. I know; but if we pass an appropriation bill for the mileage for this session, it will obviate a fight that might come on some 12 months from now.

Mr. GOOD. Well, perhaps it would bring the fight on at this time.

Mr. GARNER. No. The same argument would probably not be used now which could be used then. If this session runs into

the next session, the regular session, a part of the membership of the House will want mileage for the next session and a part of them will not, but the House will want an appropriation. If you appropriated for the mileage of this session at this session, there would be no question as to it at the other session. I have not had the opportunity to take the matter up with the gentleman from Iowa, but I have mentioned it to several gentlemen here, and they have said that they thought the method I have suggested would be the better method to pursue.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that we did not consider that at all, but that we were following the usual precedents.

Mr. GARNER. I think the gentleman can see the difficulty that would be overcome if we made the appropriation for mileage at this time, because nobody would question the fact that mileage is due at this session, although at the next session they may take the position which has sometimes heretofore been taken, that there was in fact but one session. If the gentleman would take that matter into his consideration, it might obviate a fight later on.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, namely:

LEGISLATIVE.

The appropriations for mileage of Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and Delegates from the Territories, and expenses of Resident Commissioners, made in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, are made immediately available and authorized to be paid to Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates from the Territories, and Resident Commissioners, for attendance on the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

For stationery for Members and Delegates and Resident Commissioners, at $125 each, for the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, $55,000.

For the following employees during the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, namely:

For 44 pages, including 2 riding pages, 2 telephone pages, 1 press gallery page, and 10 pages for duty at the entrances to the Hall of the House, at $2.50 per day each; 9 messengers in the post office at the rate of $100 per month each; 3 telephone operators at the rate of $75 per month each; so much as may be necessary.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. GARRETT. I want to ask the gentleman a question concerning the messengers in the post office. As I understand it, they have been drawing no pay since the adjournment. Does this take care of them?

Mr. GOOD. No; this only takes care of the 44 pages, including 2 riding pages, and the 3 telephone operators who were formerly paid out of the contingent fund of the House but who are now carried in the legislative bill instead of the contingent fund.

Mr. GARRETT. Has the matter of these messengers been brought to the attention of the committee?

Mr. GOOD. No; it has not.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. GOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

On motion of Mr. SNYDER, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Indian appropriation bill (H. R. 2480), with Mr. LONGWORTH in the chair.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield five minutes additional to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. HERNANDEZ].

Mr. Chairman, at the time I was interrupted I was calling attention to the condition of the Jicarilla Apache Indians, in the northwestern part of the State of New Mexico. The problem of better health for these Indians is very urgent at this time, and something must be done about it. The tribal diminution on account of the prevalence of tuberculosis amongst these people is appalling. About 80 per cent of them are to-day suffering more or less from tuberculosis, and unless we do something for them now it will not be many years before there will be no tribe there for whom the Congress of the United States can do anything.

Twenty years ago, when I was trading with the Jicarilla Apaches, there were 800 of them—men, women, and children. I believe the last census showed only 600, and I have a report here from the agent in which he says that something must be done at once. He says the agency school is a regular hotbed of tuberculosis; that sick children come in to attend school and spread this disease among the other children, and they in turn take it back to their homes. My idea and his idea is that the school should be abolished and that larger hospital facilities should be furnished for the tribe, in order to begin to stop that trouble. The Jicarilla Apache Indians are selling a good deal of their timber at the present time. There are ample funds to the credit of the tribe in the Treasury of the United States to-day to take care of the situation. It was my intention to offer an amendment to the bill now under consideration, but the committee at their first meeting said that in order to expedite this legislation it would be well to offer amendments either on the floor of the House or else let them be offered in the Senate. I have acquiesced in this desire of the committee, and I am going to make an effort to have the bill amended in the Senate by one of the Senators from my State.

One of the troubles in dealing with the Indians is that sometimes people who do not know very much about them are put in the management of the Indians. Not all of those who are employed by the Indian Bureau are practical men who see the practical side of things. The Jicarilla Apaches, with 750,000 acres of land, with a tribal flock of 8,000 or 10,000 head of sheep, and with a herd of over 1,000 head of cattle, have not enough food or clothing to keep them in good health. There is something wrong about that. My idea is that this fund should be so used and that these flocks should be so distributed amongst the members of the tribe that they would take care of them instead of having them taken care of by outside people. This particular section of the country is particularly adapted to the raising of sheep. The tribal flock in the last eight years shows a profit of $143,000 over and above all expenses.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I quote from a letter written to me by the present superintendent of that Indian agency, a very efficient and capable official. He says:

There should be no misunderstanding of the tasks that lie ahead of us in this field. Our purpose is to stay the appalling death rate, inspire them with new hope, encourage them in outdoor activities, and endeavor to place them in a vocation from which they not only may gain a living, but from which they may become worthy assets to the State and Nation rather than liabilities. Self-preservation is not only the desire but the inherent right of any people. Ill health, privation, and long-continued neglect for the Jicarillas has engendered a state of despondency and pessimism that has clouded their ambition, and consequently the duty confronting us is the more apparent and difficult.

In March, 1912, a contract was made for the sale of 130,000,000 feet of timber from the allotted portion of the reservation, and to date there is a total net receipt of approximately $178,500 from that sale in seven years of the nine-year life of the contract. This sum is small in comparison with funds available and being used for other tribes, but it is certain that this amount is sufficient, if properly invested, to place these people on a new level, and recent legislation has made this money available for expenditure as indicated. It is extreme hardship to longer hold up the use of this money, thus subjecting them to continued privation and probably an earlier death, whereas early and appropriate use of our means at hand would do much for their present and future benefit.

The problem of better health for the Jicarillas is one necessitating most careful study as well as untiring energy on the part of all who may be interested. Tuberculosis is found in practically every home, and general conditions prevailing favor the spread of this disease. It is said that 80 per cent of the children of school age indicate tuberculosis in one form and another. A review of the deaths of the last two years is significant and is given in summary, as follows:

Period covered June 30, 1917, to Mar. 31, 1919.

	June 30, 1917, to June 30, 1918,		Approximate per cent.	June 30, 1918, to Mar. 31, 1919.		Tuberculosis, or indicated—
	Population, 1918 census.	Deaths.		Births.	Deaths	
Births	18	10	55	32	15	In 24, or 96 per cent.
1 to 5 years	75	9	12	.....	6	In 15, or 100 per cent.
6 to 18 years	171	3	2	.....	7	In 9, or 90 per cent.
19 to 36 years	152	8	5	.....	11	In 17, or 84 per cent.
37 to 50 years	90	.....	.....	.....	.....	
51 to 93 years	117	11	9	.....	9	In 5, or 25 per cent.

Tribal diminution at that appalling rate is such that one is compelled to see the necessity for early action that may tend to stay it. The boarding school as it now operates is of doubtful value, and it is certainly adding to the spread of tuberculosis. If 75 to 80 per cent of all school children are tubercular you will appreciate the exposure made by the stronger children when they are made to eat, sleep, work, and play with

three times their number, from whom they can at any time contract the insidious disease. It has been proposed to convert the present boarding school into a sanatorium, and to do this effectively additional moneys must be appropriated or made available for this change. An estimate for $7,500 for repairs and improvements such as sleeping porches, a better system of ventilation for the dormitories, etc., and $30,000 for support and maintenance would be conservative to meet our needs. If the sum of $37,500 could be added to the total proposed for relief of distress, etc., in the current appropriation bill for the Indian Service for 1920, and made specifically for Jicarillas, this work could be done to the credit of the service and for the betterment of the Indian people on this reservation.

In 1915 a herd of cattle was purchased for the Jicarilla Tribe, with history as follows:

	Cost.	Value.
Original cost	$65,010.00	
Equipment, of equal value now	2,164.31	$2,164.31
Supplies, maintenance, etc	11,275.34	
Miscellaneous items	2,664.77	
Salaries from beginning to date	12,179.48	
Construction, house, barn, fence, corrals, etc	10,867.48	10,867.48
Receipts from herd to date		19,726.00
Present valuation of herd (estimated)		80,000.00
Total	104,161.38	102,757.79

A number of factors have opposed satisfactory results from the tribal cattle herd. Shortage of water on the range has been the greatest drawback, and predatory animals have taken a large toll, so large that it is hardly believable save to those who are actually cognizant of this territory. It is believed that with the utilization of the La Jara farm area and proper development of water on the range used by the herd, a better showing may be made. The short calf crops from year to year show the work of the wolves, bobcats, and coyotes; short range and water have likewise factored to reduce the calf showing from year to year. The herd this fall should show to the good, including 1919 calves. In October, 1914, a herd of sheep was also purchased from reimbursement moneys and gives the following results:

	Cost.	Value.
Original cost of herd	$23,477.50	
Total expense to date, labor, maintenance, etc	38,150.00	
Total receipts from herd to Mar. 31, 1919		$104,315.40
Present valuation of herd		100,000.00
Total	61,627.50	204,315.40
Balance in favor of the herd		142,687.50

Thus in four and one-half years the tribal herd of sheep have given a return almost the equal of that received from the sale of timber, and it must be understood that when the timber is once removed it will be generations to come before like returns may be expected, while with the sheep return is promised commensurate with effort put forth in their proper management.

Probably one-third of the families of the reservation have sheep or goats, or both, ranging in numbers from a few head to 1,500 and 2,000. Last fall Edd Ladd dipped 2,160 head; Garfield Velarde dipped 1,500; George Stockwell Vicenti had 1,700; Hoska Velarde, 800; Ignacio De Jesus, 570; Grande Maria, 230; and a number of others a fewer number.

You will appreciate the fact that the sheep industry for these people is not a new field. Their acquaintance with flocks of goats and sheep owned by the individual Indians and experience gained in connection with the many Mexican flockmasters, than whom there are none better, should not be overlooked in our proposed plans to establish these people in a vocation from which they are to make their living. To place 100 head of sheep with each family would give them a start commensurate with present needs, and while it is not said that each and all of them will make good, it is certain that a creditable majority will do well, and that would be as much as could be expected from any people. It is also true that those who failed could find support and employment from their more fortunate tribesmen, and after more experience there would be hope that they, too, could meet with better results in time.

The health problem would receive its best advancement from a vocation that would call these people to outdoor effort, and you will understand that a small flock of sheep would demand and have the attention of each and every member of the family from the 3-year-old up to and including both father and mother.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to myself the remainder of the time on this side.

There assembled in the city of St. Louis on May 8, 9, and 10, 1919, delegates from all of the States in the Union representing the veterans of the Great War, who there organized what is known as the American Legion. Prominent in that organization were Col. Theodore Roosevelt and Col. Bennett Clark, well known to the membership of this House. [Applause.] The high and patriotic purpose of the American Legion is best expressed by the preamble to the constitution adopted at St. Louis, which I desire to read. It is as follows:

PREAMBLE.

For God and country we associate ourselves together for the following purposes:

To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to maintain law and order; to foster and perpetuate a 100 per cent Americanism; to preserve the memories and incidents of our association in the Great War; to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation; to combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses; to make right the master of might; to promote peace and good will on earth; to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy; to consecrate and sanctify our comradeship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness.

At that meeting a number of resolutions were unanimously adopted, most of them addressed to the Congress of the United States. For the information of the House I desire that these resolutions be printed in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolutions are as follows:

INDORSEMENT OF THE VICTORY LIBERTY LOAN.

Whereas the Government of the United States has appealed to the country for financial support in order to provide the funds for expenditures made necessary in the prosecution of the war and to reestablish the country upon a peace basis: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this caucus emphatically indorse the Victory Liberty loan, and urges all Americans to promote the success of the loan in every manner possible.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS.

Resolved, That this caucus go on record as condemning the action of those responsible for protecting the men who refused full military service to the United States in accordance with the act of Congress of May 18, 1917, and who were tried by general court-martial, sentenced to prison, and later fully pardoned, restored to duty, and honorably discharged, with all back pay and allowances given them, and as condemning further the I. W. W.'s, international socialists, and anarchists in their effort to secure the release of these men already pardoned, those still in prison serving sentence; be it further

Resolved, That this caucus demands a full and complete investigation by Congress of the trial and conviction of these parties and of their subsequent pardon.

DEPORTATION OF ALIEN SLACKERS AND ALIEN ENEMIES.

Whereas there was a law passed by the Congress of these United States July, 1918, known as an amendment to the selective-service act giving persons within the draft age who had taken out first papers for American citizenship the privilege of turning in said first papers to their local exemption board and thereby becoming exempt from service; and

Whereas thousands of men within draft age who had been in this country for many years and had signified their intention to become citizens, took advantage of this law and thereby became exempted from military service, or were discharged from military service by reason thereof, and have taken lucrative positions in the mills, shipyards, and factories; and

Whereas in this great World War for democracy the rank and file of the best of our American manhood have suffered and sacrificed themselves in order to uphold the principles upon which this country was founded and for which they were willing to give up their life's blood, if necessary, to preserve; and

Whereas we, the American Legion assembled, are of the opinion that these would-be Americans who turned in their first papers to avoid service are, in our opinion, neither fish, flesh, nor fowl, and if allowed to remain in this country would contaminate the 100 per cent true American soldiers and sailors who will return to again engage in the gainful pursuits of life: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the American Legion in convention assembled in St. Louis this 8th, 9th, and 10th day of May, 1919, numbering millions of red-blooded Americans, do demand the Congress of these United States to immediately enact a law to send these aliens who withdrew their first papers and thereby avoided service back to the country from whence they came, for we want them not, neither do we need them. The country which we live in and were ready, and are now ready and willing to fight for, is good enough for us, and this country which they live in and prospered in, yet were unwilling to fight for, is too damned good for them to remain in.

Resolved, That every alien brought into the Army by the draft who refused American citizenship when offered to him also be deported.

Resolved, That we further demand the immediate deportation of every alien enemy who during the war was interned, whether such alien enemy be now interned or has been paroled.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each and every Member of the House and Senate of our United States and a copy be given to the public press.

PROTECTION OF THE UNIFORM.

Whereas it is recognized that the uniform of the United States is as much a symbol as the flag itself and thereby entitled to fitting respect; and

Whereas certain unscrupulous firms and individuals have taken nefarious advantage of popular sentiment by utilizing men in uniform as peddlers and sales agents; and

Whereas certain discharged men have so far forgotten the respect due the uniform that they have used it in peddling and panhandling on the streets and from door to door; Therefore be it

Resolved, That this caucus go on record as being unalterably opposed to such practices; and be it further

Resolved, That each State and local organization here represented be urged to do all in their power to put an end to this misuse of the uniform which has always been worn with honor and for honorable purposes.

RECLAMATION OF ARID, SWAMP, AND CUT-OVER TIMBER LANDS.

Whereas the reclamation of arid, swamp, and cut-over timber lands is one of the great constructive problems of immediate interest to this Nation; and

Whereas one of the questions for immediate consideration is that of presenting to discharged soldiers and sailors an opportunity to establish homes and create for themselves a place in the field of constructive effort; and

Whereas one of the purposes for which the formation of the American Legion is contemplated is to take an energetic interest in all constructive measures designed to promote the happiness and contentment of the people, and to actively encourage all proper movements of general nature to assist the men of the Army and Navy in solving the problems of wholesome existence; and

Whereas the Department of the Interior and the Reclamation Service have been engaged in formulating and presenting to the country broad, constructive plans for the reclamation of arid, swamp, and cut-over timber lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the caucus of delegates of the proposed American Legion in caucus assembled in this city of St. Louis, Mo., That we indorse the efforts heretofore made for the reclamation of lands, and we respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States the adoption at an early date of broad and comprehensive legislation for economic reclamation of lands susceptible to reclamation and improvement.

REEMPLOYMENT OF EX-SERVICE MEN.

Whereas it is desirable both for the welfare of the soldiers, sailors, and marines, now rapidly being discharged from the service of the United States of America, and for the industrial readjustment of the country that the process of returning these men to productive occupations in civil life be speeded up as much as possible; and

Whereas by reason of the failure of the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the purpose the said process has been retarded and left to private initiative: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, in caucus assembled, calls upon the Congress of the United States to promptly appropriate funds, to be administered for the benefit of existing coordinated bureaus for the employment of returning soldiers, sailors, and marines, to the end that there may be no interruption in the service now being rendered and that it may be broadened and speeded up; be it further

Resolved, That each local post or organization of the American Legion is urged during the period of demobilization to constitute itself a committee of the whole, which shall cooperate with the local employment bureau and shall establish and maintain a liaison between such bureau and every employer in the community through members of the local post or organization who are already employed in such establishment, to the end that it may be made easy for the employer to avail himself of the service of the bureau by communicating with some one in his own establishment, and that every soldier, sailor, and marine already replaced in industry may have an opportunity to assist his comrades to become likewise.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time—14 minutes—to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, from the outset of this Congress all the membership on both sides of the aisle are convinced, I am sure, that there is going to be rational expedition in legislation. Yesterday, because of a speeding up of legislation, there was heard from the Hall utterances that would indicate that the necessity of speed now is due to lack of speed in the last Congress, and we have heard from the Democratic side of the Chamber that the filibuster prevented the needed legislation. I do not think that any Member on either side of the aisle will say that there was any lack of effort in this Chamber. I do know that the membership is well aware that when there was talk about what ought to be done in deliberate consideration of the measures, recognizing that these large supply bills would inevitably take a good deal of time, and that any interference in the passage of the bills could very easily prevent their passage, the Republican Members consulted and served notice on the Democratic Members of the Rules Committee that if they would keep the calendar clear of unnecessary controverted issues and confine the legislation to that which was either emergent or of a supply bill character, the Republicans would join the Democrats and clear the deck, even to the extent of holding night sessions if necessary to pass the bills. I think that it is fair to say that that agreement was pretty well observed, and the measures went through with due speed and I think with rational deliberation.

The statements that have fallen from the lips of Members yesterday and to-day that what was necessary was due to a filibuster will leave the country under the belief that the filibuster was conducted somewhere and that the Republicans were responsible for it.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. FESS. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Ohio and the House, too, that most of the bills that failed of passage in the Senate had not been reported from the Senate committees and could not have been given consideration by the Senate if there had been no filibuster.

Mr. FESS. That is precisely why I have taken the floor, to explain that if there was any filibuster it was not a political filibuster and must have been due to a plan or the indifference of the Democratic committees in the Senate in not reporting the bills for action.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEVENSON. Is it not a fact that a large number of them, including the very bill we are passing now, had been passed, gone to conference, and the conference committee agreed to report, and that they were in that position when the filibuster prevented even the adoption of the conference report, and therefore it was not, as indicated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], the failure of the committees to report, but the filibuster by certain Members, who conducted it in their own individual way?

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman from Ohio will permit me to reply in his time——

Mr. FESS. I will yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to say that the Senate committees were in control of the Democratic Party in the Senate; that they did not report the bills to the Senate. The bills were not before the Senate for consideration and could not be considered, because they were not there, and it made no difference whether there was any filibuster or not.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Let me answer the gentleman from South Carolina that these bills were not sent to conference. This is the only bill, the one we are now considering, that was sent to conference, and therefore that idea would be misleading. Now I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. CARTER. Let me ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the bill passed the House and went to the Senate and had been agreed to in conference and the conferees had reported; that it had been agreed to in the House and was before the Senate.

Mr. FESS. This is the only bill of those which failed that went to conference and had been reported for action and failed for want of time to accept the conference report. This is the only appropriation bill that filled the legislative situation stated by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman will remember the water-power bill.

Mr. FESS. The water-power bill was not an appropriation bill. There are seven supply bills that will be before us which failed. This is the only one that had gone to conference and was rejected; that is, the conference report was not accepted. Therefore it comes to us at this time.

The naval bill, which carries $750,000,000, went to the Senate on February 27. That was only a week before the adjournment of Congress. The Agricultural bill went to the Senate February 3. The urgent deficiency bill that was before us yesterday got to the Senate on February 28, and the Senate committee reported it March 1.

Mr. HASTINGS. They passed it over there yesterday after we passed it yesterday.

Mr. FESS. Yes; but it is a Republican Senate now and not Democratic. [Laughter.]

Mr. HASTINGS. I thought the gentleman was intimating that they did not have time to pass it, that it required more time. They had it four or five days.

Mr. FESS. The District of Columbia bill got to the Senate December 12 and it was reported from the Senate committee February 5. They had some time on that. But if you will note, most of these bills did not reach the Senate until late, and nobody will claim that this branch of the Congress was especially dilatory. It was working by agreement, whether it was very generally known or not. There was no effort here to obstruct anything.

The Indian appropriation bill has been referred to. The military affairs bill reached the Senate February 19, and that bill was reported from the committee of the Senate back to the Senate on February 25. February 25 leaves only one week in which to pass a bill maintaining an Army of 500,000 men, and carrying an appropriation of one and a half billion dollars. It got to the Senate in time to be reported back to that body, leaving but one week in which to consider a billion and a half appropriation bill.

The sundry civil appropriation bill was not speedily passed in this House. Everybody here knows that there was a general opinion that that bill carried so many items that it could not possibly pass the other body because of the accumulated work, and it is generally known and nobody will question it that it was discussed for some time by members of the committee whether or not to report that bill at this session at all in this House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does not the gentleman from Ohio know that the House passed all these supply bills two days earlier in the short session than the average time of getting them through in a short session?

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, the former Speaker of the House always deals in specific facts. I respect his reputation in that respect too much to answer either yes or no, without knowing myself, except to say that I know that he would not make a misstatement.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I had the information looked up. Does not the gentleman know enough about the practices of the Senate to know that if they took a notion over there they would pass all seven of these bills in one day? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FESS. Whatever be the practice with the Senate, consideration of these bills in extenso is given in this House. If the Senate has such respect for the judgment of the House as

to pass them all in one day, very well, but I should think they would want to take more time than one day in which to discuss them. The sundry civil appropriation bill never was considered by the Senate committee. There was not even a meeting called by the Senate committee, and it is the Democratic members of the Senate committee who are responsible for this, and no man here has the right to even hint that Republicans were responsible for the failure of measures when the Democratic committees did not report them back to the Senate.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. I want to say that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] is right when he said that the appropriation bills were passed in this House as early last session as they have been in former short sessions. I want to say, further, that Senator MARTIN, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, told me in the presence of a Republican Senator that they had time in which to pass every single one of the appropriation bills that came from this House, because his committee had begun to study these bills as soon as we introduced them here; that they were ready to pass every one of them, and could pass them, but for the filibuster carried on by three Republicans. [Applause on the Democratic side.] While that filibuster was going on I discussed the matter with one of the leading Republican Senators, and he expressed regret that this filibuster was being made to prevent the passage of the appropriation bills.

Mr. FESS. I can not allow my friend, even with my great respect for him, to take all of my time.

Mr. KITCHIN. I put the facts into the RECORD, because the gentleman did not know them, and I knew that he wanted to know them.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman who interrupts me is past master in bluff, but he can not bluff me now.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman does not think telling the truth is bluffing him, does he? [Laughter.]

Mr. FESS. No.

Mr. KITCHIN. The facts in the case ought not to embarrass the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. I refuse to yield to the gentleman and his bluff. The gentleman assumes that the Senate committee begins the consideration of a bill as quickly as it is introduced in the House. When he does that I refuse to yield to him. I further ask, if they did begin consideration as quickly as the bill was introduced here, why he assumes that the filibuster in the Senate prevented speedy action by the Senate?

Mr. KITCHIN. I do not assume it. I know it to be a fact.

Mr. FESS. Filibuster on the floor of the Senate does not prevent a Senate committee from considering a bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. Everyone in the House and Senate knows it except, apparently, the gentleman himself.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman has not the floor. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] had the privilege of the floor as a leader for so long that he assumes that he can break the rules of the House and interrupt another gentleman and interject into his remarks certain things without getting that gentleman's consent. To so persistently interrupt is disrespectful to the Member who has the floor, and is not such a characteristic as belongs to my friend.

Mr. KITCHIN. Can I interrupt the gentleman long enough to say that I beg his pardon? [Laughter.]

Mr. FESS. Oh, begging my pardon does not yield back the time that the gentleman has taken from me. I make a further statement, Mr. Chairman. The Senate was strongly organized by the Democratic Party, with a majority of 14; every committee in the Senate was in control of the Democratic Party. Seven of these great appropriation bills reached the Senate in the latter part of the session, and because three Members of the Senate who happened to be of one political party, who did not conduct a political filibuster but who acted from a purely individual responsibility, will the gentleman presume to state to this side of the House that the bills, seven of them, failed because of the Republican minority in the Senate or the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FESS. The fault lies with the Democratic majority, and there is where it must stay. [Applause on the Republican side.]

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to extend their remarks in the RECORD to Mr. CARTER, Mr. KNUTSON, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. MCKEOWN.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LONGWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2480, the Indian appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. CARAWAY, is present and desires to be sworn in.

Mr. CARAWAY appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for leave of absence for five days for our colleague, CHARLES THOMPSON of Ohio, on account of serious illness in his family. He was called away to-day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 2329. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and for the payment of pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the files of the House the papers in the case of Harter Holderman (H. R. 12485, 65th Cong., 2d sess.), no adverse report having been made thereon.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman that such requests can be expedited by filling out a blank at the desk. Such memorandum will be sufficient. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Saturday, May 24, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting estimate of appropriation to enable the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to heat and place in condition structure for exhibit of aircraft and accessories produced by the Government since the declaration of war (H. Doc. No. 41); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury submitting supplemental estimate of appropriations required by the Bureau of Education for "School and school-directed home gardens" for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 42); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 2480) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2481) to increase pension of certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVILA: A bill (H. R. 2482) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to secure certain lands in Porto Rico for forest purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 2483) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue and for other purposes" approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEBSTER: A bill (H. R. 2484) to provide for the restoration to their former positions and rank of medical employees of the Public Health Service who resigned such services to enlist in the war with Germany; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSE: A bill (H. R. 2485) to provide for the erection of a public building at Barnesboro, Cambria County, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WHITE of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 2486) to provide for a Federal building at Norton, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 2487) for the erection of a public building at Lewistown, Ill., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 2488) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Framingham, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KRAUS: A bill (H. R. 2489) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Marion Branch, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 2490) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the State of Connecticut the 220-millimeter fieldpiece captured by the Twenty-sixth Division during the Second Battle of the Marne; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PARRISH: A bill (H. R. 2491) amending the act approved March 4, 1917, to pension survivors of certain Indian wars from January 1, 1859, to January, 1891, inclusive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 2492) to grant rank to the Army Nurse Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 2493) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Roebling, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 2494) for the erection of a post-office building at Crockett, Tex., with an appropriation of $50,000 for such purpose; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VAILE: A bill (H. R. 2495) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the city and county of Denver, in the State of Colorado, six German cannons or fieldpieces, with carriages, and two machine guns, with an appropriate number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRAND: A bill (H. R. 2496) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the University of Georgia, Athens, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 2497) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Nelsonville, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2498) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Glouster, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2499) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Pomeroy, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2500) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Middleport, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2501) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Chester, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2502) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Rutland, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2503) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Racine, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2504) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of McArthur, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2505) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Zaleski, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2506) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Hamden, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2507) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Jackson, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2508) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wellston, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2509) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Oak Hill, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2510) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ironton, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2511) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Proctorsville, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2512) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Chesapeake, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2513) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Athens, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2514) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Gallipolis, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2515) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Vinton, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2516) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Rio Grande, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD: A bill (H. R. 2517) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Statenville, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2518) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Milltown, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2519) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Blackshear, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2520) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Jesup, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2521) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Du Pont, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2522) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of St. Marys, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2523) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ray City, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2524) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Alapaha, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2525) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Folkston, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2526) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Pearson, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2527) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wallacoochee, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2528) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hahira, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2529) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sparks, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2530) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ocilla, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2531) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Baxley, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2532) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Homerville, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2533) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Nicholls, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2534) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Broxton, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 2535) to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Paola, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2536) to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Olathe, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2537) to reimburse soldiers and sailors of the Army and Navy of the United States and those honorably discharged for amounts deducted from their pay in payment for their insurance by the Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 2538) for the erection of a public building at Galva, Ill., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2539) providing for the extension of the post office at Galesburg, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE: A bill (H. R. 2540) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Passaic, county of Passaic, State of New Jersey, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2541) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Paterson, county of Passaic, State of New Jersey, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2542) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Clifton, county of Passaic, State of New Jersey, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 2543) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 2544) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Kenton County, Ky., six German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2545) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Grant County, Ky., four German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2546) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Boone County, Ky., four German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2547) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Gallatin County, Ky., four German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2548) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Carroll County, Ky., four German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2549) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Trimble County, Ky., four German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2550) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Campbell County, Ky., six German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2551) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Pendleton County, Ky., four German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 2552) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Jonesburg, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2553) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wellsville, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 2554) restoring jurisdiction of the Court of Claims in certain claims in certain cases; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2555) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Prescott, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2556) for the erection of a public building at El Dorado, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2557) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Warren, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 2558) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Bedford, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2559) donating captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Rutherford, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2560) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Lincoln, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2561) donating captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Marshall, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2562) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Coffee, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2563) donating captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Cannon, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2564) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Dekalb, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2565) donating captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Moore, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2566) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the town of Tullahoma, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2567) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the Middle Tennessee State Normal, of the town of Murfreesboro, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 2568) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments, to the village of Rossford, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2569) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments, to the village of Pemberville, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2570) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments, to the village of Bradner, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2571) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments, to the village of Risingsun, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2572) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments, to the village of Cygnet, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2573) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments, to the village of Hoytville, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2574) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments, to the village of Rudolph, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2575) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments, to the village of Tontogany, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2576) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments, to the village of Weston, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2577) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments, to the village of Milton Center, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2578) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments, to the village of Custar, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2579) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments, to the village of Kansas, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2580) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments, to the village of Monroeville, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2581) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments, to the village of Burgoon, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2582) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments, to the State Soldiers' Home, Erie County, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2583) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments, to the village of Greenspring, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2584) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments, to the village of Attica, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2585) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments, to the village of Perrysburg, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2586) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments, to the village of Bloomdale, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2587) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments, to the village of North Baltimore, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2588) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments, to the village of Prairie Depot, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BEE: A bill (H. R. 2589) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Kenedy, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2590) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Runge, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2591) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Rockport, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2592) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of San Antonio, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2593) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Karnes City, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2594) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Beeville, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2595) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Floresville, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2596) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Corpus Christi, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2597) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Seguin, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 2598) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Brooksville, Fla., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2599) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Bartow, Fla., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2600) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Leesburg, Fla., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2601) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Tampa, Fla., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2602) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lakeland, Fla., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2603) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Arcadia, Fla., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 2604) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Huntington, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2605) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lenox, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2606) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Greenfield, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2607) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Adams, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2608) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of West Stockbridge, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2609) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of North Adams, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2610) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Housatonic, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2611) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Holyoke, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2612) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Pittsfield, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2613) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of South Lee, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2614) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Chester, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2615) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Cheshire, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2616) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Shelburne, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2617) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Charlemont, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2618) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Stockbridge, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2619) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lee, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2620) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Westfield, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2621) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Colrain, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2622) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Great Barrington, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2623) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Dalton, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2624) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Williamstown, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD: A bill (H. R. 2625) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to cause survey to be made of the Colorado River in Texas with a view to controlling the flood waters of said stream, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2626) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to cause survey to be made of the Brazos River in Texas with a view of controlling the flood waters of said stream, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 2627) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Williamsport, Pa., two captured German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2628) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Ralston, Pa., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2629) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lock Haven, Pa., two captured German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2630) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Coudersport, Pa., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2631) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wellsboro, Pa., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 2632) to provide for the erection of a customhouse building at Cape Charles, Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2633) to provide for the erection of a post-office building at Phoebus, Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2634) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Belle Haven, County of Accomac, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2635) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Tangier, county of Accomac, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2636) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Onancock, county of Accomac, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2637) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Parksley, county of Accomac, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2638) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Northumberland, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2639) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Richmond, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2640) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Lancaster, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2641) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Westmoreland, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2642) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Middlesex, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2643) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Essex, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2644) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Caroline, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2645) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Spotsylvania, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2646) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hampton, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2647) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Chincoteague, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2648) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of King and Queen, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2649) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Gloucester, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2650) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Mathews, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2651) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Warwick, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2652) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Accomac, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2653) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Northampton, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2654) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fredericksburg, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2655) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Newport News, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2656) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Yorktown, county of York, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2657) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Phoebus, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2658) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Urbanna, county of Middlesex, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2659) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Cape Charles, county of Northampton, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARLAND: A bill (H. R. 2660) incorporating the Supreme Lodge of the World, Loyal Order of Moose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 2661) to amend the act establishing the eastern district of Kentucky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 2662) to incorporate the Young Men's Christian Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 2663) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Indianola, county of Warren, State of Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2664) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Story City, county of Story, State of Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2665) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Ames, county of Story, State of Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2666) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Nevada, county of Story, State of Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2667) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Pella, county of Marion, State of Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2668) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Knoxville, county of Marion, State of Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2669) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Winterset, county of Madison, State of Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2670) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Redfield, county of Dallas, State of Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2671) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Perry, county of Dallas, State of Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2672) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Adel, county of Dallas, State of Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2673) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Des Moines, State of Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 2674) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Milford, N. H., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2675) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Nashua, N. H., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2676) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Claremont, N. H., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2677) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Littleton, N. H., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 2678) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to what is known as Presidents Corners, in the county of Allen, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2679) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Howe Military School, in the city of Howe, county of Lagrange, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES: A bill (H. R. 2680) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Marble Hill, Bollinger County, in the State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2681) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Potosi, Washington County, State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2682) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of De Soto, Jefferson County, in the State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 2683) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Vinita, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2684) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Nowata, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2685) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sand Springs, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2686) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Pryor, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2687) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Miami, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2688) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Copan, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2689) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Pawhuska, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2690) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bartlesville, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2691) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Delaware, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2692) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Claremore, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2693) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Pawnee, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2694) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Tulsa, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARLAND: A bill (H. R. 2695) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Charleroi, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 2696) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to some cities of New Mexico German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 2697) for the purchase of a post-office site in Thompsonville, in the town of Enfield, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2698) for the purchase of a post-office site at Windsor Locks, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2699) for the erection of a public building at South Manchester, in the town of Manchester, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2700) for the purchase of a post-office site at Southington, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2701) for acquiring a site and erecting a public building thereon in Hartford, Conn., for the use and accommodation of the post office, as an annex thereto; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 2702) to provide for the application of the reclamation law to irrigation districts; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2703) making an appropriation to enforce the provisions of an act to regulate the sale of viruses, serums, toxins, and analogous products, and to regulate interstate traffic in said articles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2704) making an appropriation directing and empowering the purchase, preparation, and disposition free of cost of antirabic virus, to be used in the treatment of persons exposed to rabies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2705) to make April 13 of each and every year a public holiday in the District of Columbia, to be known as Jefferson day; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 2706) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes," approved September 8, 1916; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 2707) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a new public building at Lowell, Mass., and also for the sale of the present post-office building and its site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2708) to make unlawful the unauthorized wearing of naval or military medals, badges, decorations, or regalia of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2709) to amend an act entitled "An act for the improvement of the foreign service," so as to provide a system of promotion of efficient secretaries in the Diplomatic Service and consuls general to vacancies arising in the rank of minister; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 2710) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Claremont, in the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2711) to provide revenue for the Government by increasing the duty on granite, freestone, etc., imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 2712) to reimburse the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for expenses incurred in protecting bridges on main railroad lines and under direction of the commanding general Eastern Department, United States Army, and the commandant navy yard, Charlestown, Mass.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2713) to provide for the payment of assessments for the benefits for opening of streets, avenues, roads, and alleys in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 2714) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Miami, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 2715) to repeal the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 2716) for the relief of the Museum of New Mexico, which is a part of the educational system of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HULINGS: A bill (H. R. 2717) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ridgway, county seat of Elk County, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2718) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Warren, county seat of Warren County, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2719) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Tionesta, county seat of Forest County, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2720) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Franklin, county seat of Venango County, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2721) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mercer, county seat of Mercer County, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2722) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Greenville, county seat of Mercer County, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAZARO: A bill (H. R. 2723) to provide a site and erect a public building at De Ridder, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2724) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the cities of Crowley, Oberlin, De Ridder, Lake Charles, Cameron, Ville Platte, Opelousas, and Jennings, La., each, two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 2725) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of St. Marys, in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2726) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a Federal building thereon, and authority to sell the present Federal building in the city of Lima, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 2727) to provide for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other benefits and purposes in connection therewith; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 2728) to repeal the law known as the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 2729) to authorize the erection and completion of a public building at Binghamton, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 2730) for the relief of contractors and subcontractors for post offices and other buildings and work under the supervision of the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PAIGE: A bill (H. R. 2731) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the third congressional district in

Massachusetts 25 cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 49) to investigate the Bureau of Industrial Housing and Transportation and the United States Housing Corporation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Resolution (H. Res. 50) directing the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to recommend such legislation as may be found advantageous and necessary to promote the advancement of the American merchant marine; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PAIGE: Resolution (H. Res. 51) directing the Clerk of the House to post conspicuously in the House wing of the Capitol and in the House Office Building notices of committee hearings in advance thereof; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: Resolution (H. Res. 52) to provide a clerk to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 57) to suspend the requirements of annual assessment work on mining claims during the year 1919; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WELTY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 58) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 59) creating a commission to report a plan for the adoption of a national budget system; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Colorado, commending Congress for passing joint resolution No. 204; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, favoring the establishment of a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, favoring an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to regulate the hours of labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to Federal taxation of the income of manufacturers employing women or minors for excessive working hours; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, asking that irrigation possibilities in the county of San Juan, N. Mex., be investigated by the Secretary of the Interior and made a part of his program of irrigation of arid lands; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, favoring an early discharge from the United States Army all soldiers, except those in the Regular Army, who desire to be discharged; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to the needs of the Stewart Indian Institute; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, favoring the increase of pensions to maimed Civil War soldiers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, favoring the establishment of a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, favoring the extending by Congress to members of local and district boards, Government appeal agents, and members of medical and legal advisory boards the thanks of Congress for their services rendered in the administration of the selective-service law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, favoring an early consummation of peace and the subsequent establishment of a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Nevada, favoring the establishment of a league of nations to enforce peace and aim at promoting the liberty, progress, and orderly development of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, praying that the Congress of the United States of America enact into law Senate bill No. 940; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, memorial from the Missouri State Senate, urging Congress to grant relief to Mrs. Blanche Clements Winters, whose husband, with three of his companions, was murdered at Camp Funston, Kans., by Capt. Lewis Whisler, of the United States Army, on January 11, 1918, while in the discharge of his duty guarding $52,000; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, relating to the navigation of the Missouri River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the passage of such legislation as will provide for the deportation of undesirable foreigners who claimed exemption from military service on the ground of being citizens of a neutral country; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, urging the immediate release and discharge of all persons from Minnesota in the Army Engineer Corps, and in other military branches of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, urging Congress to pass legislation relative to aliens who avoided military service in the present war; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, urging the Congress of the United States to refund insurance premiums paid by soldiers, sailors, and marines under the soldiers' and sailors' insurance act during the war, and to permit such soldiers, sailors, and marines to continue such insurance after discharge; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relating to war loans made to the allied Governments by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the restoration of soldiers, sailors, and marines to the pension rolls of the United States; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the retirement on annuities of men and women in the employment of the United States who are over the age of 68 years; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the allotments of soldiers upon their discharge from the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to a stricter examination of national banks by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the extension of benefits of legislation relating to the reservation and distribution of Government lands to include the Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the purchase by the Grain Corporation of the Food Administration of the United States of beans produced in California in preference to those produced in the Orient; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 2732) granting a pension to Jacob L. Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2733) granting a pension to Margaret A. Guilliams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 2734) for the relief of Mrs. William C. O'Brien; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 2735) granting a pension to Adellan M. Fairchild; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2736) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. Bivans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVILLA: A bill (H. R. 2737) granting an increase of pension to Isabel R. Rockwell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2738) to restore Juan Maysonet, late quartermaster sergeant, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, to his rank as of July 15, 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 2739) granting a pension to Mrs. E. L. Ellis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 2740) for the relief of Maude H. Mosher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 2741) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Saylstrom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2742) to reimburse Horace A. Chouinard, chaplain in the Twenty-third Infantry, for loss of certain personal property; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 2743) granting a pension to Barton E. Conner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2744) granting a pension to Mary J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 2745) granting an increase of pension to John A. Vermeulen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2746) granting an increase of pension to Soren V. Kalsem; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2747) granting a pension to Oliver P. Jackson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 2748) for the relief of Sarah J. Ireland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 2749) for the relief of legal representatives of Dr. W. D. Barnett, deceased, late of Cleveland County, Ark.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2750) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 2751) granting a pension to Peter Beebe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2752) granting a pension to Caroline Deibert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2753) granting a pension to Mary J. McKay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULINGS: A bill (H. R. 2754) granting a pension to Mary Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KRAUS: A bill (H. R. 2755) granting a pension to James Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2756) granting a pension to Malick W. Carson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2757) granting a pension to Nancy J. Pier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2758) granting a pension to Lucy A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2759) granting a pension to Jonas Bolen, alias James Bowlen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2760) granting a pension to Gertrude Ballou; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2761) granting a pension to Abraham Beachy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2762) granting a pension to William H. Culler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2763) granting a pension to Wayne L. Dickey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2764) granting a pension to Edward Gaines; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2765) granting a pension to Sarah Elizabeth Keplinger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2766) granting a pension to Blanche Luster; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2767) granting a pension to George B. Locke; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2768) granting a pension to Christopher C. Ogden; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2769) granting a pension to Peter Poirier; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2770) granting a pension to Mardora C. Parker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2771) granting a pension to Joseph E. Sulkoski; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2772) granting a pension to Julia I. Zedaker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2773) granting a pension to Louis B. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2774) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2775) granting an increase of pension to William T. Stott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2776) granting an increase of pension to James M. Perry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2777) granting an increase of pension to Alfred McFeely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2778) granting an increase of pension to William G. Lamb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2779) granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Lillard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2780) granting an increase of pension to Chauncey B. Knowlton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2781) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Harrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2782) granting an increase of pension to John G. Harmon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2783) granting an increase of pension to Mansfield Felton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2784) granting an increase of pension to John M. Davidson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2785) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Culbertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2786) granting an increase of pension to Nimrod Brooks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2787) granting an increase of pension to Henry Barber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2788) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Denton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2789) granting an increase of pension to James M. Cash; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2790) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Little; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2791) granting an increase of pension to Oliver N. Mowrer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2792) granting an increase of pension to Harry Olds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2793) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Pefley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2794) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Priest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2795) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel U. Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2796) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Parrish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2797) granting an increase of pension to Franklin J. Sparks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2798) granting an increase of pension to Mannon Street; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2799) granting an increase of pension to Austin Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2800) granting an increase of pension to John Murphy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2801) granting an increase of pension to Russell F. Oliver; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2802) granting an increase of pension to Peter F. O'Brien; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2803) granting an increase of pension to Frank Lynch; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2804) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Lloyd; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 2805) granting a pension to William Washburn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2806) granting a pension to George H. Poust; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2807) granting a pension to Lottie E. Beisser; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2808) granting a pension to Mary A. Brace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2809) granting an increase of pension to Harry A. McKibben; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2810) granting an increase of pension to John H. Chatham; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2811) granting an increase of pension to Edward H. Dalton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2812) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Stanton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LAZARO: A bill (H. R. 2813) for the relief of the estate of Henry Ware, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2814) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Alphonse Desmare, deceased, and others; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2815) for the relief of Arthur J. Coney, sole heir of L. J. J. Coney, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2816) to reimburse the postmaster at Bayou Chicot, La., for money taken by burglars; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LESHER: A bill (H. R. 2817) granting a pension to Philip E. Hartman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2818) granting a pension to Mary A. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2819) granting a pension to Susan Purcell and six minor children; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2820) granting an increase of pension to George S. Tillson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 2821) for the relief of Mrs. G. Abbott Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 2822) granting an increase of pension to John R. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 2823) for the relief of William J. Nagel, postmaster, Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 2824) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Walsh; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TEMPLE: A bill (H. R. 2825) granting a pension to Arthur A. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 2826) granting a pension to Floyd J. Gaines; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 2827) for the relief of Edith B. Macon, sole heir of the estate of Davis W. and Elizabeth L. W. Bailey, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 2828) granting a pension to James R. Mowry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2829) granting a pension to Alva C. Foster; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2830) granting a pension to Joseph A. Beckmeyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2831) granting a pension to Blanche Bunger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2832) granting a pension to Henry M. Agenbroad; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2833) granting a pension to George F. Swob; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2834) granting an increase of pension to Isaac W. Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2835) for the relief of the Central Building & Loan Co., of Lima, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2836) granting a pension to William B. Stroope; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition in behalf of 50,000 Cherokee Indians, urging passage of strict prohibition law against the manufacture and sale of liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of George Feaver, jr., president Fresno County (Calif.) Farm Bureau, urging support of recommendation of Secretary of Agriculture regarding amounts to be appropriated for agricultural work; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of certain residents of the city of Schenectady, N. Y., praying for immediate repeal of section 904 of the revenue law of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CURRY of California: Resolutions adopted at the annual convention of Pacific coast section of the National Electric Light Association, protesting against an appropriation for the use of the Bureau of Standards in establishing standards of ethics for certain public-service corporations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of National Garment Retailers' Association, from every section of the United States, asking for repeal of section 904 of luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Board of Aldermen of city of St. Louis, urging that surplus foodstuffs be distributed and placed upon market of this country that it will reduce prices upon necessities of life to our citizens; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of electors of the town of La Grange, Wis.; farmers, voters, and taxpayers of Melvina, Norwalk, and Welving, Wis., urging repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of Merchants' Association of Joliet, opposing repeal of the present zone system for second-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KETTNER: Resolutions of the high-school principals of the State of California, indorsing plan of a league of nations and favoring the creation of a Federal department of education; to the Committee on Education.

Also, resolution of Needles Lodge No. 762, Needles, Calif., Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, relative to Government control of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KIESS: Petition of citizens of Potter County, Pa., favoring the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of James R. Evans, 1419 Eutaw Place, and Paul Kehling, 1606 Pennsylvania Avenue, both of Baltimore, Md., asking support of initiative and referendum amendment to the Constitution of United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Maryland-District of Columbia Retail Clothiers' Association, the Hub, National Garment Retailers' Association, and retail merchants from Baltimore, Md., and all sections of the country, protesting against luxury tax and asking repeal of section 904; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Henry Wessel Co., Baltimore, Md., asking for repeal of section 904 of the revenue law of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of many citizens of the city of Syracuse, N. Y., protesting against the imposition of luxury taxes and asking for the immediate repeal of section 904 of revenue law of 1918, as well as the other sales taxes in title 9; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERRITT: Papers to accompany House bill 1306; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring repeal of so-called luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of 271 citizens of Garfield County, Okla., for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of 175 citizens of Harper County, Okla., for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Farm Bureau, Imperial County, Calif., urging the adoption of Secretary Lane's bill for soldiers' settlement; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Medical Society of State of California, protesting against any curtailment of the activities of United States Public Health Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: Petition of Highland Park Presbyterian Church, 900 members; and Ministerial Union of Long Beach, both of California, urging against repeal of war prohibition and praying for enactment of enforcement legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of First Presbyterian Church of Long Beach, Calif., against repeal of war prohibition; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROWAN: Resolutions adopted by the Board of Aldermen of New York City, relating to mail tubes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolutions and petitions adopted by New York concerns, urging the repeal of the luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Fur Dressers' and Fur Dyers' Association (Inc.), of New York City, protesting against the luxury tax of 10 per cent on fur; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions by National Guard Association, requesting Congress to take necessary steps at once to establish a National Guard Corps of the Army of United States, under administration of the National Guard Bureau of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of publicity committee on reconstruction of Chicago, Ill., urging repeal of 10 per cent tax on athletic goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of members of Warsaw (N. Y.) Grange, No. 1088, urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: Resolutions adopted by the Publishers' Association of New York City, representing the daily newspapers of New York and Brooklyn, relating to second-class mail matter and cost of service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *May 24, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God our Father, whose spirit permeates all space with rays divine, bring us, we beseech Thee, en rapport with Thee, that our acts may be in consonance with Thy purposes, and thus may we hallow Thy name in thought, word, and deed, and be able at the close of this day to ask Thy blessing upon our work. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2480, the Indian appropriation bill, with Mr. LONGWORTH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2480) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The CHAIRMAN. General debate is exhausted, and the Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SURVEYING AND ALLOTTING INDIAN RESERVATIONS (REIMBURSABLE).

For the survey, resurvey, classification, and allotment of lands in severalty under the provisions of the act of February 8, 1887 (24 Stat. L., p. 388), entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to Indians," and under any other act or acts providing for the survey or allotment of Indian lands, $10,000, to be repaid proportionally out of any Indian moneys held in trust or otherwise by the United States and available by law for such reimbursable purposes: *Provided*, That no part of said sum shall be used for the survey, resurvey, classification, or allotment of any land in severalty on the public domain to any Indian, whether of the Navajo or other tribes, within the State of New Mexico and the State of Arizona, who was not residing upon the public domain prior to June 30, 1914.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to direct the chairman's attention to the fact that in line 13 there is a word that evidently is misspelled.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will correct it.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the relief and care of destitute Indians not otherwise provided for, and for the prevention and treatment of tuberculosis, trachoma, smallpox, and other contagious and infectious diseases, including transportation of patients to and from hospitals and sanatoria, $385,000, of which $10,000 shall be used to care for old and indigent Indians in western Washington, and of which sum $25 000 shall be immediately available: *Provided*, That not to exceed $45,000 of said amount may be expended in the construction and equipment of new hospitals at a unit cost of not exceeding $15,000: *Provided further*, That this appropriation may be used also for general medical and surgical treatment of Indians, including the maintenance and operation of general hospitals, where no other funds are applicable or available for that purpose: *Provided further*, That out of the appropriation herein authorized there shall be available for the maintenance of the sanatoria and hospitals hereinafter named, and for incidental and all other expenses for their proper conduct and management, including pay of employees, repairs, equipment, and improvements, not to exceed the following amounts: Blackfeet Hospital, Montana, $12,500; Carson Hospital, Nevada, $10,000; Cheyenne and Arapahoe Hospital, Oklahoma, $10,000; Choctaw and Chickasaw Hospital, Oklahoma, $35,000; Fort Lapwai Sanatorium, Idaho, $40,000; Laguna Sanatorium, New Mexico, $17,000; Mescalero Hospital, New Mexico, $10,000; Navajo Sanatorium, Arizona, $10,000; Pima Hospital, Arizona, $10,000; Phoenix Sanatorium, Arizona, $40,000; Spokane Hospital, Washington, $10,000; Sac and Fox Sanatorium, Iowa, $25,000; Turtle Mountain Hospital, North Dakota, $10,000; Winnebago Hospital, Nebraska, $15,000; Crow Creek Hospital, South Dakota, $10,000; Hoopa Valley Hospital, California, $10,000; Jicarilla Hospital, New Mexico, $10,000; Truxton Canyon camp hospital, Arizona, $10,000; Indian Oasis Hospital, Arizona, $10,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYDEN: Page 6, line 16, strike out "$385,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$375,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to correct what is clearly a clerical error in the bill. The bill as it passed the House allowed $375,000. It was amended in the Senate and the amount was increased to $385,000. The conferees did not agree to it and the Senate receded. It shows in the report that the amount should be $375,000, and therefore I move the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SUPPORT OF INDIAN SCHOOLS.

For support of Indian day and industrial schools not otherwise provided for, for other educational and industrial purposes in connection therewith, $1,750,000, of which sum not to exceed $25,000 shall be immediately available: *Provided*, That not to exceed $40,000 of this amount may be used for the support and education of deaf and dumb or blind Indian children: *Provided further*, That not more $200,000 of the amount herein appropriated may be expended for the tuition of Indian children enrolled in the public schools: *And provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the support of Indian day and industrial schools where specific appropriation is made.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to ask, in view of the fact that the present fiscal year is nearly ended, why the necessity for making $25,000 of this appropriation immediately available. They have been able to proceed without these funds up to this time. Why not let this go on?

Mr. SNYDER. When the bill was considered nearly four months ago, we were informed at that time by the commissioner that the funds would not last through. I think this is the only place in the bill where we have permitted any funds to become immediately available. On account of influenza and other emergency matters, they asked that next year much of the fund should be immediately available. But in all other sections of the bill we have made it a rule to cut out the "immediately available" proposition.

Mr. WALSH. That was the condition four months ago?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. But does the gentleman think that we should make $25,000 of this specific appropriation available for the remainder of the current fiscal year?

Mr. SNYDER. I think we should at this time.

Mr. WALSH. It seems to me that even if they require any funds or their appropriation is not sufficient that they might well get along without dipping into the next year's appropriation.

Mr. SNYDER. It has been the rule under this section to do that very thing, to make a certain amount of funds immediately available each year, and we kept the item down as small as it is advisable to do.

Mr. WALSH. Well, I will withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the next item.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to——

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, is it not the rule to finish a paragraph before making an amendment?

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I thought it was finished.

Mr. SNYDER. They are reading a new paragraph.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I wanted to ask a question under support of Indian schools.

Mr. SNYDER. Let the Clerk finish the reading of the paragraph first.

The Clerk read as follows:

For construction, lease, purchase, repair, and improvement of school and agency buildings, including the purchase of necessary lands and the installation, repair, and improvement of heating, lighting, power, and sewerage and water systems in connection therewith, $335,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of salaries and expenses of persons employed in the supervision of construction or repair work of bridges and on school and agency buildings in the Indian Service: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to allow employees in the Indian Service, who are furnished quarters, necessary heat and light for such quarters without charge, such heat and light to be paid for out of the fund chargeable with the cost of heating and lighting other buildings at the same place: *And provided further*, That the amount so expended for agency purposes shall not be included in the maximum amounts for compensation of employees prescribed by section 1, act of August 24, 1912.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. It was the other paragraph that I wished to inquire about.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GARD. Pending that, I wanted to ask the chairman of the committee if the result of the committee of conference on this bill in the last session determined the amount on page 8, line 16, to be $335,000 or $350,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have the figures right here. The bill as it passed the House carried $350,000. It was reduced in conference to $335,000.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have been authorized by the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means to state to the House——

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is proceeding out of order. I would be glad to have him ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order if he wants to.

Mr. FORDNEY. Then I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks permission to proceed out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that there now sits in the gallery a young man who has been recognized by all the commanding generals of the Army as having accomplished the greatest individual feat of the recent World War, Sergt. Alvin C. York, of Company G, Three hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment, Eighty-second Division. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

PER CAPITA COST.

That hereafter, except for pay of superintendents and for transportation of goods and supplies and transportation of pupils, not more than $225 shall be expended from appropriations made in this act, or any other act, for the annual support and education of any one pupil in any Indian school, unless the attendance in any school shall be less than 200 pupils, in which case the Secretary of the Interior may authorize a per capita expenditure of not to exceed $250: *Provided*, That the total amount appropriated for the support of such school shall not be exceeded: *Provided further*, That the number of pupils in any school entitled to the per capita allowance hereby provided for shall be based upon average attendance, determined by dividing the total daily attendance by the number of days the school is in session: *Provided further*, That all moneys appropriated for school purposes among the Indians for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, may be expended, without restriction as to per capita expenditure, for the annual support and education of any one pupil in any school.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I should like to ask the necessity for increasing the amount for the maintenance of each pupil $25 above current law?

Mr. SNYDER. That was done for two reasons. First, because of the great increase in the cost of supplies, and so forth, necessary for the maintenance of the pupils; secondly, because heretofore the amount was based upon the enrollment and not upon the attendance. The gentleman will note that this amount is to be computed upon the average attendance and does not apply to the number enrolled. It was thought necessary to increase the amount for the maintenance of each pupil a certain per cent, due to the great increase in the cost of maintenance.

Mr. WALSH. You have changed the method of ascertaining the per capita allowance, so that now it is provided that it shall be based upon the average attendance, obtained by dividing the total daily attendance by the number of days the school is in session. Do all these schools begin their terms and terminate them at the same date?

Mr. SNYDER. They all begin them at practically the same date, but they do not all terminate at the same date, due to the fact that occasionally they run out of funds and have to stop before the regular closing date.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to reserve a point of order upon the second proviso, on page 10, where they change the method of determining the per capita allowance.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I reserve the point of order until I get a little more information.

Mr. HAYDEN. I can give the gentleman this much information: The method which has been finally adopted of dividing the average attendance by the total number of days the school is in session is the method followed by practically every State in the Union in apportioning State school funds. It is obviously unfair to divide the attendance by 365 days when the school is in operation only eight or nine months. It was for that reason that this change was made. Taking the total number of days the school is actually in session as the divisor by which to get the average attendance is fair to all schools; but to divide the attendance by 365, the total number of days in a year, was not only unfair but unworkable; therefore the committee made this change.

Mr. WALSH. This method has been followed for a great many years.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; as a matter of fact it has not. The truth of the matter is that this limitation was placed upon the apportionment of Indian funds some years ago. It was tried then and found to be unworkable, and in every Indian appropriation bill thereafter until two years ago that limitation was removed by a special provision in the bill. Last year the same difficulty occurred and they are now trying to make the law workable by dividing by the number of days of attendance in school rather than by 365. I believe this new method will prove to be much more satisfactory.

Mr. WALSH. Was this provision in the law two years ago and three years ago?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; there was a provision in the Indian appropriation bills running back for a number of years, saying that for that particular fiscal year the limitation with respect to the apportionment of Indian funds should not apply. In other words, a general limitation was enacted some years ago which was found to be unworkable, and each year that limitation was lifted.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will permit me for a minute, I will state that a great many years ago a limitation was placed on expenditures for schools, outside of the superintendents' salaries and the transportation of goods, of $167 per capita. About 10 years ago it was found that that amount would not suffice for the education of these pupils for a 10 months' school; so at that time a provision was placed in the bill exempting the amount appropriated in that bill from that provision. That was carried along until two years ago, at which time the exemption was stricken out by the House, reinstated in the Senate, and then stricken out in conference. It was found that the schools were going to be unable to operate, and so the Indian Committee was called together, and we recommended that this maximum be increased to $200 per capita. That was adopted by Congress and has been followed since until an increase was authorized last year. The Indian Bureau has insisted at all times that in applying the $200 per capita the average enrollment should be taken rather than the average attendance, which was not a true statement of the case at all. For instance, a child would be enrolled and attend school for a few days and then would not be at school again for the session, and yet they might be permitted to expend $200 for the entire year for such attendance.

Mr. WALSH. The result is the less the Indian goes to school the more the per capita costs.

Mr. CARTER. No; it is just the opposite under this provision.

Mr. WALSH. The law calls for a per capita of $200 or $225, and now you are increasing it.

Mr. CARTER. The general law provides for a per capita of $167. Heretofore we have carried the exemption in the bill, as I have stated, and finally we raised it for the current year to $200; but that was based on enrollment. This bases it on the actual attendance, so that if a child goes to school only so many days he is only paid for so many days. Under the old method of enrollment, if he left school he might be charged for the entire term, his name not being stricken off and the pay being drawn and distributed among the other pupils.

Mr. WALSH. Two hundred and twenty-five dollars and $250 is merely a limitation.

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. If the gentleman will notice the hearings on page 38, he will find the following:

Mr. HASTINGS. Where would you get the money to run the school under this last proviso—that is, to make this legislation applicable to this year—if we haven't already made a sufficient appropriation?

Mr. MERITT. The schools this year will get the benefit of the change in the word "attendance" to "enrollment," and they can figure their expenses on the basis of enrollment rather than on attendance.

We had a long and careful investigation made of that, and they fought vigorously to have the bill made up based on enrollment and not on attendance, and that was why we made the bill as it is.

Mr. WALSH. Who was it that fought vigorously?

Mr. SNYDER. The Indian Bureau.

Mr. CARTER. It is based on attendance, so that there might not be any camouflage about it.

Mr. SNYDER. There was no niggardness about it on the part of the committee; the committee fixed in the bill an amount which will take care abundantly of every pupil that attends the school.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, still further reserving the point of order, I would like to ask what is the necessity for permitting the current appropriation to be expended without restriction, as provided in the last proviso of the section?

Mr. SNYDER. That was due to the same thing that I spoke about before. The influenza came on and used up the fund beyond what they expected, and this was to give a little leeway in the matter for the balance of this year.

Mr. WALSH. Well, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of a point of order.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, still further reserving the point of order, I desire to make an inquiry of the chairman of the committee. How many Indian schools are there where the attendance is more than 200?

Mr. SNYDER. I think there are 10.

Mr. GARD. How many Indian schools are there altogether?

Mr. SNYDER. Outside of the reservation schools, there are 29.

Mr. CARTER. I think the chairman might explain the difference between reservation and nonreservation schools.

Mr. SNYDER. Twenty-nine are strictly boarding schools appropriated for gratuitously and separately. The item in the bill calls for $1,750,000 for separate maintenance of the schools.

Mr. GARD. I am in favor of the education of the Indians, and I was wondering why it would not be wise to make a maximum allowance for all of them.

Mr. SNYDER. I was asked yesterday to give the amount in the bill appropriated for the purposes of schools. Of the $5,200,000 in the bill, $4,370,000 is used wholly for educational purposes for the Indian schools. A very large amount of money appropriated is not reimbursable in this bill for the education of the Indian children.

The CHAIRMAN. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That section 2138 of the Revised Statutes of the United States is hereby amended so as to read as follows: "That where restricted Indians are in possession or control of live stock purchased for or issued to them by the Government, or the increase therefrom, such stock shall not be sold, transferred, mortgaged, or otherwise disposed of, except with the consent in writing of the superintendent or other officer in charge of the tribe to which the owner or possessor of the live stock belongs, and all transactions in violation of this provision shall be void. All such live stock so purchased or issued and the increase therefrom belonging to restricted Indians and grazed in the Indian country shall be branded with the I D or reservation brand of the jurisdiction to which the owners of such stock belong, and shall not be removed from the Indian country except with the consent in writing of the superintendent or other officer in charge of the tribe to which the owner or possessor of such live stock belongs, or by order of the Secretary of War, in connection with the movement of troops. Every person who violates the provisions of this section by selling or otherwise disposing of such stock, purchasing, or otherwise acquiring an interest therein, or by removing such stock from the Indian country, shall be fined not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, or imprisoned not less than six months or more than one year, or both such fine and imprisonment."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 8, change the figures "$500" to "$50"; same page, line 9, strike out the words "six months" and substitute therefor "30 days," so that the section will read:

"Every person who violates the provisions of this section by selling or otherwise disposing of such stock, purchasing, or otherwise acquiring an interest therein, or by removing such stock from the Indian country, shall be fined not less than $50 nor more than $1,000, or imprisoned not less than 30 days or more than one year, or both such fine and imprisonment."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I will say for the benefit of the committee that this matter pertains to the sale of stock which is provided for restricted Indians by the Government. As the law exists to-day the restricted Indians can do business among themselves, but they can not sell stock to a white man.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. I want to invite the attention of the chairman to the word "or," in line 9, on page 18, after the words "one year," and suggest that that ought to be "nor," just as it is in line 8.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I accept that suggestion, and ask that the amendment be so modified.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be modified as suggested.

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. It was thought by the committee after careful consideration of this question this morning, with nearly the whole committee present, that the minimum penalty was too great an amount for an ignorant restricted Indian. There is no limitation upon the court. He may make it as much as he pleases, but we believe that in justice to the Indian the minimum amount of the penalty should be reduced as set forth in the amendment.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, this whole paragraph, beginning on page 17, line 11, is subject to a point of order as being new legislation, is it not?

Mr. SNYDER. It is not new legislation as I understand it. This amendment is an extension of the law.

Mr. GARD. I was not intending to make the point of order, but was merely inquiring whether it is new legislation.

Mr. CARTER. It changes existing law, but the point of order would not lie now, because debate has been had upon it.

Mr. GARD. What is the existing law?

Mr. CARTER. The existing law provides that the Indian, as I think the gentleman in charge of the bill stated, may sell his property to another Indian but may not sell it to a white man. That is to say, they may trade this property, which is given to them by the Government, to either a restricted or a nonrestricted Indian. A nonrestricted Indian may sell his property to anyone, so there has grown up a custom on the reservation whereby a white man would get an unrestricted Indian to buy the property of a restricted Indian and then in turn sell that property to a white man. This proposes to take care of that situation.

Mr. SNYDER. This makes them all amenable to the law.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. Some of the transactions that would make an Indian amenable to this provision of the statute are trifling in character.

Mr. SNYDER. Very trifling, indeed.

Mr. REAVIS. Does not the gentleman believe that even the minimum established by the amendment in some instances would be too high?

Mr. SNYDER. In some instances.

Mr. REAVIS. Why not amend this so as to leave the maximum and provide that he shall be fined not more than $1,000, leaving it to the discretion of the court?

Mr. SNYDER. That suggestion would be agreeable to me.

Mr. CARTER. I think that would be perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. REAVIS. Shall I offer such an amendment?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. And why not also cut down the term of imprisonment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska will state his amendment.

Mr. REAVIS. On page 18, line 8, strike out the words "not less than $500" and insert in lieu thereof "in any sum," so that it will read "shall be fined in any sum not more than $1,000."

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, before the chairman of the committee accepts that amendment let me make a suggestion to him. I have tried a great many of these cases in the Indian country, and I do not believe the amendment will accomplish what the gentleman thinks it will.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will suggest that the Clerk first report the amendment.

Mr. FERRIS. Very well.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REAVIS: Page 18, line 8, strike out the words "not less than $500 nor" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in any sum not."

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I have not yet completed the amendment. I would like to add to that, if the Clerk will take it down as a part of the amendment, in line 9, to strike out the words "less than six months or" and in line 8 insert between the words "imprisoned" and "not," at the end of the line, the word "for," so that it will read "or imprisoned for not more than one year."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from Nebraska to the fact that that is not properly an amendment to the committee amendment, but it is more in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. REAVIS. Very well; I offer it as a substitute.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, may we have the substitute reported?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. REAVIS: Page 18, line 8, strike out the words "not less than $500 nor" and insert in lieu thereof "in any sum not," and on page 18, line 8, after the word "imprisoned," insert the word "for," and on line 9 strike out the words "less than six months or," so that as amended the line will read "shall be fined in any sum not more than $1,000, or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both such fine and imprisonment."

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman from Nebraska a sentence of one year would be pretty severe, and I think we might change that and make it six months.

Mr. REAVIS. Well, inasmuch as the discretion is permitted to the trial court to fix the penalty, and only the maximum is placed in the law, the fact that we make it one year does not make it at all obligatory upon the court to fix that as the penalty.

Mr. CARTER. Except the court might take that as indicating what the punishment might be, as courts sometimes do.

Mr. FERRIS. That is the usual working of it.

Mr. CARTER. I think it ought to be really reduced. I think——

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to change my substitute so as to insert the words "six months" in lieu of the words "one year."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to modify his substitute as suggested. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the amendment offered in the nature of a substitute to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The amendment as amended by the substitute was agreed to.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 10, after the word "imprisonment," insert:
"*Provided*, That the penalty and prohibition herein provided for shall not apply to personal property purchased from the personal funds of individual allottees."

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, now I do not know what view the committee may take of it, but I want to call the attention of the committee to the actual practice of this Indian personal property. Here is an Indian who has trust funds in the Treasury of the United States, or rather in the hands of

the superintendent. That individual Indian makes application to his agent to buy a team or a binder or mower or a rake or a plow or something of that kind for his use in connection with his allotment. He makes application to his superintendent for a quota of his own funds, not the Government's funds, to buy some piece of personal property that he needs and desires, from his own personal funds, money he has inherited or that has been assembled from the sale of his land or something of that sort. In such case I do not think he ought to be put under punishment if he drives his team or his cow, purchased in this way, 10 miles off the reservation, and I do not think we ought to fine him or put him under punishment even if he sells or encumbers property that he has purchased or has had purchased for him with his own money. I think the statute has been wrong all the time, and I believe it is wrong now, and I really think the committee should confine this penal code to personal property purchased from Government gratuity appropriation, to which I have no objection. There are numerous instances of gratuity appropriations for Indians for the purchase of cattle or horses, which are branded on the left shoulder "I D," which means the Interior Department. The Indian should not be permitted to mortgage or hypothecate property which the Government has given him, but I think he should have the right to handle his own personal property derived from funds from his own individual account.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I will.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will not trouble arise in determining what is his personal fund?

Mr. FERRIS. I do not think there is any trouble about that. They can brand the property purchased from gratuity funds and let alone the property purchased from their own funds.

Mr. McKEOWN. The gentleman knows there is many an Indian who will go and dispose of personal property as soon as he can get it; that he will go to the agent and get him to buy property in order to get the money; that he will take it immediately and sell it and put the money in his pocket.

Mr. FERRIS. The answer to that is nine times out of ten when he goes to get the money from the agent he does not get it. The agent has discretion. He may grant or refuse any request. The agent is absolute. He can say yes or no, and there is no appeal. He can grant or deny, and no one can question. He has the widest powers. They have been buying too many Liberty bonds, too many of them serving in the Army, to reenact such statutes as this relative to their personal property.

Mr. ELSTON. That is the question I was going to ask. Are gratuities paid in money to the Indian before he makes the purchase?

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, no; as a rule, not. They buy his property for him. They supply discretion and everything else for him.

Mr. ELSTON. Then there is no confusion in the matter of the mingling the two kinds of money in his own possession. It is a mere matter of purchase from one or the other, according to the way he wishes——

Mr. FERRIS. But if the gentleman will pardon me, they do not let him make the purchase. Suppose he says to the Indian agent that he wishes $300 to buy a wagon or $300 to buy a team of horses. The agent sends his farmer to see if they are worth the money or not.

Mr. ELSTON. One further question. I notice the gentleman referred in his amendment to personal property. The section seems to refer to live stock only.

Mr. FERRIS. That is personal property.

Mr. ELSTON. The implication seems to be raised by the amendment that the section refers to any kind of personal property. He might use the phrase "such personal property" or use the term "live stock."

Mr. FERRIS. I am perfectly willing to make it live stock. I drew up the amendment very hurriedly. I did not wish to enlarge it. I merely intended to modify this penal code so that it would not apply to personal property purchased from their own funds.

Mr. REAVIS. I have looked at the section carefully, and it seems to me the only property the misuse of which would come within the purview of this section is that property issued to him by the Government or purchased for him by the Government.

Mr. FERRIS. They do it with his own money. Say here is a family of five, and one Indian dies and the other four inherit the money. They do not give them the money, but they put it in the hands of the agent, and the superintendent holds it and doles it out to them at $5, $10, or $15 at a time, as they are able to get it from him. Say the Indian comes and makes application to the agent and says that he wants to buy a pair of horses with which to farm or buy a pair of mules, which, we will say, cost $350. The agent will send his farmer to see if that team of horses or team of mules is worth the $350, and if so they will let him buy it.

This section as it stands would penalize the Indian who had purchased under Government supervision a team if he drove it off the reservation or ever sold it on a mortgage. I can not think this is right. I can not think it ought to be. The committee ought to change it.

Mr. REAVIS. Is it the gentleman's contention that the stock purchased for them by the Government is sought to be purchased for them by the Indians' own money?

Mr. FERRIS. Not always; and I am trying to separate the two cases. This bill is full of gratuity appropriations. I do not mean to say full of too many of them. And necessarily so. Some Indian tribes do not have anything and Congress has to give them the money out of this gratuity. If such money from that gratuity appropriation is needed to buy stock, I am glad to have them brand it "I D" on the shoulder, and I am glad to have the statute apply, so that they can not sell it or drive it off the reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FERRIS. But for stock bought with their own money, for which they did not pay more than it was actually worth, and for which they have the approval of the Interior Department, I do not believe we ought to pass such statutes as this.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I will.

Mr. SNYDER. I am in full sympathy with the suggestion, but I believe it will complicate matters and make it necessary perhaps to employ a few more inspectors and a few more people to sort all the herds and find out those that have the "I D" branded on them and those that do not. I feel that the Indian who receives his own money from tribal funds ought to have the right to purchase what he sees fit to purchase and to sell it. Here is the complication. This section is proposed to cover the sale of live stock that is handed to the Indian as a gratuity for his use and which he has no right to sell.

Mr. FERRIS. They do not stop there.

Mr. SNYDER. I understand they do not.

Mr. FERRIS. They go and brand the property as Interior Department property, even though they use the money of the Indian to buy and pay for it.

Mr. SNYDER. I believe we have gone far enough in limiting this section when we have reduced the minimum fine. It ought to be determined by a court. I think at this time we ought to let it go.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not want to be contentious about it. I think if the gentleman from New York lived on an Indian reservation, as I do, where the Indian superintendent is several counties away, and they have to spend half the value of a horse to see if the agent will let them buy horses, trade horses, or sell horses, he would think that it is more than we ought to impose on them.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman will find all through these hearings that the department maintains that they have not sufficient superintendents and assistants to do the work they have to do now. If we vote on them the additional burden of separating the property, they will ask for more assistance. I do not think we ought to do it.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not think it will do that.

Mr. SNYDER. I believe it would.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield? Is not the language of this section as proposed by the committee intended to cover only such live stock as is given to the Indians and not purchased by his money?

Mr. SNYDER. It is intended to cover exactly the things the present law covers, and no more and no less.

Mr. CARTER. It covers any property that may be purchased by the Indian with the Federal funds or his own funds. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN] made a pertinent suggestion about this matter, and which I had not thought of until he suggested it. He says if this privilege is given the Indian, he will forego the idea of getting money from the Indian Bureau, but that he will get the Indian Bureau to buy property from his funds. Then he will sell that property for less than it is worth in order to get money. Since that might teach such Indians something about trading and values, it might not be such a bad proposition after all but for one thing, and that is it might result in having done the very thing the gentleman is now trying to prevent, to wit, it might be it would go to such an extent that the Indian Bureau would decline or refuse to buy

property for the Indian with his own funds, because it would be claimed the Indian would dispose of the property as soon as it got into his hands. Therefore I think the amendment ought to be given more consideration than we are able to give it here on the floor of the House, and I hope the committee amendment as amended will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I would like to get from the committee this: The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER], the chairman of the committee, wisely suggested, if I understood him correctly, that this is solely on the Government purchases for the Indian. Now, the words "restricted Indians" refer to those who have not been given the right to dispose of their property as they see fit. So it includes those for whom the Government has bought property with the Government money, as well as the Indians for whom the Government has bought property with their own money?

Mr. CARTER. That is it.

Mr. RAKER. It takes the two classes?

Mr. CARTER. It includes both.

Mr. RAKER. And the position of the gentleman from Oklahoma now is that where the property is purchased for the Indian with Government funds there ought not to be any transfer without the consent of the department?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. But, on the other hand, where the Indian is given his own money, he ought to be able to dispose of it?

Mr. FERRIS. That is it.

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. That makes the distinction between the two?

Mr. CARTER. Yes; that makes the distinction; and my only objection to it is that it will eventually result in the department refusing to buy property for an Indian because the Indian will be likely to sell it in order to get the money instead of going to the bureau to get money.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, if the Government has my money, will it neither buy anything for me nor allow me to get it myself?

Mr. CARTER. That goes to the proposition of whether or not the Government has the right or ought to restrict an Indian that it considers incompetent.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] knows more about Indians than I do, but let me say one word about it. The chairman and I think a good deal alike on these questions relating to Indians, but the chairman thought it would result in producing more administration. I think instead it would make less administration, because if I own and operate a thing myself the bureau will not have to follow me up and run me down to see what I have done with it. It would dispense with much of the administration. I wish I could think it best to treat these Indians like mere children, but I can not adopt that view.

Mr. CARTER. But if an Indian persists, as he naturally will when he can not get more than five or ten dollars at a time and has to spend almost as much money in getting that much as it is worth in going to and from the agency, he will not want to get it in that way.

Mr. FERRIS. Is that right? Can that be conducive to the Indian's good or best welfare?

Mr. CARTER. No; but in the very nature of things the Indian will ask to have property purchased for him from his own funds, and if that property is purchased the Indian will not go back to the agency for money. He will sell that property if he needs money, because it will be less difficult that way for him to get the money he needs. The result of that will be that the Indian Bureau will close down on him and will not even buy for him the property that he may need.

Mr. FERRIS. But the discretion is always in the superintendent as to whether or not he will buy anything for him, whether he will let him have the first or second team, or in fact anything.

Mr. CARTER. Yes. We want to liberalize the administration to the Indians as far as possible, and particularly the matter of purchasing teams and cattle and team equipment for the Indians. Now, the thing that I fear is that the gentleman's amendment, while at first glance it may look good, will in practice discourage that policy that we are trying to promote, namely, to liberalize the purchase of goods that the Indian actually needs to maintain his own existence.

Mr. FERRIS. I think you will have a hard time to make the Indian think you are liberalizing his trading opportunities when you put him in jail if he uses his own money to buy a team or some other necessity. The committee in charge, of course, do not desire the bill amended, but they ought to consider it another year.

Mr. CARTER. But suppose that Charlie Carter, a restricted Indian, has the department purchase a team for him, and the department gives him the right to sell it; and suppose that Charlie Carter sells the team and squanders the money. Then will the Indian Bureau, when Scott Ferris and other restricted Indians come in, buy a team for him and them after the experience it has had with Charlie Carter?

Mr. FERRIS. If the Indian Bureau will not buy a team for an Indian who needs it and who has the money to pay for it, then it ought to be made to do it. If the verdict of the Indians who call on me are any criterion to go by, I undertake to say that they do not always perform their duty adequately in buying teams for Indians. There are many Indians who feel they do not get their affairs handled properly. Some of their objections may not be well taken, but they have some rights. They ought not to be treated too lightly either here or by the department.

Mr. CARTER. That is exactly the point I make.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman of the committee why, on page 7, line 25, the verbiage should not be changed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I suggest that you strike out the second "for" that you use there and insert instead of it the word "and," so that it will read "and other educational and industrial purposes." It does not weaken the sentence. It is all on the same subject, and it seems to me that the construction there would be more euphonious.

Mr. SNYDER. I see no objection to that.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I notice also on page 11 on line 25——

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman please state again what he had to say as to page 7?

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I notice on page 7, on line 25, that there are two "fors" together. I suggest that you strike out the second "for" and insert the word "and," so that the line will read "and other educational and industrial purposes." It all relates to the same subject.

Mr. HASTINGS. I see no objection to it. The gentleman can ask unanimous consent to recur to that page and make that correction.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania ask unanimous consent to return to page 7?

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Yes; I ask unanimous consent to return to page 7.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to return to page 7 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I offer an amendment that the second "for" on line 25 be stricken out and the word "and" be inserted in its place.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania offers an amendment: Page 7, line 25, after the word "for" where it occurs the first time, strike out the second "for" and insert in lieu thereof the word "and."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ARIZONA AND NEW MEXICO.

SEC. 2. For support and civilization of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, including pay of employees, $330,000.

For support and education of 150 Indian pupils at the Indian school at Fort Mojave, Ariz., and for pay of superintendent, $35,050; for general repairs and improvements, $3,800; in all, $38,850.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GARD. I do so for the purpose of inquiring as to section 2, what provision under the appropriation of $300,000 is made for the support and civilization and the pay of employees. In other words, how much is the pay of employees?

Mr. HAYDEN. In the hearings, on page 116, the gentleman will find the appropriation itemized completely. The analysis shows as follows:

Analysis of expenditures:

Salaries, wages, etc	$147,810.00
Traveling expenses	6,924.29
Transportation of supplies	12,846.01
Telegraph and telephone service	577.03
Printing, binding, advertising, etc	41.80
Subsistence supplies	25,015.87
Dry goods, clothing, etc	1,298.27
Forage	9,964.28
Fuel, lubricants, power and light service	15,182.02
Medical, educational, stationery, etc	8,354.55
Live stock	1,712.00
Equipment and miscellaneous material	52,066.55
Sheep dip	6,709.67
Seed	1,013.44
Rent of buildings	114.70
Irrigating water	925.45
Miscellaneous	1,517.72
Outstanding liabilities	19,934.21
Total	312,007.86

Mr. GARD. How much actually came down for the support and civilization of these Indians?

Mr. HAYDEN. The whole amount is for that purpose. That is, this covers the pay of Indian superintendents, teachers, farmers, and all other employees in the Indian Service. It is not the design of the Indian Service in Arizona and New Mexico to issue rations except to old and helpless Indians. They are instructed in agriculture, they are given educational advantages in the schools, and thereby are advanced in civilization. The term "*support*" is carried all through this bill, but it is a survival from former times, when rations and clothing were commonly issued to the Indians. That is not the custom any more; in the Southwest, at least.

Mr. GARD. "Civilization" is likewise an expression which the gentleman might term a relic, is it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. It seems to me that if an Indian child is taken from the reservation when he does not know how to speak English, is placed in school, taught to speak our tongue, and instructed in our ways of life, he certainly is advanced in civilization. I think the term is correctly used here.

Mr. REAVIS. Where is the Fort Mojave school?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Fort Mojave school is in western Arizona, near the Colorado River.

Mr. REAVIS. Near Yuma?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; it is above Needles.

Mr. REAVIS. In the northwestern part?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; in Mojave County.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. I should like to ask the gentleman what is the necessity for these increases in practically all of these items connected with Arizona? It is "Arizona and New Mexico" in the title, but the items are mostly for Arizona in the text. I should like to ask what is the reason for these increases.

Mr. HAYDEN. The increases in the schools in the Indian Service are uniform throughout the bill, beginning, as we do, with schools in Arizona, because Arizona comes first on the alphabetical list of States. The gentleman from Connecticut will find that by reason of the increased cost of living, the cost of supplies and clothing and other necessary materials for the support of Indian children in these schools, it has been necessary to uniformly increase the amount for the maintenance of these schools all over the United States. The number of pupils in the school is multiplied by the per capita sum that has been determined upon for the use of that school, and that fixes the amount. The same rule is applied in Arizona as it is in Kansas, the Dakotas, and everywhere else.

Mr. TILSON. Is that the reason for the very large total of the present bill above the current law?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the exact reason for the increase in the school appropriations.

Mr. TILSON. An increase in the grand total of $4,000,000 over the current law?

Mr. SNYDER. The reason for that is that the tribal funds were not included in the total in the bill presented a few months ago. The gentlemen will note that for this year the tribal funds are added to the grand total of the bill, so that the committee may know the total amount of funds disbursed under the bill under the four items—treaties, reimbursable, gratuities, and tribal funds.

Mr. TILSON. So that instead of being an increase of $4,000,000 it is an increase of $500,000.

Mr. SNYDER. Just about that.

Mr. HAYDEN. And of that increase of $500,000 the greater part is necessary for the proper maintenance of the Indian schools.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] suggested that there was a distinction between the funds used for the support and civilization of the Indians and the funds used for the administrative work. I presume the gentleman had some idea of the distinction, and I confess I am interested to find out what was in his mind with regard to that. That is, What are the processes of civilization of the Indians? Is administrative work a part of that process? I should be very glad to have the gentleman enlighten us as to that.

Mr. GARD. I confess I do not know. That is the reason I made my inquiry of the gentleman in charge of the Indian appropriation bill. I should be very glad to have them advise us officially, since they can do it much better than I can.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has had a good deal of experience, or at least he has much definite knowledge about the Indian situation, and I should like to ask him if these schools that are mentioned throughout the bill are in the nature of public schools attended by all children, old and young?

Mr. HAYDEN. All Indian children?

Mr. FESS. I mean all Indian children.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. The Indian school system is based, first, upon the day schools on the reservations, which are similar to the common schools for white children in country districts, where the children attend school during certain hours in the day and then return to their homes. Then on the various reservations and off the reservations have been established Indian boarding schools, where, as the children become a little older, they may be taken away from their parents and sent to boarding school, given an education, and then returned to the reservation.

Mr. FESS. That answers my question. What proportion of the Indian children throughout the States have the advantage of educational facilities?

Mr. HAYDEN. It varies greatly in different parts of the United States.

Mr. FESS. Are any of them deprived of educational facilities?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. For instance, the Navajo Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, a tribe comprising about 23,000 Indians, have very limited school facilities so far. There was a provision in the treaty with these Indians that the United States should provide them with school facilities, but nothing was done until seven years ago, when Congress began appropriations to carry out that old treaty, and schools are being established that Indian children may attend, but the work has not yet been completed.

Mr. FESS. There are schools where Indian children attend with children of the Caucasian race, are there not?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; there is an appropriation in this bill relating to the State of Oklahoma where money is appropriated by the Federal Government for schools attended by both white and Indian children. As a matter of fact, an Indian child makes greater progress where he goes to school with white children than he does in an Indian school. They play together on the playgrounds, and he learns much faster than he otherwise would.

Mr. FESS. There is no limitation on the kind of instruction given Indian children; they have the same instruction as the white children?

Mr. HAYDEN. The only limitation is the amount of money that Congress appropriates for the schools for the Indian children.

Mr. FESS. I thank the gentleman. Now, one question more. In the boarding schools, what is the course of study? How thorough is it?

Mr. HAYDEN. If the gentleman is interested in that subject, he might ask the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to furnish him a document, which is about the size of these hearings, giving the complete course of instruction, a very elaborate plan worked out, I believe, in connection with the Bureau of Education in the Interior Department.

Mr. FESS. One more question, purely for information. Have we many instances where Indians have gone out of these schools into professional life in which they have made great achievements?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; a number of Indians residing in the East have been successful as physicians, some as lawyers, some of them in journalism and other professions. They all obtained their primary instruction in the Indian schools. We had before us last year a delegation of Indians from Minnesota, two of whom were graduates of the University of Minnesota. One was the district attorney of his county at the time.

Mr. FESS. Do you have vocational education as a part of the instruction?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; the course of instruction which I mentioned a moment ago lays great stress on vocational education.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There have been so many inquiries in regard to this particular item that I think it would be well to put in the RECORD the reasons for the appropriation as outlined on page 117 of the hearings. It reads as follows:

This item, as the title indicates, is for the general support and civilization of the Indians of Arizona and New Mexico, which have a combined Indian population of 65,685, and is in the same amount as allowed for 1919. The affairs of these Indians are looked after by 20 superintendencies, which share in this appropriation. The following table shows the Indian population by superintendencies and the land area of each, which totals 23,343,035 acres:

Superintendency.	Area.	Population.
	Acres.	
Camp Verde	298	435
Colorado River	240,699	1,184
Fort Apache	1,681,920	2,456
Havasupai	518	171
Jicarilla	761,112	621
Kaibab	138,240	102
Mescalero	474,240	630
Moqui	2,472,320	4,225
Pima	381,653	6,253
Pueblo Day	873,832	8,896
Salt River	71,691	1,277
San Carlos	1,834,240	2,623
San Xavier	155,954	5,237
Truxton Canyon	730,940	450
Zuni	215,040	1,815
Leupp	13,310,338	1,441
Navajo		12,080
Pueblo Bonito		2,724
San Juan		6,500
Western Navajo		6,565
Total	23,343,035	65,685

The Indians who benefit by this appropriation are scattered throughout the two States, either living on reservations established for their use and occupancy or on the public domain. The chief industry of the Indians of these States is that of stock raising, though a large number are engaged in agriculture where their land is adapted for such purposes. The efforts of the Government at this time are being directed to the work of making these Indians successful stockmen and farmers. The greatest needs of the Indians consist of the improvement of their stock by the introduction of high-bred rams, bulls, and stallions, the purchase of modern farming implements, and instruction and supervision in both industries by men qualified along these lines. There is also need of further fencing to be done to prevent trespassing by outside stock and to protect the grazing and farming lands of the Indians.

Of the amount expended for salaries of employees during 1918, approximately $26,000 was paid to Indians in various positions which they were capable of filling in connection with their industries, and $33,660 for the pay of physicians and nurses, whose efforts are devoted to improving the physical condition of these Indians and lessening or stamping out various diseases which they are subject to. The remainder of the amount expended for salaries was used in the employment of farmers, stockmen, carpenters, blacksmiths, wheelwrights, sawyers, millers, and other tradesmen in performing work and instructing the Indians in their industries, and the pay of clerical employees who are necessary to the conduct of the several agencies.

You will find further in the hearings specifically every one of the activities that this appropriation covers itemized so that it can be run down to the smallest item.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. What proportion of the Indians are domiciled in tribal relations; that is, do they live as separate families or do they live in the aggregate in tribal relations?

Mr. SNYDER. I will have to ask the gentleman from Arizona to answer the gentleman.

Mr. HAYDEN. All of the Indians who receive the benefit of these Arizona and New Mexico appropriations are living in tribal relations.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. In villages?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not necessarily. The Navajo Indians are nomadic, traveling from place to place, whereas the agricultural Indians are congregated in settlements.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing the construction of the pumping plant for irrigation purposes on the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz., by the installation of a settling basin, $11,000, and for continuing the construction of the necessary canals and laterals for the utilization of water in connection with said pumping plant, as provided in the act of April 4, 1910 (36 Stat. L., p. 273), $82,000, and for maintaining and operating the pumping plant, canals, and structures, $41,000, reimbursable as provided in said act; and for continuing the purpose of securing an appropriation of water for the irrigation of approximately 150,000 acres of land on said reservation by the conduct of surveys and the preparation of plans and estimates for a complete irrigation system to supply water to said land, $54,000, reimbursable from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of said reservation arising from the proceeds from the sale of town lots authorized by the act of April 13, 1908 (35 Stat. L., p. 70); in all, $188,000, to be immediately available.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. What is the necessity for such a tremendous increase in the appropriation for this project—from $70,000 to $188,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. By reason of the fact that the pumping plant in operation there is capable of supplying a larger area of land under irrigation which the Indians and lessees are cultivating. It is an important and feasible project, and the department recommends that the work be continued.

Mr. WALSH. Most of the projects in the bill are feasible, but they do not double the appropriation, as far as I have ascertained.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the gentleman will look in other parts of the bill he will find large appropriations for new projects which have been recommended as feasible by the department.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; but those are new projects, while this one is a continuing project.

Mr. HAYDEN. And has demonstrated its entire feasibility.

Mr. WALSH. It seems to me that we might very well continue the development of this project by a more moderate increase of the appropriation.

Mr. HAYDEN. As a matter of fact the Indian Service asked for $30,000 more than is allowed in this appropriation. The committee reduced it to this sum, which is the lowest amount possible to properly carry it on.

Mr. WALSH. Is the gentleman familiar with the reimbursement provision of the statute that has been set out at the conclusion of this paragraph?

I notice in the current law the citation is given as Thirty-fifth Statutes at Large, page 77, and in this act it is page 70. Is it the same act or the same paragraph or the same section of the law?

Mr. HAYDEN. I can not verify the citation.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, if the citation is not correct——

Mr. HAYDEN. If it is not I should be very glad to recur to it and correct it.

Mr. WALSH. I am only pointing out that in the current law the citation is given as the act of April 13, 1908, Thirty-fifth Statutes at Large, page 77. If we are trying now to make this reimbursable by virtue of the act of April 13, 1908, we ought to be advised of it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am quite sure that the current law is correct. I shall verify that, however.

Mr. WALSH. I assumed that the gentleman has the current law before him.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have not.

Mr. WALSH. Perhaps the gentleman can point out the authority for installing a settling basin in this project. I notice that that is something new.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the gentleman will look at the hearings, he will find that previously a settling basin was built at this pumping plant which proved to be very satisfactory, only it was not large enough, and this appropriation is a continuation of that work.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that the settling basin is constructed or is about to be constructed. Under what authority was that undertaken?

Mr. HAYDEN. On page 125 of the hearings the gentleman will find:

In addition to operation, it is essential in order to convey the water through the canals and laterals of the distribution system to remove large quantities of silt that are continually being deposited, and which, if not removed, soon render the canal useless.

During the past few months it has been necessary to remove more than 40,000 cubic yards of silt. The work of ditch cleaning, however, was not completed because of insufficient funds. It is proposed to overcome this silt problem, which is a serious menace to the efficient operation of the system, and avoid the annual heavy expenditure for cleaning the canals by constructing a settling basin at an estimated cost of $11,000. Funds for this purpose are included in this estimate.

I have personally visited this pumping plant, and I know there was a small settling basin there. The engineer said that it was very efficient for its size, and that by enlarging it so as to make a greater area where the velocity of the water could be checked, thus causing the silt to be deposited, there would be a great saving of expense. Therefore this appropriation was asked for.

Mr. WALSH. Apparently the only work of continuation, as far as the construction goes now, that is necessary at this reservation is the installation of the settling basin.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; the settling basin is a part of the pumping plant.

Mr. WALSH. And I say that all of the rest of the pumping plant has been completed, except they need a larger settling basin?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order, on page 20, line 4, to the words "to be immediately available."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order. Clearly this comes within the rule that appro-

priations may be made in continuation of a project already in progress. Beginning in 1910 appropriations have been made for the construction and operation of this pumping plant. The pumping plant has been in existence since that time. It has been enlarged; settling basins have been added to it. This is an addition to that same plant. The appropriations for the maintenance and operation of the plant are a continuation of the work already in progress. I can not see that the item is at all subject to a point of order. It is an existing public work which must be maintained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman whether the provision that the funds are to be made immediately available is subject to the point of order?

Mr. HAYDEN. Is that the point of order that the gentleman from Massachusetts is making?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman in making the point of order did not state the point of order that he made. He made a general point of order against the item.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, no; I made the point of order against the words "to be immediately available," and cited the line and the page where those words are to be found.

Mr. HAYDEN. I can only say this to the gentleman: It makes very little difference as a practical proposition whether the money is available on the 1st day of July next or is available when this bill is signed, possibly two or three weeks before that time. I only know this, that there is now not a cent of money available for work on that project; that areas of land have been planted which greatly need water. It is requested by the Indian Office that this appropriation be made immediately available to prevent the Indians and the lessees from suffering a loss of their crops. Two or three weeks' time might be of inestimable advantage to them. It can do no possible injury to the Government to allow the money to be made immediately available.

Mr. WALSH. They can not expend $188,000 in two or three weeks.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; but such part as could be applied to operation and maintenance ought to be made available at this time. I can not see how it possibly could do any harm, while a substantial injury may be done to the Indians, and it is liable to be done, if this appropriation is not made available at once.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, it is usually the rule that the larger the appropriation in various items in many appropriation bills the greater the injury that is stated why the money should be made immediately available. This bill is for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920. There are various items in this paragraph, some of which are undoubtedly authorized by existing law; but I think the universal ruling of the Chairmen of Committees of the Whole has been that in a general appropriation bill, where the items are specifically set forth, to add the words "to be immediately available" makes the language subject to the point of order, being new legislation.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am not resisting the point of order, but I am merely appealing to the gentleman as a business proposition, because I think he is doing an injury by not letting this money become immediately available. If the gentleman insists, of course the point of order can be made.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist upon his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is clearly a change of existing law and sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the construction of seven new pumping plants, including the sinking of wells, installation of pumping machinery, construction of tanks for domestic and stock water, and necessary structures for the development and distribution of a supply of water for Papago Indian villages in southern Arizona, $38,000; for operation and maintenance of constructed works for these villages, $14,000; in all, $52,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I desire to ask what authority of law there exists for the construction of seven new pumping plants?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, there is no authority of law for it; it is clearly new matter carried in this bill. The Papago Indians live in the driest and most arid part of the United States. The question of their living there depends upon the water supply, and on that alone. It is highly advantageous to them that these wells be drilled so that they may have a larger supply of water for their stock and be able to drive cattle and horses farther away from existing wells. It is true in that country, as almost all over Arizona, that the limit of the stock-carrying capacity in any locality is not grass but is water supply. Horses and cows can go so far away from a well and can come back, but the richest grass in the world might be beyond that limit and yet not be available. The Indian Service has carefully explored this country to ascertain the areas where water can be obtained. They have purchased a well-drilling outfit to go from one part of the reservation to the other drilling these wells and thus create an increased water supply for the Indians.

Mr. WALSH. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the authorities are now drilling these wells, that this new apparatus has been purchased?

Mr. HAYDEN. The well-drilling apparatus was purchased three or four years ago, but they have not had sufficient funds to carry on the work.

Mr. WALSH. Well, the current law provides for the sinking of these various wells. Now you want to establish seven new pumping plants, and apparently you have only $18,000 for the establishment of those new plants, because the act of last year carried $20,000 under the first item of this paragraph.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Is it contemplated that they can sink other wells and install pumping machinery and construct tanks and other necessary structures and in addition to that establish seven new pumping plants for $38,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is not a very expensive matter to establish a pumping plant in connection with a well for domestic and stock water purposes. It merely takes a pump and a gasoline engine.

Mr. ELSTON. And that is separate from the well entirely?

Mr. HAYDEN. Of course, the wells must be dug.

Mr. WALSH. You must have the well hitched up to it somewhere in order to get the water.

Mr. HAYDEN. This appropriation authorizes the sinking of wells and installing of pumping plants, the construction of tanks for domestic and stock water purposes, and all of those are covered with the $38,000.

Mr. WALSH. So it includes the seven new pumping plants?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw the point of order?

Mr. WALSH. Well, I will withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing the development of a water supply for the Navajo and Hopi Indians on the Navajo, Moqui, Pueblo, Bonito, San Juan, and Western Navajo Reservations, $30,000, to be immediately available, reimbursable out of any funds of said Indians now or hereafter available.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. I will make it to the words "to be immediately available."

Mr. HAYDEN. It is admitted that those words are subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MADDEN). Does the gentleman make the point of order or reserve it?

Mr. WALSH. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the point of order, it is understood, was made to the words "immediately available," in line 24?

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the amount of $42,500 appropriated by the Indian appropriation act approved March 2, 1917 (39 Stat. L., p. 975), for the construction of two bridges over the Little Colorado and Canyon Diablo Rivers, near the Leupp Indian Agency, Ariz., is hereby reappropriated for the same purposes as provided in said act, to be immediately available, reimbursable as provided in said act, and to remain a charge and lien upon the lands and funds of the Navajo Tribe of Indians until paid.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the words "to be immediately available," page 22, line 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States the sum of $17,500 of any tribal funds on deposit to the credit of the Indians of the San Carlos Reservation in Arizona, and to expend the same for the operation and maintenance of pumping plants for irrigating the lands of the Indians on the said reservation, and for the installation of a tank or tanks for the economical handling of fuel oil for said pumping plants: *Provided*, That the sum so used shall be reimbursed to the tribe by the Indians benefited, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. This seems to be an entirely new project. I do not know what authorization there may exist for undertaking this work, and I would like to ask what particular necessity there is for undertaking this at the present time, and if it might not well go over to another year?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will look at the hearings, on page 135 he will find a very elaborate justification for this appropriation. The Indians on that reservation had an irrigation system drawing water from the Gila River,

but great floods came down that stream and washed out the headworks, so that it was impossible to get the water from the river into the canal. This pumping plant is to be built for the purpose of pumping the water into the irrigating canal. The money is not to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States but out of funds of the Indian tribe.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. Just a moment, Mr. Chairman. How extensive is this work of installing oil tanks?

Mr. HAYDEN. Distillate is brought from California for the purpose of operating the engines, and it is cheaper to buy it in carload lots. It is proposed to construct suitable tanks capable of holding carloads of distillate. Otherwise they would have to buy this fuel oil in iron drums.

Mr. WALSH. Do I understand the gentleman to say that this project has been deferred for a year or two?

Mr. SNYDER. The purchase of the tanks has been.

Mr. HAYDEN. The project was undertaken some years ago, but on account of the flood conditions the Indians have made comparatively little use of it. There are 1,400 acres there ready to be irrigated, and the Indians would like to have this pumping plant constructed at once.

Mr. WALSH. Was this agreed to in conference?

Mr. HAYDEN. This item passed the House in the last Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States the sum of $17,600 of any tribal funds on deposit to the credit of the Indians of the Fort Apache Reservation in Arizona, and to expend the same, in connection with an equal sum of the funds appropriated in this act for Indian school and agency buildings, for reconstructing, repairing, and improving the power plant and irrigation system on the Fort Apache Indian Reservation, Ariz.: *Provided*, That the tribal funds so expended shall be reimbursed to the tribe under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior: *And provided further*, That the sum of $17,600 of the amount appropriated in this act for Indian school and agency buildings is hereby set apart and reserved for this purpose.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph, and I would like to ask the chairman of the committee what is the necessity for this expenditure?

Mr. HAYDEN. You will find justification for it on page 136 of the hearings.

Mr. SNYDER. I will have to say to the gentleman that it has been so long since we went over that particular section I can not now really state the necessity for it.

Mr. HAYDEN. This is the situation, if the gentleman from Massachusetts would like to have information from me——

Mr. SNYDER. I would like to have the gentleman explain it.

Mr. HAYDEN. All the money heretofore expended upon the power plant and irrigation system at Fort Apache was directly out of the Treasury of the United States. Under this provision the Indians will pay for half of the cost of the necessary repairs and improvements. It is here directed that half of the expenditure, or $17,600, be made from their funds, and the other half from Government funds.

Mr. WALSH. Then the Government reimburses them?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the reimbursement is made by the Indians benefited to the tribal fund itself. I intend to offer an amendment on line 1, page 23, to insert the words, "by the Indians benefited," so as to make it conform to the language in the previous paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. I was about to direct the gentleman's attention to the fact.

Mr. HAYDEN. I offer the following amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment is in order until the point of order is disposed of. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts insist on his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. No; I will withdraw the point of order, in view of the information that has been given.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYDEN: Page 23, line 1, after the word "tribe" insert the words "by the Indians benefited."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For reimbursement of Yuma County, Ariz., for traveling and other expenses incurred by its county officers in the arrest, prosecution, and commitment of four Indian youths of the Colorado River Reservation to State institutions, $167.75, to be immediately available.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington and Mr. WALSH rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman did not make a point of order, but reserved it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the point of order was made. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he can see any objection to adding to this bill, in the right place, a new section, to read as follows:

That after the passage and approval of this act all Indians who have served with the armed forces of the United States during the European War shall be citizens of the United States and possess all the rights and privileges thereof: *Provided*, That said Indians shall forfeit none of their rights to tribal funds or lands.

Mr. SNYDER. I will say to the gentleman that the Committee on Indian Affairs was called together this morning to consider this particular matter, it having been mentioned so many times yesterday, and after going over the matter very carefully we found that there were so many difficulties surrounding it that it was impossible for us, in the time that we had, to prepare an amendment that would cover the question. So we determined to introduce a bill to-day covering the question; and the committee agreed to make it the first business of the committee and report it as their first bill after the appropriation bill. The bill has been presented, and the subcommittee has been appointed to prepare and perfect a bill that will make it possible to do what the gentleman has suggested in his amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman think if such a bill is placed on the calendar there could be any possible objection to its passage?

Mr. SNYDER. I do not see how there could possibly be any objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For support and education of 680 Indian pupils at the Sherman Institute, Riverside, Calif., including pay of superintendent, $138,600; for general repairs and improvements, $15,000; in all, $153,600: *Provided*, That not to exceed $20,000 may be expended from Indian moneys, Proceeds of labor, Sherman Institute, for the purchase of land and water rights, the title to which is to be held in the United States.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order on the proviso.

Mr. WALSH. What is this question of land and water rights to be acquired out there?

Mr. SNYDER. It is claimed that they have not sufficient water for the proper care and maintenance of the school, and in order to provide it, it is necessary to purchase more land.

Mr. HAYDEN. You will find it in the hearings at the bottom of page 141; a short paragraph there.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman will find it is well covered in the hearings. Additional farm land is required at this school, to cost $20,000. This is a good school; one of the schools where the children are taught vocational education, and particularly in the vocation of agriculture, and it is necessary to add some more property in order to provide occupation for the children and to get a further supply of vegetables, and so forth, for the use of the school.

Mr. WALSH. I think they have some 40 acres out there already. Has the present supply run out?

Mr. HAYDEN. As the gentleman will notice from the hearings, the school authorities are now renting 240 acres of land, in scattered tracts, to be cultivated by the Indian students at this school. It is proposed, instead of renting land, to buy land with this money and add it to the school farm.

Mr. SNYDER. This is one of the best managed institutions under the direction of the bureau, and the committee thought it advisable to permit that number of acres to be added to the project, so that the development of school supplies for the needs of the school could be intensified, at least, to the extent of taking care of the requirements of the school. They may also sell some of the products of their farm.

Mr. WALSH. They own 40 acres of land and want to buy 240?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes. They rent more than that now in addition to what they own.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the reservation of the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For reclamation and maintenance charge on Yuma allotments, $131,564.94, to be reimbursed from the sale of surplus lands or from other funds that may be available, in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. L., p. 1063).

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph, and wish to ask the reason for the increase in this item.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Yuma reclamation project was declared completed by the Secretary of the Interior and the charges for reclamation fixed. This is the first of 20 annual payments that it will be necessary to pay for the entire cost of that project. A contract was entered into by the Indian Service on behalf of the Indians with the Reclamation Service requiring that full payment be made for the cost of water service to the Indian lands. When the surplus Indian land is sold the United States will be reimbursed, and if enough money is not received from that source when final patents are issued to the Indians they must pay out the same as white men.

Mr. WALSH. The charge on the Yuma allotments in the current law was about $15,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly; but that was merely for the operation and maintenance of the project while in process of construction. It has now been completed, and this is the first year in which the construction charges must be paid.

Mr. WALSH. If that is so, you will have to change the language of the act, will you not?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; there is no necessity for any change in the act. It says, "For reclamation and maintenance charges."

Mr. WALSH. Yes; and that was the language you carried before you began to make the payments.

Mr. HAYDEN. That may be true, but it fully covers the case now. It was a reclamation charge and a maintenance charge, the bulk of it now being the cost of the reclamation of the land as part of the Yuma project.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question, if he will yield.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] yield?

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts withdraws the point of order.

Mr. McKENZIE. I simply desire to ask the gentleman of the committee in charge of the bill if this scheme of reclamation now being carried out was brought about at the suggestion of the Indians living on these allotted lands, or is it a part of the general reclamation scheme that has been carried on by the Interior Department?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Yuma reclamation project includes about 75,000 acres of land, a part of it—some four or five thousand acres—being on the Indian reservation. The main canal from the Colorado River passes through the Yuma Indian Reservation, and therefore makes possible the irrigation of Indian lands. The Yuma Indians are furnished with water on the same basis as the white people, but the Indians being poverty stricken and unable to pay the charges, the Federal Government is advancing the money now for them to pay the cost of reclamation. The money so advanced is to be reimbursed later to the United States from the sale of surplus lands on the reservation.

Mr. McKENZIE. Can the gentleman say whether or not, in his judgment, this has been a wise expenditure of the public money?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, there is no question about it. The Colorado River Valley contains the most fertile land in the United States. Lands near Yuma owned by white men, to my own knowledge, are now renting at $30 an acre.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For support and education of 100 Indian pupils at the Greenville Indian School, California, including pay of superintendent, $24,000; for general repairs and improvements, including developing and installation of water supply and the purchase of land and water rights, $10,000; for purchase of dairy cows and farming implements, $1,200; in all, $35,200.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. DYER. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill a question. I notice in this paragraph and the one preceding and many others where provision is made for the support and education of certain Indian pupils, including pay of superintendent. Can the gentleman tell me how much of that $24,000 in this item, in the paragraph beginning with line 8, is for the pay of the superintendent?

Mr. SNYDER. I can tell you, I think. That is at the Fort Little School. The superintendent receives $1,500 a year.

Mr. DYER. The same as to the Greenville Indian School in California?

Mr. SNYDER. I think it will be the same.

Mr. DYER. Who appoints those superintendents?

Mr. SNYDER. Those are appointed by the superintendent of the reservation or by the Indian Service.

Mr. DYER. Are they appointed upon competitive examination?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes. They are all civil-service employees.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing the construction of a road from Hoopa to Weitchpec, on the Hoopa Valley Reservation, in Humboldt County, Calif., in conformity with plans approved by the Secretary of the Interior, $10,000, to be immediately available, and to be reimbursed out of any funds of the Indians of said reservation now or hereafter placed to their credit in the Treasury of the United States, in accordance with the Indian appropriation act of May 25, 1918 (40 Stats. L., pp. 570, 571).

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the words "to be immediately available" in lines 22 and 23.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of obtaining some information, with a view to offering an amendment. The Committee on Indian Affairs did not hold any hearings on the present bill, except those that were held last year?

Mr. SNYDER. The committee held no hearings where witnesses were questioned. They held several meetings.

Mr. RAKER. I mean during this session.

Mr. SNYDER. We called no witnesses.

Mr. RAKER. There is an item that was in the last bill as it passed the Senate but which was not agreed to by the House conferees. We appeared before the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and presented the facts as fully as we could, and we had them at hand, and the Senate allowed the item unanimously; but it was not concurred in by the House conferees. We did not get all the facts, because the Indian Bureau, as well as the Board of Indian Commissioners, agreed to make an investigation and report as to the condition of these California Indians, so that when the next appropriation bill came up we might legislate intelligently on the matter and provide for these Indians as they should be provided for. But in the meantime they allowed an item of $20,000 for the purpose of caring for these nonreservation homeless Indians. While I do not desire to take the time, and I do not know whether the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. SNYDER] has gone into the question, it seems to me that we ought to have at least this $20,000 for the present, until the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Board of Indian Commissioners can investigate the condition of these California Indians.

Away back in 1851 and 1852 there were 23 treaties made with the Indians in California. By some hook or crook, because of the value of the mineral lands at that time, these treaties were not approved, and these Indians in California, who ought to be among the well-provided-for Indians of the United States, because of what they gave up and because of the lands to which they are entitled, have been only partially provided for. The purpose of the California members is to get the full data and facts, so that we may provide for these Indians in the future. I would like to have the committee put this small amendment on this bill. I will read it before I offer it:

Page 25, line 3, after the end of line 3, insert as a new paragraph the following:

"For the relief and care of nonreservation Indians in California in destitute circumstances, for the prevention and treatment of tuberculosis, trachoma, conjunctivitis, smallpox, and other diseases, and including the transportation of patients to and from county hospitals and almshouses, and to special physicians when necessary, $20,000; said fund to be expended under contract with county supervisors and under such regulations and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided*, That not to exceed 50 per cent of the actual cost of such service to the supervisors shall be paid from said fund."

That amendment was unanimously allowed by the Senate committee. The facts as presented to that committee appealed to them so strongly that they urged the department officials, the head of whom was there, to make the necessary report, so that these Indians might be properly provided for.

Tuberculosis is raging among these Indians; trachoma is raging amongst them. Poverty stalks among them at all times, and the people have been trying to provide for them by contributions, as was stated by the ladies and the distinguished men present; and I should like to see this provision made in this bill, and would like to have the chairman of the committee offer this amendment himself, if he will.

Mr. SNYDER. I will say to the gentleman that while my sympathy is with him and his people down in that section of California, I do not feel justified in inserting any new matter in this bill, and this looks like going out and bringing back into the fold Indians who have gone astray.

Mr. RAKER. These Indians have been in a poor way for these many years. They have been given some consideration by the Government. The various counties of the State and the State itself, as well as private individuals all over California, have been assisting in this matter, but it is a reproach to this Government, when we look over the past history of the California Indians, and see how they have been buffeted about from pillar to post, their property taken from them, and no consideration given them, when, as a matter of fact, if they had the land that they are entitled to and which was agreed to be given to them under these 23 treaties they would be equal to the Oklahoma Indians, among the richest in the United States.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McKENZIE. What is the status of these Indians?

Mr. RAKER. Their status is very bad, so bad that they have not had much to eat and very little to wear.

Mr. McKENZIE. I mean under the law what is their status? Are they tramps or itinerants?

Mr. RAKER. They have their various localities where they stay, and they go from place to place and live in wicki-ups and wigwams, and sometimes they survive and sometimes they do not. Twenty years ago there were about 40,000 of them, and now their number has been reduced to 20,000. They have been neglected for many years. It is time that we take care of them.

Mr. SNYDER. I will say to the gentleman that the committee expect to be in session frequently, and if he will present a bill covering this matter we will be very glad to give it consideration and give him a hearing on it at any time.

Mr. RAKER. If I introduce a special bill and get a report from the department on it, will the committee consider such a bill for the relief of these Indians, notwithstanding the general bill?

Mr. SNYDER. We will consider it on its merits.

Mr. RAKER. I mean nothing else except its merits.

Mr. SNYDER. We will consider it on its merits and pass on it when it comes before the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I will.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is this the matter that was brought to the attention of the committee by George Wharton James and a number of other gentlemen from California?

Mr. RAKER. It has been brought to my attention by personal contact and observation for 40 years. Because I have been fortunate enough to come to this great House as a Member, gentlemen have called my attention to it, as many others have. I have seen this condition from a boy up. I have seen people go without clothing to wear or enough of it, and I have seen them diseased, driven from pillar to post, when other Indians have been provided for. I am not criticizing the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House, because we have not had the data and had no opportunity to present it to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HAYDEN. I want to suggest to the gentleman, as I did to Mr. James, when he and others called on me in the last Congress, that Congress had appropriated $20,000, and the Indian Bureau had spent only $250 for that purpose, leaving $19,750. I suggested that before he came to Congress for more appropriations he should visit the Indian Bureau and induce them to spend the money already appropriated.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. They spent $180 to give a man a trip to California, and it was not spent for the Indians at all.

Mr. RAKER. Oh, I hope the gentleman from Kansas will not bring anything like that into this controversy. The matter that the gentleman from Arizona referred to was for the purchase of land. The land will not give the Indians something to eat or cure their tuberculosis. It will not cure the smallpox. Our people had smallpox brought in by the Indians, and in my county we spent $15,000 to prevent the spread of that smallpox. The matter the gentleman refers to relates to land, and it takes money to make these investigations. I am very much disappointed that the chairman can not see his way clear to offer this amendment. I will say this, that I will re-present the matter to the Senate again; they will have hearings on the bill, and we will come back with all the facts and all the graciousness we can, with the truth in our behalf, and present the matter, hoping that it will be put into the bill. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

FLORIDA.

SEC. 4. For relief of distress among the Seminole Indians in Florida, and for purposes of their civilization and education, $20,000, including the construction and equipment of necessary buildings.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 7, after the word "education," strike out the figures "$20,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$10,000."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, in support of this amendment I direct the attention of the committee to the fact that the year ending June 30, 1918, Congress appropriated $8,000 for this very purpose—relieving the distress among the Seminoles. Of that sum only $1,022 was expended. Last year we appropriated $10,000, and this year we are asked to appropriate $20,000.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS], who, of course, is very familiar with phases of Indian matters, when a similar bill was up before the committee in the Sixty-fifth Congress presented the apparent necessity for the relief of the Seminole Indians. I understand from a hasty perusal of the hearings that somebody, apparently of the Indian Bureau, sent a man down there named Frank Brandon, who went through the camp making an investigation of the condition of these Seminole Indians. I understand that he was a Cherokee Indian and unable to speak the Seminole language, and possibly that accounts for the surprisingly small expenditure made of the $8,000 appropriation. But it seems to me that unless this is a matter which comes within the general supervision of the Indian Bureau it is a subject that should receive some consideration by the State. We have listened to the eloquent plea of the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], who wishes to cure some of the worthy red men in his district of tuberculosis, smallpox, conjunctivitis, and other serious diseases in that great wealthy State of California. I believe from the perusal of the facts set forth before the committee that the gentleman from California presents a far more worthy case for an appropriation than the facts warrant in this case. But as I understand it, the Federal Government has expended some money down there; we have established a precedent and recognized the principle, but it does not seem to me that this is quite the proper time to be doubling up on appropriations for this purpose. They have jacked it up since 1918 from $8,000 to $20,000, and it is not justified.

Furthermore, I should like to know—I assume that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS], who has been on his feet since I offered the amendment, is waiting to give the information—just how this $20,000 is to be expended. I think, Mr. Chairman, in view of the manner in which increases have been made in other items of the bill, particularly for the support of schools and civilized Indians, that to double an appropriation made for this purpose is extremely unwise. I trust that the chairman of the committee will see fit to accept the amendment that I have offered decreasing the figures from $20,000 to $10,000.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I trust the gentleman from Massachusetts will not insist on the motion he has made cutting down this appropriation, and that if he does insist the Members of this House will vote down the motion. There are those in the House who can make a much stronger statement than I can make upon the subject, because I may be influenced by local surroundings, but I trust I am not. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] knows the conditions of the Seminoles, and I am only sorry that Mr. Norton and Mr. ELLSWORTH are not present also on that side of the House to make a statement.

In 1832, under a treaty entered into by this Government, $250,000 was left in the Treasury for the Seminole Indians in Florida should they ever remove to the West. I contend that money is still theirs, if they should move to the West, but they prefer to remain in Florida. They have never been conquered, yet they are a law-abiding people. They are not citizens and they have no rights of citizenship. The State of Florida out of her own generosity, rather than any moral obligation, following the suggestion of the Committee on Indian Affairs, Republicans and Democrats, which was sent down there to investigate conditions, gave to the Seminole Indians a hundred thousand acres of land, and this $20,000 is for the purpose of building for them schoolhouses and giving to them some assistance. It might be surprising to my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] to learn that while these Indians have lived there ever since 1832, and prior thereto, the Seminole Indians of Florida to-day are the only real Indians that I know of in the United States. They have kept themselves apart; they have not mixed or mingled with the white race; and they pride themselves upon their honesty, their virtue, and their integrity. The committee which made the investigation was only struck with the one ap-

palling fact; that they still mistrusted the white man and they still believe that the white man will not give them justice. That will be borne out by my colleague from Kansas, Mr. CAMPBELL, and my good friend, Mr. TILLMAN, and others on the Indian Committee. It is nothing but right that these Indians should receive some relief, and this same appropriation was passed overwhelmingly by the House at the last session.

Just one word of suggestion to my good friend from Massachusetts as to the amount of money expended. And my colleague the chairmon of this committee will bear me out in the assertion, as will also other Members of the House. I have always fought the appropriation of money for Indians unless the Indians receive the money. I am on record during the past Congress and I am going on record before the House to-day that if we can not secure for the Indians, for their immediate relief, the $20,000, I shall stop asking the membership of the House to give them any relief. I do not believe in making an appropriation and wasting it. I have tried for four years, and the House has been good to me, and it has made appropriation after appropriation, and yet you can only get about one thousand dollars of the eight or ten thousand dollars expended. The good citizens of Fort Lauderdale and Miami, during the influenza epidemic, with this money lying in the Treasury for the relief of the Indians, hired physicians with their own money; bought coffins with their own money; and buried the Indians who were unfortunate enough to die during that epidemic, with the Government of the United States, I claim, failing to do its part.

Mr. EMERSON. Where do these Seminoles live?

Mr. SEARS. The Seminoles, when I first went to Florida in 1880, lived near my home town.

Mr. EMERSON. I thought they lived in the Everglades.

Mr. SEARS. They first lived at or near Tallahassee, but the white man has gradually forced them back and back and back. In 1880, as I say, it was no uncommon sight to see the Seminole Indians walking the streets of my home town, Kissimmee. To-day they are living down on the southern, eastern, and western edge of Lake Okechobee, nearly 100 miles from there.

Mr. EMERSON. And that is in the Everglades?

Mr. SEARS. Practically. They go out and clear up a piece of land and in some cases, I am told, build a house upon it—I concede they have no title to the land—and then some white man would file on the land or purchase same. Then the Indian would be told to move on, and, rather than have any trouble, he would move on. And they have been driven back and back until they can go no farther, and to protect them the State of Florida has given them 100,000 acres of land where they are living and around where they are living. And now we are only asking the Government to carry out a part of the moral obligation that we feel is due them in order that they may receive some education and relief.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, the report of the hearings will show that for four years I have been consistently against this proposition. The final statement in the report of this year shows that I said then that in reality we must look upon it as a moral responsibility more than a legal one, and that was conceded by the commissioner and by all of the members of the committee. There was never any legal responsibility on the part of the Government to take these Seminoles back into the fold of the Indian Bureau. Year after year for four years we have been prevailed on to put something in the bill for the benefit of these Indians. I have contended all of the time that it was a State burden, and that the State should take care of its own paupers the same as any other State in the Union.

Mr. SEARS. The chairman is absolutely correct, but I still insist that my point is well taken, that if the Seminoles should move to Oklahoma to-day, under the treaty entered into by the Government, they would be entitled to the $250,000 and at least 3 per cent interest from 1832 down to the present date.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman will concede that they had a right to go 100 years ago, of which they did not avail themselves.

Mr. SEARS. The treaty says whenever they may go.

Mr. SNYDER. And they have chosen to stay where they are. Notwithstanding that, they want us to increase this appropriation every year, and after doing that we can not get the department to expend any of it. The amendment as offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is the same amount that was carried in the bill when it passed the House. I think it is a sufficient amount and the amendment is acceptable to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, some years ago I was at Miami and close enough to the reservation to go out and see the Seminole Indians. I became interested in them. They were at that time about the only Indians in the United States for which the Government was not doing something. They were a clean, self-supporting, fine-looking lot of people, without schools, without churches, without homes, without hope.

White people were closing in on them and crowding them closer and closer, and about the only places they had were little knolls in the swamps to live on. In making up the next Indian appropriation bill I asked that an item be placed in the bill, with a view of investigating their status and to see whether or not something could be done for those Indians. That was some five or six years ago, and we have been appropriating about $10,000 a year for the Seminole Indians ever since. The Seminole Indians have had absolutely no benefits out of that. Somebody who was sent down there has spent somewhere in the neighborhood of $1,000 or $1,100 a year. The money has never been spent for the benefit of those Indians. I would make this item $50,000 gladly if the money could be spent for the benefit of the Seminole Indians and show results. Whether or not this item shall be $10,000 or $20,000 is a matter of small concern if the Seminole Indians can get some benefit. I think the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] agrees with me perfectly on this matter. We have been unable to get any action by the Bureau of Indian Affairs that has resulted in any benefit to the Seminole Indians. Congress has done everything it can do with respect to the matter, and whether this item is $10,000 or $20,000 makes very little difference if the policy is pursued for the next fiscal year that has been pursued in the past four years in respect to this appropriation.

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SEARS. The gentleman recalls my statement when this was up before the committee, that unless we could get it expended for the benefit of the Indians I would not even ask the committee for an appropriation, but I want the House to give the $20,000, that I may have a chance during the next 12 months to see if I can not get it expended in the interests of the Indians. If we do not, it will stay in the fund; so nobody is hurt.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I recall the statement of the gentleman from Florida with respect to this item, and I do not know why the item was increased, or why it should be increased, in view of the attitude of the Bureau of Indian Affairs heretofore with the appropriations already made. If the gentleman from Florida wants the amount increased, I am disposed to agree with him. My interest in the Seminole Indians is so great that I want something done for the Seminoles, and I am opposed to making appropriations from year to year and having a small amount of it used for the benefit of somebody who wants to make a trip to Florida, and the Indians get absolutely nothing out of it in the way of benefit.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman, I rise rather to support the item in this bill as reported by the committee. I think this is as meritorious, if not the most meritorious, appropriation that is contained in this bill and I feel at full liberty to speak about it because it does not affect my own State. It is to be expended wholly within the State of Florida. I agree heartily with much that has been said by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL]. I share with him his criticism of the department that declines or fails to expend the money. I believe any appropriation by the Congress of the United States of a sum of money is in effect a command upon the particular department that it ought to be expended in the way that Congress intended it should be. Now, some three years ago Congress provided by an amendment in the Indian appropriation bill for a committee to investigate the various Indian tribes, and in March, 1917, a part of the Committee on Indian Affairs, of which I happened to be then a member, started out upon this investigation, and the first place we went was to investigate the condition of the Seminoles of Florida, and I want to say to the House and I want to say to the country that no man has sufficient language to exaggerate the conditions of the Seminole Indians in Florida. They are the most backward Indians on the face of the earth. They are the least civilized of any Indians that I have ever known of or ever read about. There are approximately about 600 of these Seminole Indians in Florida, almost all of them of pure blood. I will surprise the House when I tell you that of the 600 there are only one or perhaps two who ever entered a schoolhouse; one boy who seemed to be precocious had been taken charge of by some white friend and he had been induced to enter a school and made a very fine record, and we also understood that his sister or some relative or perhaps two of them had been induced to enter a white school. Now, let me say to the House that as far as the testimony disclosed before the committee they did not have a single school that the Seminole children attended. More than that, they did not have a single missionary among them. There is not a single Seminole child who ever went to a Sunday school. There are no preachers, as I stated a moment ago, and

there has absolutely nothing been done to civilize them. They have been living down there, as my friend from Florida says, around Lake Okechobee and around the Everglades of Florida. When Florida was sparsely settled they made a living by hunting and fishing. They killed plumed birds down there and would sell their plumes to the white traders for a splendid sum. Florida has passed a law preventing them doing that, so that means of making a livelihood was closed. I am not criticizing that. Railroads have been built through various parts of Florida, particularly along the eastern coast. Cities have been built up, and the population of Florida has been greatly increased so that the Indians are crowded back into the interior, and there is very little hunting and fishing for them. Now, they do not have any homes. They live in little camps in tents, and whenever the land is homesteaded upon which they were on they simply moved to another place. Now, that is the condition of these Seminoles in Florida. They are in a terribly bad condition.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. Just for some information. When the Federal Government made an arrangement with the Seminole Tribe to remove them to the State of Oklahoma it was unfortunate that all the Seminole Indians did not go and participate in the Government's allotments given to them out there and become wards of the Government, but remained in the State of Florida as citizens or, you might say, subjects of the State of Florida.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McKENZIE. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have two or three minutes longer.

Mr. HASTINGS. Three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McKENZIE. If the gentleman will yield further, what I want to get at is this: These Seminole Indians at the present time are not under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government or the Bureau of Indian Affairs, are they?

Mr. HASTINGS. No.

Mr. McKENZIE. That being true, by what authority could the Commissioner of Indian Affairs or any Federal officer expend money such as authorized in this appropriation without further legislation?

Mr. HASTINGS. Well, they can do it provided we authorize it. For instance, if we make an appropriation and authorize the expenditure for the purpose of the support and civilization of those Indians, that money can be expended.

Mr. McKENZIE. If we go that far and authorize the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to expend this money for the benefit of the Indians in Florida, will we not then again assume jurisdiction of those Indians and they become wards of the Government in the State of Florida?

Mr. HASTINGS. If the gentleman from Illinois could have gone with this committee down there and visited those camps that they occupy and seen the pitiable condition of those Indians there, he would not hesitate, I venture to say, to vote ten times this amount in order that they might be cared for.

Mr. McKENZIE. If the gentleman will pardon me, I am perfectly ready and willing to do anything for these unfortunate people; and I feel, as the gentleman does perhaps, that on account of their ignorance some advantage has been taken of them, and I feel our Government ought to do justice to them. But we must so legislate that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs shall have the right to expend money that we appropriate here.

Mr. HASTINGS. I do not think there would be any doubt but that he has the right to expend it, provided we make an appropriation, but the trouble has been that the Indian Office has been investigating, and the money has not been expended. And I agree with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] and the chairman of the committee, and with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] in their criticism of the nonexpenditure of this money. I think it ought to be expended, and I think it can be wisely expended, and I think in such a way as to greatly help the Seminoles down there in the State of Florida. And I believe it is a meritorious appropriation. I do not believe at the present time the amount ought to be reduced, and hence I hope that the amendment that reduces it will not be adopted.

Mr. SNYDER. I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks there is any more reason now why it should be made $20,000 than we originally made the bill?

Mr. HASTINGS. I never did think that $10,000, taking into consideration what I know of the condition of the Seminoles, the number of them, and how they are scattered over the country, was sufficient, and particularly in view of the action of the Florida Legislature, as I understand, in granting a large area of land to the Seminoles down there, I do not think the original appropriation was sufficient, and I believe we ought to make an appropriation in an amount sufficient that they can make some little showing among the Seminoles this coming year.

Mr. SNYDER. If the gentleman will permit, certainly it is large enough an amount until they can demonstrate they can expend the money and do something with it.

Mr. HASTINGS. I will say frankly, Mr. Chairman, the money has not been expended or was not expended last year. I do not know what has been done in the last five or six months, but up to that time it had not been expended. The failure to expend the money met with the criticism of all the Members who were in Florida and knew the conditions down there. I do not believe there is a single member of the investigating committee but who agrees with me about the condition of the Seminoles down there in Florida, and that the statement of their condition can not be overdrawn, and that you can not find language to overstate it.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes, to answer the questions asked by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SEARS. My colleague is fair and wants to be fair. The fact of the business is this: In 1832 the United States entered into a treaty with the Seminole Indians. It is claimed—but I do not know whether it is true or not—that the Indians representing the Seminoles were made drunk by the white people. It is a fact that the treaty was signed by the Indians by their mark, showing that they could not write their names. It is signed by the representatives of the United States, but there were no witnesses to the transaction. It gave to the United States the entire State of Florida. The Government thereby recognized that the Seminoles owned the State. The gentleman will not deny that. These 600 Indians have always denied the right of those Indians representing them to sign that treaty for them. And they contend, and I contended to the Indian Committee, on account of their ignorance the treaty was not binding, and that there is at least a moral obligation resting upon us. The gentleman knows no court will hold that a deed signed by myself and my wife by our marks and without any witnesses is a good deed. I could come in and set it aside. But the Indian has no court to come to. He is simply coming to the Congress through myself as a representative of the people—they can not vote—asking that you give them something in the nature of relief.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

I feel that these Seminole Indians ought to be treated as human beings or as animals. Now, if human beings, they ought to be brought out of the Everglades somehow and educated. I visited them a little over a year ago, and I want to concur in everything that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS] has said concerning their condition. And when we entered into any treaty with them it was like entering into a treaty with a lot of alligators down there. I do not have any idea that they had any conception of what the treaty meant. They are the most ignorant class of people I ever saw; they are the most primitive class of people I ever saw. They were all barefooted. They live up in the swamps and Everglades, where no white man would think of living. I have not any recollection, as my friend from Kansas says, that they were clean, unless they had fallen into the water of the swamp accidentally.

The women wear 40 or 50 rows of beads around their necks—the most peculiar thing I ever saw in my life. Those strings of beads look like a great muffler such as a farmer up in New England might wear in the depth of winter. Forty or fifty or seventy-five rows of beads are worn, and one row is supposed to be worn for each year of their age.

I think something should be done for this class of people. They should be brought out into a state of civilization.

Mr. HASTINGS. Did the gentleman examine their camps?

Mr. EMERSON. No; I did not.

Mr. HASTINGS. If the gentleman will permit me, I wish to say that I went down to one of those camps, and I do not think they had 10 cents' worth of breadstuff there for 40 or 50 people to live on. They had no houses. They had what they call thatched tents. They put up four posts and cover them with thatch, and put down a board floor, 2 or 3 feet from the ground, and they sleep there. They may have a wagon cover or sheet, or something of that kind, but it is impossible for a man to find language properly to describe the condition of those Seminoles. If we make a gratuitous appropriation for Indians in the West, I do not believe that any man who has gone down

there and has seen those Indians as I saw them and as the committee saw them would deny that something ought to be done to take care of them. They have no schools or churches or anything.

Mr. EMERSON. I may say that after looking at them I decided not to visit them in their camp. I thought I would go back to Miami, where I was staying.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, the Seminole Indians are a strong, virile race of people, primitive, ignorant, and uncivilized, but evidence of their virility is given in the fact that they have lived right up against the white man's civilization for lo, these many generations, and still have not as yet accepted one iota of it. They live in a manner just as primitive, they are just as much native tribesmen, as when the great Genoese navigator landed on the sunny shores of San Salvador.

Mr. EMERSON. And wear the same clothes.

Mr. CARTER. They have not changed their mode of life at all. They are the one tribe of Indians in the United States who, man, woman, and child, have totally rejected the white man's civilization and even the white man's Christianity. I was told on the stand, by preachers and missionaries among them, and by one or two of the Seminoles themselves, that never had a native Florida Seminole been in a house of worship of the white man, and that they never expected to enter any except their own places of worship, where they expected to pursue for the remainder of their lives their devotion to the Great Spirit and entertain their hope of eventually attaining the happy hunting grounds.

These primitive people at one time owned the entire peninsula of Florida. They have been divested of title, they have been divested of possession, in order that the white man might have a home, in order that the white man, the United States citizen, might be given some convenient place on which he could pursue the method of his livelihood.

There are only about 600 of those Seminoles left, and it would not cost this Government a great deal to take care of that small band of Indians. It will cost more, perhaps, per capita to civilize and educate them on account of their obstinate disposition than it would to educate any other class of people in the United States.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. In just a moment. But when once they have been educated, when once they have been raised to the plane of civilization which the white man has attained, they will make citizens equal to the white man. Now I yield to my friend.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. After this appropriation is made it seems to me the difficulty may be in expending it for the benefit of those Indians. As I understand it, they do not care for anything connected with the white man's civilization. I wish the gentleman could tell us how this money can be expended.

Mr. CARTER. I will get to that. The gentleman is now complaining that the appropriation heretofore made is not expended. I have complained of that myself, and I have complained of it to the Indian Bureau. But we must take into consideration a true estimate of the conditions. When you find a people who like these will not accept civilization, and have sufficient virility to do so successfully, you have a more difficult task in spending money for civilization than with respect to other Indian tribes or members of other Indian tribes who will accept civilization. The Indian Bureau has had men in Florida heretofore. They have tried to induce the Indians to go into the schools, to become connected with churches. Seminoles and Creek Indians speaking the Seminole language have gone from Oklahoma at their own expense and have taken an interest in those Indians. They have tried to bring them to some degree of civilization, but all their efforts to teach them have been failures. Nevertheless I believe that if the proper persons can be sent among them, if the Indian Bureau will adopt the policy of sending among the Florida Seminoles none but persons who can speak the Seminole language, people of their own blood, a great deal of good could be accomplished. The Indian Bureau can find many teachers, preachers, and others from among the Seminoles and Creeks in Oklahoma who would delight to undertake this task.

It will not take a great many of them. There are many teachers there who are teaching in the schools now who would be glad to take the responsibility, would be glad to try to elevate those who are in fact their own kith and kin. I think if that policy were pursued and if our Indian Bureau were to send to them some intelligent people who can speak to them in their own language their confidence could be gained and something could be done that will preserve and keep them from utter ruin and extermination. Those people have within them the traits of good citizenship, if we can only develop them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. CARTER. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. I wish to suggest that it is probably not known that the Seminoles of Florida speak the Mississippi language, and attempts have sometimes been made to send among them Seminoles from Oklahoma who speak the Muskogee language.

Mr. CARTER. I may say to my friend that the Seminoles from Oklahoma conversed with the Florida Seminoles fluently and with no difficulty. If I remember correctly, one of the Creeks from Oklahoma acted as interpreter at one of our hearings. He had no difficulty in making himself understood, and the Seminole Indians seemed to have more confidence in him than they had in those who could not speak their language.

When we were down on this trip the citizens of Florida seemed to hail our coming there as an event foreshadowing the purchase from the State of a large area of land for the Seminoles in Florida. We had several hearings there, and, as chairman of the committee, I thought it well to dispel that idea as much as possible, so I made a statement, which was carried to the newspapers, to the effect that the furnishing of land for the Seminoles was not in any sense of the word a task for the Federal Government to perform; that the Federal Government had turned over to the State of Florida all of the public land within that State; that if the Indians had any claim at all it was to the lands of Florida originally and those of no other State; that since the State of Florida had acquired those lands as a gratuity, I think, from the Federal Government, I was sure Congress would look upon the proposition of furnishing land as a State proposition and not a Federal one; but I concluded by saying that so far as I was concerned—and I could speak only as one Member of the House—if the State of Florida would undertake to furnish land for the Seminole Indians I would advocate, as best I could, the appropriation of sufficient funds to educate them, and teach them how to cultivate the land, and give them the elements of a common-school education at the expense of the Federal Government.

Since that time the State of Florida has set aside about 100,000 acres for the Florida Seminoles, and the persons interested in that work have advised me that there are sufficient hummocks and other lands in that grant subject to cultivation to furnish agricultural sustenance for the Seminoles. So if we provide schools for them out of this $20,000, and if the money is used judiciously, perhaps we can finally coax them into the schools. If this can be done, I have no doubt we can make good citizens out of 600 people who probably otherwise will disappear in the Everglades and lie in unmarked graves within the next few years.

Now, just a word to my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] about the amount of the appropriation. As I recall the bill as it passed the House last session this item contained $10,000 and an unexpended balance. The Senate increased it to $40,000. We insisted on the House proposition; but after looking into it we found that the appropriation and the unexpended balance would amount to $28,000 or $29,000, so we reduced the amount to make it only $20,000. I think these Indians are entitled to another trial. As a matter of fact, they have never had any fair trial as yet, so let us agree that the Indian Bureau at least is entitled to another trial. Therefore I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will not insist upon his amendment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For improvement and maintenance and operation of the Fort Hall irrigation system, $50,000, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That expenditures hereunder for improvements shall be reimbursable to the United States in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 1, 1907.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the words "to be immediately available," in lines 14 and 15.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay to the authorities of Kansas City, Kans., the sum of $1,000 in consideration of the agreement of said authorities forever to maintain and care for the Huron Cemetery, a tract of land in the city of Kansas City, Kans., owned by the Government of the United States, as provided in the contract for said purposes with the said city of Kansas City, Kans., the use of which was conveyed by treaty to the Wyandotte Tribe of Indians as a cemetry for members of said tribe, such payment

to be made from the $10,000 appropriated for the preservation and improvement of said cemetery by the act of September 8, 1916 (39 Stats. L., p. 844).

Mr. WALSH. I reserve a point of order.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I suggest to the chairman of the committee that there is an error in the spelling, in line 19, of the word "cemetery," which ought to be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will make the correction.

There was no objection.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman from Massachusetts has reserved a point of order.

Mr. WALSH. I should like a little information about this item. It seems that we are going to pay $1,000 of Government money in consideration of an agreement with somebody to do something, nothing having been done as yet.

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] is very much interested in this item. When the matter was before the House in the last session he gave a very complete explanation of it. I think he is about the only person in the House competent to explain it fully. If it is agreeable to the chairman of the committee, it seems to me we might as well pass over this paragraph until the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] is here, if the gentleman from Massachusetts insists on obtaining first-hand information.

Mr. SNYDER. There is a justification for this item here in the report. I recall that at the time the bill was on the floor before we held the matter in abeyance until the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] got some information on the subject from Kansas City.

This does not involve the appropriation of any additional funds. The act of September 8, 1916, Thirty-ninth Statutes at Large, page 844, appropriated $10,000 for the preservation and improvement of Huron Cemetery, a tract of land in the city of Kansas City, Kans., owned by the Government of the United States, the use of which was conveyed by treaty to the Wyandotte Tribe of Indians as a cemetery for the members of said tribe.

In pursuance of the above act, contracts have been entered into for the repair and improvement of the cemetery, and said contracts have been completed. To further carry out the purpose of the act with reference to the preservation thereof, a contract was entered into with the city of Kansas City to the effect that for and in consideration of the payment of $1,000 by the United States and for other considerations named in the contract, the city of Kansas City agreed to forever maintain, care for, preserve the lawns and trim the trees and give the grounds the same and equal attention that it gives its city parks within the main part of the city, etc.

In view of the provisions of section 3648 of the United States Revised Statute prohibiting payment on a contract in advance of services rendered, it is desired that specific authority for the payment to the city of Kansas City of $1,000 from the amount heretofore appropriated for the preservation and improvement of the said cemetery be granted.

Now, there is no possible way for the city of Kansas City to enter into a contract unless this special authority is given at this time, ahead of the actual expenditure of the money.

Mr. WALSH. How much of the $10,000 has been expended?

Mr. SNYDER. That I can not say.

Mr. WALSH. This $1,000 is to pay the city of Kansas City for the consideration of an agreement for the perpetual care of this cemetery?

Mr. SNYDER. For the perpetual care of the cemetery.

Mr. WALSH. There is to be no further charge on the Federal Government?

Mr. SNYDER. No; this is one lump payment, which is to be put out at interest, to furnish a small amount of money for the care of that cemetery, or that little plot in the cemetery, for an indefinite period.

Mr. WALSH. In view of the explanation given by the chairman of the committee, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. GARD. I renew the point of order made by the gentleman from Massachusetts. I make the point of order, unless the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] desires to be heard.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this paragraph may be passed over until the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] is here.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to pass the paragraph for the time being. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the sum of $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the tribal funds of the Chippewa Indians of the State of Minnesota, is hereby appropriated to pay the expenses of the general council of said tribe to be held during July, 1919, pursuant to the constitution of the general council of said Chippewa Indians of Minnesota, organized in May, 1913, and to pay the expenses of said general council in looking after the affairs of said tribe, including the actual and necessary expenses of its legislative committee in visiting Washington during the second and third sessions of the Sixty-fifth Congress; said sum to be immediately available, and said actual and necessary expenses to be approved by the president and secretary of the general council and certified to the Secretary of the Interior, and as so approved and certified to be paid.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the words "to be immediately available," in line 7, page 20.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What is the necessity of making an appropriation for the visit of a legislative committee to Washington for the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress? The expenses of that visit are carried in the current law.

Mr. SNYDER. The amount appropriated here is the same as was provided in the bill which passed the House, but failed to pass Congress. This is for the visit of the council who came here a year ago.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, no.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes; they have to come here every year, and this is out of their own money. They want to come here.

Mr. WALSH. Then you want to change the language of the appropriation, for it says "to pay the expenses of said general council during the second and third sessions of the Sixty-fifth Congress." That was carried in the current law.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the gentleman from Massachusetts will permit, I will state that there was some friction among the Chippewa Indians in their tribal council. There are two factions, and each side claimed to be the legitimate council of the tribe. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs being in doubt as to which faction was entitled to receive money, did not pay anything to the contesting delegates for the time they spent here in the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, and had paid nothing for the third session at the time the bill was under consideration last spring.

Mr. WALSH. Has the Indian Service decided who is entitled to it?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not know.

Mr. SNYDER. It has not. A delegation from one or the other, from the Red Lake or the White Lake, I do not know which one, waited on me a day or two ago and wanted us to decide for them which one should have the money. The chairman of the committee thought he would leave the matter in the hands of the Indian Office, where it has been heretofore, and let them decide.

Mr. WALSH. Do I understand that the Indians are coming down here to secure legislation from Congress, and that Congress is paying the expenses, giving them a trip from the reservation?

Mr. SNYDER. There is a dispute there as to who is really the commission or council entitled to be considered. They were here in the last Congress, both sides, attempting to get legislation, and both sides were against certain appropriations in the bill.

Mr. CARTER. Let me say to the gentleman that this appropriation comes out of the Indians' own money.

Mr. SNYDER. I so stated when I rose, that this is the Indians' own money, and the only difficulty is it has to be appropriated before the department can pay it out. The department has not yet determined which party that claims to be the real representative of the tribes is entitled to the money. The committee does not see fit to attempt to decide it.

Mr. WALSH. So under the authorization of the current law none of the expenses have been paid?

Mr. SNYDER. Not one cent has been paid, and probably will not be.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter on ceded lands in the State of Minnesota embraced within the provisions of the law entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota," approved January 14, 1889, the minerals in and mineral rights pertaining to any of the lands, the cession of which was provided for in said act and which the United States has not conveyed title, shall be and remain in and are reserved for the use and benefit of the Chippewa Indians of the State of Minnesota.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. This seems to me legislation of a rather important nature. I would like to know what effect this reservation is going to have on the lands under the jurisdiction of the State of Minnesota. Perhaps some member of the Minnesota delegation may be able to enlighten me.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, in the section of Minnesota where this reservation is situated it is expected that there are

large deposits of iron ore. The idea is, as I understand from this section, to protect the Indians by preserving to them all the mineral rights on the land. The State of Minnesota, in selling State school lands, reserves all mineral rights, and we want the same protection for the Indian lands.

Mr. SNYDER. That covers my understanding of the section, that this is a reservation of the minerals for the benefit of the Indians themselves.

Mr. KNUTSON. Absolutely. There are quarter sections up in that country that are worth $40,000,000.

Mr. SNYDER. Well, that is an estimate?

Mr. KNUTSON. No; they have taken $40,000,000 out of a quarter section up there in iron ore.

Mr. ELSTON. Why not have these mineral rights reserved to the United States?

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, it is the Indians' land, and why should they not have the mineral rights? It will prevent speculators going in and getting hold of the land for the mineral value at a nominal price.

Mr. ELSTON. I assume from the first two or three lines of the paragraph that heretofore the United States has reserved the mineral rights, and why should not the United States, in ceding this land to the Indians, reserve those mineral rights? It is clearly implied in the first three or four lines of the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] has stated that some of these lands are worth $40,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, I did not say some of these lands.

Mr. WALSH. Some of the mineral deposits on this land are worth $40,000,000. It is apparently intended upon ceded land embraced within the provisions of the law provided for the relief of the Chippewa Indians that minerals in that land are to still remain the property of the Indians. We know that further on in this bill we carried a provision for taking the minerals out of the Indian lands, and as long as that ore remains in the land which belongs to the Indians it will be worth nothing—at least that is the argument that is made here in inducing the House to agree to mining on Indian reservations, which was carried in the last session of Congress. I think we would better reserve to the United States the right to take this ore out of the land that is worth $40,000,000. It might come in handy a little later on to have the United States obtain authority to mine some of it. I make the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. For a moment.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman might argue with equal fairness that all of the ore in Oklahoma on Indian reservations should be reserved to the Government. I did not say that there was iron ore on these lands. I said that it was suspected that there might be iron ore on these lands. The ores should clearly go to the Indians. There is no question about that. If iron ore is found on these lands, the Indians would take the same steps, probably, with the consent of the Indian Bureau, that an individual would take in working the land. It is out of the question for any individual to mine iron ore on a large scale. It takes considerable capital. He would simply allow some company to go in there and develop it and receive a royalty of 50 or 75 cents per ton, depending upon the value of the ore.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not exactly understand this situation. In the sixteenth line it speaks of the ceded lands in the State of Minnesota. Were those some lands ceded to the Indians by the United States Government in lieu of some other lands?

Mr. KNUTSON. That is my understanding, though I have not read the hearings. These are lands that have already been ceded.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. From what is going on here we can hardly tell whether they are the same lands that originally belonged to the Indians or lands that were ceded by the Government, or just what rights the Indians have in them. If these are lands the Indians originally possessed and never lost their right to, it would appear that they ought to keep these mineral rights; but if, on the other hand, it is some land that was ceded by the Government to the Indians, it seems to me that the position of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is correct, that the Government ought to keep these minerals, if the mineral rights did not pass.

Mr. ELSTON. Particularly if these lands were ceded in exchange for other lands of nominal value, and it was supposed at the time that the lands were only agricultural lands, possibly of small value. Of course, I am influenced in my remarks by the statement of the gentleman that 160 acres of land might be worth $40,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. These lands are situated 100 miles west of the proven mineral belt. There has been no mineral found within 75 miles of these Indian lands, but I want to protect the Indians in case it is found later on. In case minerals are found, then those mineral rights should go to the Indians. Originally the Chippewas of Minnesota had about $18,000,000 in visible assets, which have shrunken to about $6,000,000. I think it is about time the Indians should get a square deal and receive what they are entitled to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman speaks of the Indians and their fortunes, and speaks of millions of dollars in such a way as to make it reminiscent of appropriations made for war purposes. I do not think there will be any very great rush upon the almshouses of Minnesota if Uncle Sam retains the rights to these minerals up there. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States the sum of $60,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the tribal funds of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota, and to expend or pay the same, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, for the erection or purchase of homes for Chippewa Indians in said State whose homes were destroyed by forest fires during the year 1918, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That said sum may be used for material and labor for the construction of such houses; for the purchase of portable houses; or to pay for the erection of houses under contract, said contract to be executed or approved by the superintendent, who shall also inspect and approve all work done or houses erected or purchased hereunder before making payment therefor: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $1,000 may be used for the purchase or construction of any one home: *And provided further*, That not to exceed 5 per cent of the amount expended may be used for administrative purposes.

Mr. WALSH. I make the point of order on the words "to be immediately available" in lines 8 and 9, page 30.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will not the gentleman withhold his point for a moment. Last fall the northeastern part of Minnesota was visited by one of the most disastrous forest fires in the history of the country. A number of Indians lost their homes and everything they possessed, except the bare land, as a result of that fire. They are now living in absolute destitution, and if this money could be made immediately available it would tend to ease the situation materially. I am sure that if the gentleman understood the condition of these Indians, who are and have been living in shacks all winter, he would withdraw his objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; I yield to my friend.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. This is the Indians' own money?

Mr. KNUTSON. Absolutely. What difference does it make whether we make it available to-day or next month?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And they have no houses to live in?

Mr. KNUTSON. They have nothing but tents and shacks. They are absolutely destitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States the sum of $20,000 of the tribal funds of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota, and to expend or pay the same, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, for the construction and repair of roads on the Chippewa and ceded Indian reservations in the State of Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, after line 2, insert the following paragraph:

"Road construction, Red Lake: That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States the sum of $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the funds on deposit to the credit of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians, in the State of Minnesota, and to expend the same in the construction of roads and bridges on the Red Lake Indian Reservation in said State, including purchase of material, equipment and supplies, and the employment of labor: *Provided*, That Indian labor shall be employed as far as practicable."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman presenting the amendment has satisfied the committee that this is a proper item, the committee has no objection to its passage.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 26, last section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has that right under the agreement.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I am informed—I was not here when the objection was made—that there was some objection or

some inquiry made about this item, which refers to the Thirty-ninth Statutes at Large, page 844. That was a special act introduced by my predecessor from that district, Mr. Taggart. The act is very short, and I will read it, and I think it will explain the matter. It is "An act making appropriation for the preservation, improvement, and perpetual care of Huron Cemetery, a burial place of the Wyandotte Indians, in the city of Kansas City, Kans." The act is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the preservation and improvement of Huron Cemetery, a tract of land in the city of Kansas City, Kans., owned by the Government of the United States, the use of which was conveyed by treaty to the Wyandotte Tribe of Indians as a cemetery for the members of said tribe: *Provided*, That the authorities of Kansas City, Kans., will construct and maintain all necessary retaining or outside walls along all the boundaries of said cemetery abutting on streets.

For some reason the department just would not spend that money. Last year I went to them, presented the facts, and they began the necessary improvements. The Government owns that land. The Wyandotte Indians secured by treaty the use of it perpetually as a cemetery. There has been some litigation over it and the courts so adjudicated. That plot of ground lies right in the heart of Kansas City, Kans., in the business part of the city. For many years the Government would not do a thing about it, or did not, and the city could not, and did not, and the Government finally, at Mr. Taggart's suggestion, with the facts before the House, enacted that special bit of legislation which provided that the Government should appropriate $10,000 to fix up that cemetery and maintain it, providing the city would build certain walls along the streets.

Those walls were built. The city complied with its part to the satisfaction of the Indian Bureau. The Government then took a portion of this $10,000, within the last year or two, of that fund and built the inner walls. This divides the cemetery from the park on the inside and there is a wall on the street on the outside, except at the corner block. The Government built the inner walls and built two or three stone and concrete sidewalks and cleared it up. Possibly the Government has spent half of that; I do not know, although I have heard and seen a good deal of what has been done, because my office is in the same block. As I say, there has been a good deal of legislation and trouble about it. Two Indian women chased the United States marshal out of the place with a shotgun, ran the police away, and, as a matter of fact, were going to run the police out the last time. A couple of quarter or eighth blood Indian women built a little house on it, and it has been a constant source of annoyance and trouble to that city. It was a bad looking place, overgrown with brush and shrubbery, and no care taken of it for years, and if anybody else wanted to go there the Indian women went after him. The United States marshal tried it, and they bluffed him, and in the last two years I suggested to the department that they spend some of that money, and they did, and the ladies went there armed to interfere; but the mayor was firm, and police stopped the interference. The city was simply carrying out this contract with the Indian Bureau. The ladies have sued the mayor for a good many thousands for not letting them stay there, though, if they are patient, they will be allowed to stay there permanently after a while, though the mayor can not. It has been a great nuisance to our town, and the Government and the town have now gotten together, and last year when this bill was put through it went through in these words, and the understanding was the Government would authorize—had authorized—the city to go on and trim the trees and grass and take care of it and keep it in order, provided the city would do so—would take care of it and maintain it in a proper fashion—and the city agreed to do this for $1,000 out of that $10,000. The original appropriation was "is hereby appropriated for the preservation and improvement." Now, the city said, "We will preserve it and keep up the improvements if you will give us $1,000." As a matter of fact, the city took over a very big job, and I wired the mayor if he knew what they had agreed to do——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARD. I ask that the gentleman have three minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LITTLE. And the mayor said, yes, in view of all the lawsuits and near killings and trouble that they had had in the city, if they got $1,000 they would do it, and so this was put in last year in the bill, and now we have a beautiful bit of forest as becomes an Indian cemetery. It does not cost the Government a cent from now on, and if you do not pay the city this $1,000 you will have to go ahead and spend a great deal more money. Did I understand the gentleman from Ohio desired to ask a question?

Mr. GARD. I desire to inquire whether the city of Kansas City has been able to pacify these wild ladies to whom the gentleman alludes?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; I saw the policemen pacify her. The lady was pretty vigorous, but the mayor stood pat, and she did not really shoot, and that ended the matter. The improvements went through after years of wrangling.

Mr. GARD. If this money is given to the city of Kansas City, is it the purpose to maintain that as a cemetery and see that it is properly preserved?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; that is the fact. There is nobody allowed to be buried there except the Wyandotte Indians, however.

Mr. GARD. How much of the authorization of $10,000 has been expended?

Mr. LITTLE. I am unable to give the exact amount, but I should presume probably $4,000 or $5,000.

Mr. GARD. This amount of $1,000 is supposed to be the last grant or authorization?

Mr. LITTLE. That is the intention.

Mr. GARD. For the care of the cemetery?

Mr. LITTLE. That is the intention. There is a written contract between the Indian Department and the city.

Mr. GARD. I do not insist on the point of order.

Mr. ELSTON. Does not the gentleman think it might be well to add to this paragraph a clause repealing that old statute of which he speaks in order that the same request will not be again made to bring the appropriation up to $10,000?

Mr. LITTLE. I think we ought to leave the department a little leeway. I do not know but they may have spent $9,000. I think we had better leave the department a little leeway so that if next year there is any question about it we will look it up.

Mr. HASTINGS. I think it only fair that the House understand that the relatives of these two women are buried there, and that the women feel very deeply about this matter. This land was allotted against their will, and they protested against it. They felt that they had some legal right that they ought to protect. I remember reading one of the decisions of the Supreme Court. One of the women, Elizabeth Conolly, came here in person and argued that case before the Supreme Court. It shows how deeply these Indians feel in reference to the matter. I think that statement ought to be made in view of the statement as to the standing-off of the officers there.

Mr. LITTLE. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. Those Indians tried to employ my partner and myself to try that lawsuit, but we felt it was a big job, and they thought the fee we suggested was pretty high. So they came here and won their case in the Supreme Court of the United States. Then they went back and got a shotgun and carried out the ruling of the Supreme Court. I did not mean to cast any criticism upon them. They desired to preserve the tombs of their people, and it would seem that will be done. They feared if white men had their way the graves would be removed, but they made it impossible for the city to care for the cemetery. It was very unsightly. Now it is a pretty spot in the heart of a great city and always will be, I presume. These two Wyandotte women acted from motives which do them credit, but the city, too, wished to preserve the place, and I hope the misunderstanding is finally terminated.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing construction, maintenance, and operation of the irrigation systems on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, in Montana, $50,000 (reimbursable): *Provided*, That not to exceed $15,000 of applicable appropriations made for the Flathead, Blackfeet, and Fort Peck irrigation projects shall be available for the maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles for official use upon the aforesaid irrigation project: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $3,500 may be used for the purchase of horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, and that not to exceed $4,000 may be used for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the first proviso, page 33, the paragraph beginning with line 18, to inquire what is the necessity for such a large apportionment as this for motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger vehicles on this irrigation project.

Mr. CARTER. I did not understand.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asked why there was such a large amount required for motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger vehicles upon this irrigation project. The reason for it is that it has been found it is more feasible to operate with Ford cars than it is with horses, and it is claimed by the department heads that much more progress can be made by the use of Fords than by the use of horses, and there is more work being done this year on this project than heretofore, and therefore the necessity for two or three more cars.

Mr. WALSH. Well, what is there about this particular irrigation project upon the Blackfeet Reservation that is different from others?

Mr. SNYDER. I think that has reference to this whole irrigation system here, including this $100,000 in the $375,000 items. The vehicles mentioned are for use in the entire Montana proposition.

Mr. WALSH. Well, what is there about the Montana reservations that makes motor-propelled vehicles necessary that does not apply to others?

Mr. SNYDER. There is nothing about the Montana irrigation systems that makes motor vehicles more applicable there than elsewhere, and I think perhaps you will find in the other irrigation systems as you go along that they are asking for increases for the purchase of cars as against the purchase of horses and wagons.

Mr. WALSH. I had not noticed that they had asked for any such authorization before.

Mr. CARTER. These propositions are being constructed by the Reclamation Service and not by the Indian Service. Therefore it is necessary to have the fund for these vehicles in order to carry it specifically. The other amount appropriated will apply only to the activities carried on by the Indian Bureau. Those are paid for out of the Indian fund and reimbursable, and carried on by the Indian Service.

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, I wish to make an inquiry about the appropriation of $15,000 for motor-propelled vehicles for official use, and the second proviso, not to exceed $3,500 for horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, and not to exceed $4,000 to be used for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger vehicles.

Mr. CARTER. The first is for maintenance and repair, and the other is for purchase.

Mr. GARD. One is said to be for official purposes and the other is for motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will read along, he will see that the first is for maintenance and repair and the second is for purchase.

Mr. GARD. Is $15,000 considered to be a proper amount for the maintenance and repair of a number of Ford cars out there on this irrigation project?

Mr. CARTER. Maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles. The last proviso is for the purchase of horse-drawn and passenger-carrying vehicles, $4,000.

Mr. GARD. My inquiry was whether the gentleman is satisfied that this sum is proper for the maintenance and operation of these automobiles?

Mr. CARTER. Yes; I would think that would be a reasonable amount for the maintenance, repair, and operation on all the projects.

The Clerk read as follows:

That so much of the Indian appropriation act of March 1, 1907 (34 Stats. L., pp. 1015, 1035), as relates to the disposal of surplus unallotted lands within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation in Montana is hereby repealed, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make allotments under existing laws within the said reservation to any Indians of said Blackfeet Tribe not heretofore allotted, living six months after the approval of this act, and thereafter to prorate all unallotted and otherwise unreserved lands therein among the Indians who have been allotted or may be entitled to rights within said reservation: *Provided*, That of the lands so allotted 80 acres of each allotment shall be designated as a homestead by the allottee and be evidenced by a trust patent and shall remain inalienable until Congress shall otherwise direct: *Provided further*, That the Blackfeet tribal rolls shall close as of six months after the approval of this act and thereafter no additional names shall be added to said rolls: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to repeal the grants of land made by the act of March 1, 1907, to religious institutions and to the State of Montana for school purposes, nor repeal the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of any land within said reservation suitable for town-site purposes, as provided by that act: *Provided*, That the State of Montana in making indemnity school selections shall be confined to nonmineral and nonirrigable lands: *Provided further*, That the provisions of the act of March 1, 1907, which require a division of the funds received from the sale of the surplus lands immediately upon the date of the approval of the allotments of land are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That the lands within said reservation, whether allotted, unallotted, reserved, set aside for town-site purposes, granted to the State of Montana for school purposes, or otherwise disposed of, shall be subject to all the laws of the United States prohibiting the introduction of intoxicants into the Indian country until otherwise provided by Congress: *Provided*, That the lands may be leased by the allottee for mineral purposes under such rules and regulations and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided further*, That allotments herein provided for shall be made under such rules and regulations as the said Secretary may prescribe, and trust patents shall be issued therefor as provided by the aforesaid act of March 1, 1907, except as to the homestead hereinbefore mentioned.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. GARD. And I reserve a point of order on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. This is apparently the repeal of existing law and substituting a new system or method for the disposal of unallotted lands. I would like to ask somebody who is familiar with the situation why it is necessary to take out these unallotted lands in Montana from the provisions of the act referred to of March 1, 1907?

Mr. CARTER. Well, the gentleman has noticed, of course, that this original law related to the surplus unallotted lands. Provision was made for the homesteading of those lands, but it was found not to be desirable to homestead them, because they are really not agricultural lands. They lie in a very high altitude and very far north, and the frost comes too late in the spring and too early in the fall to permit the making possible of any kind of agricultural pursuits. Now, the Indians have quite a good many cattle themselves, cattle that have been distributed among individuals, and if this land is allotted I think it will give the Indians about 450 acres per capita, and this particular band of Indians are stock raisers and not farmers anyway, so that this will give them 450 acres upon which to graze a number of cattle, probably sufficient for their maintenance. Therefore it was thought better to allot the land than to dispose of it by homesteading.

Mr. WALSH. How much does the gentleman think it will permit each Indian to have?

Mr. CARTER. As I recall, about 450 acres.

Mr. WALSH. Glancing over the hearings hastily, I think it is stated to be about 80 acres.

Mr. CARTER. We have it right at page 199 of the hearings:

Under this item of legislation each Indian having rights on the reservation will obtain as a full allotment approximately 450 acres.

That is at the top of the page.

Mr. WALSH. This is the only reservation—the Blackfeet Reservation—where such conditions obtain?

Mr. CARTER. That is the only one that I have in mind now. I think it is really the only one in the United States.

Mr. WALSH. Of course these conditions were known in March, 1907, when this legislation was passed?

Mr. CARTER. I doubt if they were known to Congress. This was done after the Indians had made their protest against the sale of these lands. There was quite a long-drawn-out fight. Some gentlemen in Montana insisted that the lands be homesteaded and irrigated, and so forth, and the Indians insisted that they should not be, and Congress was forced to face about and take the Indian view of the proposition. I think it was taken correctly.

Mr. WALSH. It says they shall be allotted by the Secretary of the Interior under the existing law. What law is that?

Mr. CARTER. That is the Burke Act.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. GARD. Continuing the point of order, Mr. Chairman, I desire to make inquiry about the proviso in this part of the new legislation concerning the leasing to allottees for mineral purposes. That is on page 36.

Mr. HAYDEN. The proviso says that the lands may be leased by the allottee for mineral purposes, under such regulations and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe. This legislation is in conformity with the practice of the Indian Office with respect to mineral lands in Oklahoma, in the Osage country, and elsewhere. It was rumored that there might be oil in that country. If there is, the same procedure will be followed as in Oklahoma.

Mr. GARD. With this proviso out, there is under the present law no authority for the leasing by allottees for mineral purposes?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not at all.

Mr. GARD. Is it desirable that there should be such a provision?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not doubt it.

Mr. GARD. Why?

Mr. HAYDEN. If a restricted allottee has a tract of land that contains coal or oil, the leasing will be under the supervision of the Department of the Interior, which will secure the proper royalties for him on his oil or coal. What objection could there be to such a plan?

Mr. GARD. The objection to my mind would be that the people who are allotted are not capable of taking care of it.

Mr. HAYDEN. This proviso says "under such terms and supervision as the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe."

Mr. GARD. Are these Indians restricted Indians—the Blackfeet?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. They are not allotted yet. An Indian's restrictions really go to his land, and until his land is allotted he is restricted. He is certainly restricted in the sale of tribal land.

Mr. HAYDEN. The leasing will be under the supervision of the Indian Office.

Mr. GARD. Is this the only allotment the Blackfeet have?

Mr. CARTER. I think this is the only allotment they have. It may be that some of the older ones have taken allotments, but the younger have not.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the pay of one special attorney for the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico, to be designated by the Secretary of the Interior, and for necessary traveling expenses of said attorney, $5,000, or so much thereof as the Secretary of the Interior may deem necessary.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to inquire why it is necessary to increase the special appropriation for this special attorney in New Mexico?

Mr. HAYDEN. The explanation is that it will be the duty of this attorney to defend certain Indian water rights for lands on the Rio Grande River. There is litigation pending, and a competent attorney could not be obtained to care for it for the sum of money heretofore appropriated. The litigation, it was expected, would last about a year; and the Indians need a good lawyer, who would defend them in the proper manner. The amount was raised to $5,000 by the Senate, and the House agreed to the increase in the last Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For road and bridge construction on the Mescalero Indian Reservation, in New Mexico, including the purchase of material, equipment, and supplies; the employment of labor; and the cost of surveys, plans, and estimates, if necessary, $25,000, to be immediately available and to be reimbursed from any funds of the Indians of said reservation now or hereafter on deposit in the Treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That Indian labor shall be employed as far as practicable.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the words "to be immediately available," in line 19, page 38.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing work on the Indian highway extending from the Mesa Verde National Park to Gallup (N. Mex.) Indian Reservation, $4,226.14, in addition to the $16,500 appropriated for this purpose by the act approved June 30, 1913 (38 Stat. L., p. 91), to be immediately available for payment to the El Paso Bridge & Iron Co., of El Paso, Tex., for extra work and material, the same being made necessary by acts of the Government: *Provided*, That said sum shall be reimbursed to the United States by the Navajo Indians and shall remain a charge and lien upon the lands, property, and funds belonging to said Navajo Indians until paid in full.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order upon the words "to be immediately available," in lines 3 and 4, page 39.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 15. For support and education of 160 Indian pupils at the Indian school at Cherokee, N. C., including pay of superintendent, $37,800; for general repairs and improvements, $6,000; in all, $43,800. That the sum of $8,000 appropriated for the construction of a bridge across the Ocona Lufty River at or near the Indian school at Cherokee, N. C., by the act approved May 25, 1918 (public No. 159, 65th Cong.), or so much thereof as may be required, is hereby reappropriated and made immediately available for the same purpose and under the same conditions as provided in the said act.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the words "to be immediately available," in line 3, page 40.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this item appropriates an unexpended balance. There is some reason for making items of that kind immediately available. Other items in this bill that have been made immediately available do not come within that class. I merely mention this in order to preserve the rights of an appropriating committee with respect to this kind of an item, reappropriating an unexpended balance. Yet I think there is no question that it is really subject to the point of order if the point of order is made. If, however, there was any sort of chance for using this money before the 1st of July, I should appeal to the gentleman making the point of order not to make it; but there is no chance that the President will return and sign this bill and make this appropriation available before the 1st of July.

Mr. WEAVER. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. WEAVER. In regard to the $8,000 appropriated for this bridge, I wish to say that the contract has already been made for its construction.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. WEAVER. Under the act as passed in May, 1918, the sum of $8,000 was to be paid by the Federal Government, and the balance, which would be about $8,000, is to be paid by the county of Swain, in which Cherokee is located. They have worked out their plans for the construction of the bridge with the State highway commissioner. Swain County has appropriated her part of the funds for the construction of the bridge, the contract has been made, and the matter is, in fact, under way. I sincerely trust that the gentleman from Massachusetts will not insist on his point of order.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is the reason I made the suggestion. Usually when an unexpended balance is reappropriated, it is for work under a contract that is continuing. In this case just that condition exists, but this bill will not become a law before the 1st of July, and it makes very little difference whether this amount is made immediately available or not. If, however, it did make any difference, I should urge that the point of order be not made.

Mr. WALSH. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $676, to reimburse Benson County, N. Dak., for money actually paid by said county to the State of North Dakota for care of three insane Indians, Mary Josephine Pejihutaskana, Alfred Littlewind, and Joseph Langer, in the North Dakota State Insane Asylum.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the paragraph. I do not think we ought to establish the precedent, or if it has already been established, to follow it up, by paying for charges such as these, and unless some extraordinary reason is given, I make the point of order upon the paragraph. It is clearly a specific appropriation that does not come within the general purposes of the bill, and would ordinarily be reported by the committee in a special bill. It is legislation, and I submit does not come within the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States, at his discretion, the sum of $250,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available, of the funds on deposit to the credit of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma, and pay out the same for the benefit of the members of said tribes for their maintenance and support and improvement of their homesteads for the ensuing year in such manner and under such regulations as he may prescribe: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall report to Congress on the first Monday in December, 1920, a detailed statement as to all moneys expended as provided for herein.

Mr. WALSH. I make the point of order on the words "to be immediately available," in line 15, page 43.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For support of Quapaws, Oklahoma: For education (art. 3, treaty of May 13, 1833), $1,000; for blacksmith and assistants, and tools, iron, and steel for blacksmith shop (same article and treaty), $500; in all, $1,500: *Provided*, That the President of the United States shall certify the same to be for the best interests of the Indians: *Provided further*, That hereafter no moneys shall be expended from tribal or individual funds belonging to the Quapaw or other tribes of Indians of the Quapaw Agency in the State of Oklahoma without specific authority of law.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question as to the proviso at the beginning of page 45, that hereafter no moneys shall be expended from tribal or individual funds belonging to these Indians without specific authority of law. Has money been expended heretofore without specific authority of law, and is that the reason for inserting this proviso?

Mr. CARTER. Yes; the Interior Department has spent in all over $3,000,000 out of tribal funds without any annual appropriation by Congress, and now we require them to come in before Congress and make estimates for expenditures out of the tribal funds, just as they do for expenditures out of the Federal Treasury.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States, at his discretion, not to exceed the sum of $20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the money on deposit to the credit of the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma, to be expended for the support, education, and systematic vocational instruction of Osage children: *Provided*, That the expenditure of said money shall include the renewal of the present contract with the St. Louis Mission Boarding School, except that there shall not be expended more than $300 for annual support and education of any one pupil.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order in order to get some information as to the contract for the education of the Osage children, and the amount expended for annual support and education of one pupil in excess of that granted in other instances.

Mr. CARTER. This is out of the tribal fund, and the other appropriation is out of the Treasury fund. This St. Louis mission boarding school is probably a very small school, and therefore it takes more money per capita. These Osages are the richest people in the world. They draw $4,000 per annum for every man, woman, and child. They can afford to pay this.

Mr. SNYDER. And they very much desire to do it.

Mr. GARD. I withdraw the reservation of a point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to pay to Victor M. Locke the sum of $1,290.26 as balance in full due him for salary and expenses as principal chief of the Choctaw Nation.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What is there about this item to pay this salary which does not come out of the tribal fund?

Mr. CARTER. It comes out of the tribal fund. If it does not so provide, there should be an amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It is paid out of the tribal fund.

Mr. CARTER. Yes; it is.

Mr. WALSH. According to the provisions of this item it is paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to insert, on page 46, after line 19, the words "from the tribal fund of the Choctaw Indians in Oklahoma."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 19, after the word "pay," insert the words "from the tribal funds of the Choctaw Indians in Oklahoma."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For payment of interest upon certain interest-bearing trust funds belonging to the Cherokee Nation, which funds arose from the judgment of the Court of Claims of May 18, 1905, in favor of said nation, and were paid into and retained in the Treasury of the United States, as follows, to wit: On the amount of the fund which arose from item 1 of said judgment as such amount was determined and paid to the Secretary of the Interior on July 2, 1906, to be by him credited to the principal of the Cherokee school fund, interest at 5 per cent per annum from July 2, 1906, to and including May 26, 1910; on the amount of the fund which arose from item 4 of said judgment, as such amount was determined and paid to the Secretary of the Interior on July 2, 1906, to be by him credited to the principal of the Cherokee national fund, interest at 5 per cent per annum from July 2, 1906, to and including May 26, 1910; on the original principal sum of item 4 of said judgment, interest at 5 per cent per annum from July 1, 1893, to July 1, 1903, and on the amount of the interest thus accruing interest at 4 per cent per annum from December 29, 1905, to May 14, 1906; and on the aggregate of the sums of the interest for the last two periods herein above mentioned, interest at 5 per cent per annum from July 2, 1906, to the date of the passage of this act; and the sum of $27,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay the interest above allowed, is hereby appropriated and authorized to be paid to the Cherokee Nation: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay the amount arising from item 4 of said judgment, with interest thereon as herein above provided for, to the agent appointed by the Cherokee Nation acting through its principal chief to receive the same, said payment to be made immediately upon the approval of this act.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LONGWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 2480, the Indian appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE WHITE HOUSE FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they presented to the White House, for the approval of the President of the United States, the following bill:

H. R. 2329. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and for the payment of pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent the following leave of absence was granted:

To Mr. COOPER, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. MCFADDEN, at the request of Mr. KIESS, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. PORTER, for two weeks, on account of illness in his family.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the oath be administered to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. CONNALLY, a qualified Member.

Mr. CONNALLY appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office as prescribed by law.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, May 26, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, submitting a paragraph of legislation for inclusion in the deficiency bill, reappropriating the unexpended balances of appropriations for International Exchanges, Smithsonian Institution for the fiscal years 1917 and 1918, and making the same available during the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 43); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Postmaster General recommending increase of appropriation for temporary and auxiliary clerk hire, etc., for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 44); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Acting Secretary of State submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Department of State for "Relief and protection of American seamen" for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 45); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting requests for appropriation for inclusion in the sundry civil appropriation bill for sundry items for the Public Health Service (H. Doc. No. 46); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting estimate of appropriation for constructing or purchasing and equipping lighthouse tenders and light vessels to replace vessels worn out in service in the third, fifth, and eighth lighthouse districts, or for use in the Lighthouse Service generally (H. Doc. No. 47); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, requesting the passage of certain legislation for aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes (H. Doc. No. 48); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Julia K. Wilson, daughter of James R. Gibbany, deceased, against the United States (H. Doc. No. 49); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Ellen A. Benn, widow and natural guardian of the minor children of Frederick L. Benn, deceased, son of Frederick Benn, deceased, against the United States (H. Doc. No. 50); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Samuel F. Curtis against the United States (H. Doc. No. 51); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of William A. Duff, son and sole heir of John W. Duff, deceased, against the United States (H. Doc. No. 52); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

11. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Director General of Railroads submitting an estimate of appropriation for Federal control of the Federal transportation systems, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended (H. Doc. No. 53); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

12. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Attorney General submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Department of Justice for supplies for United States courts and judicial officers for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 54); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

13. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting supplemental estimates of appropriations required by the National Park Service for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 55); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

14. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, submitting supplemental estimates of appropriations required by the Bureau of Standards for research and investigations for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 56); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 2837) to repeal section 630 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 2838) to amend the war-risk insurance act and to increase and more definitely fix the rate of compensation thereunder to be paid for certain injuries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 2839) granting citizenship to certain Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2840) to amend section 1754 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 2841) to establish a bureau for the study of the criminal, pauper, and defective classes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 2842) to repeal the law known as the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 2843) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the cities of Boise, Twin Falls, Pocatello, Idaho Falls, Blackfoot, St. Anthony, Montpelier, Hailey, Buhl, Burley, Filer, Jerome, Rexburg, Preston, Mountain Home, Gooding, Arco, Fairfield, Rupert, Silver City, Malad City, Shoshone, American Falls, Malad, Rigby, Meridian, and Driggs, in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 2844) to increase the limit of cost of a new post office at Geneseo, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 2845) to provide that the United States shall cooperate with the States in promoting the health of the rural population of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 2846) authorizing the Indian tribes and individual Indians, or any of them, residing in the State of Washington and west of the summit of the Cascade Mountains, to submit to the Court of Claims certain claims growing out of treaties and otherwise; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OGDEN: A bill (H. R. 2847) providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MANSFIELD: A bill (H. R. 2848) fixing the rate of postal charges on mail matter of the first class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BROOKS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2849) to provide for the erection of a public building at Lawrenceville, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 2850) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Marlboro, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 2851) to grant medals to survivors and heirs of volunteers of the Port Hudson forlorn-hope storming party; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 2852) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of New London, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece to be placed on the top of a memorial to be erected by the citizens of New London, Mo., in memory of the boys from Ralls County who served in the war against Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 2853) making it unlawful to carry any flag in any parade or procession other than the Stars and Stripes (United States flag); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACGREGOR (by request): A bill (H. R. 2854) to establish a gold currency and a silver currency on a basis of interchangeable value throughout the world; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 2855) to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation in interstate commerce of misbranded articles, to regulate the traffic therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 2856) to regulate dealing in leaf tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2857) to regulate the interstate use of automobiles and all self-propelled vehicles which use the public highways in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2858) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Bloomington, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GOODALL: A bill (H. R. 2859) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Freeport, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 2860) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the cemetery at Salona, Pa., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 2861) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2862) for the relief of certain retired noncommissioned officers of the United States Army who were recalled to active service during the war with Germany and commissioned as officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REAVIS: A bill (H. R. 2863) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate two captured cannons to the town of Pawnee City, Nebr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2864) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate two captured cannons to the town of Plattsmouth, Nebr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2865) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate two captured cannons to the town of Humboldt, Nebr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2866) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate two captured cannons to the town of Burr, Nebr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2867) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate two captured cannons to the city of Lincoln, Nebr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2868) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate two captured cannons to the town of Syracuse, Nebr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2869) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate two captured cannons to the town of Falls City, Nebr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2870) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate two captured cannons to the town of Nebraska City, Nebr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2871) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate two captured cannons to the town of Tecumseh, Nebr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2872) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate two captured cannons to the town of Auburn, Nebr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2873) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate two captured cannons to the town of Brock, Nebr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2874) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate two captured cannons to the Peru State Normal School, Peru, Nebr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 2875) to provide for the erection of a public building at Morgan City, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2876) to provide for the erection of a public building at Houma, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2877) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece each to certain towns in Louisiana; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 2878) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Rumford, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2879) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Fryeburg Academy, in the town of Fryeburg, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2880) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Canton, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2881) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Auburn, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2882) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bath, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2883) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Dixfield, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2884) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Rangeley, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2885) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Greenwood, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2886) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Norway, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD: A bill (H. R. 2887) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Manor, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2888) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Glenmore, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2889) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lenox, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2890) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Denton, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2891) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cecil, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2892) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Morven, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2893) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Screven, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2894) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Patterson, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2895) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Odum, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2896) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Enigma, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2897) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Barney, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2898) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Stockton, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2899) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Naylor, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2900) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Douglas, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2901) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Quitman, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2902) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Alma, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2903) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Nashville, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2904) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Waycross, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2905) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Valdosta, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2906) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Brunswick, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2907) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Adel, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2908) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hazlehurst, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 2909) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Quincy, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2910) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Soldiers' and Sailors' Home at Quincy, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2911) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Galesburg, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2912) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Canton, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2913) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Geneseo, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2914) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Rushville, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2915) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lewistown, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2916) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cambridge, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2917) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Orion, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2918) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Yates City, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2919) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Kewance, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2920) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Oneida, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2921) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Abingdon, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 2922) to increase the pensions of those who have lost limbs or have been totally disabled in the same in the military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 2923) regulating the honorable discharges or resignations of those who served their country in the Army and Navy during the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BEE: A bill (H. R. 2924) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Johnson City, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2925) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Boerne, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 2926) providing for the erection of a public building for the city of Urbana, Champaign County, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. IRELAND: A bill (H. R. 2927) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wenona, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2928) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Minier, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2929) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Princeville, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2930) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Brimfield, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2931) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Putnam, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2932) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Averyville, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2933) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Bradford, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2934) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wyanet, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2935) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Delavan, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2936) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Princeton, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2937) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lacon, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2938) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Pekin, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2939) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Granville, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2940) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Toulon, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2941) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Washington, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2942) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Peoria, Ill., certain relics of the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2943) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Chillicothe, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2944) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Henry, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 2945) to authorize the sale of certain lands at or near Minidoka, Idaho, for railroad purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2946) to amend acts to permit the use of the right of way through the public lands for tramroads, canals, and reservoirs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2947) to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Blackfoot, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2948) to provide for the erection of a public building at Hailey, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 2949) to provide revenue for the Government and to promote the production of tungsten ores and manufactures thereof in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 2950) to authorize a preference right of entry by certain Carey Act entrymen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 2951) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Nowata, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 2952) to provide a preliminary survey of the Grand River and its several forks and tributaries in Missouri with a view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 2953) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Plymouth, N. H., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEBSTER: A bill (H. R. 2954) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pend Oreille River, between the towns of Metaline and Metaline Falls, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2955) to authorize the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Newport, in the State of Washington, one German cannon or fieldpiece with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PHELAN: A bill (H. R. 2956) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lawrence, Mass., a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2957) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lynn, Mass., a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2958) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Peabody, Mass., a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2959) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of North Andover, Mass., a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2960) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of North Reading, Mass., a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2961) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Boxford, Mass., a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2962) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Middleton, Mass., a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2963) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lynnfield, Mass., a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2964) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Nahant, Mass., a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2965) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Saugus, Mass., a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PARRISH: A bill (H. R. 2966) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Wilbarger County, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece captured by the American Army from the forces of the Imperial German Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2967) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Wise County, Tex., one cannon or fieldpiece captured by the American Army from the forces of the Imperial German Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2968) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Baylor County, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece captured by the American Army from the forces of the Imperial German Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2969) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Cooke County, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece captured by the American Army from the forces of the Imperial German Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2970) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Montague County, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece captured by the American Army from the forces of the Imperial German Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2971) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Archer County, Tex., one cannon or fieldpiece captured by the American Army from the forces of the Imperial German Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2972) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Throckmorton County, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece captured by the American Army from the forces of the Imperial German Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2973) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Wichita County, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece captured by the American Army from the forces of the Imperial German Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2974) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Jack County, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece captured by the American Army from the forces of the Imperial German Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2975) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Clay County, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece captured by the American Army from the forces of the Imperial German Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2976) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Denton, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2977) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Young County, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece captured by the American Army from the forces of the Imperial German Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 2978) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes," approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 2979) to permit the widows of officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps to purchase subsistence stores; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2980) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 2981) to provide for the examination of temporary commissioned officers in the Army for permanent commissions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 2982) to extend the time for cutting timber on the Tusayan and Coconino National Forests, Ariz.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 2983) to authorize exploration for and disposition of coal, phosphate, sodium, oil, oil shale, or gas on the public domain; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 60) proposing an initiative and referendum amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of its citizens when they so desire to vote upon constitutional amendments and laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 61) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan tents and other material to the State of Wisconsin for a National Army encampment to be held in Milwaukee, Wis.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MASON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 62) to repeal section 906 of the war-revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 63) for the relief of the Van Dorn Iron Works Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOTT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 64) to repeal section 902 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 65) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan tents for use at encampments held by veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 66) to correct an error in the wording of the appropriation of $71,000 made in the act approved July 9, 1918, and to authorize the Secretary of War to pay said sum to respective parties entitled thereto; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, with reference to maintaining the sovereignty and independence of the United States of America and against entangling alliances with other countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, favoring the enactment of such laws as will make provisions for the mutual exchange of lands by the United States and railroads; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, asking that irrigation possibilities in the county of San Juan, N. Mex., be investigated by the Secretary of the Interior and made a part of his program of irrigation of arid lands; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. REBER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, relative to the establishment of a national system of highways; to the Committee on Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 2984) granting an increase of pension to William C. Stuart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 2985) granting an increase of pension to John F. Iliff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 2986) granting a pension to Philip Jochem; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2987) granting a pension to Christian R. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 2988) granting an increase of pension to Cadle Burrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 2989) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo D. Hargis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 2990) granting a pension to Charles T. Durand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2991) granting a pension to Walter S. Reece; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2992) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Ready; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2993) granting a pension to Henry Lebrecht; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 2994) granting a pension to Bettie Cowels; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2995) granting a pension to Ella Thatcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2996) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Sheldon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2997) granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Cleaveland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 2998) granting an increase of pension to Wade H. Pyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 2999) granting an increase of pension to Uriah T. Alley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 3000) granting an increase of pension to George W. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3001) granting an increase of pension to Isaac S. Doan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 3002) granting a pension to C. B. Chamness; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3003) for the relief of Caleb B. Zachry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 3004) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James McCullough; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KRAUS: A bill (H. R. 3005) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Geer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 3006) granting a pension to John E. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 3007) granting a pension to George Polleti; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3008) granting a pension to Charles Michener; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3009) granting a pension to Leonard Ripple; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 3010) for the relief of Laban H. Davies; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3011) for the relief of Samuel Currier; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 3012) granting an increase of pension to William A. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3013) granting an increase of pension to Emily Elmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3014) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Moses Chauncey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 3015) granting a pension to Newton J. Foote; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 3016) granting a pension to Elizabeth Dickinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 3017) granting six months' pay to Fannie Appleby, mother of Robert W. Appleby, deceased, who served in Headquarters Company, Eighth Regiment Infantry, Ohio National Guard, border defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3018) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Guseman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3019) granting an increase of pension to Walter Griffith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3020) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Hopkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3021) granting an increase of pension to Anthony Headley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3022) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Hawkingbery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3023) granting an increase of pension to Jerry S. Fish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3024) granting an increase of pension to William W. Echols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3025) granting an increase of pensions to William H. Fulkineer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3026) granting an increase of pension to James W. Duty; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3027) granting an increase of pension to John T. Downey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3028) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3029) granting an increase of pension to Timothy K. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3030) granting an increase of pension to John William Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3031) granting an increase of pension to William G. Camp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3032) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Cain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3033) granting an increase of pension to George W. Crawford; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3034) granting an increase of pension to William E. Cornwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3035) granting an increase of pension to John R. Bungard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3036) granting an increase of pension to Alpheus N. Barnhouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3037) granting an increase of pension to Stinnett Bee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3038) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Bumgardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3039) granting an increase of pension to James Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3040) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Barnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3041) granting an increase of pension to Inez M. Batson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3042) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Atherton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3043) granting an increase of pension to William H. Atwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3044) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Aplin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3045) granting an increase of pension to William L. Alley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3046) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Aplin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3047) granting a pension to Emiline Hartley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3048) granting a pension to Mary C. Herrington; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3049) granting a pension to Sturgis G. Grim; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3050) granting a pension to Richard Glover; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3051) granting a pension to Sarah M. Foster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3052) granting a pension to Andrew B. Erb; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3053) granting a pension to John P. Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3054) granting a pension to Nancy A. B. Easton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3055) granting a pension to John R. Crayton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3056) granting a pension to Samuel S. Calliham; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3057) granting a pension to Nancy J. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3058) granting a pension to Robert Campbell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3059) granting a pension to Harry Cook; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3060) granting a pension to Mary C. Bartlebaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3061) granting pensions to Zelia Barker, Eva G. Barker, Stellia Barker, Gertrude Barker, Dora Barker, Edna Barker, and Annie W. Barker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3062) granting a pension to Sarah M. J. Bertram; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3063) granting a pension to Joseph E. Blackwell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3064) granting a pension to Sarah K. Arnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3065) granting a pension to Charles Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3066) granting a pension to Horace V. Andrews; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 3067) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Householder; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3068) for the relief of Arthur D. Moore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 3069) granting a pension to Isaac N. Troutman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 3070) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. McGrew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VOIGT: A bill (H. R. 3071) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Pohlman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 3072) granting a pension to Sarah C. Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3073) granting a pension to Elizabeth G. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 3074) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Frank S. Bowker; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of Centennial Evangelical Church, Chicago, Ill., asking for continuance of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, asking for the adoption of new oriental policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Committee for the Defense of Jews in Poland, urging President Wilson and the peace conference to take such steps as shall guarantee full civil, religious, and political rights to Jewish inhabitants of eastern European countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of San Francisco and Northern California Fur Dealers' Association, for the repeal of tax on furs, section 900, subdivision 19, revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Petition of Board of Aldermen of St. Louis, urging distribution of surplus foodstuffs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLE: Petition of Cooperative Association of Hancock County, Ohio, on behalf of repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Marion (Ohio) Section of Council of Jewish Women, that the United States approve a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COPLEY: Petition of Merchants' Association of Joliet, Ill., protesting against the repeal of the zone system for carrying second-class mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Twenty-seventh Infantry Association, Chicago, urging that American soldiers in Russia be brought home immediately; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Joliet, Ill., urging immediate repeal of section 904 of revenue law of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY of California: Petition of Medical Society of the State of California, protesting against curtailment of any appropriations for activities of the United States Public Health Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: Petition with 22 signers of Cass County, Mo., asking for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, expressing gratitude for the establishment of the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, asking that legislation be passed by Congress providing for the adequate protection of the lives and property of aliens by the Federal authorities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, asking that a Federal law be enacted for the suppression of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Twenty-seventh Infantry Auxiliary, urging return of soldiers from Siberia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, relating to war-time prohibition; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Hoyle Rarick Clothing Co., St. Louis, Mo., urging repeal of section 904, luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Jewelers' Vigilance Committee (Inc.), New York City, urging repeal of luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of Sara J. Darr, president Woman's Christian Temperance Union of California, for 12,000 California women, urging enforcement of war-time prohibition and the Sheppard constitutional amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EMERSON: Resolutions adopted by the National Garment Retailers' Association, against the luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Twenty-seventh Infantry Association, in favor of returning our soldiers from Siberia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Twenty-seventh Infantry Auxiliary, Chicago, Ill., urging return of American soldiers from Siberia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of jewelers of the United States, urging that the entire Title IX, covering sections 900 to 907, inclusive, be taken from the revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, relating to the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of sundry citizens of Kingston, Ill., for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Twenty-seventh Infantry auxiliary, asking for return of American soldiers from Siberia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: Petition of New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, urging that railroads be turned back to their owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, favoring import duty on live stock and its products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, indorsing the Kendrick bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KIESS: Petition of citizens of Tioga County, Pa., favoring the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of David Cowan, Robert Macdonald, and Gustav J. Merbach, of Baltimore, Md., asking support of the initiative and referendum amendment to the Constitution of the United States and also the noninterest bond bill, as advocated by Jacob Sechler Coxey, sr.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Leon Simon (Inc.), Baltimore Fur Manufacturing Co., Bernheimer Bros., Big Home Stores, Stewart & Co., all of Baltimore, Md., urging repeal of luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Retail Dry Goods Association, New York City, asking for immediate repeal of section 904 of luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Maryland Federation of Women's Clubs, relating to Lewis-Raker bill (S. 4811; H. R. 12698), giving military rank to Army nurses; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., urging repeal of luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of National Garment Retailers' Association, urging repeal of section 904 of revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New York, protesting against the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of many residents of the city of Syracuse, N. Y., protesting against the imposition of luxury taxes and asking for the immediate repeal of section 904 of the revenue law of 1918, as well as the other sales taxes in title 9; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of citizens of Fulton, N. Y., opposing repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NEELY: Petition of United Presbyterian Congregation of Chester, W. Va., urging constitutional amendment against polygamy and polygamous cohabitation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Petition of farmers from Polk County, Wis., for repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of central committee, Socialist Party of Douglas County, Wis., transmitting certain demands of the Socialist Party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of County Board of Taylor County, Wis., for the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Iron River, Wis., relating to the sale of medicines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Self-Determination League, of Liberty, N. Y., asking for repeal of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of jewelers of the United States, urging repeal of revenue-tax sections 900 to 907; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Twenty-seventh Infantry Auxiliary, Chicago, Ill., urging immediate return of American soldiers from Siberia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Petition of California Goldsmiths' and Silversmiths' Association, in opposition to the extent of the sales tax imposed upon their products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Messrs. Lensky & Laewn, of Los Angeles, Calif., in opposition to the tax imposed on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Sacramento Valley Development Association, of California, in support of the Mondell bill proposing a soldier settlement plan for reclamation of arid and swamp lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: Petition of Bethel Friends Church, of Long Beach, Calif., against repeal of war prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Federal Council of Churches, favoring enactment of laws to rigidly enforce war and constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Council of Churches, favoring a Federal law to remove the disgrace of lynching from America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of First Church of the Nazarene, Pasadena, Calif., protesting against repeal of the war prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Pasadena, Calif., against repeal of war prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Federal Council of Churches, favoring inclusion of a clause in the league of nations constitution guaranteeing freedom of religious belief; also guaranteeing equality of race treatment in respect of law and its administration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Federal Council of Churches, favoring restriction of immigration based on just and equitable regard for the rights of the nations concerned; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of prohibitionists of California against repeal of the war prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RHODES: Petition of Twenty-seventh Infantry Auxiliary, of the city of Chicago, for an early return of the American soldiers from Siberia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of William Lorenz et al., of Farmington, Mo., for the repeal of daylight-saving act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Papers in support of House bill 1331; to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *May 26, 1919.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee for the religious instinct and passion that Thou hast put into Thy creature, man. As we face the difficult tasks of life with faith and feel the need of the high inspiration for noble endeavor, we constantly turn back to the source of our life and our noblest thought and our highest inspiration. So we turn to Thee this day and pray that Thou wilt so guide us that our lives may count for the upbuilding of civilization, for the advancement of man, and the prosperity and interest of the world for the glory of Thy name. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

CONNERS BROS. V. THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 8).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims certifying that the cause of Milton C. Conners and George G. Conners, doing business under the firm name of Conners Bros., *v.* The United States, which was referred to the Court of Claims August 5, 1916, under the judicial code, was dismissed by the court March 24, 1919, for nonprosecution on motion of the defendants, which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 9).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact and conclusions filed by the court in the following causes:

The Fore River Ship & Engine Co. *v.* The United States and Genevieve Griswold Kennon *v.* The United States.

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

SILK INDUSTRY OF JAPAN.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented the statement of Sobei Mogi, a director of the Japan Silk Association and president of the United Export Silk Textile Association of Japan, concerning relations between the United States and Japan, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1200) making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR DEAF AND DUMB.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. POMERENE a director of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Dumb, under the requirements of the act approved June 10, 1872.

COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. CHAMBERLAIN a director of the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum, under the requirements of the act approved June 10, 1872.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented resolutions adopted by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, favoring legislation providing for the adequate protection of the lives and property of aliens by the Federal authorities, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, favoring the enactment of legislation for the suppression of lynching, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Owaneco, Ill., remonstrating against the proposed modification of the prohibition act, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MOSES presented a petition of sundry citizens of Belmont, N. H., praying for the repeal of the luxury tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SPENCER presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from sundry citizens of Clinton, Mo., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRONNA. I present a telegram, which is very brief, and I ask that it may be read.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, as follows:

FARGO, N. DAK., *May 22, 1919.*

Hon. ASLE J. GRONNA,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union of North Dakota, representing 3,000 women, strongly protests against the repeal or weakening of war-time prohibition.

ELIZABETH PRESTON ANDERSON, *President.*
BARBARA H. WYLIE, *Secretary.*

Mr. GRONNA. I present a petition of the Niagara-Shawnee Agricultural Club, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Hon. ASLE J. GRONNA,
Senator from the State of North Dakota, Washington, D. C.

SIR: We, the undersigned committee, were duly appointed to present to you the following resolution adopted at one of the club's regular meetings, in which you were respectfully requested to obtain, if possible, the repeal of the daylight-saving law, for the following reasons:

First. In our State we have many frosty mornings early in the spring. It is impossible to do good work and start early, so the men and teams lose time and the men refuse to make it up in the evenings. The same holds good in haying and harvesting time. On account of the dewy mornings it is absolutely impossible to make hay or harvest grain in the early hours, and the men refuse to work later. In thrashing, it is the same. It has caused untold loss of grain.

Second. We find it impossible to combine the two systems because it confuses our work and operations in such a manner that we can not attend meetings and gatherings conveniently if we work under the old time and conform with the new in other ways.

Third. We find that for the foregoing reasons it damages the producer more than it benefits the consumer.

Fourth. We find it works a hardship on the very young children attending the consolidated high schools. They have to make long drives and do not get sufficient rest under the new system.

Respectfully, yours,

F. A. MUNSON,
Chairman.
FRANK GEORGESON.
DAVID KIRK.

Mr. CURTIS presented a memorial of the Central Labor Union of Arkansas City, Kans., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Satanta and Clyde, Kans., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Sedgwick County Republican Club, of Kansas, praying for the separation of the peace treaty from the league of nations plan, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Lawrence, Detroit, Topeka, Pretty Prairie, Valley Falls, Netawaka, Oskaloosa, and Ozawkie, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Kansas and Michigan Association, praying for the establishment of a national soldiers' home at St. Cloud, Fla., which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of Dick Yates Post No. 50, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Eureka, Kans., and a petition of Princeton Post No. 111, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Richmond, Kans., praying for an increase in the pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of deceased Civil War veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of sundry soldiers, members of Ambulance Company 347, Eighty-seventh Division, in France, praying for a congressional investigation of certain actions by the War Department, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Russell, Kans., praying for the deportation of aliens who, in order to escape military service, dropped their first naturalization papers, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Manhattan, Topeka, Utopia, Nortonville, Paola, Columbus, Olathe, Oswego, and of Wheat Belt Grange No. 1735, Patrons of Husbandry, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Emporia, Kans., and a petition of sundry citizens of Arkansas City, Kans., praying for Government ownership of railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Local Council No. 976, Knights of Columbus, of Newton, Kans., praying for the self-determination of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Atchison, Kans., praying for the return to private ownership of the railroad, telegraph, and telephone lines, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Wichita, Kans., praying for the removal from office of Postmaster General Burleson, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of Pomona Grange No. 1498, Patrons of Husbandry, of Holton, Kans., praying for an investigation of the interference by the Department of Agriculture with the work of the Bureau of Farm Management, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of sundry citizens of Columbus, Kans., favoring the repeal of the espionage act, the withdrawal of American troops from Russia, the reestablishment of the rights of free speech, free press, and free assemblage, self-determination by any country of their form of government without interference from troops abroad, and the immediate release of all political, religious, industrial, and other prisoners incarcerated for their views, etc., which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ, of Beloit, Kans., praying for the independence of Korea, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the United Trades and Labor Council of Pittsburg, Kans., favoring the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of all Federal judges, with short terms of office, and placing the power to recall Federal judges in the people, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Winfield, Kans., praying for the repeal of the tax on shoes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Independence, McPherson, and Kansas City, all in the State of Kansas, pray-

ing for the establishment of a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. ASHURST presented a petition of Yavapai Council, No. 1032, Knights of Columbus, of Prescott, Ariz., praying for the self-determination of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of the Norumbega Club of Bangor, Me., praying for the establishment of a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented petitions of Local Grange No. 166, Patrons of Husbandry, of Tecumseh, of sundry school-teachers of Highland Park, and of sundry citizens of Ann Arbor, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the ratification of the league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Pattern Makers' Association of Grand Rapids, Mich., praying for Government ownership of railroads and the merchant marine, and also for the ratification of the league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Joseph, Mich., remonstrating against the repeal of the present zone system of postage rates, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Common Council of Detroit, Mich., praying that Fort Wayne, in that State, be turned over to the city of Detroit, Mich., for park and recreational purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FERNALD presented petitions of sundry citizens of Sanford, Berwick, and Pittsfield, all in the State of Maine, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. McLEAN presented petitions of the New Haven Theosophical Society of New Haven; Connecticut Alumni Association of Wesleyan University; Machinists' Lodge, No. 819, International Association of Machinists, of Meriden; Silver City Council, No. 21, F. B. L., of Meriden; Meriden Grange, of Meriden; Nepang Congregational Church of New Hartford; Beacon Valley Grange of Naugatuck; citizens of Middletown; Court Silver City Friendly Society; and Daughters of the American Revolution of New Haven; of the Men's Club of the First Congregational Church of West Haven; St. John's Church of Washington; Arawanna Tribe, No. 17, I. O. R. M., of Middletown; American citizens of Polish descent of New Haven; Excelsior Council, No. 2, O. U. A. M., of Waterbury; Admiral Foote Camp, No. 17, Sons of Veterans of New Haven; of the vestry of Christ Church of Westport; of Company D, First Regiment, Knights of Washington; of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Watertown; First Church of Waterbury; congregations of the Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, Howard Avenue Congregational Church, and the Howard Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, all of New Haven; St. Michael's vestry of Naugatuck; faculty of Wesleyan University, of Middletown; the vestry of St. John's Church, of Warehouse Point; Men's Club of the South Park Methodist Episcopal Church of Hartford; of Local Division, No. 281, A. A. of S. E. R. E. of A.; Central Labor Union of Waterbury; the First Church of Christ of New Haven; Visiting Nurse Association of New Haven; Lord Nelson Lodge, No. 137, O. S. of St. George, of Ansonia; Red Cross Lodge, No. 162, of New Haven; and Immanuel Congregational Church of Hartford, all in the State of Connecticut; and of the New England Regional Conference of the Interchurch World Movement of North America, of Boston, Mass., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the New Haven District of Epworth League, of Waterbury, Conn., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Trades Council of New Haven, Conn., and a memorial of the Central Labor Union of Hartford, Conn., remonstrating against national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the National Garment Retailers' Association, of Hartford, Conn., praying for the repeal of the so-called "luxury" tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, Putnam, Thompson, Taftville, Ellington, Litchfield, Canterbury, Wauregan, and Ivoryton, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 135, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of Orange, N. J., and a petition of Local Lodge No. 1246, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of Summit, N. J., praying for the deportation of those aliens who, in order to escape military service, dropped their first naturalization papers, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask to have printed in the RECORD a very short petition from the Private Soldiers and Sailors' Legion.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATE SOLDIERS AND SAILORS' LEGION
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1919.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

GENTLEMEN: Your petitioners of the Private Soldiers and Sailors' Legion of the United States of America, an organization incorporated in March, 1919, under the act of Congress of those who served as privates in the military and naval forces of the United States during the World War in the years 1917 to 1919, inclusive, hereby respectfully petition the Congress of the United States for the enactment at the earliest possible date of the following legislation, believing as we do that this legislation will not only do a measure of justice to the private soldiers, sailors, and marines of the United States who bore the burdens, hazards, and losses of the war but will promote in the highest degree the welfare and prosperity of all the people of the United States.

We respectfully ask:

First. That Congress enact legislation to provide employment on public works for all soldiers, sailors, marines, and war workers who are unable to secure employment in private business.

Second. To tide over the change from military to civil life, and as a scant measure of justice to the soldiers, sailors, and marines who fought the war to save civilization in 1917 to 1919, we ask that Congress enact legislation to pay each private soldier, sailor, or marine upon his honorable discharge from the service the sum of $500, this payment also to be made to those who were already discharged previous to the passage of this law.

Third. That as thousands of soldiers were subject to needless hardships and privations by the unjustly heavy fines and penalties imposed on soldiers by incompetent and unfit officers in courts-martial for insignificant, petty infractions of military regulations, Congress should at once take necessary action to see that these fines for petty offenses should be promptly repaid to the honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines. Legislation should also be enacted to review all court-martial findings, with a view that justice may be done.

Fourth. In aid of the foregoing policy for providing work for the unemployed we ask prompt action by Congress to open up for demobilized soldiers, sailors, and marines the opportunity to employ their labor on the unused lands and natural resources of our country. And we don't want to be confined to swamp lands, cut-over stump lands, and desert lands, either. We hold that the hundreds of millions of idle acres of good agricultural, mineral, and timber lands and vacant city lots are none too good for the use of the soldiers who are conceded to have saved civilization at $30 per month, minus large reductions for court-martial fines, insurance, etc. Nature's bounty has provided Uncle Sam and all his nephews with ample opportunity for all to work if the Government will only let down the bars of monopoly and privilege.

Fifth. We ask that the burdensome and onerous taxes now levied as a war measure on ice cream, soda water, and soft drinks, and those levied by section 906 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February, 1919, on the private soldier's and poor man's theater, known as the film tax, be repealed.

Respectfully submitted.

MARVIN GATES SPERRY,
National President Private Soldiers and Sailors' Legion of the United States of America.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are next in order.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, on Friday last the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] made a motion to discharge the Committee on Woman Suffrage from the further consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women. I rise for the purpose of calling up that motion in order that the joint resolution may be placed on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not understand that the motion was formally made, and I do not think it is in order to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is in order to make the motion now.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; but it must go over for a day.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The motion was made on Friday under the rule and entered on the Journal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion was made on Friday. The question now is on the motion of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I think it is proper before the motion is put to state what the Committee on Woman Suffrage did on Saturday. I presented the question to the Senate on last Friday as to the authority and duty of the committee. Under the resolution adopted at the last session of Congress all the old committees were continued in power and authority, and likewise were subjected to the burdens and duties of whatever matters might properly be referred to the committees. After that announcement was made here on Friday I felt that I was under obligations, at least, to relieve myself of any duty that might devolve upon that committee, and there-

fore I called a meeting of the committee for Saturday morning last.

We had a meeting of the committee. Of course, I recognize the delicate situation with respect to my successor on the committee, but at the same time I did not feel that I could avoid taking some action and assuming the responsibility of my position. When we met we decided that the quickest way to bring the joint resolution before the Senate for action was to favor the motion made by the Senator from the State of Washington, that the committee be discharged from its further consideration. Under the rules, if we had made a report from the committee, on objection that report would have had to lie over a day for consideration. The Senator from Washington made this motion on Friday and let it lie over under the rule, so that it can be acted upon at this time, and as representing the Committee on Woman Suffrage I desire to support the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to discharge the Committee on Woman Suffrage from the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask that the motion be read from the Secretary's desk.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I call for the regular order. I do not think it comes up until later in the day under the order of business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is as much in order now as at any other time.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It will occupy the attitude of a resolution. It is in the shape of a resolution and comes up when we reach resolutions. There is a prescribed order of business—petitions, reports of committees, and so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will be read, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

The Secretary read from page 129 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 23, 1919, as follows:

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I desire to enter a motion to discharge the Committee on Woman Suffrage from the consideration of House joint resolution No. 1 that was referred to that committee to-day, and I ask that the motion lie over for one day under the rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts in the chair). That action will be taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is an entirely new question to the Chair. Resolutions that go over under the rule, of course, are never taken up until after the conclusion of routine morning business; but this is not a resolution. This is a motion to discharge a committee. The Chair believes it was the appropriate time when reports of committees were called to take up the motion. Unless there is an appeal from the Chair, we will go ahead with it. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Do I understand the ruling of the Chair to be that the Chair is going to proceed with the ordinary business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No. The question has never arisen before, but the Chair believes that under the call of reports of committees the motion to discharge the committee is in order.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I do not intend to delay the Senate by any extended debate on this motion, but I desire to say a few words in giving my reasons why I shall vote against the motion at this itme.

Mr. BORAH. Will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] if it is his purpose to proceed at once to a vote to-day?

Mr. WATSON. I think so, if we can reach it on the calendar. My understanding is that a motion to discharge a committee, if carried, carries a bill to the calendar, and if, under the rules, it could be taken up to-day, I should be very glad. I have not consulted the Vice President to know whether or not that is in order.

Mr. BORAH. I presume it will be in order if the Senator is disposed to make the motion to take it up at the proper time. I want to know whether the Senator is proposing to do that.

Mr. WATSON. I am.

Mr. BORAH. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Rule XXVI provides that—

All subjects from which a committee shall be discharged shall lie over for one day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

Mr. WATSON. That is my understanding. It has to lie over for a day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, this body has been called in extraordinary session at an unusually early date. There are nearly two years before under the Constitution the life of the Congress will expire. This particular resolution came over here without any lengthy consideration by the House of Representatives. It was sent through without any extended debate. It is a matter of grave interest to the American people, whether it be decided in the affirmative or the negative.

I recognize that under the rules of the Senate there is a provision for the discharge of a committee, but I also recognize that under the rules of the Senate committees are organized to aid in the transaction of the business of the Senate. You may say in answer to that that whether there is a two-thirds majority of the Senate in favor of the joint resolution or not, there is unquestionably a majority in favor of the joint resolution, and a majority determines. All of which is true. But there is an orderly way of doing business, and there is a way to conduct business under the rules of the Senate.

That is the purpose of appointing committees. The rule requires every piece of legislation that is not passed by unanimous consent to go to some committee of the Senate, not merely that the will of the majority may be worked out in that committee, but the rules of the Senate and the rules of all parliamentary bodies are primarily made to protect the minority. The majority can always do what it pleases. The rules of a parliamentary body are for two purposes. One is to conduct business in an orderly way, and the other is to protect the minority and give it a reasonable opportunity to be heard on all questions, to present its amendments and present its view to the country, and afford an opportunity to be heard. If you wipe out the rules and wipe out the committees, you proceed then to the brutal will of the majority. I am one of those who have always believed that the majority have a right to act. I was one of those who supported the cloture rule at the last session of the Senate, because I believe a majority have a right to act. I would support a cloture rule in the Senate of this Congress. But that does not excuse the majority from living up to the rule and conducting business in an orderly way.

There is no reason for the immediate consideration of this proposal unless it be that Senators who are in favor of the resolution desire to show that they are more enthusiastic about its immediate adoption than anybody else in the Senate. There can be no question whatever that the majority of the Senate will bring the joint resolution before the Senate for consideration. They did so two or three times at the last session of Congress, and there can be no question that when they bring it before the Senate they can keep it here until it is disposed of. There are a number of amendments that may be proposed to the joint resolution. Amendments, whether they are adopted or not, are entitled to consideration. The committee is already organized. We know that to-morrow or the next day the new committees of the Senate as proposed by the majority will be elected. We know that the committee can consider it, can give hearings on it, and ought to give such hearings. It is idle to say that the question was heard in the last Congress and that that bars the consideration by the committees of this Congress, for the complexion of the Congress has changed, and possibly there may be some change in public sentiment.

I see no reason why a motion should be made at this early hour to discharge a committee that has consideration of the matter, everyone knowing that a majority of the members of that committee are in favor of the resolution and will report it in an orderly way, if they are allowed to do so. The only purpose that can be accomplished by this procedure is possibly to hasten the passage of the resolution by a day or two. I can not see, if the resolution commands a two-thirds vote, why this is necessary; and, if it can not command a two-thirds vote, then there is no object to be accomplished by the motion anyway.

I do not think we ought to make the precedent in the very first act of this new Congress of breaking down the committees, of breaking down the protection of the minority by proposing at once to discharge a committee that has not had the opportunity to consider this resolution, for if it had considered it the committee would have reported the resolution to the Senate. It can get just as good a place on the calendar and have practically as early a hearing, barring possibly a day or two, by being considered in the proper and orderly way, being reported by the committee and brought up from the calendar in due course, as it can by this motion. For that reason I think a protest ought to be made against this method.

Of course I recognize what the rule of the Senate is for. It is to prevent a committee from suppressing legislation that a majority of the Senate desires to consider. If this resolution had been before this committee for days or weeks possibly, and there had been no consideration of it and no report, and a majority of the Senate desired to consider the resolution——

Mr. JONES of New Mexico rose.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Just one moment. I recognize that in such case it would be in perfect order and perfectly proper to move to discharge the committee. That, however, is not the case.

There is no Senator here who says that this committee is not in favor of the joint resolution; there is not a Senator here who says that this committee in the new Congress has had an opportunity to consider it. It is simply adopting revolutionary tactics in the Senate in order to railroad a piece of legislation through as the very opening method of this Congress.

Now I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Does not the Senator from Alabama recognize the fact that the Committee on Woman Suffrage met on last Saturday and considered this question, and would not that have any bearing upon the argument which he is now presenting?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The committee had possession of the documents, did they not?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The committee had possession of the documents; they considered the situation; and, in order to expedite the consideration of the resolution by the Senate, instead of reporting the resolution favorably, the committee decided to support the motion of the Senator from Washington in order that there might not be any delay in coming to a vote upon the resolution.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am always glad to listen to the Senator's arguments, and he always has sound grounds behind them. The Senator says that the Committee on Woman Suffrage pursued this course in order to expedite the matter. I suppose there was a majority of the committee present?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. There was.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. With a majority of the committee present and desiring to expedite the resolution, instead of ordering some member of the committee, either the present acting chairman of the committee or the Senator who will be the chairman in a few days, to report the resolution to the calendar—and it would have been on the calendar right now if that course had been pursued—instead of doing that, conducting it in the orderly way, bringing the resolution up here in the most expeditious way, the committee resolved in favor of adopting revolutionary methods. I can not see how such action expedites the legislation.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It seems to me the Senator from Alabama overlooks another rule of the Senate, that any report of a committee must lie over for one day in order to be considered, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That does not change this proposition in the least.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It changes the proposition to this extent, that by the committee supporting this motion the matter can be brought to a vote to-day by a majority of the Senate, and if it came up on a report of the committee any Senator could object and require the report to go over for one day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, my friend from New Mexico is again stepping into deep water, for the President of the Senate has just announced a ruling that, if this motion is adopted, on objection it must go over for one day before it can be considered, and that is the rule of the Senate. So the situation will not be expedited at all.

Therefore I ask why these revolutionary methods? Why was it necessary for a committee that had the power to report the joint resolution and had the power to bring the measure before the Senate to disregard the rules of the Senate, disregard the situation in the case, when it would really have expedited the matter if it had pursued the usual course in an orderly and proper manner? That I can not understand.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask the Senator from New Mexico why it was that the committee thought it more desirable to support a motion to discharge the committee than to report the joint resolution?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. As I have already stated, it was for the purpose of expedition.

Mr. BORAH. In what respect? It does not change the rule at all. The matter goes over a day under the same circumstances.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It was the understanding of the committee that it would expedite the consideration of the joint resolution to-day.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, there has been a specific ruling on this question, which is found in Gilfry's Precedents, in which Mr. Pettigrew, on the 26th of February, 1901, made a motion to discharge a committee. It came up on the 28th, and Mr. Platt, of Connecticut, raised a point of order—

That the consideration of the resolution was not in order during the morning hour; that it not only proposed to discharge the committee from the consideration of the bill but to consider it on the same day, and therefore the resolution was not in order.

The President pro tempore sustained the question of order and decided that the resolution was not in order.

It is not stated whether the President pro tempore decided so on account of the motion being made during the morning hour or because of the motion then to proceed to its consideration. Clearly the motion ought to go over for one day; there is no dispute about that. Nothing can be considered in the morning hour except by unanimous consent. It seems to me that after the morning hour has been concluded this motion would come up regularly, but clearly it would have to go over under this decision until to-morrow for action upon it, unless by unanimous consent objection was waived.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I do not so consider the decision just referred to by the Senator from Virginia. I think it is quite probable that this joint resolution, after it goes to the calendar, must then wait at least until 1 o'clock, or until the morning business shall have been disposed of, but that then, like any other measure upon the calendar, it can be brought up on motion.

Mr. SWANSON. The decision was specific on this point. The resolution was introduced on the 26th of February, and it came up on the 28th, when a point of order was made against it on two grounds: First, that it could not be considered during the morning hour—until morning business was disposed of; and, second, that it could not be brought up for consideration on the same day, except by unanimous consent; that all motions must lie over for one day. The point of order was sustained by the Chair, and no appeal was taken from the decision, which was specific.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I call the Senator's attention to the point that the heading of this decision, or that which might be called the syllabus of the decision, in capital letters, simply declares, "Motion to discharge not in order in morning hour." That was the point that was decided by the Chair at that time.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator from New Mexico will read the decision, he will find that the point of order was made on two grounds: First, that the resolution could not be considered in the morning hour; and, second, that even if the motion carried it could not be considered on that day but would have to go over one day. The point of order was sustained, as the Senator will find if he reads the decision.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to ask if the Senator from New Mexico contends that the syllabus to a decision ever controls the decision or that it affords even an index to govern in any way the decision unless the syllabus is written by the deciding power itself? In this case, of course, it was written by some Public Printer.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Nobody knows better than does the Senator from Missouri—and I suppose he will concede that it is a subject with which we are all quite familiar—that what he has stated is undoubtedly sound; but where a case involves two propositions, either one of which might be good, and the heading or syllabus indicates the ground on which it was decided, I think the syllabus can be taken into consideration for that purpose.

Mr. REED. In other words, the Senator thinks that a Public Printer can decide what part of the decision of the Senate is controlling.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I do not take it that a Public Printer framed these rules or made the syllabus to them; I take it that that was done by the Committee on Rules of the Senate, as going to indicate and make explicit what the rules intended to convey.

Mr. REED. But it is not a rule; it is a decision we are talking about.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Yes; but it is in this volume that we are talking about.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think the rules are very plain that this discussion is out of place. I will merely refer to Rule XXVI, paragraph 2 of which provides:

All reports of committees and motions to discharge a committee from the consideration of the subject, and subjects from which a committee shall be discharged, shall lie over for one day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

I do not think that the case cited by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is parallel; but our rules are so plain on the question it seems to me that there is not any need of discussion.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico obtained the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I will yield in a moment. I desire to call attention to and to read the decision referred to by the Senator from Virginia.

The President pro tempore [Mr. Frye] laid before the Senate the resolution submitted by Mr. Pettigrew on the 26th instant to discharge the Committee on Education and Labor from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6882) limiting hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics—

And so forth.

Mr. SMOOT. I call for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has already ruled, probably incorrectly, that this motion to discharge the committee was before the Senate. No objection has been made to debate; but the Chair has heretofore ruled on all such motions that prior to the hour of 1 o'clock they are not debatable, and unless there is an appeal from the Chair——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from New Mexico one question, and that is, if he relies upon the syllabus of the decision, then is it not true that the decision of the Senate was that a motion to discharge a committee, going over a day, could not be considered during the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That decision is perfectly plain. The motion in that case was not the same as the pending motion at all; that motion was to discharge a committee and then proceed to the immediate consideration of the question.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I desired to ask the Senator from New Mexico a question. He insisted that the syllabus controlled; that the effect of the decision was that the motion had to go over one day, and that it could not be considered in the morning hour. If he is right about that, is not our entire procedure now out of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that is true.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona and Mr. SMOOT called for the regular order.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It is entirely immaterial to me. What I am after is to have this motion acted upon now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has ruled, and that ruling stands unless there is an appeal, that this is not a debatable question. The question is, Shall the committee be discharged?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Is that motion in order at this time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so ruled, and there was no appeal.

Mr. BORAH. The Chair has since modified his opinion, has he not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Chair stated that he did not know whether he was ruling right or not, but he was ruling.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then I desire to enter an appeal from the decision of the Chair as to this matter being in order at this time.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I make the point of order that the appeal comes too late.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will have to sustain the point of order of the Senator from New Mexico, that the appeal comes too late. The question is, Shall the Committee on Woman Suffrage be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Upon that question I wish to be heard.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has ruled that it is not a debatable question before 1 o'clock.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understood the Chair to rule that the point of order is not a debatable question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; that the motion to discharge is not debatable before 1 o'clock under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, does the Chair rule that an appeal can not be taken from the decision of the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Senator can appeal from that decision, if he wishes to do so, because that is the last one made.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The decision I desired to appeal from was the decision of the Chair that this motion could come up at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that; but the Senator did not appeal until there was intervening business; that was the trouble.

Mr. REED. What intervening business?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Did not the Chair permit it to intervene?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair permitted it until the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] raised the question.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Did the Senator from Utah raise the question?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I called for the regular order, because it seemed to me that it was a waste of time, under the rules of this body, to talk about the question whether this matter can be discussed now or acted upon on this day.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It seems to me an inconsistency to deny the right of appeal because it is too late, and at the same time shut off debate, no matter how late objection to debate is raised.

Mr. SMOOT. Regular order!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	McNary	Simmons
Ball	Hale	Martin	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Harding	Moses	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Harris	Myers	Smith, Md.
Borah	Harrison	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	Henderson	New	Smoot
Calder	Hitchcock	Newberry	Spencer
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Norris	Stanley
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Sterling
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Sutherland
Culberson	Kellogg	Owen	Swanson
Cummins	Kendrick	Page	Townsend
Curtis	Kenyon	Penrose	Trammell
Dial	Keyes	Phelan	Underwood
Dillingham	King	Phipps	Wadsworth
Elkins	Knox	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Fall	La Follette	Poindexter	Walsh, Mont.
Fernald	Lenroot	Pomerene	Warren
Fletcher	Lodge	Ransdell	Watson
France	McCormick	Reed	Williams
Frelinghuysen	McCumber	Robinson	Wolcott
Gay	McKellar	Sheppard	
Gore	McLean	Sherman	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I move to lay upon the table the motion to discharge the committee; and on that I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays having been ordered and taken, the result was announced—yeas 27, nays 64, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Bankhead	Fletcher	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Gay	Penrose	Swanson
Borah	Gore	Reed	Trammell
Brandegee	Harrison	Shields	Underwood
Dial	King	Simmons	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Lodge	Smith, Ga.	Wolcott
Fall	Moses	Smith, Md.	

NAYS—64.

Ashurst	Harding	McKellar	Ransdell
Ball	Harris	McLean	Robinson
Calder	Henderson	McNary	Sheppard
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Myers	Sherman
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.
Colt	Jones, Wash.	New	Smoot
Culberson	Kellogg	Newberry	Spencer
Cummins	Kendrick	Norris	Stanley
Curtis	Kenyon	Nugent	Sterling
Edge	Keyes	Owen	Sutherland
Elkins	Kirby	Page	Townsend
Fernald	Knox	Phelan	Walsh, Mass.
France	La Follette	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Pittman	Warren
Gronna	McCormick	Poindexter	Watson
Hale	McCumber	Pomerene	Williams

NOT VOTING—5.

Gerry	Johnson, S. Dak.	Martin	Thomas
Hitchcock			

So the motion to lay on the table was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 1 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia. [Putting the question.] By the sound the "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WATSON. I insist on the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request is for the yeas and nays. Is it seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered, and the motion was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is, Shall the Committee on Woman Suffrage be discharged from the consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the folowing Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Capper	Dillingham	Frelinghuysen
Ball	Chamberlain	Edge	Gay
Bankhead	Colt	Elkins	Gore
Beckham	Culberson	Fall	Gronna
Borah	Cummins	Fernald	Hale
Brandegee	Curtis	Fletcher	Harding
Calder	Dial	France	Harris

Harrison	McCumber	Phipps	Spencer
Henderson	McKellar	Pittman	Stanley
Hitchcock	McNary	Poindexter	Sterling
Johnson, Calif.	Martin	Pomerene	Sutherland
Jones, N. Mex.	Moses	Ransdell	Swanson
Jones, Wash.	Myers	Reed	Townsend
Kellogg	Nelson	Robinson	Trammell
Kendrick	New	Sheppard	Underwood
Kenyon	Newberry	Sherman	Wadsworth
Keyes	Norris	Shields	Walsh, Mass.
King	Nugent	Simmons	Walsh, Mont.
Kirby	Overman	Smith, Ariz.	Warren
La Follette	Owen	Smith, Ga.	Watson
Lenroot	Page	Smith, Md.	Williams
Lodge	Penrose	Smith, S. C.	Wolcott
McCormick	Phelan	Smoot	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to offer the following amendment to the pending motion:

That the committee be discharged at the end of three days, unless they shall have sooner reported.

Upon that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays; and I ask that the amendment be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the motion by substituting the following:

That the committee be discharged at the end of three days, unless they shall have sooner reported.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays are requested. Is the request seconded?

The yeas and nays having been ordered and taken, the result was announced—yeas 24, nays 63, as follows:

YEAS—24.

Bankhead	Gay	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Harrison	Reed	Swanson
Brandegee	Hitchcock	Shields	Trammell
Dial	King	Simmons	Underwood
Dillingham	Lodge	Smith, Ga.	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Moses	Smith, Md.	Wolcott

NAYS—63.

Ashurst	Harding	McNary	Robinson
Ball	Harris	Myers	Sheppard
Capper	Henderson	Nelson	Sherman
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	New	Smith, Ariz.
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Newberry	Smoot
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Spencer
Cummins	Kellogg	Nugent	Stanley
Curtis	Kendrick	Owen	Sterling
Edge	Kenyon	Page	Sutherland
Elkins	Keyes	Penrose	Townsend
Fernald	Kirby	Phelan	Walsh, Mass.
France	La Follette	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Pittman	Warren
Gore	McCormick	Poindexter	Watson
Gronna	McKellar	Pomerene	Williams
Hale	McLean	Ransdell	

NOT VOTING—9.

Borah	Gerry	Knox	Martin
Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	McCumber	Thomas
Fall			

So the amendment of Mr. SMITH of Georgia was rejected.

At this point Mr. MYERS introduced sundry bills, which appear under the appropriate heading.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I call for the regular order.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understood the Chair to rule that debate was out of order until 1 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair did so rule, but now the motion to discharge the committee is debatable from this time forward.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I should like to say a word on the question of order, as to whether or not it is now debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair rules that it is.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I dislike to appeal from the decision of the Chair, but let me state a proposition for his consideration. I have looked through the rules and I can not find anywhere a statement that when a motion is made that is undebatable it becomes debatable at any subsequent period. The question is as to the time when the motion was made. If it is debatable when made, it continues to be debatable; and if it is not debatable when made, then I find nothing in the rule to show that it becomes debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico is exactly right. The ruling of the Chair was based upon a former ruling of the Chair to the effect that until the hour of 1 o'clock had arrived motions are not debatable. The Chair is ruling consistently, admitting that the ruling was perhaps altogether wrong. The hour of 1 o'clock has passed, and after the hour of 1 o'clock motions are debatable.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. In view of the statement of the Chair, I appeal from his ruling.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Business has since intervened and no appeal was taken from the decision of the Chair at that time. As I understood the Chair a little while ago, I was unable to appeal from the ruling of the Chair that a motion was in order, because I did not appeal at once.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no recollection of having ruled that it was debatable until just now.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Chair announced that it would be debatable only after 1 o'clock and stopped debate upon it about half past 12.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia rose to get the opinion of the Chair as to whether the motion was debatable. The Chair ruled, to be consistent, that at that time it was debatable. The Chair feels that the Senator from New Mexico has appealed from the ruling of the Chair within the proper time.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The appeal from the ruling of the Chair is debatable, I think.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks so; but we might as well go ahead and talk a little while on suffrage.

Mr. WATSON. In this connection I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry. Is the motion debatable until 2 o'clock or after that time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was not here when the Senate adjourned on Friday. Is there a special order for 2 o'clock?

Mr. WATSON. I have been informed that there is a special order, which is the resolution of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. I was wondering whether or not when we reach the hour of 2 o'clock the special order must be taken up to the exclusion of this motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly.

Mr. SWANSON. It seems to me the prohibition on debate until 2 o'clock comes under Rule VIII, which is that—

All motions made before 2 o'clock to proceed to the consideration of any matter shall be determined without debate.

This is not a motion to proceed to the consideration of any matter; it is a motion to discharge a committee. I do not see anything in the rules that prohibits debate on the pending motion. Rule VIII limits it to a certain kind of motion that shall be determined without debate. I have not been able to find any rule of the Senate which prohibits debate on this motion. A motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject on the calendar before 1 o'clock is not debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If Senators will listen to the Chair for a moment, they will hear the reason for the ruling. It was based upon a former ruling of the Chair, from which no appeal was taken, that a motion to discharge a committee was not debatable prior to 1 o'clock. At 1 o'clock the Senator from Georgia asked whether it was debatable or not and the Chair said that it was. The Senator from New Mexico appealed. The Chair thinks the question, whether or not the appeal is well taken, is debatable.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It seems to me that whether it is debatable depends upon the decision on the other appeal. An appeal with respect to a question which is not debatable is itself not debatable under the decision, and so in this case whether the appeal is debatable depends upon the question whether the prior motion to which it relates is debatable or not. It seems to me there must be a decision upon the other appeal.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator is debating now the very point he makes. I submit that the ruling of the Chair that the subject was debatable on an appeal is also a ruling according to the view expressed by the Senator from New Mexico that the appeal is debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Was the Senator from New Mexico rising to a point of order?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I raise a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That the appeal from the Chair is not debatable?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That the appeal from the Chair is not debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair overrules that point of order. Do you appeal from it?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I suppose it would do no good to appeal from it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If you do not, it stands.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just a moment. Let us find out what the Senator from New Mexico wants to do.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I want to call the attention of the Chair to the prior decision that where the original motion is not debatable, then an appeal from a decision on that motion is not debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But the Chair has ruled.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I do not want to multiply appeals here. It not only takes time but it may take more time than the

discussion which is likely to follow. Nevertheless, I appeal from that decision of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Now, that appeal is not debatable. The Chair calls attention to the rule:

When an appeal is taken, any subsequent question of order which may arise before the decision of such appeal shall be decided by the Presiding Officer without debate, and every appeal therefrom shall be decided at once and without debate.

Now, the Chair has decided that the appeal from the ruling of the Chair is debatable. The Senator from New Mexico raises the point of order that it is not debatable and appeals from the ruling of the Chair. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and being taken, resulted—yeas 70, nays 10, as follows:

YEAS—70.

Ashurst	Harding	Nugent	Smith, S. C.
Ball	Harris	Overman	Smoot
Bankhead	Harrison	Owen	Spencer
Beckham	Hitchcock	Page	Stanley
Brandegee	Kellogg	Penrose	Sterling
Chamberlain	Kendrick	Phipps	Sutherland
Colt	Keyes	Pittman	Swanson
Dial	King	Pomerene	Townsend
Dillingham	La Follette	Ransdell	Trammell
Edge	Lenroot	Reed	Underwood
Elkins	Lodge	Robinson	Wadsworth
Fletcher	McCormick	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
France	McLean	Sherman	Walsh, Mont.
Frelinghuysen	Moses	Shields	Watson
Gay	Myers	Simmons	Williams
Gore	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Gronna	New	Smith, Ga.	
Hale	Newberry	Smith, Md.	

NAYS—10.

Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	McKellar	Poindexter
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	McNary	
Henderson	Kirby	Phelan	

NOT VOTING—16.

Borah	Fall	Johnson, S. Dak.	Martin
Calder	Fernald	Kenyon	Norris
Culberson	Gerry	Knox	Thomas
Cummins	Johnson, Calif.	McCumber	Warren

So the decision of the Chair was sustained.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to disclaim any purpose of delaying action upon the proposed constitutional amendment. I think action should be had in a few days, and I certainly would be the last simply to consume time in order to prevent a vote upon this question after a reasonably decent opportunity had been given to those of us who are opposed to it to express ourselves. The little delay that I helped to cause, from half past 12 until 1 o'clock, was due to a conviction upon my part that Senators who intended to vote against this motion to discharge the committee ought to have an opportunity to express themselves. By consuming a half hour's time of the Senate I was sure they would have the opportunity to say why they desired some little delay on the adoption of this motion to discharge the committee, as after 1 o'clock the Chair had said debate would be in order.

I agree with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] that it would be much better if the committee were allowed to consider the subject in order to see if any amendment were needed to this proposed constitutional amendment, to perfect it, if it needs perfection in any way, and to bring it back to the Senate. It can be brought to the Senate within a week; indeed, it could be brought to the Senate in two or three days. It seems that the committee did not consider it yesterday, because they hoped by failing then to consider it the committee could be discharged to-day and the Senate could proceed to-day with the consideration of the proposed amendment to the Constitution. Mr. President, that is not giving due consideration to so important a subject. If the Senate shall determine to-morrow, or when the time comes to vote upon the motion, that they prefer to discharge the committee, of course the Senate has the right to do so, and we shall all submit; the amendment will then go to the calendar; and the day after it goes to the calendar a motion will be in order to take it from the calendar.

Mr. President, at the time the attention of the Senate was called to the motion to discharge the committee we were engaged in "morning business," and the Senate rules prescribe what that business shall be. There was no report of a committee. If there had been a report of a committee, it would have gone over for a day before any action or the report of the committee could have been had. Although the Chair ruled upon it, and there was no appeal, I wish to say, as an explanation in part of the course which I have pursued, that, in my opinion, a motion to discharge the committee could not be taken up during the morning hour. The rules of the Senate prescribe the business to be transacted during the morning hour. Such a motion as this motion to discharge a committee is not found in that list. It might possibly be passed as a resolution and be called up in that way; but it was not a report of a committee, and it could not properly be taken up, with all due deference to the ruling of the Chair, I submit, as a report of a committee or in connection with that part of the order of business which provides for reports of committees. I was inclined to think that the Chair also had changed his opinion as to the proper ruling.

Mr. President, under the rules of the Senate, during the morning hour until 1 o'clock no motion is debatable. A motion to discharge a committee frequently involves matters of serious importance. To permit it to be called up or to provide for it to be called up at a time when debate is impossible would be to make an order of business unwise and unsafe.

I feel sure that the motion to discharge the committee should not have been taken up when it was, and several of us concluded that it was desirable to delay action until 1 o'clock in order that those of us who had opposed the immediate consideration of the motion might have an opportunity to say briefly, not with any consumption of time that amounted in any sense to a filibuster, but merely for the purpose of making it known that we did not intend in any way to filibuster and that we did not intend in any way to unduly delay a vote upon this proposed constitutional amendment, but that we thought a few days should pass before action should be had. I have no doubt that within the week, certainly next week, we will vote on this proposed amendment. I for one shall take less than an hour, perhaps not half an hour, to say what I wish to say about the condition in my State and to express my objections to a proposed constitutional amendment which would interfere with the right of each separate State to settle this question to suit itself.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not think this question needs debating; it needs settling. It has been debated for some 20 years. Big men, little men, and middle-sized men have talked about it until the whole country is tired of hearing talk upon this subject. The advocates of it have consumed time enough. Let us, the opponents of it, not imitate their example. I think the sooner we can get a vote upon this question the better. I expect to vote against this proposed constitutional amendment, but I do not want to retard its consideration.

Now, the whole world—not only America, but all the world—is messed up and mussed up with every sort of important question, and this question is not of the slightest importance on the thoughts or the habits or the legislation of men or of women here or elsewhere. The trouble has been that the advocates of it have thought that the entire civilized world depended upon its passage, and the opponents of it have thought that the home life and morality of the world depended upon its defeat.

The truth is that in some 11 or 12 States where for 20 years or more it has been tried it has done neither good nor harm. So far as I am concerned, I was opposed to it, and am yet, because I think it affects to a certain extent the social fabric of the South; but I see the handwriting on the wall. I do not want to imitate old Jonathan Higginbotham, who during the war refused to secede with Arkansas, and after the war refused to make peace when Arkansas surrendered but who carried on war against both the State of Arkansas and the Federal Government for about two years afterwards, until he had to be hunted up and rooted out of the Ozark Mountains.

What is the use? We have many matters to get through with here. The world has got to reconstruct itself; it has to demobilize from a war basis and remobilize upon a peace basis, to reconstruct industry and society. Those of us who are opponents of this measure who can see anything when written upon the book of fate at all can see that this is written there. The question is settled. Why not simply satisfy ourselves in voting against it, and why not benefit the country and the world by getting it to a vote just as soon as possible?

I am in favor of making a fight to the last ditch when you have got to fight and making it as long as there is a scintilla of hope upon the horizon, making it as long as you think you can beat your opponents in any proper, honest, or right way. One of the proper and honest and right ways is, if you think you can defeat a proposition next week, and you can not defeat it now, to carry it over until then; but nobody believes that in this case; everybody knows it is a question of whether the thing shall come to a vote now and be passed or whether it shall come to a vote, according to the judgment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], in three days and be passed. What good will talking do? I have done my share of talking upon it privately and publicly, although I never made a stated speech about it. It seems to me that it is having the Federal Government take a power and authority that was intended originally for the States. This Union never would have been formed if anybody had known that the Federal Government was ever going

to try to exercise a power of that sort; but when two-thirds of Congress are in favor of submitting a joint resolution to the States for adoption by the usual three-fourths, and when you know beforehand that that is the case, and when you know that the country and the world have important business to attend to, and when you know that the practical results of the adoption or defeat of woman suffrage will amount to nothing, as the experience of the world wherever it has been adopted has demonstrated beyond cavil or doubt, then why should we stand here and just delay things for parliamentary advantage of one or two days or something else?

There is no one in this body to whom, temperamentally and sectionally, this motion is more obnoxious; but my ancestors have been through this temperamental and sectional opposition once before, and when they found out that the game was lost no less men than Robert E. Lee and Joseph E. Johnston and other great men said, "We will not carry on a war by ambush. When we have lost the last regular battle that we can lose, and the last regular army that we have, we will quit, and we will make peace in good faith, and we will keep it in good faith."

I am sorry that it is written upon the book of fate, but it is written there. Now, let us face the situation, and go down in honor, as we do in defeat, which we can not help. Let us not spend any time trying to get three or four more days to talk in; and, by the way, here I have just been taking fully my share of what would have been the three or four days to talk in.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I understand, of course, this measure will at no distant day be passed. It seems to be a settled proposition that the votes have been secured to submit it to the States for ratification; and it has not been my purpose to unduly delay the vote.

If those who have charge of the measure and are anxious that it shall be voted on will suggest a day when we can take it up and proceed with its consideration to its final disposition, I certainly shall not stand in the way of any such proposition. I had expected to submit some reasons why I shall vote against the joint resolution, and I shall be brief in doing so. If an arrangement may be had so that we may proceed in an orderly but expeditious way to final submission of the question, giving those who have not yet been converted to the program an opportunity to state their reasons, so far as I am concerned they may proceed. I have not changed my view; and while anything said here will not change a vote, I nevertheless, for reasons satisfactory to myself, would like to make some observations.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I just want to suggest to the Senator that we will be in a position to do that just as soon as this motion is carried, and the joint resolution goes to the calendar; and I feel that that would be the disposition—to try to fix a definite time, so that every Senator would know when the matter was coming up to be considered and voted on just as quickly as possible.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator will recall that I asked the Senator in charge of the measure if it was his purpose to proceed to-day, and he said it was if he could. Of course, he could not bring it to a vote to-day as long as Senators desired to discuss it. I think there might be some question as to whether it would be in order to move to take it up to-day; but I feel satisfied that if it goes on the calendar an agreement can be made, satisfactory to everybody, to fix a time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to say that I voted for the motion to table the motion to discharge the committee. I would not have it inferred from that vote that I am adverse to the proposed constitutional amendment. I have voted for it on two or three previous occasions. In fact, I have formed the habit; and I shall vote for this amendment whenever it comes in a regular parliamentary way to a vote. My objection was against the procedure. The committee on Saturday last could have voted a favorable report upon this amendment, and it could have been reported to-day, and after going over one day under the rule it would have been in order. If the motion to discharge the committee prevails, the amendment will still have to go over for one day under the rule, if there be objection; so, if there be any responsibility for this one day's delay, that responsibility attaches to the committee.

I see no reason why we should not proceed in the regular way to the consideration and adoption of this constitutional amendment. The tactics proposed are somewhat revolutionary in their character. The friends of this constitutional amendment might justify those revolutionary tactics in this particular instance; perhaps I could overlook it myself; but I do not like to have a revolutionary procedure established so early in the session, just after the change in the control of the Senate—a revolutionary method which might hereafter be invoked as a precedent, and there might be universal objection on this side.

I do not wish to be committed in advance, and I am sorry to see this side committed in advance, to revolutionary methods of procedure of this sort.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I feel with reference to this matter as the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] has expressed himself. I think the sooner we have a vote upon this joint resolution the better. I have myself, therefore, absolutely no disposition to delay action for one day; but I do think that this is a very important matter. I do believe that every Senator desires to be recorded upon this question; and I think the best solution of it would be—and I wish to suggest that to the Senator from Washington—to fix a day as early as he pleases, but sufficiently in the future to give Senators an opportunity to be present, and let us agree to a unanimous-consent rule to take up the matter on that day and bring it to a final vote.

I make that suggestion to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I was interrupted, and did not catch the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. SIMMONS. My suggestion was, in order to give every Senator an opportunity to be recorded upon this very important matter, that the proponents of this joint resolution ask for unanimous consent to vote at a certain time, making that sufficiently far in the future to enable Senators to be present if they desire.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator refers to a vote upon the joint resolution submitting the amendment, not upon this motion?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I should be very glad myself to do that. I do not know that it would be in order, however, to do it until the joint resolution is brought before the Senate. The joint resolution is now before the committee, and the purpose of this motion is to get it from the committee and get it on the calendar. Then we can make just such an arrangement as the Senator suggests; and I think that is a very good suggestion.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have no particular interest in the procedure by which the joint resolution is brought before the Senate, but I have some interest in the question of whether we are to vote here without due notice to Senators that this important matter is to be acted on.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, no; I agree with the Senator that it should be set down in plenty of time so that every Senator will have notice to be here, and I have no doubt that that will be done.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I shall vote against the motion to take this action, as proposed by the Senator from Washington, at this time. I am consistently a friend of the constitutional amendment itself, and shall vote for it whenever opportunity offers, and shall vote for any legitimate method of expediting that opportunity.

Under the ruling of the presiding officer this morning, if such ruling continues to be the rule of the Senate with reference to all legislation, the situation would be this: An appropriation bill coming over from the House, and being referred to a committee, any Member of the Senate the next morning, or immediately, could make a motion to discharge the committee. That motion would lie over one day; and under the ruling of the Chair the next day, under "Reports of committees," it could be brought up, and must be voted on without debate before 1 o'clock.

I can not vote to sustain any such ruling of the Chair. That ruling was erroneous. I will not vote to take a measure from a committee which does not exist. According to my interpretation of the joint resolution, the committee had no jurisdiction of this measure at all, and has not had the joint resolution in its hands; and therefore a motion to discharge it should not be entertained.

For those two reasons I can not vote in favor of this motion, and shall vote against it. It will pass; it will be adopted, and I shall cheerfully vote for the constitutional amendment whenever I have an opportunity; and I will vote for any motion which I consider a proper motion to expedite a vote upon the constitutional amendment itself.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I want to say just a word in reply to those who consider this action revolutionary.

The Committee on Woman Suffrage met and considered this very situation and decided to support this motion; so the committee has considered this joint resolution, which came from the House, proposing the amendment, and it has decided to take this course in order to bring the matter to a vote in the Senate. It is a joint resolution which has been before the Senate and the country for a generation, and no one can say that he has not had an opportunity to consider it fully.

When the committee charged with the duty of considering the joint resolution decides to bring it before the Senate in this way, I can not understand how anyone can claim that it has not had consideration, that it is revolutionary, or that it sets any bad precedent. The committee has considered it time after time, brought it to a vote before the Senate at least twice during the last Congress, and it is the same thing, the same committee; and can anyone say that to recommend this procedure is revolutionary?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STANLEY in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gay	McCormick	Sherman
Ball	Gore	McCumber	Shields
Bankhead	Hale	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.
Brandegee	Harris	McLean	Smith, Md.
Calder	Henderson	McNary	Smoot
Capper	Hitchcock	Moses	Spencer
Colt	Johnson, Calif.	Nelson	Stanley
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Sterling
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Newberry	Sutherland
Dial	Kellogg	Norris	Townsend
Dillingham	Kendrick	Nugent	Trammell
Edge	Kenyon	Overman	Wadsworth
Elkins	Keyes	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Fernald	King	Pittman	Warren
Fletcher	Knox	Poindexter	Watson
France	La Follette	Reed	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Sheppard	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate resolution No. 12, submitted by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. The pending question is the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from California, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be temporarily laid aside until we dispose of the other proposition. It will take only a few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FLETCHER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection.

Mr. WATSON. Do I understand the Senator from Florida to object?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of California entered the Chamber.

Mr. WATSON. The Senator from California is now here.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I did not know the Senator from California was entering the Chamber. A request was made that the resolution be temporarily laid aside, but unanimous consent was not granted for that purpose, and in the absence of the Senator from California I expected to move that it be laid aside temporarily for the purpose of disposing of the motion which has already been considered this morning. I should like to ask the pleasure of the Senator from California regarding the matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have no objection if the matter is to be concluded within a brief period. I do not want the particular matter which is now the unfinished business to be supplanted indefinitely.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Does the Senator from California understand that a motion can not be made to lay aside the resolution temporarily, but that it is supplanted by the matter that comes up? However, the Senate can afterwards take up this particular resolution if it sees fit.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If that be the case, I ask that we proceed with the unfinished business.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I simply wish to make a suggestion. I am satisfied there is no one on this side of the Chamber who desires to discuss the motion. I have the impression that no one on the other side cares to discuss it further, and we could probably dispose of it in three or four minutes. I suggest to the Senator from Florida that he withdraw his objection to laying aside temporarily the unfinished business in order that we may see if we can not get a vote on the motion to discharge the committee.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I notice the absence of a good many Senators who are interested in the subject which has been under consideration, and I did not feel that it was fair to them to let the matter come to a vote in their absence.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have heard several Senators who are opposed to this constitutional amendment express a desire to discuss it. I understand that some of those Senators are now absent from the Chamber. It seems to me the difficulty could be met if the chairman of the Woman Suffrage Committee, if there be such a committee, would call a hurry-up meeting of the committee in the cloakroom. It would not take two minutes for that committee to report the resolution, and it would then take its place on the calendar properly and obviate this discussion. It would have to go over for a day in either case, and it would facilitate the consideration of the constitutional amendment, which I favor. I do not think we should adopt a method which some regard as revolutionary.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 731) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

A bill (S. 732) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Canton, Ohio, one German cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEYES:

A bill (S. 733) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Milford, N. H., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 734) for the promotion of Col. William A. Simpson, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 735) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Redman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 736) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Idabel, Okla.; and

A bill (S. 737) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Hugo, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 738) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Wakeeney, Kans., for use in library grounds.

A bill (S. 739) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Coffeyville, Kans., for use in Forest Park;

A bill (S. 740) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Greenleaf, Kans., for use in City Park;

A bill (S. 741) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Pittsburg, Kans., for use of the Manual Training Normal School;

A bill (S. 742) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Lawrence, Kans., for use in the Memorial High School grounds;

A bill (S. 743) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Topeka, Kans., for use in the State capitol grounds;

A bill (S. 744) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles for use in the City Park, Salina, Kans.;

A bill (S. 745) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to John A. Dix Post, No. 59, Columbus, Kans.;

A bill (S. 746) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Baker University, Baldwin City, Kans.;

A bill (S. 747) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Kirwin, Kans.; and

A bill (S. 748) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Wellington, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 749) for the relief of Ellen Oglesby (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 750) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Fulton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 751) granting a pension to Laura E. Hugess (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 752) granting an increase of pension to John J. Boles (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 753) granting an increase of pension to Leonard Chapman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 754) granting an increase of pension to Ethalemia Scott (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 755) granting an increase of pension to Elijah G. W. Ebert (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 756) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Keith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 757) to found and maintain a mutual insurance fund for depositors in national banks, to be kept available in the United States Treasury, and to be administered by a bureau in the Treasury Department organized and regulated for that purpose; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 758) to provide for a commission to investigate commissions and to make recommendations concerning the same; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (S. 759) to authorize certain late physicians and surgeons of the United States Volunteer Army in the War with Spain to practice their respective professions in any Territory, district, dependency, or possession of the United States under the constitutional jurisdiction of Congress upon the presentation and proof of certain facts; to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

A bill (S. 760) to revive the right of action under the captured and abandoned property acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A *bill* (S. 761) to establish a drainage fund and to provide for the reclamation of swamp and overflowed lands in certain States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 762) to provide for the erection of memorials and the entombment of bodies in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, in Arlington National Cemetery, Va.; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 763) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the National Military Park, Vicksburg, Miss., two German cannons or fieldpieces; and

A bill (S. 764) to place Lieut. Col. Junius L. Powell on the retired list of the Army with the rank of brigadier general; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 765) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to readjudicate the cases of Mattie W. Jackson, widow, and others against the United States, and Mattie E. Hughes against the United States;

A bill (S. 766) for the relief of the representative of the estate of Haller Nutt, deceased;

A bill (S. 767) for the relief of the heirs of W. H. Sneed, deceased;

A bill (S. 768) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, at Sageville, Lauderdale County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 769) for the relief of the legal representatives of James M. Brabston and Roche H. Brabston;

A bill (S. 770) for the relief of the trustees of the Sageville Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Sageville, Lauderdale County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 771) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Decatur, Miss.;

A bill (S. 772) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Decatur, Miss.;

A bill (S. 773) for the relief of the trustees of Evergreen Lodge, No. 77, Free and Accepted Masons, of Decatur, Miss.;

A bill (S. 774) for the relief of M. T. Sigrest;

A bill (S. 775) for the relief of the heirs of Jacob Kuykendall;

A bill (S. 776) for the relief of James K. Hamblen;

A bill (S. 777) for the relief of the estate of Capt. John Belino, deceased;

A bill (S. 778) to authorize the Postmaster General to settle the accounts of Capt. J. H. Estes;

A bill (S. 779) for the relief of Maria Elizabeth Burnett;

A bill (S. 780) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and adjudicate claims for the destruction of private property and damage thereto as the result of the construction of levees along, and other improvements of, the Mississippi River; and

A bill (S. 781) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and adjudicate claims for the destruction of private property and damage thereto as the result of the construction of levees along, and other improvements of, the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 782) granting a pension to John H. Isiley (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 783) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. McElroy;

A bill (S. 784) granting a pension to Susan A. Strickler;

A bill (S. 785) granting a pension to Eva A. Trager;

A bill (S. 786) granting a pension to Elvis R. Street;

A bill (S. 787) granting an increase of pension to David W. Herriman;

A bill (S. 788) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Brooks;

A bill (S. 789) granting an increase of pension to Elie Jones Quinby;

A bill (S. 790) granting a pension to John E. Hall; and

A bill (S. 791) granting a pension to Robert Webb Banks; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 792) providing for cooperation between the United States and State governments in the rural settlement of soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to promote the reclamation of lands, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 793) authorizing the issuance of patent to the Milk River Valley Gun Club;

A bill (S. 794) granting lands for school purposes in Government town sites on reclamation projects;

A bill (S. 795) to provide for the disposition of public lands withdrawn and improved under the provisions of the reclamation laws, and which are no longer needed in connection with said laws;

A bill (S. 796) for furnishing water supply for miscellaneous purposes in connection with reclamation projects;

A bill (S. 797) providing for noncontiguous homestead entries within the former Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., of land of the character described in the enlarged homestead act of February 19, 1909;

A bill (S. 798) giving the right to an additional homestead to all persons who have exhausted or who shall exhaust their original right of entry through the purchase of Indian lands; and

A bill (S. 799) for the relief of private owners of lands within or near the Bitter Root, Lolo, or Missoula National Forests, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 800) to indemnify depositors in "member banks," as defined by the Federal reserve act, against loss in the event of the failure or suspension of business of such bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 801) to provide for carrying into effect of the agreement between the United States and the Muskogee (Creek) Nation of Indians ratified by act of Congress approved March 1, 1901, and supplemental agreement of June 30, 1902, and other laws and treaties with said tribe of Indians;

A bill (S. 802) to pay the balance due the loyal Creek Indians on the award made by the Senate on the 16th day of February, 1903;

A bill (S. 803) to adjust and settle the claims of the loyal Shawnee, Cherokee-Shawnees, and loyal Absentee Shawnee and Delaware Tribes of Indians;

A bill (S. 804) authorizing the Ponca Tribe of Indians, residing in the States of Oklahoma and Nebraska, to submit claims to the Court of Claims;

A bill (S. 805) to provide for a determination of heirship in cases of deceased members of the Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, and Seminole Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma, and conferring authority on the courts of said State in reference thereto, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 806) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in claims of the Iowa Tribe of Indians against the United States;

A bill (S. 807) to adjust and settle the claims of the loyal Shawnee, Cherokee-Shawnees, and loyal Absentee Shawnee and Delaware Tribes of Indians; and

A bill (S. 808) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in the Osage civilization fund claim of the Osage Nation of Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 809) authorizing the licensing and control of corporations engaged in the storing of food products for interstate shipment; and

A bill (S. 810) to establish an interstate marketing system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce;

A bill (S. 811) for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia; and

A bill (S. 812) to amend an act entitled "An act to parole United States prisoners, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1910, as amended by an act approved January 23, 1913; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 813) to establish a sanitary reserve corps for the Public Health Service; and

A bill (S. 814) to establish a department of health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

A bill (S. 815) to revise, amend, and codify the laws relating to publicity of contributions and disbursements at elections at which candidates for the offices of United States Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States are nomi-

nated and elected, regulating and limiting the purposes and the amounts for which contributions and disbursements may be made, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 816) to provide for public education upon political questions and for the dissemination of information upon political issues and matters of a political nature of public interest by an authorized publicity pamphlet; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

A bill (S. 817) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims for adjudging the rights of the Otoe and Missouria Tribes of Indians for compensation on a basis of guardian and ward, and conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to adjust the claims between the Otoe and Missouria Tribes of Indians and the Omaha Indians to certain moneys received by the Omaha Indians; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 818) to establish a United States court of patent appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

A bill (S. 819) to create the department of education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 820) for the construction of a Federal building at Fillmore, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 821) granting a pension to Martin T. Knapp; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KNOX:

A bill (S. 822) for the relief of James W. Cross; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 823) to donate a cannon to the city of Trafford, Pa.;

A bill (S. 824) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Warren, Pa., six German cannons or fieldpieces;

A bill (S. 825) to donate a cannon to the city of Erie, Pa.; and

A bill (S. 826) to donate a piece of field artillery to Girard College, of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 827) granting an increase of pension to William C. Shaffer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 828) to amend an act entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1913; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ELKINS:

A bill (S. 829) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wheeling, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 830) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of New Martinsville, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 831) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Parkersburg, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 832) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Elkins, Randolph County, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 833) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Grafton, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 834) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Martinsburg, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 835) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Moundsville, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 836) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fairmont, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 837) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Morgantown, Monongalia County, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 838) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bluefield, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 839) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Clarksburg, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 840) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Charleston, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; and

A bill (S. 841) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Huntington, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 842) granting a pension to W. E. Crookshanks;

A bill (S. 843) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Lynch; and

A bill (S. 844) granting a pension to John Bennett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 28) authorizing the appointment of an ambassador to the Republic of Peru; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 29) requesting the Commission of Fine Arts to submit to the Congress certain suggestions; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MYERS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 30) to permit of the disposition of certain lands in Montana ceded by the Crow Indians; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. OWEN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense and for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to supervise the issuance of securities, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF REVENUE ACT.

Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 25) to repeal sections 630, 900, and 904 of the act entitled "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes," approved February 24, 1919, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 40), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That a committee, consisting of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, together with the four senior minority members of the four committees first named, shall be constituted a committee to be called "the committee on the budget," and shall be charged with the duty of making recommendations for the coordination of governmental expenditures and governmental revenues.

Resolved further, That all appropriation bills, all bills for the expenditures of money, and all bills raising revenue shall be submitted by the committees having jurisdiction to the committee on the budget for amendments suggested by it before being reported to the Senate for action.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. At the request of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 1200. An act making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

TREATY OF PEACE.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 12) submitted by Mr. JOHNSON of California on the 20th instant, as follows:

Whereas the peace treaty has been completed and has been delivered to the representatives of Germany; and

Whereas a synopsis only of the treaty has been given publicity in the United States, and our people are entitled to know its full contents, and to what, if any, engagements they have been committed; and

Whereas it is reported in the press that the entire treaty has been cabled to the State Department and is now in the possession of the State Department: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested forthwith to transmit to the Senate the full text of the treaty of peace completed at the Paris conference and delivered to the representatives of Germany.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the revised covenant of the league of nations has been laid before the country. In my opinion none of the grave objections to be found in the original document have been removed. Upon the contrary, in a number of instances the evils have been aggravated or those evils now for the first time fully disclosed.

A striking illustration is found in the fact that we are now for the first time informed what nations are to constitute the members of the league. It will be remembered that the original covenant, so far as published, mentioned by name as members of the league the British Empire, France, Italy, Japan, and the United States, and that the names of the other members were referred to as being contained in a protocol, the contents of which was sedulously concealed from the American people and,

I presume, from the people of the world. Whatever motive led to this concealment, it is certain that the primal shock to American intelligence and patriotism would have been much greater had the people been at first frankly informed who were to be the partners of the United States in the world government about to be set up.

The names are now given. We know who are to sit about the council board of the international tribunal which is to undertake in many respects the government of the world. An examination of the character of this membership ought in itself to cause the instant rejection of the entire scheme. It brands the plan as futile and impossible and dooms it to ignominious failure.

If the proposed constitution of the league of nations were in fact what it is not, perfect in all its parts and capable, if wisely interpreted and justly enforced, of producing universal happiness and bringing unbroken peace to the world, still, if left to the interpretation and enforcement of the members of the proposed league, it would utterly fail in its object and bring misery rather than happiness to mankind. That assertion I now undertake to demonstrate.

It was Pope who said:

> For forms of government let fools contest;
> Whate're is best administered is best.

Making due allowance for poetic exaggeration, the couplet contains a great truth. Granted arbitrary powers, the wise, virtuous, and humane despot will nevertheless promote the happiness of his subjects. Upon the other hand, an enlightened constitution and code of laws in the hands of an ignorant, depraved, or cruel president have never afforded the people protection against outrage and wrong.

Numerous illustrations of this truth are found in the Governments of certain South American and Negro Republics which have copied the letter of the Constitution of the United States, but which have nevertheless been perpetually the victims of tyranny.

If the league were to be composed of the most enlightened nations of the world, it might be argued that we could consign to them many questions of importance, trusting to their sense of justice and equity for fair decisions.

An examination, however, of the membership of this present league will first astonish and then arouse the indignation of every thoughtful man. It will come as a distinct shock, first, that this is a colored league of nations; that is to say, the majority of the nations composing the league do not belong to the white race of men. On the contrary, they are a conglomerate of the black, yellow, brown, and red races, frequently so intermixed and commingled as to constitute an unclassifiable mongrel breed.

The league is composed of 32 nations. I present them in two classifications—white and dark—including as white all those countries in which the white race predominates, and classifying as dark those nations in which the dark-skinned people are in the majority. To this there is in the list one exception—Cuba. I have placed it among the dark races because fully one-third of its people are of negro stock and for the further reason that in the island race equality is completely recognized and miscegenation is commonly practiced. On the other hand, I have placed Uruguay in the white column, although it has a large Indian population, together with an excessive immigrant population of undesirables. In these tables I also show, where figures are obtainable, the degree of illiteracy. It will be found that among the dark races illiteracy is astonishingly high. The figures as to population are the latest obtainable. But in some instances the nations have not reached the point of civilization where a reliable census has ever been taken. In such cases the best estimates available have been followed.

Mr. President, as I shall comment on each of the respective nations as I proceed, giving the population, I now at this time ask to print without reading the list of the dark nations, together with their populations and percentage of illiteracy, and the list of white nations, with populations and percentage of illiteracy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave will be granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Dark countries.					White countries.		
Country.	Year estimated.	Population.	Percentage of dark and mixed races.	Percentage of illiteracy.	Country.	Population.	Percentage of illiteracy.
1. Liberia	[1] 1916–17	2,000,000	100	98	1. United States	110,000,000	7.7
2. Haiti	1911	1,500,000	90	Very high.	2. Belgium	7,500,000	13.1
3. Hedjaz	1911	300,000	100	High.	3. British Isles	45,000,000	11
4. Panama	1916	450,000	90	High.	4. Canada	8,300,000	11
5. Honduras	1911	562,000	85	68	5. Australia	5,000,000	1.8
6. Nicaragua	1914	703,500	90	High.	6. New South Wales	2,000,000	2
7. Guatemala	1903	1,842,000	85	92	7. Czechoslovakia	13,000,000	
8. Ecuador	1900	1,500,000	93	High.	8. France	39,500,000	3
9. Cuba	1907	2,048,000	33	44	9. Greece	2,750,000	57
10. Bolivia	1900	1,816,000	87	82	10. Italy	28,500,000	34
11. Peru	1908	4,500,000	86	[2] Very high.	11. Poland	10,000,000	
12. Brazil	1904	24,500,000	88	80	12. Portugal	6,000,000	68
13. South Africa		5,000,000	80	69	13. Roumania	7,500,000	41
14. Siam	1909	6,230,000	99	Very high.	14. Serbia	3,000,000	84
15. India	1911	294,361,000	95	92	15. Uruguay	1,378,000	
16. China	1906	407,253,000	100	High.			
17. Japan	1917	56,860,000	99	Low.			
		811,425,500	[3] 89			289,428,000	

[1] Negro Yearbook. [2] Statesman's Yearbook, 1169. [3] Average.

NOTE.—Figures are from Encyclopædia Britannica and Statesman's Yearbook.

Mr. REED. From the foregoing table it appears that when the members of the league of nations meet about the council table there will be 15 men representing white nations and 17 men representing black, brown, yellow, and red races; and that among the nations classified as dark the average of the dark-skinned people compared with the total population is nearly 9 to 1. It is also shown that among these races the degree of illiteracy is astonishingly high. Where figures are available the percentage runs from nearly 50 per cent in Cuba to 98 per cent in Liberia. The average is about 85 per cent. Thus we not only bring to the council board races which are dark skinned, but also those so low in civilization that they constitute the very dregs of ignorance. As I shall later show, they are the victims of superstition and are steeped in barbarism.

Even among the white races that are to sit in the council of the world and determine the fate of America we find nations so backward as to raise a serious question regarding their ability to perform the functions of civilized government. Witness Serbia, 84 per cent of whose people can not read or write; Portugal, with 68 per cent of illiteracy; Roumania, with 41 per cent; and Greece, with 57 per cent. To the votes of a tribunal thus constituted it is proposed to submit for final decision questions which may involve the very life of the United States. By their votes we may be plunged into war; by their decision subjected to wrongs of the most grievous character; by their decree the very fate of the world may be determined.

Let us now a little more in detail examine the character of these new governors of the world, the exponents of the "new magic." That examination will disclose that in a large part they have in the past been unable to maintain anything approaching a decent or civilized government. Indeed, many of them could not have existed except as wards protected by the United States or other civilized nations. In this connection notice that the United States, with its population of 110,000,000, is given no greater voting strength than the smallest of the nations concerned. To this attention will hereafter be directed.

LIBERIA.

Let me now call your attention, O you men of the South, to Liberia—Liberia that is given a vote equal to the vote of the United States; Liberia that shall vote upon the fate of the

world. Its total population, according to the Negro Yearbook of 1916, was 2,000,000. The number of Afro-American Liberians is estimated at 12,000. About 50,000 of the coast negroes are classed as civilized or semicivilized. The rest are in their original state of African barbarism.

Here, then, we have a total population of 50,000 civilized or semicivilized negroes against which is to be balanced 1,950,000 savages. The Encyclopædia Britannica tells us that "*in the forest depths beyond 40 miles from the coast many of the indigenous races still practice cannibalism.*" The Republic from the first has been a joke nation. Negroes from America have refused to emigrate there. In 1910 America, acting in conjunction with Great Britain, France, and Germany, took over the administration of the finances, military organization, agricultural, and boundary questions. The customs were placed in charge of American officials and a loan of $2,000,000 arranged. On top of this we have since the war, just after or just before Liberia declared war and "sent her serried hordes to battle at the front," loaned her 5,000,000 good, hard American dollars. The representatives of these 50,000 civilized and semicivilized negroes, not counting the cannibals, are now to be permitted to sit in the council of nations and help to settle the policies of the world and the destiny of the United States.

No better commentary on the absurdity of the right of such a nation to sit in the council of the world, cast a vote equal to that of the United States, can be found than the fact that, although the American negroes have been frequently importuned to emigrate to that country, they have consistently refused. Although in that land of liberty all are excluded from voting save persons of negro blood, still our American negroes are too progressive and too intelligent to cast their lot with such a nation in such a place. Men of the South, when you go back to your people, if you shall vote for this league of nations, answer to them and answer to the rest of the world how you justify excluding the negro from the ballot box in this country and at the same time propose to give to this negro nation, with only 50,000 civilized people, the right to cast a vote equal to the vote of the first nation of the earth. Take that question back and answer it. Answer it to your consciences here and answer it by your vote. Do not try to dodge it, for there is no dodging. Even in the North there has practically come a state of acquiescence in the custom of not allowing negroes to vote down South, upon the theory that white men would better control the affairs of those States. Now you propose to go to Africa, bring in a representative of 2,000,000 negroes, 1,950,000 of whom are savages, some of them cannibals, and give them a vote which will settle perhaps the fate of the United States or the destiny of the world. Of course, as it is in the league of nations, it is enshrined in the holy of the holies; accordingly many of you will shut your eyes and open your mouths and swallow, with the docility of those who have well learned the lesson of obedience.

That nation which is not fit to govern itself, for which the United States is to-day compelled to act as receiver, is to sit in a league of nations and vote. But, somebody will say, we will control their vote. Is that so? Then why are they there? Is this league of nations a fake, and are these people to be controlled as mere automatons? If so, we start out with a fraud upon the world; we seek to perpetrate a trick upon humanity; and we brand ourselves as unworthy of the confidence of men.

HAITI.

I now invite you to a change of scene, but not to change of environment or color. Haiti. What man is there in all the world who saw us a few months ago send our marines into Haiti to preserve order and stop murder and pillage and riot, and to compel obedience to the decencies of life—what man is there outside of the precincts of some building where the insane are cared for would have prophesied a year ago that it would now be solemnly proposed that Haiti shall sit in the councils of nations empowered to vote a decree that may settle the fate of the United States? Who but a man bereft of reason would have thought that the representatives of the United States would ever have consented to so monstrous a proposal?

Haiti: Total population, 1,500,000 in 1911. Practically 99 per cent of the people are negroes or of negro extraction. Illiteracy is the common condition. The Republic was established by assassination. In 1804 the blacks rose in revolt and massacred the French, man, woman, and child, almost to the last individual. From that time to this their Government has been a succession of petty tyrannies generally established in blood and usually extinguished by battle or murder. Their elections are generally held by a group of assassins who meet together and determine the exact moment at which they propose to kill the ruler and to put another one in his place.

I desire to read from the American Geographic Magazine of 1916, and I am inviting all the reformers there are here, and all the dreamers who dream dreams and see visions, and all of those who believe in the new magic, to follow me as I peruse these somber lines. Says this disinterested authority:

It was Dessalines who led these forces which defeated the French, massacred their women and children, and set up an independent Government. From that time, 1804, to the present they have had 28 rulers, including a king and an emperor. Of these, only 4 completed their terms of office, 2 died in power, 5 were assassinated, 10 were exiled, 1 commited suicide, and 1 abdicated under compulsion.

Of Christophe, the second ruler, Sir Frederick Treves gives us this glimpse:

To Dessalines succeeded Christophe, one of the most ludicrous figures in modern history. He was a mulatto slave who took upon himself the title of Henri I. He created a copious black aristocracy—

Which I presume now will be transformed into a modern democracy—

whereby the water-side porter became a duke and the footman a marquis. He drew up a code of laws, the Code Henri in imitation of the Code Napoleon. His court was as gorgeous as the court of an opera bouffe. More than that, he built the palace of Sans Souci, an unbelievable edifice, worthy of Arabian Nights. The ruins of this fantastic edifice still crown certain gracious heights near Cape Haitien. Henri I did one wise thing. He shot himself after a burlesque reign of some 13 years.

The author adds—

He, Sir Frederick Treves, might have added that the fastidious Christophe used a silver bullet. Lead was too plebian for his aristocratic brain.

Another ruler was Soulouque, an illiterate and superstitious negro, who under the title of Emperor Faustin I established a nobility——

[Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The galleries will refrain from demonstrations.

Mr. REED. This author continues:

Among the recipients of his honors being His Grace the Duke of Limonade and His Highness Prince Bobo.

In 1912, when the Knox mission to Latin America visited Port au Prince, President Laconte was in power. The city then thoroughly fitted Ober's description of it when he wrote:

"As to Port au Prince, I can bear testimony respecting its utter filthiness and agree with a recent resident there that it may bear away the palm of being the most foul-smelling and consequently fever-stricken city in the world. Everyone throws his refuse before his door, so that the heaps of manure and every species of rubbish incumber the way. The gutters are open, pools of stagnant water obstruct the streets everywhere and receive constant accession from the inhabitants using them as cesspools and sewers."

But conditions were good then to what they became later. Laconte had set some of his generals to breaking stone for macadamizing the streets, and white residents said that the town was cleaner that year than it had been in their memory.

A REIGN OF TERROR.

But Laconte did not rule long. He was assassinated, the palace was burned down, and there was inaugurated a carnival of crime and an orgy of revolution such as history perhaps never before was called upon to record. Indeed, the four years that began with the assassination of Laconte and ended with the surrender of the last rebels to United States authority were a nightmare of terror.

In one case the body of a dead ruler was lying in state in the cathedral when a military company was drawn up and commanded to fire into the coffin, which they did with riddling effect. In still another case 110 leading citizens were shot and a reign of terror surpassing even past performances was inaugurated.

This in its turn resulted in the storming of the French legation, where President Guillaume Sam, who had ordered the execution of these people, had taken refuge. He was dragged out; his body was drawn in quarters and dragged through the streets.

Then follow some historical sketches of that country, which I do not pause to read, but I do pause long enough to read to these reformers who want to put the advanced peoples, who represent science and humanity and religion, in command of the bad—I pause long enough to read you this little sketch, and may it sink into your hearts:

Every authority on Haiti agrees that vaudoux or voodoo worship exists there and that it is probably a survival of African fetishism. It is agreed by all authorities that now and then in the frenzy of the snake dances the worshippers refuse to be content with anything less than a sacrifice of the "goat without horns"—a living child. When one of the recent presidents of the republic was assassinated he carried the emblems of vaudouxism next to his heart, showing that the cult has existed even in the highest places.

So these baby murderers, these creatures of the forest who sacrifice children to their idols, are to have a place in the councils of the nations, and their vote is to be the equal of the vote of the United States. My friend from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] shakes his head in the negative. I say, "yes." It is time for misrepresentation to cease. Haiti sits as a member; every member has one vote, and but one vote. How, then, can it be denied that they have a vote?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I want to inquire of the Senator whether he has changed his opinion heretofore expressed in the Senate, that this league was to be dominated by the monarchs and kings of Europe and Asia?

Mr. REED. Yes; I changed my opinion, for then I thought that no sane man would ever propose that any but the leading nations of the world should sit in this council and vote. I

never dreamed that anybody would propose that the representative of Liberia, the representative of Haiti, and the representatives of other countries that constitute the dregs of civilization would be given a vote.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And has the Senator also changed his opinion heretofore expressed that this is a league which is going to be dominated by Great Britain and her dominions?

Mr. REED. I will answer that. I say that among the great nations Great Britain will have six votes, if not seven, to our one. That is expressly guaranteed in this league. When I discussed this question heretofore, I said she might at some time have five votes. I did not then know, and surely the Senator from Nebraska did not know, that she was already guaranteed six votes, for the Senator from Nebraska on the floor of the Senate denied that the British Empire would have five votes to our one, but she has six votes given to her.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Of course, the Senator from Nebraska denies that statement. It was the Senator from Missouri who made the statement that this was a league which was to be dominated by the British Empire.

Mr. REED. Exactly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then he said it was going to be dominated by monarchs of Europe and of Asia. Now he says it is going to be dominated by the little half-baked countries that he is proceeding to name.

Mr. REED. Oh, Mr. President——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to know which the Senator means.

Mr. REED. Well, I will tell the Senator where I stand, and he will find that I am standing upon the rock of truth and have nothing to take back; but I think before we get through this debate he will have to take back everything he has said.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from Missouri admits he has changed his position two or three times.

Mr. REED. Oh, no; I do not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I want to know which rock the Senator is standing on at the present time.

Mr. REED. Well, I am standing on one which is so solid that the Senator can not push me from it. He need not worry about that.

The first speech I made upon the league of nations was before the so-called constitution of the league had been given to the world, but had been discussed through the newspapers. All we had was news leaking out and obtained by the newspaper men as best they could. Upon that I discussed the question of what kind of league we would have to have if one possessing any real power were created. I therefore discussed what was in fact a hypothetical league.

The next speech I made on the league of nations was on the 22d day of February—Washington's Birthday. At that time we had been furnished with a copy of the original draft of the first league of nations as prepared and presented. That document gave us the names of but five member countries, and sedulously concealed from us the other countries that were to be admitted. I then discussed the question and said that that league, if it were organized, would probably be controlled by Great Britain, because it contained a clause which gave to the colonies and to the dominions of Great Britain the right to vote; and that, therefore, Great Britain might obtain, if she availed herself of the powers of the league, a vote for the dominion and for each of her four colonies; but whether they would obtain it or not seemed to be a matter for the future. But I said when Great Britain did obtain it, with her then power and influence with the other nations, she could dominate this league. Now we find that all the time it was written not that Great Britain may in the future obtain this advantage, but that all the time Australia and Canada and New Zealand and India and South Africa had been written in the league and given a vote. So Great Britain then, as now, was guaranteed 6 votes to the 1 vote of the United States.

Now, I come and say that on top of that infamy, that iniquity, that unjustifiable situation, it is proposed to fill this league up with the backward nations of the world, and that, if those nations were to unite, they could constitute a majority; and upon any race question they will, in all probability, constitute a majority.

The Senator from Nebraska can talk about abandoned positions. If I abandoned my position as often as the advocates of this league have changed theirs, I should move so fast that I would resemble the country acrobat whose neighbors boasted that he could spin on his heel so fast the observer could not tell whether the patch was in front or behind.

I propose to proceed with Haiti, and let my friend from Nebraska defend his position regarding Liberia; let him go to the people of Nebraska and tell them whether he believes that 50,000 semicivilized negroes along the coast of Africa should cast a vote in the league of nations equal to that of the United States. I ask the Senator the question now.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask the Senator this question——

Mr. REED. No; I ask the Senator from Nebraska a question.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, unfortunately I have not the floor.

Mr. REED. Oh, I am giving it to the Senator to answer this question. Is the Senator willing or not?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Willing to what?

Mr. REED. To give to 50,000 civilized or semicivilized negroes along the coast of Africa the right to cast a vote in the league of nations equal to the vote of the 110,000,000 people of the United States?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. My judgment is that if Great Britain and France do not object to these small nations, that are practically under the protection of the United States, being financed by the United States, and largely controlled by the United States, coming into the league, it is not likely that we will suffer very much from them.

Mr. REED. I am asking the Senator if he is willing to consent to the proposition? Can we not have a categorical answer? Is the Senator willing to put these 50,000 negroes up as the equals of the 110,000,000 people of the United States?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to ask the Senator whether he has named any country that is not practically under the protection of the United States?

Mr. REED. Why, certainly; I will name some.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And dominated by the United States at the present time?

Mr. REED. I will name some. Just abide in patience a wee bit; I am coming to that just as fast as my poor tongue can travel. I observe that I am unable to get an answer to my question. I therefore proceed.

Mr. President, let us see about this tutelage and guardianship. Again I say either these nations will sit there as free nations, with the right of self-determination, or else a monstrous fake and hoax and fraud is being put off on the world. How do you know you will vote the representatives of this race always? It is my opinion that you could buy the representative of Liberia at any time with a peck of potatoes if somebody did not bid a bushel; and the representative of Haiti for even a less sum unless somebody raised the "ante." But at any time we are likely to be outbid.

The Senator states that Liberia is under our protection. Just at present she is in the hands of this country financially as receiver; but the French influence there was, until recently, more than ours. But why is Liberia given a seat in the league of nations if, as you intimate, another country is to control its vote? What kind of logic are you employing, sir, when your only excuse for admitting into the league the depraved, the vicious, and the wicked is that they will not perform their functions as members but that they will be controlled as cats-paws and voted as automatons by some other nation? Are we to establish voting mandatories in the league? And does the Senator insist that the United States is to act as vote mandatory for Liberia?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I understood the Senator made some such charge with relation to the dominions of Great Britain—that they would be controlled by Great Britain.

Mr. REED. I do; and I say it is monstrous to put them in. Now, I presume the Senator's plea will be that Great Britain is to have five or six votes, represented by these great colonies of hers, and we are to have as an offset these negro dominions, so that both the United States and England will each have a number of fake votes in the league of nations, that is to constitute the brotherhood of man and the high tribunal that is to usher in the millenium! The league is to be packed with fake votes, whose voices upon command shall proclaim the coming of God and the complete equality of the races of men! At such a proposition the gorge ought to rise, but it will not rise in the stomach of the Senator from Nebraska.

I was discussing Haiti when I was interrupted by the Senator from Nebraska. I then for a time returned to Liberia. I now read a little further about Haiti:

> Marriage is neither frequent nor legally prescribed, since all children are considered legitimate. In the interior polygamy is frequent. On the whole, it must be owned that after a century of independence and self-government the Haitians have made little or no progress, if, indeed, they have not shown actual signs of retrogression. Justice is venal and the police are brutal.

Well, if down there they sell their decisions in their courts, I suppose their representative might sell his vote in the league of nations.

> All classes seem to be permeated with a thinly disguised belief in voodooism (a devil worship imported with the slaves from Africa). (Encyclopedia Brit., 11th edition, 1911.)

I am going to give, for whatever pleasure he can get out of it, a seat between Haiti and Liberia—a seat of honor—to my distinguished friend from Nebraska.

HEDJAZ.

I pass to another country that will not be controlled by America, another country, that, if controlled at all, will be controlled by France or England; happily it may be, for if it is controlled by France or England we may at least conclude that its vote will not be worse for the world than France or England desires; but if it be cast on its own account then only the Infinite can tell how it may vote. I refer to Hedjaz. Few Americans ever heard of that blessed country until this war began. And yet its representative is to enjoy a vote in the league of nations equal to the vote of this great Republic. It has a total population of 300,000—less than the population of one ward of certain American cities. One hundred and fifty thousand of these people are the wild Bedouins of the desert, wanderers, creatures who follow the camels and sleep under the skies, who live as their fathers lived 10,000 years ago, and who have not accumulated an idea since, except that they have adopted Mohammedanism. Who is going to vote them—America?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator explain what they can vote on? I think that would be interesting.

Mr. REED. On anything that America can vote on in the league of nations, and have an equal vote.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is entirely mistaken.

Mr. REED. Ah, does the Senator claim the league of nations has nothing to do? Let us have it out—does it have nothing to do, or does it have something to do?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The league has very little to do.

Mr. REED. Then the league is a fake, is it not?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Practically all of its powers, as the Senator well knows if he has studied the constitution of the proposed league, are in the hands of the executive council, and the only five permanent members of that executive council are the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan.

Mr. REED. Then you have not a league of nations; you have a quintuple alliance. Instead of having a league of nations of the world, as the President said he was going to have, you have five great nations that have united themselves to govern and dominate the world. You plead too much, my friend. You have stood declaring in this Chamber and on the public platforms of the United States, in substance and effect, that this league of nations was to be an assembly of the nations of the world, destined to become a great force, that would control the evil passions of men and of races and bring to the world peace, harmony, and good will, and now you stand here declaring, as your only excuse for its existence, that it is a powerless thing, that it is a thing without body, parts, passions, or anything else to constitute a governing body—you stand here and proclaim to the world that the whole thing is a fake, that it is a pitiable fraud, that it is a miserable pretense; and therefore it does not make any difference what you put into it, as nothing is to come out of it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am giving the Senator's statement. He has stated that the small nations which he has named will have as great a vote as the United States, when he knows, as a matter of fact, that no nation not one of the five permanent members of the executive council can have as much vote, influence, and power as the five members named on the executive council permanently; he knows that.

Mr. REED. Oh, Mr. President, I said that in the *league* they will have as much power as will the United States——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, I should like to ask the Senator if the executive council is not the governing body of the league?

Mr. REED. Wait a moment—and when I said that I meant exactly what I said, that when it comes to a vote *in the league*—and everybody knows that there are two elements; there is the membership, and then there is an executive council, and I have been talking about the *membership*—as members in the league the nations to which I have referred have exactly the same vote as the United States, and the Senator knows it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to know what questions can come before the membership? Can the Senator state them?

Mr. REED. Yes; I will. The Senator seems to have lost his temper, his poise, and his usual good nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri will desist for a moment. In interrupting the Senator from Missouri the Senator from Nebraska and others will get either his consent or the recognition of the Chair.

Mr. REED. Although I am being diverted from my object, which was to make a close argument about the league membership, I will depart from it at this point long enough to read this for the delectation of the Senator from Nebraska:

The assembly—

That is the league, is it not? That is the membership—

may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the league, or affecting the peace of the world.

Now, this assembly, of which Liberia is a member, of which Haiti is a member, and of which the United States is a member, are granted the authority to deal with *any question affecting the peace of the world;* and when they come to those questions Haiti and Liberia each have the same vote as the vote of the United States. A man who will deny that is simply dishonest, unfair, and unwilling to have the truth go before the American people.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. KNOX. Perhaps the Senator from Missouri will read that paragraph of the fifteenth section which says that any question which is carried to the council may be carried from the council to the assembly at the request of either party.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to answer that question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. REED. Let me read that first, and then I shall be glad to have the Senator answer it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I understand it, and I have an answer.

Mr. REED. Perhaps the Senator would prefer making the answer now.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will make the answer. The Senator from Pennsylvania refers to disputes between two nations. They may be referred to the body of delegates instead of being heard by the executive council; but when heard by the body of delegates the same rules apply as in the executive council, and the vote must be unanimous except where specifically otherwise provided. That makes it impossible for any little countries like these to control the decision unless the great nations of the world are agreed.

Mr. REED. And it makes it impossible for a great nation like ours to control the decisions if even one of the little countries is not agreed.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. REED. So that you tie the hands of the United States by the vote of the gentleman from Liberia; and where do you come out? All you have argued thus far is that your league is an innocuous thing because it is powerless, and yet you tell us it is to save the world!

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President——

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KNOX. As the reply of the Senator from Nebraska was addressed to me, I should like to add that if you take the trouble to read this thing, you will find out what it says. There is so much of "it means thus and so because somebody says so, and he said so because somebody else said so." If you take up the twelfth section, you will find that it is the fundamental right of every member of the league to raise any question against a nation that, in its judgment, affects a good understanding between nations, or which is liable to disturb the peace of the world; and then if you turn to section 15 you will find that that matter goes to the council, and then either party may carry it from the council to the assembly; and it is just as the Senator from Missouri has said—that while, of course, these little nations could not put over an injustice in their own favor, yet they could, by their vote, prevent justice from being done to the greatest nations of the world.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am obliged to the Senator from Pennsylvania and I am obliged to the Senator from Nebraska for these interruptions. I will attempt to discuss that particular phase at the proper time. I want to discuss now the personnel of the league. I am discussing the jury that is to try the great world causes; I am challenging the array. I am saying it is dishonestly drawn and outrageously brought together. I am going to pause long enough to challenge the lawyers of the Senate: Which one of you, having an important case to try, involving the life or the property of your friend or your client or yourself, would be willing to submit it to a jury composed—and I will put the good nations in with the bad—of an Englishman, a Frenchman, an Italian, an American, a Jap, a Chinaman, an Indian from India, a Siamese, a Negro from Liberia, a half-caste from Honduras, a Negro from Haiti, and an Arab from Hedjaz? Which one of you would submit the question of your own life or your own liberty or that of your friends to such a jury? And if you would not

submit matters of property of the individual to such a jury, which one of you dare submit the life of your Nation, the honor of your country, the glory of your flag to such a tribunal? And what a beggarly thing it is to stand and say, "Though we set up the league with all this blare of trumpets, though we proclaim it the guarantor of peace for all time, though we impiously assert that it is the greatest conception since Christ's Sermon on the Mount"—still the moment it is shown that its power may be abused we immediately assert that it has no power for harm, because it has no power at all! What a miserable argument to say that the United States can not be bound by the votes of these degenerate races of men, because everything must have unanimous consent, when you must at the same time admit that that rule enables any one of these degenerate nations to prevent the United States and all the other members from accomplishing any reform or bringing about any good result. For if the United States can cast a negative vote that can save it from control, then the Negro Republic of Haiti can cast a vote that will block the machinery of the league and will withhold every reform that others may seek to effect.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I call the Senator's attention now to the fact that he has again shifted his position.

Mr. REED. Oh, no.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. He came into the Senate Chamber some weeks ago and said that the United States was going into a league in which it would be outvoted and ruined. Now he is condemning the league because it has not the power to do that thing.

Mr. REED. Oh, Mr. President, one has to shift his position when he has an antagonist who will not stand still three seconds. [Laughter in the galleries.]

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator meet the issue.

Mr. REED. I will meet it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will desist for a moment. The occupants of the galleries must preserve order.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask the Senator whether he did not complain on a former occasion that the United States was going into an enterprise in which a majority might decide against it?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And is not the Senator here now condemning the league because it requires a unanimous vote?

Mr. REED. Oh, no. I am using your own argument to eat up your own argument with; that is all. I did say on a former occasion that a majority vote could bind the United States, and the Senator from Nebraska said it could not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I did, and I insist on it now.

Mr. REED. And your friends over in Paris, knowing that you were wrong, wrote into the league a clause saying that except where it was specifically otherwise stated a unanimous vote should be had, thus saying that when you said to the American people, as the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, that a decision by the league required a unanimous vote, you were utterly mistaken, and they repudiated you the first time they met.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I ask the Senator now will he come to the point? Has he shifted his ground or not?

Mr. REED. I have not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Did the Senator formerly condemn the league because a majority vote might control, and does he now condemn it because a unanimous vote is necessary?

Mr. REED. I condemn any league——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I guess that is right.

Mr. REED (continuing). That proposes to put the vital interests of the United States within the power of a majority of foreigners, or to put the United States into a position so that once an order has been made it never can escape from that, except by the unanimous vote of other nations. If the Senator will simply pause long enough to analyze that, he will see how logical it is.

I object, in the first place, to giving to the representatives of foreign countries, by a majority vote or by a unanimous vote, the right to bind this country on vital questions. Now, according to the Senator's construction, this league can not bind us without our consent having been given. Very well. It goes further than that. Our consent once having been given, we can never escape, unless we can get every one of the nations of the world that is a member of this league to grant its gracious consent. That leaves us utterly defenseless. The covenant as construed by the Senator is exactly like the laws of the Medes and Persians. Once a decree has been rendered, once an order has been made, it can not be changed, except by a unanimous vote. That is almost the equivalent of saying no change can ever be made when the subject is one of serious dispute.

Let me take an illustration. Suppose that this league by unanimous consent were to fix the size of the American Army at 250,000 men, and suppose the United States were to vote for that decision, believing it to be a proper thing at that time. Suppose that subsequently we should conclude that we needed an army of 500,000 men. We could not have that army without the consent of the league. If Great Britain voted "No" we could not have it. If every nation voted "Aye" except Liberia, we could not have it. So we place our Nation in such a position that its fate may be determined adversely by the single vote of one degenerate race or by the vote of one of our enemies.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is confusing the duties of the league. The duties he refers to belong exclusively to the executive council.

Mr. REED. Very well. Do they require a unanimous vote?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. They do not go before the league.

Mr. REED. I insist that they do; but I do not care to argue it. If you are going to put the matter before the executive council, does it require a unanimous vote?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It certainly does.

Mr. REED. Very well.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But I object to the Senator saying that Liberia could object, because Liberia is not a member of the executive council.

Mr. REED. I do not care to discuss the question from that narrow basis. Liberia might not be a member of the council, but it is certain Japan will be, and eight or nine other countries may be, and any one might cast a vote as fatal to us. But even if I discuss the inconsequential, I pause to insist that we do not know whether Liberia may not finally get on even the executive council, although I think it unlikely. We did not believe Liberia would be in the league. We did not think any one would put it in, but you did put it in. I remember making a speech in Missouri, out at the State university. I was discussing the possibilities of this league, and went on to say that a lot of the smaller nations might have a vote equal to ours. I said, "It is even possible that Liberia may be given such a vote"; and then I said, "No; that is not fair; I withdraw that statement. It is possible, but no sane man would propose it"; and hence I apologized for having mentioned it. Imagine my consternation and astonishment three days afterwards when it was announced that Liberia was in the league, along with Haiti.

But now I am discussing our friend Hedjaz. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will desist for just a moment. The occupants of the galleries will abstain from that character of demonstration or the Chair will have to take such steps as are necessary to preserve order in the galleries.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I hope the Chair will not be too stern with the galleries. I am to blame. Besides, the Chair is interrupting me more than the occupants of the galleries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not mean to interrupt any Senator.

Mr. REED. I know. I apologize if my remark seemed somewhat impolite. I did not so mean it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. But the Senator is well aware of the fact, of course, that the rules provide that it is the duty of the Chair to preserve order in the galleries.

Mr. REED. Oh, I understand, and I apologize if I have spoken in a way that was misunderstood. I meant no more than to indulge in a pleasantry.

The total population of Hedjaz is 300,000, but it is given a vote equal to the United States. One hundred and fifty thousand, as I said a moment ago, are wandering Bedouins of the desert. The Encyclopædia Britannica has this to say:

> Though physically the most desolate and uninviting Province in Arabia, it has a special interest and importance as containing the two sacred cities of Islam—Mecca and Medina—the birthplace and burial spot, respectively, of Mahomet, which are visited yearly by large numbers of Moslem pilgrims from all parts of the world.

Of the Bedouins, it says:

> All these nomadic tribes receive money payments of large amounts from the Turkish Government to insure the safe conduct of the annual pilgrimage, otherwise they are practically independent of the Turkish administration.

As a matter of fact, they have for decades been the highwaymen of the desert, and have levied their tribute under the

guise of protection upon every pious soul who has come to weep over the ashes of Mahomet. One hundred and fifty thousand Bedouins wander the desert. One hundred and fifty thousand other Hedjazians live in the towns; all of them are Mohammedans who regard it a virtue to kill a Christian. All of them who can afford it fill their harems with slaves captured or purchased; and yet this body of men, under the control certainly of France or England, not of the United States, if they are controlled at all, are to cast a vote equal to the 110,000,000 sovereigns of the United States!

Let those who like that swallow it; but the man who can swallow it would agree to a proposition to give a vote to the inmates of every first-class lunatic asylum of the United States, or to grant a seat in the league to the naked Hottentots that remain uncaught in Africa.

PANAMA.

Again I present you with another one of these kindred spirits, just now embarking on the reform of the world and in the control of the evil passions of men. I refer to Panama.

Population, 450,000. That is not as many people as live in the city of Kansas City alone. Ninety per cent of these are a mixture of negroes and Spanish mulattoes. Yet, you men of the South, you lily-whites, you gentlemen who say that white men alone should control in your own States, are willing to allow this meagre population, 90 per cent of whom are negroes and mulattoes, living hundreds of miles from our shores, to have a vote equal to the total vote of the United States in the league of nations! Go back to your people and justify yourselves if you can. Tell them this is the new democracy, a magic democracy, in which one negro outside the United States has a vote substantially equal to 220 of the white citizens of this Republic! But perhaps they have been put in for the purpose of toning up the moral situation, for we are also to look after the morals of the world, I read.

The morals of these people are shown by this fact from the Statesman's Yearbook of 1918, which recites that—

> In 1915 there were 12,040 births, of which 8,077 were illegitimate.

The slothfulness of the inhabitants—

This author continues—

> is illustrated by the fact that although the soil is of great fertility fully three-eighths of it is unoccupied.

And I suppose as they meet here in Washington to organize the league of nations the representative of Panama, bearing a milk-white banner emblematic of purity, and the representative of Hedjaz, at the head of his harem, will lead the procession, each appropriately adorned with rings in ears and nose.

HONDURAS.

Population, 562,000, estimated, because they have not advanced far enough to count the people. They have not had sense enough to take a census. Indeed, I presume the task would be difficult, for many of the natives are hard to catch. They have been running ever since the Spaniards came down there and murdered a lot of them. Total population, 562,000—a good deal less than the city of St. Louis. These are chiefly Mestizos and Indians. The Mestizo is a conglomerate. His blood is composed of that of the Spanish buccaneer and marauder, some negro, some Chinese, but principally it is Indian blood. It is said that over 200,000 inhabitants are of pure Indian blood, and 90,000 of these are mountain Indians, who are thoroughly wild and in their aboriginal state. The Encyclopædia Britannica declares that a complete and accurate census can not be taken throughout the country, since the ignorant masses of the people, and especially the Indians, avoid a census as in some way connected with military conscription or taxation. Primary education is free, secular, and compulsory, but the percentage of illiterates is very high, especially among the Indians; and further information that I have from other sources is that while they have upon their statute books compulsory education, it is in fact practically not availed of at all.

Honduras's history, says the Encyclopædia Britannica, has been one round of intrigues of aspiring revolutionists with other revolutionists of Guatemala, Nicaragua, and other neighboring States. They have had nothing like a stable government. They have had nothing like a government of sobriety and of law. And yet the representatives of these people, not far enough advanced to take their own census, not sufficiently stable so that a man elected to an office there knows whether he will hold it a day or a week—this country, where a revolution is a common method of election—is proposed now to be set up to govern the world and to bring order to the universe! Who is to cast that vote? Are we to own it also? If so, how much are we to pay for it? Who is to control the vote of that Indian who comes here, or that mulatto who comes here from Honduras?

By what system of logic will you justify giving to the inhabitants of a country that has a little over a half million population a vote equal to the United States, with its 110,000,000 people? One man in the United States, one country township in the most remote district of Mississippi or of Georgia or of Missouri is better entitled to a single vote than the entire country of Honduras. This is another member of your world jury. You may accept him. I object. I challenge his capacity. The average citizens of that State could not vote in Massachusetts, because he could not pass the educational qualifications. The average citizens of that State could not vote in Mississippi or Georgia or North Carolina, because of his color. Neither could he vote in many States, because of the provisions of their constitutions, as has just been suggested. No; they could not vote for constable, as the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] states.

NICARAGUA.

Now I come to Nicaragua. The great mass of the population is a composite race, descended chiefly from the native Indians, their Spanish conquerors, and negro slaves introduced during the Spanish colonial period. I am reading from the Statesman's Yearbook, on page 1122. The total population of this country in 1914 was 703,500, not quite equal to the population of the single city of Boston. I believe Boston far outruns it now. Yet it is given a vote equal to the vote of the United States! Oh, my friends, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] shakes his head, because he holds that members of the league do not have anything to do; they are, he thinks, mere figureheads. He thinks that the executive council is going to run everything, by which he admits that his world league is a failure and a fake, that it can not be trusted; therefore he insists that it has been given nothing to do. But it does have much to do—a question that will be debated at another time. We have already gone far enough into it, and I have already read that there is consigned to this league—not to the council, *but to the league itself—every question affecting the peace of the world.* Any other construction makes the thing a fraud and a fake and a joke.

Due to a revolution in 1909 and subsequent annual insurrections, United States marines are now garrisoned in Bluefields and other principal coast towns. The immediate cause of this is found in the fact that the Government, always a mere succession of tyrants, finally for a time rested in the hands of Zelaya. This tyrant was overthrown, and the conversion of the country from an unspeakable despotism into one of ruinous anarchy resulted. I read from the National Geographic Magazine of 1916, page 151:

> The rival factions—

Says this author—

> issued fiat money as freely as tap water flows from a spigot. The treasury was bankrupt, interest was in default, foreign creditors were threatening——

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

Mr. REED. Pardon me one moment—

> foreign creditors were threatening, through their Governments, to collect their debts with gunboats and cruisers, and there was not enough money to be had by the party in power to pay salaries, much less soldiers' wages.
>
> HELPING NICARAGUA ESCAPE THE THROES OF CHRONIC REVOLUTION.
>
> In its insecure tenure under these conditions the party in power was only too willing to save itself and incidentally the country by appealing to the United States, and by offering to make itself an instrumentality in America's hands for the rejuvenation of the nation.

The United States accepted the offer and Nicaragua has been practically an American receiver, order being maintained by American marines. The United States was compelled to take these steps in Nicaragua or to be forced to abandon the Monroe doctrine. Now, this country, incapable of government, absolutely in such condition that our country had to interfere and act as its receiver, is to be placed in the league of nations to cast a vote equal to the vote of the United States! Its population of the dark and mixed races—that is, of Indians and Negroes and Mestizos—is 90 per cent of the total.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Has the Senator spoken about the neighboring State of Guatemala?

Mr. REED. I have not. I am coming to it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes. The conditions are quite similar, I dare say, as in Honduras and Nicaragua.

Mr. REED. I think they are.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Guatemala is represented in the present peace conference, is she not?

Mr. REED. I imagine she is.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Has the Senator learned that any disaster is likely to ensue to the world by reason of the representation of that State in the peace conference?

Mr. REED. Oh, Mr. President, I want to be polite, but is not that begging the question? You might just as well say that because a thief had been at large for 10 days and had not yet stolen anything that is proof he never will and therefore that all citizens should receive him into their homes. If Guatemala has been over there, she has not been permitted to say anything yet. The Senator will doubtless reply, She is never going to be. If so, why is she given a seat in the league?

GUATEMALA.

I come now to Guatemala, for that is my next topic. The total population of Guatemala in 1903, which was the latest I could get, was 1,842,000. Eighty-five per cent are Indians and Mestizos and 92 per cent can not read or write. Of course, that qualifies them to sit in judgment upon the world and to pass their opinion with reference to all creation!

I have gone over the question of their illiteracy and I shall not repeat it. The Encyclopædia Britannica says:

The condition of the Indians on the plantation is often akin to slavery, owing to the system adopted by some planters of making payments in advance, for the Indians spend their earnings and thus contract debts which can only be paid by long service. The inhabitants tend to increase rapidly, due to high birth rate and low morality. About one-half of the births among the Indians and one-third among the whites are illegitimate.

Mr. President, I do not care to stop to comment on a situation such as that as I pass along. I have already made comments that I think fairly well cover the case and will let it apply to this.

ECUADOR.

I come now to Ecuador. No general census has ever been taken. According to the official estimate of 1900, and it was only an estimate, the total population was 1,500,000, being 1,000,000 Indians, 300,000 Mestizos—a better word for them being "greasers"—100,000 whites, 44,000 Negroes, and 6,000 foreigners. The whites, although numbering only 100,000, form an exclusive governing caste, as in Chile. The territory of the Republic is divided among a few of them, and the government is in their hands. Of course, they are brought in here to increase the general average of democracy, and their vote necessarily would be cast in favor of the rights of man, this body that hold the lands and control all the people and runs the Government. The land is held by a few proprietors. The caste sentiment is strong among those who claim unmixed European descent. Consequently the Mestizos have a limited opportunity to improve their condition. During the years 1830 to 1909 Ecuador adopted no less than 11 constitutions.

I think I know why we have her in here. She is an expert on constitutions. She has written more than any country on earth and ought to know more about the experiments under them.

Although primary education is free and obligatory, a considerable part of the population is unprovided with schools and is indifferent to them. In 1900 there were only 94,500 pupils in the entire country. So we have there a governing population of 100,000, and that governing population that has enslaved the rest of their fellowmen, that governing population of 100,000, is to have a vote in the league of nations equal to the vote of the United States! But, of course, that is all right; it is written in the league of nations.

BOLIVIA.

We come now to Bolivia. The total population in 1900, the last figures I could get that seemed reliable, was 1,766,451; Indians, 50.7 per cent; Mestizos, 26.8; whites, 12.8 per cent; Negroes, 0.3 per cent; and unknown, 9.4 per cent.

All the census returns and estimates in such a country are subject to many allowances—

Says the Encyclopædia Britannica.

The Indian population (920,860) is largely composed of the so-called civilized tribes of the Andes, which once formed part of the nationality ruled by the Incas. * * * They are peaceable and industrious and form an important laboring element. They are addicted to the use of chica (native rum), and have little or no ambition to improve their condition, but this may be attributed to their profound ignorance and to the state of peonage in which they are held.

And so they are to be put up to govern the world. I read on:

The white population (231,088) is descended in great part from the early Spanish adventurers who entered the country in search of mineral wealth. The percentage of whites does not increase, as in Argentina and Brazil, and can not until means are found to promote European immigration.

Mestizos (486,018) are less numerous than the Indians, but outnumber the whites by more than 2 to 1. *It has been said of the Mestizos that they inherit the vices of both races and the virtues of neither.* Yet with a decreasing Indian population, and with a white population wanting in energy, the future of Bolivia mainly depends on them. As a rule they are ignorant, unprogressive, and apathetic, intensely cruel, superstitious, and intemperate—

Outside of that, I suppose, they are all right.

It may be that education and experience will develop the Mestizo into a progressive nationality, but the first century of self-government can hardly be said to have given much promise of such a result.

The rest of this I reserve the right to print. I have been reading excerpts from the Encyclopædia Britannica.

Physically Bolivia is an inland Republic, intensely mountainous, with few good roads—communication is difficult—and she owns to only 430 miles of railroad.

Although Bolivia has a free and "compulsory" school system, education and the provision therefor have made little progress. Only a small percentage of the people can read and write. Although Spanish is the language of the dominant minority, Indian idioms are the languages of the natives, who form a majority of the population. A considerable percentage of the Indians do not understand Spanish at all and resist every effort to have it forced on them. Even the Mestizos are more familiar with the Indian language than with Spanish.

The school enrollment—1901—was only 1 to 43 of population.

Bolivia's right of suffrage is exercised by all male citizens over 21 years (if single) and over 18 (if married) who can read and write, and who own real estate or have an income of $75 a year, said income not to be compensation for services as a servant.

The electoral body is therefore small, and is under the control of a political oligarchy which practically rules the country, no matter which party is in power. (Encyclopædia Britannica, 11th edition, 1911.)

Of course, that sort of education and environment ought to fit the gentlemen from Bolivia for a high position on the court of the world and intellectually ought to qualify him to teach the people of the United States how to run their business and manage their country.

PERU.

I come now to Peru. I ask you if there is a single one of these nations I have read up to this time to whose representative you dare refer a matter vital to the interests of the United States.

The population of Peru is a matter of highest doubt. According to some figures only a few years ago they had only 1,500,000 people. They now claim 4,500,000, but of these the percentage of the dark and mixed races to the white is 86. Education is exceedingly low.

I quote the Encyclopædia Britannica, eleventh edition, 1911:

Like the other States of South America, its constitution (1860) provides for popular control of legislation and the execution of the laws through free elections and short terms of office, but in practice these safeguards are often set aside and dictatorial methods supersede all others. Nominally the people are free and sovereign, but the ignorance of the masses, their apathy, poverty, and dependence upon the great landowners and industrial corporations practically defeat these fundamental constitutional provisions.

No country is better provided with more or better safeguards against electoral and official abuse than Peru, yet few countries suffered more from political disorder during the nineteenth century. The independence of the Peruvian courts has not been maintained, and there has been much criticism of their character and decisions.

Notice how far they go in education with 4,500,000 people.

Primary education is free and "compulsory" since 1905. However, in 1906 the enrollment in the private schools outnumbered the public schools three to one and the private institutions claimed only 22,000—

A fact which certifies not only to the ignorance of those people, but to their willing ignorance, for they decline education that is made legal and offered to them.

BRAZIL.

Mr. President, of all the countries on this side of the Atlantic, with the exception of Canada, which is a part of the British Empire, and, of course, excepting our own Nation, Brazil occupies the best position, the best right to a seat in the council of nations; and yet the total population in 1904 being 24,500,000, there were of this population only 8,000,000 whites. There were 8,000,000 mulattoes or Mestizos, 4,000,000 Negroes, 2,500,000 Indians, and 2,000,000 unclassified. So the whites of that country constitute only one-third of the population. If we ever come to a time of self-determination it is reasonable to anticipate that the colored races will claim their own.

SOUTH AFRICA.

Now, Mr. President, I pass to a British possession, South Africa, the South African colony based upon the ruins of two South African republics. The first interesting question is that of population. The total population is 5,000,000, of whom 1,000,000 are whites and 4,000,000 are blacks. It is therefore proper to classify this nation as among the colored nations of the world.

Here is a question to which I challenge your thought. Either the races of South Africa were capable of self-government or they were not. If they were capable of self-government, having gone to that distant land and set themselves up as independent governments, their people should have been permitted to retain their liberty.

But, sir, Great Britain came to that country and, with fire and sword, devastated it and broke up the arms and the armies

of these Republics. Either Great Britain committed one of the monstrous crimes of history when she thus overwhelmed these Republics capable of self-government, or else they were incapable of self-government. If they were incapable of self-government and therefore England was justified, then they are incapable now of sitting on the league of nations and casting a vote that will help control the destinies of the world. If they could not control their own destiny, if they were so backward that Great Britain was impelled in the interests of civilization to take their government away from them and to control them by her armies and her fleets, then under what logic do you propose to set them up now to help govern the world? Great Britain insists that to-day they are incapable of self-government, and hence holds them enthralled. Will that vote be controlled, I ask the Senator from Nebraska—who happens to have vanished from the Chamber, I am sorry to say—by our country or will it be controlled by the armed forces of Great Britain and cast as Great Britain shall dictate?

But if not, and if it have a representative form of government, then why should not the blacks of that country be entitled to a black man to represent them upon the league of nations? Either we are to have democracy or we are not. We are to have self-determination or we are not to have it.

I pass now from that, and yet I do not want to pass from it without calling attention to the fact that in that country the degree of illiteracy is 80 per cent. Eighty per cent of the people can not read or write, and yet their representative is to vote to control the destiny of the United States. They are to be in the league of nations what they are outside of the league of nations, the chattel and the pawns and the dummy directors of Great Britain.

SIAM.

Again I call your attention to Siam—I have not any doubt this will appeal particularly to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]—as one of the nations that ought to sit on the league of nations and tell us how we shall run our affairs. Siam's population in 1909 was 6,230,000. Although it is one of the oldest countries claiming to be civilized, and although centuries ago it had a literature and an established form of government, only one out of a hundred of the people can read and write. It is steeped in ignorance and debased by superstition. Its government is a tyranny exercised by an hereditary monarch. It affords a most fitting illustration of a dying race. Its people are divided into castes overridden by Buddhist priests. The most ridiculous superstition and the vilest forms of fetish worship prevail.

I desire to print a list of the people as they are divided. Encyclopædia Britannica, eleventh edition, 1911, shows—

Total population (1909)	6,230,000
Siamese	3,000,000
Laos	2,000,000
Chinese	400,000
Malay	115,000
Cambodians	80,000
Europeans	1,300 to 1,500
English	500
Germans	190
Danes	160
Americans	150

Polygamy is permitted, but common only among the upper classes.
The Siamese are mild mannered—

Says the Encyclopædia Britannica, from which I am now reading—

patient, submissive to authority, kindly, and hospitable to foreigners.
Most of the industries are in the hands of the Chinese.
The Buddhist monasteries scattered throughout the country carry on almost the whole of the elementary education.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. REED. I yield for a question.

Mr. PHELAN. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the hereditary monarch of Siam is a graduate of Oxford University, that he is a man of large education and very intelligent, or would it affect his argument at all if aware of that fact?

Mr. REED. I would not care if a hereditary monarch graduated at all the schools or universities, it would not make me love a monarch. Nearly all monarchs are well educated. One of the very best educated monarchs I know of was a gentleman named William of Germany.

Incidentally, I should like to ask the Senator from California, since he seems to like the king, if speaking for the people of California he would like to open the doors of California for these Siamese people to immigrate and settle in his State? Let us have a real straight-out answer.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I did not raise the question for the purpose of discussing the merits of the people of Siam, but the hereditary monarch and the ruling classes, according to their form of government, are educated and well-informed persons, like the Senator from Missouri. I think, therefore, that, representing their Government, they can speak with intelligence and knowledge of the world. But that he is a monarch does not interest me, nor should it interest us in the effort to create a league of nations. We must accept the nations as they are, and possibly under the inspiration of the league there will be a broader democracy in the future.

As to California, we, like the Australians, are bent upon preserving her for a white man's country, and therefore we do not want to transplant the Siamese to California, nor would it be good for the Siamese. Under a league of nations racial distinctions are observed as a cardinal feature, and where a race is permitted to develop along those lines it is best for that race and for the rest of the world.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator pardon me if I suggest that under a league of nations races are not preserved in the manner he states, but, on the contrary, that is a live, burning question yet undecided, as I shall show a little later on.

The Senator states that he is unwilling to have the Siamese come to California, because he does not want them to mingle with his people, and he would not let them vote there, either, would he?

Mr. PHELAN. I do not believe they are assimilable.

Mr. REED. And while they are not assimilable with the people living in California, if you take them and put them in the league of nations, it is perfectly proper to have them vote on the destiny of the United States. You are perfectly willing to have that done, are you not, Senator?

Mr. PHELAN. In so far as they are members of the league they will vote. I do not know how far it will affect the destinies of the United States; but very little, I imagine. They are civilized.

Mr. REED. They would affect it by their vote the same as any other nation. Are you willing to submit a question vital to the interests of the United States to the vote of men you are not even willing to have land on the sacred soil of California?

Mr. PHELAN. The gentleman is opening a large question as to the influence of the members of the league in affecting the destinies of particular States. I am of the opinion that the United States will have a very large voice in determining the destinies of foreign nations.

Mr. REED. The Senator argues that we let these people all in as equals and then we proceed to run the whole thing ourselves. That is usually the argument of the man who has no argument, because either these people come in as equals or else they might better not come in at all. If they come in as equals, then, of course, they are equals, and if we have a right to vote upon a question, they have the same right to vote upon that question.

Mr. PHELAN. There is no question of equality involved in the organization of the league, so far as control is concerned, because the larger nations, four or five of them, are established permanently in control.

Mr. REED. Oh, no; that is just where the Senator is mistaken. I argued that question while the Senator was out, and as I want to get through some time this evening, he will permit me to make a very brief reply to his point. If you argue that the league of nations has no authority—I am speaking now of the membership—then you argue yourself out of court, for that which can do nothing amounts to nothing and becomes a farce and a thing for laughter, sneers, and jeers, like the American aristocracy, as Tom Hood said.

If, on the other hand, there is any power vested in the league, then the representative of Siam has exactly the same power as the representative of Uncle Sam, and it is a pitiable thing to find men standing here proclaiming in one breath that we must have a league of nations as a salvation of the world and that it is to be a great tribunal of equality and democracy, and in the next breath asserting that it has no power and can not do anything. I would be ashamed to make that argument to a country justice of the peace.

But I proceed. I was discussing Siam. Since the question has been raised, if my friends will take the pains to read they will find that among the most honored people of that country are those who have disfigured themselves in superstitious rites. They will learn that the country is divided into castes and classes, so that if one of the lower classes shall but touch the garment of one of the upper class he is unclean and must bathe himself seven or eight times before he feels that he is purified.

I have not time to dwell on these monstrous things. It is because of their debasement and their defilement that this degenerate and dying race has to have sent to it Christian ministers and Christian missionaries, and yet it clings to its old faith; it follows its old dogmas; it wanders amongst the shadows of ignorance; it cringes in the caves of fear; it crouches

before the coiled serpent of superstition. In the heart of every one of them are found those monsters of the mind that are only possible where the mind is but half civilized or half developed.

Here is another author on the subject:

[Quotation from The World's Peoples, by Keane, 1908, p. 203.]

Slavery or serfdom was not restricted, as mostly elsewhere, to a particular class, but extending to all the King's subjects. So that the sense of personal dignity was lost, and anyone from the highest to the lowest citizen might at any moment lapse into bondage. Like most Mongoloid peoples *they are incurable gamblers, and before the recent reforms a freeman of any rank might stake all his effects, his wives, children, and self on the hazard of the die.* * * * But beneath it all spirit or devil worship is still rife, and in many districts Animism is the only religion. Even temples have been raised to the countless gods of land and water, woods, mountains, hamlets, and households. To these gods are credited all evils, and to prevent them from getting into the bodies of the dead these are brought out, not through door or window, but through a breach in the wall, which is afterwards carefully built up.

And they are to be at the council table of the nations. Of course, it is all right. If it had been proposed by an inmate of an asylum who was seeking relief, you would have voted him an incurable, but since it is written in the league of nations, we shall cry, "Holy! Holy! Holy!" and bow our heads in meek submission.

INDIA.

I can give you a picture of India in a word. She has a population of 294,361,056. She has been held in thraldom by a little English army, and has not had the spirit to rise and break her chains. Such a people mark and brand themselves at once as not only unfit for the government of others, but as almost unfit for their own government; yet I would not deny that right to the lowest of God's creatures if he lived off with others like himself and wanted a government of his own.

Amongst those 294,000,000 people there is no excess of superstition to which they have not gone; there is no shadow of intellectual night so black that they have not wrapped their souls in its sable folds; there is no species of caste by which men have sought to divide themselves and to keep oppressed by power and priestcraft their fellow men that has not been rife in India for centuries of time.

Again, a dying race, a country in which there are 147 distinct languages, where in religion there are 207,000,000 Hindus, 62,000,000 Mohammedans, 9,000,000 Buddhists, 2,195,000 Sikhs, and various other religions.

A singular fact in relation to them is that the chief article of their revenue is a duty laid upon opium, and in the fumes of that drug what is left of the living soul of India is expiring. This little chattel of Great Britain, this pawn of the British Empire, is brought in here and given a vote equal to the vote of the United States. Yet here, when some of her people emigrated to California, the people of California protested, and when they emigrated to Canada the people of Canada rose and drove them out as a polluted and dangerous people—dangerous to their civilization and ruinous to the wages of labor. Now, it is proposed that this nation, that Great Britain says can not rule herself, shall sit in the council, with her chains upon her wrists, a slave to Great Britain's power, and shall cast her vote equal to the vote of the United States! But it is written in the league of nations, and hence it is a sacred thing.

CHINA.

Then we come to China, and how shall I discuss her? Of all the ironies of history there has never been a thing like this. As we induct China into the league of nations, as she takes a seat in the charmed circle of the brotherhood of man, as she enters upon that reign of justice where all international outrage shall cease and when the power of armies shall no longer control—as she takes her seat she is handed a decree ratifying the ravishment of her Provinces by Japan—the theft of 44,000,000 of her citizens—and is told that, as a member of the league, she must sign a ratification and sanctification of that international outrage which has been perpetrated only within the last few months. China, that has been the one nation in all the world that for centuries of time has proclaimed the doctrine of peace; China, that has said the world is too civilized, or ought to be too civilized, to settle questions by the arbitrament of arms, is brought to the council table, and her sentence is that the sword that cut from her heart 44,000,000 of her people shall be sanctified by the league of nations, and shall be made holy by the primary decree of this congregation of saints! But it is written in the league of nations, and it is, therefore, a sacred thing.

If a Republican President had brought the league here; if Roosevelt had brought it here, there is not a Democrat who would not have been standing by my side fighting to the last ditch to rescue the country from the threatened danger, and all these eloquent voices would have been raised, and from your brains would have come those sparks of eloquent fire that would have set a conflagration in the hearts of all the Democrats in this country and brought them with burning haste to your side to save this country from so monstrous and so cruel a fate.

Oh, but says the Encyclopædia Britannica:

If the Chinese character is inferior to the European, its inferiority lies in the fact that the Chinaman's whole philosophy of life disinclines him to change or to energetic action. He is industrious, but his industry is nominally along the lines marked out by authority and tradition. He is brave, but his courage does not naturally seek an outlet in war.

He ought to be brought here and sainted as the original pacifist of the world. That nation should be enshrined and made almost an object of adoration by those who now preach the doctrine of pacifism.

He is brave, but his courage does not naturally seek an outlet in war. The jealously exclusive Empire into which in the nineteenth century the nations of the West forced an entrance was organized for peace; the arts of war had been all but forgotten, and soldiers of all classes were the most despised.

The highest class in China (since the republic) is that forming the civil service.

And yet, Mr. President, this race, with this history and with these attributes, the Senators from California and other Senators from the West would exclude from our shores. They would say to the individual Chinaman, "You can not have citizenship in this country even though your vote shall be only as one to many thousands of Americans"; but they will consent, and they will insist, that China shall cast her vote as a member of the league of nations and that that vote shall be counted as equal to the vote of the United States!

JAPAN.

Now I come to Japan. Japan has a population of 56,860,000. Over 90 per cent of them belong to the dark or mixed races. It is said that the percentage of illiteracy is low, but so little is known regarding large parts of the Empire that the statement must be open to question. Nevertheless and notwithstanding all that may be claimed to the contrary, this country is not only a monarchy but it is a monarchy exercising a tyranny over both mind and body. For more than 2,000 years the reigning house of Japan has held undisputed sway. The recent slight changes in this Government are merely on the surface. The Japanese citizen remains unchanged.

I quote from The World's Peoples, by Keane, page 170, for the year 1908:

In Japan Shintoism, as reformed in recent times and almost merged in the Bushidoism now affected by the educated classes, has become much more a political institution than a religious system. The Kami-No-Michi, or "The Way of the Gods" or "Spirits," is inseparably bound up with the political interests of the reigning dynasty sprung from the sun goddess; hence its three cardinal virtues are:

1. Honor the Kami (spirits), of whom the Emperor is the chief representative on earth.
2. Revere him as thy sovereign.
3. Obey his will, and that is the only duty of man.

There is a fine representative to help establish a world democracy and to make the world safe for democracy!

There is no moral code—

Continues this author—

and loyal expositors have declared that the Mikado's will is the supreme or only test of right and wrong.

I now desire to put two questions, and to two classes of American Senators.

First. How will Senators from the South who represent States which have contended that the white race alone is fit to control the destiny of the States of America, who have, therefore, contended that the black man of the South should not be permitted to cast his individual ballot to be counted against the ballot of the white man—how can they contend that Liberia, Haiti, and other negro or seminegro nations should be permitted to sit at the council table of the world and each cast a vote equal to that of the United States?

NEGRO QUESTION AND THE LEAGUE.

And, Senators, you will have that question to answer to your people; and at that point, to show you that it is a living question and that you are playing with fire, I call your attention to The Crisis, a negro publication, which I understand is a paper of wide influence and power. I read an editorial from the May number:

A league of nations is absolutely necessary to the salvation of the negro race. Unless we have some supernational power to curb the anti-negro policy of the United States and South Africa, we are doomed eventually to *fight* for our rights. The proposed internation will have overwhelming influences around it which will oppose the doctrines of "race" antagonism and inferiority. *It will from the beginning recognize negro nations.*

How shrewdly this man had looked into the situation! I venture to say that the majority of the men in this room did not anticipate that truth.

It will from the beginning recognize negro nations. *It will be open to the larger influences of civilization and culture which are ineffective in the United States because of the prevailing barbarism of the ruling*

classes in the South and their overwhelming political power. What we can not accomplish before the choked conscience of America we have an infinitely better chance to accomplish before the organized public opinion of the world. Peace for us is not simply relief from wars like the past, *but relief from the specter of the great war of races, which will be absolutely inevitable unless the selfish nations of white civilization are curbed by a great world congress, in which black and white and yellow sit and speak and act.* The refusal to adopt the Japanese race equality amendment is deplorable, but it is an argument for and not against a nation of nations. It is the beginning of a mighty end.

Chew on that quid in your reflective moments, you men of the South!

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator once more?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I wish to inquire of the Senator why he did not protest against Japan participating in the present conference that is settling these great world problems which are of such transcendant importance to this country, and having the same voice there that she will have in any assemblage of the league of nations?

Mr. REED. Because I was not asked my opinion, and was given the same opportunity to protest that the rest of the Senate has been given to advise or consent, which is simply nothing at all.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But if the Senator had been asked whether Japan should be invited to participate in the present peace conference, what would he have said?

Mr. REED. If I had been asked whether Japan was to be invited to take part in the present peace conference with reference to the terms of peace, I would have to say that, as Japan had in some measure helped to win the war, she would have the right to have something to say about making the terms of peace, but I would insist upon that being settled as a separate proposition. I am not discussing the question of the terms of peace; I am discussing the question of a world government which it is proposed to set up, in which Japan shall be the equal of the United States, and now, even before that covenant comes here in an official form, I am protesting.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I understand the Senator is protesting against Japan's occupying a position in the world's conference of the league of nations and dealing with questions of vital importance to the United States. I am calling attention to the fact that she is even to-day doing so without any protest upon the part of anybody, and, of course, nobody could in decency protest against her action.

Mr. REED. Of course, if Japan, going in with England, France, and Italy, becomes a participant in a war against Germany and Austria and Turkey, and if thereafter we enter that war, we must recognize that fact that when the war comes to be settled all of the belligerents must be consulted. But that is not the question I am discussing. I am discussing the question of making arrangements by which a part of the governing control of the United States shall be permanently transferred to an international tribunal, on which Japan shall have a right to cast a vote concerning the destiny of this country. Against that I protest and shall continue to protest. The monstrous thing that is presented is this: We went into this war because our sovereignty had been offended against by Germany, because Germany had sunk some of our ships and had killed some of our people; and now it is proposed, although we went in for that reason, that we shall end by setting up a European, Asiatic, and African tribunal, in which we shall be a minority stockholder, and shall give to it the right to control the fate of America.

Mr. POINDEXTER and Mr. WALSH of Montana addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment in order that I may finish my inquiry?

Mr. REED. Perhaps I had better yield first to the Senator from Montana in order that he may finish his inquiry, and then I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I merely desire to inquire of the Senator if he can now anticipate any question that may be presented to the league of nations of more profound importance than the question that drove us into the present war, the issues of which we invite Japan to join with us in solving?

Mr. REED. Oh, yes; I can imagine any number of questions. The question that drove us into this war was an infringement of our rights upon the sea. What has that got to do with the future government of America? Of course, we have helped whip Germany, and, having helped whip Germany, it stands to reason that the representatives of the United States will make Germany admit her wrong, make Germany agree not to do it any more, and we ought to make her pay, and pay dearly, for every ship she sank, for every life that she took, and for every insult she put upon us.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I can not refrain from suggesting, in answer to the question of the Senator from Montana, that there is nothing that Japan can do at the peace conference, however important those matters are, that will have any validity whatever upon the United States until it receives the approval of the Senate of the United States, two-thirds of the Senators present concurring. Furthermore, I apprehend that neither the Senator from Missouri nor any opponent of the league of nations has any objection to conferring and negotiating upon international matters in the future with Japan, with China, or even with the King of Hedjaz. Nobody proposes that we shall live an isolated life. What we object to is changing the principle upon which these negotiations are being carried on at the present time, in which each nation reserves its independence to ratify or to reject, and to submit the future of the world, as the Senator from Missouri has just said, to the decision of a different entity, from whom there lies no appeal.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, recurring to my topic—and I wish to say that I should have concluded this address in less than 60 minutes if I had not been interrupted, and I am very near the close—I now ask the second question:

"RACIAL EQUALITY."

How can the representatives of the Pacific Coast States who have contended and who still contend that neither Japanese nor Chinamen shall land upon their shores, and that both are totally unfit for citizenship, justify their conduct if they now vote that in the council of the world Japan and China shall each cast a vote equal to the vote of the United States? That question will have to be answered. It is a living question.

The shrewdest diplomats, next to those of England, appearing at the council now being held in Europe are unquestionably the representatives of Japan. Compared with them, I think that the American diplomat who is over there—well, they had better not be compared; let it go at that. It will be remembered that the representative of Japan offered an amendment declaring for racial equality. I read now from the New York Times Current History for May:

The commission rejected an amendment offered by the Japanese delegates for incorporating into the preamble a declaration on "racial equality." It failed to receive unanimous approval, and hence was declared rejected—

Evidently there were a good many votes for it when it only failed because the vote was not unanimous.

The official statement on this subject, issued April 12, said:

At a meeting of the league of nations commission on Friday, April 11, the Japanese delegation proposed an amendment to the preamble of the covenant as follows: To insert after the words "by the prescription of open, just, and honorable relations between nations," an additional clause, to read: "By the indorsement of the principle of the equality of nations and just treatment of their nationals."

The amendment was admirably presented by Baron Makino. In the course of his speech he emphasized the great desire of the Japanese Government and of the Japanese people that such a principle be recognized in the covenant. His argument was supported with great force by Viscount Chinda.

A discussion followed, in which practically all of the members of the commission participated. The discussion was marked by breadth of thought, free and sympathetic exchange of opinion, and a complete appreciation by the members of the commission of the difficulties which lay in the way of either accepting or rejecting the amendment.

The commission was impressed by the justice of the Japanese claim and by the spirit in which it was presented.

This is the official report, à la Creel, although I believe he did not make it; somebody else was issuing official reports; then,

Therefore the commission was reluctantly unable to give to the amendment that unanimous approval which is necessary for its adoption.

My understanding is that at the last the one man who stood out was the representative of Australia. Australia has declared for a white man's government from the first, and to all intents and purposes they do not allow anybody else to emigrate there. The Japanese amendment came that near to being adopted.

The Japanese delegates announced that they reserved the right to bring the amendment before a plenary session of the conference. The chief opposition to the Japanese proposal came from Australia.

So, my friends from California and from the great golden States of the West, you have a proposition to confront. When you organize this league of nations, and when that league of nations undertakes to pass upon this question of race equality, remember that, according to this official report, substantially the only opposition at the last to a declaration of race equality came from Mr. Hughes, representing Australia; and remember that pressure can be easily brought to bear upon Great Britain by Japan because of their mutual interests in the Orient and

because of their intertreaties which bind them together; and remember that apparently our own representatives did not protest. Now, I put it to you, how can you stand, how dare you stand and protest against Chinese and Japanese landing on your shores, or Chinese and Japanese children having places in your schools beside your children, while at the same time you vote to erect a league of nations that will have the right—the members of the league itself will have the right—to determine whether a question in dispute between Japan and the United States is likely to create war, and thereupon to assume jurisdiction to settle that question? How dare you vote to erect a league of nations and confer this power upon Japan and China, give them the backing of a majority of other races not of the white blood, and yet ask the people of this country to stand by you in your action to exclude Chinese and Japanese from your own sacred soil?

Mr. President, I call the attention of men of the South and men of the West, and I am making my argument to them because these particular questions presented to-day have a particular interest to them. I put the question to you to remember history. You may think you can control the votes of these black races, and maybe they can be controlled upon many important questions, but you will never control them on a question where race equality is to be decided. Men of the South, you raised the negro; you lived among him; and notwithstanding all that has been said, you have always claimed, and claimed with much truth, that you were his friend and his benefactor, although you were his master. You love to boast that the old negro stayed at home with your wife or your mother while the husband or the father stood on the red line of battle. You love to tell how to-day they are still faithful in their hearts; and yet there has never been a time when you could control their votes, and why? Because they said that the Republican Party had given them equality in the world; that the Republican Party had declared that they were men; and no amount of persuasion, nothing short of something that looked very much like sheer force, has been evoked to keep them from the polls. The best you have been able to do is to keep them from having the vote; and I warn you, men of the South, I warn you that when the representatives of these black races—and they are in the majority—assemble around the council table of the league of nations, when the question of race equality comes up, they will vote for race equality, because it has been the dream of their hearts; it has been the hope of their souls; it has been the star toward which they have turned their longing eyes; it has been the one great desire of soul and body and heart and all that makes them men.

My countrymen, I say to you that if you erect a league of nations you will have taken a long step toward the declaration that America's doors shall be opened to the people of all lands; and we shall have Chinese and Japanese knocking at our gates, and along with them all of the races of Asia and of Africa that desire to enter the golden gates of this great country. We may laugh at it to-day, but it is before us. The controversy is on, and it will be seized by this body of men and will be employed by them.

So I pause now to challenge your thought only to this one thing:

Why is it that these nations, most of them the dregs of civilization, most of them the most backward of men, some of them to-day held in a condition of peace by the arms of other nations—why is it that they are selected to sit about a council board that is to determine the creed of the world and that is to evolve something superior to American civilization itself?

I tell you, sirs, that I will never consent to take one single atom of power from the American citizen and confer that power upon the representative of any of these backward races, upon the representative of any of these yellow or brown races. *More than that, I will not consent to grant any governing power over this country to any race of men on earth save the citizens of our own Republic.* He who shall do it under the pretext that as he does it he does nothing, and yet claiming at the same time that he has produced some organization here that is to change the world, who talks with a forked tongue, who looks in two directions at the same time, who assumes contrary positions—the man who does that, and by that kind of policy fastens on this country a league that shall in any respect control this country, betrays the Republic, betrays its Constitution, betrays his oath of office, betrays the cause of justice and the cause of man.

Permit me to say in conclusion that I have no prejudice against races because of color. I do not want to stir against them any rancor or distrust. I speak as I have only because we are presented with a great practical question. In face of such a situation we can not afford to disregard the facts of history. We must not close our eyes to the stern realities of life.

I hope these races may advance, but I am unwilling they shall control the destiny of the United States now or hereafter.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, with the understanding that it will not displace the resolution of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution that I send to the desk. I do not think anybody will object to it. It will not take any time for its consideration.

Mr. CURTIS. It is with the understanding that it does not displace the unfinished business.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment to make a statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a motion pending before the Senate. The resolution of the Senator from New York can be taken up only by unanimous consent.

Mr. CALDER. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk. I am sure no one will object. It deals with the treatment of the Jews in Poland, Roumania, and Galicia, and is a matter in which they are particularly interested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas object?

Mr. ROBINSON. I have no objection. I merely desire to make an announcement. Inasmuch as it is expected that the Senate will adjourn in a few moments, I desire to state that if the business of the Senate permits, on the next meeting day, which will be Wednesday, according to the order heretofore adopted, I shall address the Senate on the subject of a league of nations.

PERSECUTION OF JEWS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] offers a resolution, which will be read by the Secretary.

The resolution (S. Res. 41) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Whereas it is reported that innocent men, women, and children, particularly of the Jewish faith, are being outraged and massacred in Poland, Roumania, and Galicia: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Department of State be, and hereby is, directed to communicate such reports to the President of the United States, and request that he confer with the representatives at the peace conference of the countries where such outrages and massacres are reported to occur and inform them that this body and the American people generally deeply deplore acts of violence and cruelty committed against men, women, and children because of race or religion.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CURTIS. At the request of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], I move that the Senate adjourn, the adjournment being until Wednesday next under the previous order.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, May 28, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *May 26, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Ever blessed God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for the day that has passed, with its quiet, rest, reflections, and spiritual uplift.

May it strengthen us for the duties of the hour, that with clean minds and pure hearts we may do whatever we are called to do willingly, conscientiously, efficiently. After the similitude of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, May 24, 1919, was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. OLNEY, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. CALDWELL, are both here and desire to have the oath of office administered to them.

Mr. OLNEY and Mr. CALDWELL appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office as prescribed by law.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Accounts, this May 26, 1919.

BEN JOHNSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

CORRECTION.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask a correction of the Journal and the RECORD as of May 19, with respect to House joint resolution No. 2, terminating Government supervision, possession, control, and operation of the telephone and telegraph systems of the United States, introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON]. According to the Journal and the RECORD this resolution was referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. As I understand it, according to the notation on the resolution itself, reference was made to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The resolution contained an indorsement made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] for reference to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. In the printing of that day's proceedings the resolution was printed as having been referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, notwithstanding the official reference to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I ask, therefore, that the correction of the RECORD and the Journal be made in accordance with the direction of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction of the Journal and the RECORD will be made in accordance with the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin——

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, there is no dispute about that. At the proper time in the order of business, after the approval of the Journal, I desire to make a motion in respect to this.

The SPEAKER. That will always be in order, but this is not a question of a change of reference.

Mr. GARRETT. If I understood the gentleman correctly, the resolution to which he refers was in fact officially referred by the Speaker to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. ESCH. That is correct.

Mr. GARRETT. But through some error in delivering it by messenger, it went to the wrong committee?

Mr. ESCH. It was printed in the RECORD and in the Journal as having been referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. GARRETT. This is not in fact a change of reference?

Mr. ESCH. No.

The SPEAKER. It is a mere correction of the Journal and the RECORD. Without objection, the correction will be made in the Journal and in the RECORD, in accordance with the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

There was no objection.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, as I understand now, the next business in order is the correction of the reference of public bills.

The SPEAKER. That is true.

Mr. STEENERSON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move that reference of House joint resolution No. 2, terminating Government supervision, possession, control, and operation of the telephone and telegraph systems of the United States, be taken from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and given to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and in that connection I ask unanimous consent to make a short statement with reference to it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves a change of reference and asks unanimous consent for how long?

Mr. STEENERSON. Three minutes.

The SPEAKER. Three minutes in which to discuss it. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, the gentleman from Minnesota does not do this by direction of the committee.

Mr. STEENERSON. No; the rules do not require that.

Mr. GARRETT. The minority members of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads have not been elected, but will be within the next hour. Would not the gentleman be willing to withhold his motion until to-morrow?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

ADDITIONAL MEMBER ON COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, without changing the rules, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SMITH] be permitted to sit this session as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a rather unusual request. I am not certain that ordinarily we would be justified in granting it. We have already agreed to an increase in the Committee on Ways and Means in order to accommodate the minority. This is a request not to increase the Committee on Foreign Affairs but to allow the gentleman from New York [Mr. SMITH] to serve as an additional member of the committee during this session. As I said, this is an unusual request, but after consideration it has been deemed proper to grant this courtesy to the minority, as I understand it will be very helpful to them in making up their organization.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MINORITY MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I nominate the gentlemen named in the list which I now send to the desk as additional members of the committees therein named, and move their election.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from North Carolina desire to have the list read at this time?

Mr. KITCHIN. I think we should save time and do what was done the other day in the election of the majority members—dispense with the reading of the list and have it printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Are there any other nominations?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina if the members of the Committee on Ways and Means are included in that list?

Mr. GARNER. No; they were elected the other day.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the authority of the gentleman from Texas for that statement.

Mr. GARNER. It is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; the gentleman from Texas does not need to have authority; it is in the RECORD.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to question the gentleman's statement to this extent: I do not think the gentleman from North Carolina is a member of the Ways and Means Committee——

Mr. GARNER. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the next morning showed the gentleman was appointed. The gentleman did not happen to be in the Hall when it was done——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then it is all right. I wanted to see that a motion for the gentleman's election was offered if it had not been.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the list of these names be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the list of names be printed in the RECORD without reading. Are there any other nominations? If not, the question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The list is as follows:

DEMOCRATIC NOMINATIONS FOR COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS.

Accounts: Ewin L. Davis, of Tennessee.

Agriculture: Asbury F. Lever, of South Carolina; Gordon Lee, of Georgia; Ezekiel S. Candler, of Mississippi; J. Thomas Heflin, of Alabama; Thomas L. Rubey, of Missouri; James Young, of Texas; Henderson M. Jacoway, of Arkansas; John V. Lesher, of Pennsylvania.

Alcoholic Liquor Traffic: William D. Upshaw, of Georgia; John C. Box, of Texas.

Banking and Currency: Michael F. Phelan, of Massachusetts; Joe H. Eagle, of Texas; Otis Wingo, of Arkansas; Henry B. Steagall, of Alabama; James A. Hamill, of New Jersey; Augustine Lonergan, of Connecticut; Charles H. Brand, of Georgia; W. F. Stevenson, of South Carolina.

Census: James B. Aswell, of Louisiana; Joshua W. Alexander, of Missouri; William W. Larsen, of Georgia; Hubert D. Stephens, of Mississippi; Carlos Bee, of Texas; Samuel M. Brinson, of North Carolina.

Claims: Henry B. Steagall, of Alabama; Milton A. Romjue, of Missouri; John J. Babka, of Ohio; Richard F. McKiniry, of New York; Carlos Bee, of Texas; Daniel F. Minahan, of New Jersey.

Coinage, Weights, and Measures: William A. Ashbrook, of Ohio; William L. Nelson, of Missouri; Daniel F. Minahan, of New Jersey; Samuel M. Brinson, of North Carolina; Clay S. Briggs, of Texas; Hugh S. Hersman, of California.

District of Columbia: Ben Johnson, of Kentucky; Christopher D. Sullivan, of New York; Milton A. Romjue, of Missouri; Herbert J. Drane, of Florida; James W. Overstreet, of Georgia; Carville D. Benson, of Maryland; James P. Woods, of Virginia; Fritz G. Lanham, of Texas.

Education: William J. Sears, of Florida; William B. Bankhead, of Alabama; Charles H. Brand, of Georgia; Thomas L. Blanton, of Texas; Jerome F. Donovan, of New York; William L. Nelson, of Missouri.

Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress: William W. Rucker, of Missouri; Fred H. Dominick, of South Carolina; William C. Wright, of Georgia; Herbert C. Pell, of New York; Clay Stone Briggs, of Texas.

Elections No. 1: Joe H. Eagle, of Texas; Leonidas D. Robinson, of North Carolina.

Elections No. 2: James W. Overstreet, of Georgia; John B. Johnston, of New York; Cornelius J. McGlennon, of New Jersey.

Elections No. 3: Joseph Rowan, of New York; C. B. Hudspeth, of Texas.

Enrolled Bills: Ladislas Lazaro, of Louisiana; Samuel C. Major, of Missouri; Paul B. Johnson, of Mississippi.
Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture: Robert L. Doughton, of North Carolina; David H. Kincheloe, of Kentucky.
Expenditures in the Department of Commerce: Michael F. Phelan, of Massachusetts; William E. Cleary, of New York.
Expenditures in the Interior Department: William F. Stevenson, of South Carolina; E. B. Howard, of Oklahoma.
Expenditures in the Department of Justice: James P. Buchanan, of Texas; James M. Mead, of New York.
Expenditures in the Department of Labor: John J. Casey, of Pennsylvania; James V. Ganly, of New York.
Expenditures in the Navy Department: Rufus Hardy, of Texas; Thomas H. Cullen, of New York.
Expenditures in the Post Office Department: Benjamin G. Humphreys, of Mississippi; James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina.
Expenditures in the State Department: Clement Brumbaugh, of Ohio; William S. Goodwin, of Arkansas.
Expenditures in the Treasury Department: Charles D. Carter, of Oklahoma.
Expenditures in the War Department: Jerome F. Donovan, of New York; Henry D. Flood, of Virginia.
Expenditures on Public Buildings: Ezekiel S. Candler, of Mississippi; Herbert C. Pell, of New York.
Flood Control: Benjamin G. Humphreys, of Mississippi; Riley J. Wilson, of Louisiana; Joseph J. Mansfield, of Texas; Guy E. Campbell, of Pennsylvania; William T. Bland, of Missouri; John McDuffie, of Alabama.
Foreign Affairs: Henry D. Flood, of Virginia; J. Charles Linthicum, of Maryland; William S. Goodwin, of Arkansas; Charles M. Stedman, of North Carolina; Adolph J. Sabath, of Illinois; J. Willard Ragsdale, of South Carolina; George Huddleston, of Alabama; Tom Connally, of Texas; Thomas F. Smith, of New York.
Immigration and Naturalization: Adolph J. Sabath, of Illinois; John E. Raker, of California; Riley J. Wilson, of Louisiana; Benjamin F. Welty, of Ohio; Joseph B. Thompson, of Oklahoma; John C. Box, of Texas.
Indian Affairs: Charles D. Carter, of Oklahoma; Carl Hayden, of Arizona; William J. Sears, of Florida; John N. Tillman, of Arkansas; Harry L. Gandy, of South Dakota; William W. Hastings, of Oklahoma; Zebulon V. Weaver, of North Carolina; Richard F. McKiniry, of New York.
Industrial Arts and Expositions: Isaac R. Sherwood, of Ohio; Martin L. Davey, of Ohio; James V. Ganly of New York; Fritz G. Lanham, of Texas; William C. Lankford, of Georgia; John H. Smithwick, of Florida.
Insular Affairs: Finis J. Garrett, of Tennessee; Clement Brumbaugh, of Ohio; Christopher D. Sullivan, of New York; Tom D. McKeown, of Oklahoma; Leonidas D. Robinson, of North Carolina; Marvin Jones, of Texas; Fred H. Dominick, of South Carolina; Schuyler Otis Bland, of Virginia.
Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Thetus W. Sims, of Tennessee; Frank E. Doremus, of Michigan; Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky; Sam Rayburn, of Texas; Andrew J. Montague, of Virginia; Charles P. Coady, of Maryland; Arthur G. Dewalt, of Pennsylvania; Jared Y. Sanders, of Louisiana.
Invalid Pensions: Isaac R. Sherwood, of Ohio; William A. Ashbrook, of Ohio; Augustine Lonergan, of Connecticut; David J. O'Connell, of New York; William T. Bland, of Missouri; Patrick McLane, of Pennsylvania.
Irrigation of Arid Lands: Edward T. Taylor, of Colorado; Carl Hayden, of Arizona; Milton H. Welling, of Utah; Charles R. Evans, of Nevada; Claude Hudspeth, of Texas.
Judiciary: Edwin Y. Webb, of North Carolina; Robert Y. Thomas, jr., of Kentucky; William L. Igoe, of Missouri; Warren Gard, of Ohio; Richard S. Whaley, of South Carolina; Thaddeus H. Caraway, of Arkansas; M. M. Neely, of West Virginia; Henry J. Steele, of Pennsylvania.
Labor: James P. Maher, of New York; Walter A. Watson, of Virginia; John J. Casey, of Pennsylvania; W. L. Carss, of Minnesota; Samuel C. Major, of Missouri.
Library: Ben Johnson, of Kentucky; Joseph B. Thompson, of Oklahoma.
Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Joshua W. Alexander, of Missouri; Rufus Hardy, of Texas; Edward W. Saunders, of Virginia; Peter J. Dooling, of New York; Ladislas Lazaro, of Louisiana; David H. Kincheloe, of Kentucky; William B. Bankhead, of Alabama; William C. Wright, of Georgia.
Military Affairs: S. Hubert Dent, jr., of Alabama; William J. Fields, of Kentucky; Percy E. Quin, of Mississippi; Chas. Pope Caldwell, of New York; James W. Wise, of Georgia; Richard Olney, of Massachusetts; Thomas W. Harrison, of Virginia; Hubert F. Fisher, of Tennessee.
Mines and Mining: Otis Wingo, of Arkansas; Milton H. Welling, of Utah; Peter J. Dooling, of New York; Lucien W. Parrish, of Texas; Everett B. Howard, of Oklahoma.
Naval Affairs: Lemuel P. Padgett, of Tennessee; Daniel J. Riordan, of New York; William B. Oliver, of Alabama; William W. Venable, of Mississippi; Carl Vinson, of Georgia; William Kettner, of California; William A. Ayres, of Kansas; Samuel J. Nicholls, of South Carolina.
Patents: Guy E. Campbell, of Pennsylvania; John B. Johnston, of New York; John J. Babka, of Ohio; E. L. Davis, of Tennessee; John McDuffie, of Alabama.
Pensions: James V. McClintic, of Oklahoma; James M. Mead, of New York; Cornelius A. McGlennon, of New Jersey; John H. Wilson, of Pennsylvania; John H. Smithwick, of Florida; William D. Upshaw, of Georgia; William L. Carss, of Minnesota.
Post Office and Post Roads: John A. Moon, of Tennessee; Thomas M. Bell, of Georgia; Arthur B. Rouse, of Kentucky; Fred L. Blackmon, of Alabama; Edward E. Holland, of Virginia; Eugene Black, of Texas; Charles H. Randall, of California; Henry M. Goldfogle, of New York.
Printing: James V. McClintic, of Oklahoma.
Public Buildings and Grounds: Frank Clark, of Florida; James C. Cantrill, of Kentucky; Fran Park, of Georgia; William W. Rucker, of Missouri; Joseph J. Mansfield, of Texas; Anthony J. Griffin, of New York; John W. Rainey, of Illinois; John F. Fitzgerald, of Massachusetts.
Public Lands: Scott Ferris, of Oklahoma; Edward T. Taylor, of Colorado; John E. Raker, of California; James H. Mays, of Utah; John N. Tillman, of Arkansas; Harry L. Gandy, of South Dakota; Hugh S. Hersman, of California; Paul B. Johnson, of Mississippi.
Railways and Canals: Benjamin F. Welty, of Ohio; Herbert J. Drane, of Florida; Hannibal L. Godwin, of North Carolina; Thomas H. Cullen, of New York; Patrick McLane, of Pennsylvania.
Reform in the Civil Service: Hannibal L. Godwin, of North Carolina; James A. Hamill, of New Jersey; Charles A. Mooney, of Ohio; Joseph Rowan, of New York.
Revision of the Laws: John T. Watkins, of Louisiana; James H. Mays, of Utah; Edward B. Almon, of Alabama; Anthony J. Griffin, of New York.
Rivers and Harbors: John H. Small, of North Carolina; Charles F. Booher, of Missouri; Thomas Gallagher, of Illinois; Thomas J. Scully, of New Jersey; Samuel M. Taylor, of Arkansas; H. Garland Dupré, of Louisiana; Clarence F. Lea, of California; William E. Cleary, of New York.
Roads: Edward W. Saunders, of Virginia; Hubert D. Stephens, of Mississippi; Robert L. Doughton, of North Carolina; James B. Aswell, of Louisiana; Edward B. Almon, of Alabama; Marvin Jones, of Texas; William W. Larsen, of Georgia; Tom D. McKeown, of Oklahoma.
Territories: John T. Watkins, of Louisiana; Scott Ferris, of Oklahoma; Walter A. Watson, of Virginia; Zebulon V. Weaver, of North Carolina; William C. Lankford, of Georgia; Martin L. Davey, of Ohio.
War Claims: Frank Clark, of Florida; John W. Rainey, of Illinois; Charles A. Mooney, of Ohio; John H. Wilson, of Pennsylvania; David J. O'Connell, of New York.
Woman Suffrage: John E. Raker, of California; Frank Clark, of Florida; James H. Mays, of Utah; Christopher D. Sullivan, of New York; Thomas L. Blanton, of Texas.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the consideration of the concurrent resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk—House concurrent resolution 4.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 4.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That an edition of the Congressional Directory for the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress be prepared and published, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, as provided for in section 73 of the printing act approved January 12, 1895, and that the sum of $800 be paid for preparing, compiling, and indexing said edition, one-half of the said sum to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

The question was taken, and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

P. W. BURNETT.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask consideration for the privileged resolution which I now send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 47.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, to P. W. Burnett, clerk to the late Hon. John L. Burnett, a Representative in Congress from Alabama at the time of his death, May 13, 1919, the sum of $166.66, being an amount equal to one month's salary of a clerk of a Representative in Congress.

Mr. IRELAND. I move its adoption.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON RULES.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House further for the consideration of the privileged resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 30.

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and is hereby, allowed an assistant clerk at a salary at the rate of $1,500 per annum from May 17, 1919, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise authorized by law.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE TO SIT, COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 53.

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, or such subcommittees as it may designate, shall have leave to sit during sessions of the House during the Sixty-sixth Congress and during the recesses of that Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUTLER. I move its adoption.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for one hour.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will yield.

THANKS OF CONGRESS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, our country and its people were during the period of the last Congress, in cooperation with the gallant Allies, engaged to the utmost of their strength and energy and patriotic purpose in prosecuting a great war against the evil designs and sinister purposes of military autocracy. The active hostilities of that great war are happily ended, and our gallant forces are returning from their service, wherever duty called, to their homes or home stations. In this situation it is fitting that the Congress should, at an appropriate time and in a proper form, express its thanks and appreciation to those who served and those who sacrificed in connection with this great enterprise of righteous war. With this thought in mind, and at the suggestion of several Members, I have drawn a resolution designed to accomplish this purpose, and reminded of the near approach of Memorial Day it seemed that this would be an appropriate time for the consideration and adoption of such a resolution as has been suggested. I therefore present a resolution to be read for the information of the House, and shall ask unanimous consent that Friday, May 30, Memorial Day, be set aside for its consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution for the information of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 67) tendering the thanks of Congress to those who served, or gave others to the service of, the country in the Great War.

Resolved, etc., That the thanks of Congress are hereby extended to those who served in the armed forces of the United States in the war against the Imperial German Government, and who, through their patriotic sacrifice, steadfast fidelity, brilliant strategy, and courageous service, secured a victorious peace, gave to the world a new insight into the high ideals and lofty purposes of America, and left to future generations a splendid heritage of heroic achievement and noble devotion to duty. That the thanks of Congress are hereby extended to those who served in the various auxiliary forces, whose humane and benevolent work at home and on the field of battle contributed so greatly to the comfort and support of our valiant warriors. That the thanks of Congress are hereby extended to the mothers, wives, and relatives, who, patriotic and uncomplaining, gave their nearest and their dearest in the hour of the Nation's need, and its deep and heartfelt sympathy to those disabled in the great struggle. That Congress reverently expresses its profound appreciation of the sublime act of those who made the supreme sacrifice by giving their lives for their country and their country's cause.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion? I notice the gentleman refers to those who were in the war against the Imperial German Government. Now, America declared war against the Austrian Government, and some of our soldiers were fighting only against the Austrians in that war.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, I will say to the gentleman that I have given a good deal of thought to the preparation of the resolution and have asked the opinion of many Members of the House in regard to it. I have no pride of opinion in regard to the phraseology other than I have tried to express the fact and view of those with whom I have conferred. I suppose that no resolution could possibly be drawn that might not be drawn in some different phraseology. The title of the resolution refers to it as the "Great War."

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will yield. Of course, the resolution will be subject to amendment when taken up.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman does not propose to take it up to-day?

Mr. MONDELL. I propose to ask that Friday be set apart for the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield further? I have a kind of hazy remembrance that the rule of the House in reference to the thanks of Congress being given to individuals gives them the privilege of the floor, and I was a little anxious——

Mr. MONDELL. This does not give anyone the privileges of the floor.

Mr. GARNER. But the very fact that the thanks of Congress are extended to an individual under the rules of the House gives him the privilege of the floor of the House, and if you extend this to a great mass of people, including mothers, and so forth, I am not so certain but that, under the rules of the House——

Mr. MONDELL. I have sought the advice of those who ought to know and have experience in regard to the matter and they all say under the phraseology of the resolution it would not have that effect.

Mr. GARNER. I have no objection to the resolution at all, but merely wanted to direct the gentleman's attention to that so as to be sure.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I think the gentleman from Texas will find the rule says that is where the thanks are extended by name, and the names are not mentioned here.

Mr. MONDELL. Just a moment. There were many suggestions with regard to the form of this resolution. Some suggested the naming of certain officers. It seemed to those I conferred with on both sides that a general resolution, which would express the thanks and appreciation of the Congress, would be the best possible form.

Mr. TILSON. I suggest that just one phrase would accomplish what I am trying to, and that is "the Imperial German Government and its allies."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that there would be serious objection to adding after the words "Imperial German Government" the words "and its allies."

The SPEAKER. It is simply before the House for information. It can be changed.

Mr. MONDELL. The suggestion is to modify my resolution.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit? I apprehend there will be——

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I think I am sometimes rather too good-natured. After thinking about it further, I am not inclined to modify the resolution. The resolution was given very careful consideration. It may not be just what it ought to be. If it is not, let us amend it when we take it up on Friday.

Mr. GARRETT. I wanted to ask the gentleman a question. Doubtless there will be a large number of Members who will desire time upon this resolution. Has the gentleman thought anything about the question of time?

Mr. MONDELL. My thought was we would consume the entire day or such portion of the day as the Members desire to speak, and, of course, give equal opportunity to Members on either side.

Mr. GARRETT. I had this thought in mind, if the gentleman will permit: Of course, under the rules of the House, any man who got the privilege of the floor would be entitled to an hour. Would it not be better to have an agreement made now or then—possibly then would be better—for the control of the time, or let us understand in advance that, despite the general rules of the House, Members would be limited to a certain time?

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will allow me, what I have in mind is this, that Members would have in mind the fact that the resolution would be taken up Friday. Between now and then we could have a consultation and on Friday a formal agreement as to what should be done in the matter of time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming that this resolution be in order for next Friday?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the printing of the resolution in the usual form.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], according to a previous order of the House, is recognized for one hour. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, to properly tell the story of America's participation in the war would require more time than I have been allotted to speak and a man of greater ability to present the case, for it is a marvelous story and one which will live in history.

UNPREPAREDNESS AND EXPENDITURES.

At the declaration of war we had no Army and our Navy was not at its best, and the details of organizing an army and a navy to meet the problems that confronted us was a gigantic task. The size of the task will be better realized when it is understood that the total expenditures of the National Government during the first 143 years of the Republic amounted to but twenty-five and one-half billions of dollars, while the appropriations made during the period of the war have aggregated fifty-one and one-half billions.

On July 1, 1913, the country's interest-bearing obligations amounted to nine hundred and sixty-five millions, the annual interest charge on which was twenty-two and three-quarters millions. The interest-bearing debt, exclusive of certificates of indebtedness, when the obligations due to the settlement of unfinished contracts are met, will be in the neighborhood of $30,000,000,000 and the annual interest and sinking-fund charges will amount to approximately one and one-half billions.

The annual cost of maintaining the Government before 1913 was about one and one-half billion dollars. It is fair to assume that the annual cost for some years to come will not be less than five billions. From this it will be seen that the war has imposed financial obligations upon the American people which will call for a high rate of taxation.

AMERICA'S OBLIGATIONS.

In assuming the obligations imposed upon the country by the declaration of war the people were called upon to make many sacrifices. They made these sacrifices cheerfully. The

draft law as originally passed and afterwards modified brought responses from 23,000,000 men of military age, who registered a vow to serve their country. Young men everywhere throughout the Nation responded to the call to arms. Mothers, fathers, sisters, and wives encouraged the men of their families who were fit for military service to join the colors. The result was that 3,700,000 men wore the uniform of the Army, 200,000 the uniform of the Marines, and 560,000 the uniform of the Navy, or a total of 4,500,000. Of this number, the Army sent 1,949,000 men abroad; 22,500 were on the sea when the armistice was signed, and 1,390,000 of the men abroad were engaged in the conflict; 288,000 of them were either killed or wounded; 70,000 of them were buried in the soil of France; 1,700,000 were held in American camps awaiting orders; but whether in camps in America or on the battle fronts in France, they were all ready to respond to any emergency and are equally entitled to credit, no matter where they served. They were the most wonderful aggregation of men that ever assembled under a flag. That is conceded on every hand. They are entitled to the undying gratitude of the American people. Their patriotism will be recorded in the history of their country. Distinguished-service medals and crosses have been given to many men for deeds of valor on the fields of battle during the war. Many of these have been given to men who were wounded, and others have been wounded to whom no insignia of distinction has been given; but what greater insignia of distinction can a man have than that which marks the scar of battle on his person?

Most of these wounded men are at home; they are happy to be alive, and we are happy to have them with us. They have earned America's gratitude. Every time I meet one of these men I feel like walking up and kissing him [applause], but he wants none of that; he is proud of his participation in the war, and he wants no hero worship; no American does.

The American people, however, should not forget these men; they should be the special wards of the Nation to the extent that it may be necessary. They should never be permitted to want, and all Americans in and out of the Government should see that they are held in grateful remembrance. They carry the story of their achievements and their sacrifices with them, and it should be the pleasure, to say nothing of the duty, of every American to make them feel proud of the sacrifices they have made for their country.

The Navy should not be forgotten. It was the outpost that protected the Nation against invasion from the beginning of the war to the end. Its achievements are deserving of high praise. In the lonely vigil of the night, on the trackless oceans, the men of the Navy protected the ships carrying our troops abroad. They braved every danger; they sought no publicity. Their only purpose was the achievement of the object of the Nation and the protection of its honor and the preservation of its institutions. They did it well. They have earned the confidence of the American people. The Nation is prouder of its Navy to-day than ever before. [Applause.]

The achievements of the Marine Corps will always stand out in bold relief in the history of the great conflict. No man was admitted to the Marine Corps unless he passed a standard test of physical and mental superiority, and all of these qualifications were manifest in the battle line, where they crowned America with glory at Chateau-Thierry, in which battle 5,700 were killed or wounded out of a force of 8,000.

When one comes in contact with the men who composed the Army and Navy and Marine Corps one must admit that a higher order of intelligence existed in these three great bodies of men than ever existed in such organizations before. The college man, the artisan, the mechanic, the engineer, the electrician, the chemist, the teamster, the doctor, the lawyer, the merchant, the laborer, all joined together in a single whole. The rich, the poor, the high, the low met on the same level, slept in the same bunks, ate at the same mess, drilled in the same line, and fought in the same battles. They learned to know each other as they never had the opportunity to do before. They are coming back better men, with a better understanding, a broader vision, and a more comprehensive view of the Nation and its needs; they will be glad to tell the story of liberty under the American flag as they never knew it before. They will take part, as they should, in the Nation's activities; they will help to stabilize conditions here, and they will give the people the benefit of their experience abroad. They understand now, better than ever before, what America means, what government of the people consists of, and they will be glad to use this understanding to good advantage for the improvement of the Nation.

AMERICA'S WOMEN.

We must not forget the sacrifices made by the women of the Nation—the Red Cross nurse, the Army nurse, the Salvation Army, and the Young Women's Christian Association workers—who braved every danger of war to relieve the suffering of the soldiers. Wonderful women these, unselfish, devoted, kind-hearted, painstaking, and generous. They, too, have earned the right of participation in shaping the future policies of the Nation. [Applause.]

ORGANIZATION.

To assemble this vast Army and Navy and Marine Corps was an enormous task; to supply them with clothing, equipment, and food a problem more difficult than one can imagine. Expenditures on a large scale were necessary to meet the needs of the hour and to prepare our men and women for the duties which the obligation they took imposed upon them. Ships were required, transportation facilities needed. It was necessary to transform factories of all kinds from peace to war activities. The genius of the American business man with his faculty for organization was brought into play. Many of them unselfishly gave their time and devoted themselves to the task. Thirty per cent of our people were engaged in war activities. Nearly all of the people were interested. There were but few who were not loyal, and of this few but an infinitesimal number publicly expressed their disloyalty. A marvelous exhibition of unity was displayed throughout the country. A determination on the part of the people to give all they had in men and money for success was manifest everywhere. The Congress acted upon an American basis. There was no question of politics involved in any action Congress took. [Applause.] The demands of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy were promptly met. Everything that he suggested as a means of winning the war was granted without hesitation. Money was placed at his disposal without question; he was given more power than that of any other ruler in all the world. In the exercise of that power and the expenditure of the fabulous sums of money appropriated it is but natural that mistakes should have been made. Money was wasted, extravagance was indulged in, contracts were let at figures frequently unjustified, but no complaint was heard from any source. The winning of the war was the only object to which everyone who believed in the Nation's welfare applied himself. Efficiency was not always obtained; economies were rarely ever practiced. We had to have ships to carry supplies. They were built or requisitioned at extravagant prices, but no one found fault. Ships that cost before the war $75 a ton were built at as high as $200 a ton. The powder factories, the ordnance works, the aeroplane plants, all were erected without thought of cost, and sometimes without results. It is said that America never had on the battle line a fieldpiece that was made in an American ordnance factory, except a few guns from the battleships; that no American shell had ever been fired in the course of the war, though vast sums of money were expended in the erection of plants for the creation of ordnance. Our Army had the guns, however, with which to fight the battles in which they were engaged. French 75's and 155's were supplied to the Army in quantity sufficient to meet every need, and our soldiers who were abroad gave high praise to the efficiency of these guns.

Among the things the President wanted was the railroads, which he took over. During the Government operation of the roads they collected $1,100,000,000 the first year from excess freight and passenger charges. Congress gave them $500,000,000 as a revolving fund to operate the roads, and they lost $250,000,000 besides, and are asking for $750,000,000 now, and probably a billion; they will collect another $1,100,000,000 in additional freight and passenger rates, and will probably lose another $250,000,000, which will make $3,950,000,000, which is more on that one extravagance than it has cost to run the Government for a similar period in times of peace.

And they are before the Committee on Appropriations to-day asking $1,200,000,000 as a working fund. These two items together will make $2,300,000,000; and if we assume it will all be expended at the end of the next year's administration of the railroads, we will have before us the spectacle of Government operation of railroads for a period of two years at a cost of $4,150,000,000 to the American people, or $1,150,000,000 more in the single item of operating the railroads by the Government of the United States than it cost for an equal period to run every activity of the Government before the war began.

They also took the wires over, and the first thing the Postmaster General did was to issue an order to require a $15 installation fee for a telephone. This was finally reduced so that now it ranges from $3.50 to $7, depending on conditions.

And I wish to call the attention of the House and the country to the fact that prior to the Government control and operation no installation charge was ever made by any telephone company in the United States.

On the pretense of reducing the long-distance telephone rate he fixed a person to person call, which, compared with the

person to person call prior to the Government control of the wires, is 144 per cent higher; and he also increased the commercial telegraph rates 20 per cent.

IMPRESSIONS OF EUROPEAN CONDITIONS.

It was my privilege to go abroad to visit the battle fields after the close of the Congress on the 4th of March. I was accorded every facility possible to see what had been done over there. I saw the wonderful achievements of the allied forces, and paid particular attention to what had been done by the American Army. I visited Brest and examined the camp against which so much criticism has been leveled. I was happy to find that although in its early stages the camp was untenable it had been so improved that no complaint was found from any source. Gen. Butler, of the marines, son of the honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania [applause], who was in direct command of the camp, which has facilities for 81,000 men, had cleaned it up and made it habitable and attractive. He in company with 5,000 men went to Brest and carried the lumber on their backs to the camp to make the sidewalks necessary to admit of passage through the grounds. When one remembers that it rains every day at Brest, and that the surface is a turf-like soil for a depth of 3 feet, underlaid with clay, it will readily be seen how impossible it was to meet the demands of the hour until sidewalks and tent floors had been laid. I ate with the troops at the camp. Their food was good and the sleeping quarters clean. Facilities are afforded for the feeding of 50,000 men within an hour. Nothing more is to be desired.

I next visited Le Mans, a replacement camp, where provisions are made for 260,000 men. In the early stages of the war Le Mans was used as a replacement camp entirely. From this camp units at the front were supplied with men to take the place of those who had fallen in battle. To-day Le Mans is used as a delousing camp, a reequipment camp, and troops are sent there to be cleaned up before starting back home.

From Le Mans my trip led me to Tours, the headquarters of the service of supplies, a wonderful organization in charge of the movement of all supplies for the Army. Here I found a great salvage plant, in which the worn-out clothing was being restored to usefulness; shoes were made over, rubber boots repaired, dirty clothes fumigated, everything that could be done to utilize the fragments of what had been at one time complete equipment. At this point I visited the German prison camp, where America has a number of its prisoners of war. I found them well housed, well fed, well treated, and with every indication that they were happy.

From Tours I went to Gierves, where I found a marvelous storage plant, with 180 warehouses, aggregating four and one-half million feet of storage space, with 145 miles of railroad track, 135 locomotives, and a billion dollars' worth of supplies on hand—everything from a needle to an anchor. Here also was a great cold-storage plant, in which all the meat supplied to the Army was kept for shipment to the front. Twenty-one thousand men were employed in loading and unloading and storing supplies. The supplies were sent forward from here to Is-sur-Tele, the great distributing point, from which all the supplies to every front were sent. The remarkable thing about Gierves is that it was not known to the Germans as the great supply center of the American Army, and it is said that never at any time from the beginning of the war to the end was any request made for any supplies from this depot which did not meet with prompt response.

The feeding and equipping of an army such as America had abroad requires the supervision of men experienced in the movement of supplies, and, from what I could see, the service of supplies of the American Army in France was beyond criticism.

I next visited Bourges, the service of records headquarters. At this place there are 5,000 men and women employed, 600 of them being English girls, keeping the records of each soldier, recording each one wounded, each death, each burial, and every assignment and order, general or special. In fact, a complete record of every man from the time he reaches France until he leaves for home or is buried is kept here. The record of undelivered mail is kept here also, and every effort possible seems to be made to learn the location of missing soldiers, so that the mail can be delivered to them, but I am impressed with the fact that the mail section of the records division had not accomplished the purpose for which it was organized. That in a large measure, I think, was due to the fact that our system of organizing units of the Army made it impossible to trace the men. For example, in the English Army when a man enlists he enlists for a given regiment, and his mail address is always with that regiment; no matter where he may be his regiment knows where he is. Our organization gave a man no particular mail address. He was not necessarily attached to any special unit. He was sent to a replacement camp, no matter what unit he went over with, and when any division at the front needed men they were sent from the replacement camps to a unit where men were wounded, and they lost their identity as a member of the unit to which they originally belonged. If he was wounded or went to a hospital, his record went to the hospital with him, so that his company commander was unable to trace where he was, and the people at the hospital were interested in his recovery more than they were in his receiving his mail, so altogether the delivery of mail was a mixed-up mess.

Much complaint was made among the people of America that the casualties were not reported more promptly after the casualties occurred. Upon inquiry from the Records Division I found that when men were wounded and sent back from the front they were taken to a field hospital and from there to a hospital farther back from the line, and finally taken to a base hospital, where it frequently happened that the base hospital was so full that another transfer had to be made and the record would not show the transfer. And then, too, it was not always possible to tell who was killed or wounded; there were so many missing after each battle. They had to be traced, and that took a long time. Others were shot so badly that identification was impossible, but I was convinced that every effort possible was being made not only to make prompt reports but to identify every missing man, and I was told by the commander of the Records Division that he had traced the entire missing forces of the American Army with the exception of 4,351, and the next day when I saw him that had been reduced to 4,124, while the records of the French Army show 280,000 missing and the English 174,000 missing. Our people hope to reduce our number of missing to 2,000.

Mr. FERRIS. Would it disturb the gentleman if I interrupted him for information purely?

Mr. MADDEN. Surely not.

Mr. FERRIS. Are they marking those graves so that they can be identified and visited by their friends later on?

Mr. MADDEN. They are establishing national cemeteries now, and I will get to that.

My next visit was to the battle fields, and in this I was fortunate in having accompany me Capt. Harper, who was in command of a battery of the Seventeenth Artillery at the Battle of Belleau Wood. He directed the fire of 1,040 shells in a single day into the village of Vaux. Capt. Harper had made a special study of every battle and knew all of the troops engaged in each and the strategic importance of each engagement.

The first battle field visited was Belleau Wood. Belleau Wood is a small forest one mile long and a half mile wide, standing on the top of a large hill. It was in the possession of the Germans until the American troops drove the Germans out and took possession of the wood and the town of Vaux, which was entirely destroyed by American shell fire.

The day's trip took us to Chateau-Thierry, where the Americans won such undying glory and turned the tide of the war. [Applause.] It was at this point where the French were retreating as the Americans came in, and the French officer who was in command of the retreating forces said to the American commander who was leading his forces into the battle, "We are retreating; why are you going in?" To which the American commander replied, "That is why we are going in." [Applause.]

After leaving Chateau-Thierry I visited Romaigne. On that day they were establishing a national cemetery for American soldiers. This will answer the inquiry of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS]. The cemetery was all laid out, trenches were dug, and several companies of soldiers with motor trucks were removing bodies from the cemeteries in that vicinity and placing them in caskets and taking them to the national cemetery, where they are to lie in soil to be owned by America, and there forever to be enshrined in the hearts of the American people.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman mind telling the House how the graves in the temporary cemeteries are marked?

Mr. MADDEN. The graves are marked with wooden crosses, marked in each case with the name of the man and the regiment to which he belonged, and also with the identification tag of the man who is buried there. Of course, the identification tag might possibly be removed, and thereby the identity of the man might be lost; but the records of the office at Bourges are so complete that the burial place of every soldier who is known and the grave in which he lies is recorded. I saw the heart-rending scene where they were taking up 26,000 bodies of our boys. It was possible, even while I was there, to identify the men. But they were buried in shallow trenches, with their uniforms on,

not covered with a casket of any kind, and their bodies had become so heavy on account of their clothing being saturated with rain that four husky soldiers were required, while they were carrying a single body on a stretcher, to rest every 25 feet. The work that these men are doing is one of the works which I believe is a distinguished service, and if any class of men who have served in the American Army deserve and should receive the distinguished-service cross those men who are doing this work of love certainly ought to receive it. [Applause.]

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. ROSE. Only recently I received a letter from a relative of mine, in which it is said that the remains of Pvt. Deckert had been removed and buried in an isolated grave at an isolated cemetery, the name of which I do not now recall to mind. Does it mean that that grave can not be located?

Mr. MADDEN. No. As one travels over the area over which the battles were fought, individual graves can be seen here and there and everywhere, but every grave is properly marked. Sometimes you find a grave on the roadside, on a hill made by dirt taken from a ditch alongside the road. Next you will see a grave or two in the distance, a few feet away from the roadside. Then you may see a hundred graves, all surrounded by a fence. But the national cemetery at Romaigne is to care for 26,000 American soldiers who were killed in that locality, and I believe that to-day every one of these soldiers is buried there. There is to be another American cemetery established in France, but just where I do not know.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. MILLER. It might be interesting if the gentleman from Illinois would compare the care that has been shown in the collection and preservation of the bodies of American soldiers, as contrasted with that of the French and British.

Mr. MADDEN. I would be delighted to do that, but I do not think that I am qualified to do it. But I will say one thing, that the men who had the care of the men who were killed in the American Army have seen to it that their comrades' graves were marked so that they can be located.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Some American families are very anxious to have the remains of their soldier dead returned for Christian burial in the United States. Does the gentleman know whether any effort was made to preserve these remains so that they can be brought back?

Mr. MADDEN. It would not have been possible to preserve the remains. They had to be buried as quickly as possible on the battle field. It was not possible to have scientifically prepared the bodies, and my judgment is that no family in America should ever ask to have the body of their boy brought back, because they are to be laid away in the cemeteries to be owned by the Nation, devoted to the care of the remains of those who fell in the country's defense, and properly cared for in a shrine to which every American can go. My own judgment is that it would not be possible to bring them back with any degree of satisfaction, and I hope the American people will not attempt to have them brought back.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Some efforts have been made to bring them back, and it has been intimated that the War Department, in due course, will permit the return of certain of those remains.

Mr. MADDEN. I understand the War Department will bring back the remains of any boy whose parents or friends wish to have them brought back; but if my advice were sought, I would say what I have already said, "Do not do it."

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I do not want to disturb the line of the gentleman's statement.

Mr. MADDEN. It will not disturb me at all.

Mr. GARD. Is the gentleman going to advise us about the burial of American soldiers in German territory and at Brest?

Mr. MADDEN. All the bodies of American soldiers buried anywhere in France are to be removed to the cemeteries to be established.

Mr. GARD. I refer particularly to the army of occupation and as to the men who died on German soil.

Mr. MADDEN. I am not familiar with any plans of the War Department as to that, but I might assume that any men who have died in the occupied territory on German soil will either be removed to America or removed to the national cemeteries located in France.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield?

Mr. MADDEN. With pleasure.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I might perhaps supplement the statement of the gentleman by a statement of fact, that I was advised that the bodies of such soldiers as had died in hospitals were embalmed and placed in caskets.

Mr. MADDEN. That may be true.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. That is true. Only such men as died on the battle field were buried at once.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. There was a movement to create what they called a field of honor, in which it was proposed that the Government was to accept the gift of something like a thousand acres of land in some beautiful portion of France, and then a hall of records to be erected and a chapel, and the bodies be brought there and buried in the one place, and the Government represented there by a garrison, and later on the place to be beautified and embellished from funds to be received by the Government through donations.

Mr. MADDEN. That would be a beautiful idea, and one which I think ought to receive serious consideration; and since we have established these national cemeteries, to which all the bodies that we have been able to find have been removed, it would be very easy to move them from these cemeteries to the central place indicated by the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. I am glad to have the gentleman's indorsement of that, because I think it is becoming a matter of nation-wide interest.

Mr. MADDEN. It ought to.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Surely.

Mr. McKENZIE. Do I understand my colleague to say that he thinks it would be a good idea to have the bodies of these patriots turned over to some individual corporation or society, rather than taken care of by the Government?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, no. The plan contemplated in the question of the gentleman from Ohio is based on the understanding that it is to be a cemetery owned by the Government of the United States. Nobody would think for a moment of the other plan.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MADDEN. Surely.

Mr. SNYDER. Is it the understanding that the men are to be buried over there if their parents desire to have them brought back to this country?

Mr. MADDEN. I understand that it will be the policy of the War Department to have every soldier brought back whose parents wish it.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. How many of these national cemeteries are contemplated?

Mr. MADDEN. Only two are in contemplation now, one at Romaigne, where 26,000 American soldiers are to be buried. Undoubtedly they are already buried there, because the trenches were all dug when I was there. It is a beautifully situated spot on the side of a hill, and large enough to provide for all of the 26,000 bodies that were being removed from the adjoining cemeteries.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Has that land been donated by the French Government?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know exactly how it was acquired, whether it was donated or purchased, but we are to own it.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. LAZARO. Does not the gentleman think it would be wise for our Government to make known to the parents of all these dead soldiers what the Government intends to do, so that the parents can come to a definite understanding about it?

Mr. MADDEN. I think it would be a good idea. I think it might be wise for the Secretary of War to send broadcast some kind of a communication indicating what the policy of the Government is to be with respect to the care of the remains of the soldiers who are buried in France.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. I have the impression that that has been done already.

Mr. MADDEN. Perhaps it has.

Mr. GARRETT. I know it has been done in some instances.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I asked the gentleman that question a little while ago, and I am not sure whether he indicated that the War Department had announced a policy.

Mr. MADDEN. I said the Secretary of War said that in any case where the family requested it he would have the bodies brought back.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But not at the present time?
Mr. MADDEN. Not at the present time.
Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That would give to every soldier's family the right to have the soldier's body returned in case it was desired?
Mr. MADDEN. Yes.
Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That ought to be done.
Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.
Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I should like to know whether he knows if the War Department has determined that it will enter immediately upon the work of returning the bodies of soldiers who were killed in France?
Mr. MADDEN. My understanding is that the Secretary of War has indicated that he would rather not begin the returning of the bodies until the war is over and the proclamation of peace has been issued.
Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I want to say that I have had several cases where I have made requests for the return of bodies, and that was the advice I received.
Mr. MADDEN. I think that information is correct.
Mr. LUFKIN. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. MADDEN. Yes.
Mr. LUFKIN. I want to say that this morning I called at the War Department on an errand of that kind, and they told me that this matter will not be taken up until the American Army has practically all been returned to this country.
Mr. MADDEN. That is what I thought.

ARGONNE-MEUSE BATTLE.

It seems proper at this point to call special attention to the achievements of the American Army at the Argonne-Meuse Battle. Here the difficulties seemed to be so insurmountable as to make success doubtful, but a visit to the place confirms one in the opinion that every American has—that no soldier is the equal of the American soldier. [Applause.]

The Argonne Forest is about 30 miles long and 3 miles wide, with a great canyon about 1,000 feet wide running through the center, north and south. On one side of this canyon the French were intrenched in dugouts all up and down the mountain side. The Germans were intrenched on the other side of the canyon. The two armies were able to look each other in the face. They remained in this position for four years, with an occasional skirmish from the front-line trenches, with no indication that any effort would be made by either side to come out and fight for supremacy.

The difficulty of the situation was such that one is obliged to conclude that if the demands of the Allies, that the American Army should be merged with the French and English and Italian Armies and fight without identity, had not been denied the war would still be on if Germany had not succeeded in mastering the allied forces; and it is to the persistent and determined efforts of Gen. Pershing that the credit is due for insisting that an all-American army, fighting as an American army, should be organized, and to the fact that the American Army was assigned to the Argonne Forest sector, in my judgment, is due the successful conclusion of the war. When one stops to think that the French and German Armies remained in their trenches within a thousand feet of each other in the Argonne region for four years and that the American Army marched through the ravine between the two armies and drove the Germans into the open across the valley through which the Meuse River runs, into an open plain where Gen. Pershing assembled 810,000 American soldiers of all armies facing the Germans on the hills across the valley, which seemed impregnable; that the American engineers succeeded in building bridges across the Meuse River for the passage of the American soldiers, which were finished under the heaviest possible German shell fire from the amphitheater of hills that surrounded the plain, it will be seen that without the valor and daring and genius and courage of the Americans and the matchless leadership of their commander in chief the war would still be on if the Allies were able to hold out at all. At Mount Faucon, one of the high points of vantage on this battle ground, was the headquarters of the Crown Prince of Germany.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.
Mr. LONGWORTH. The general statement that the gentleman made a short time ago, that the American troops turned the tide, is fully borne out in an article I read in the afternoon paper purporting to be a statement by Gen. Ludendorff:

France and England would have been beaten in 1918 but for America.

And then he goes on to say:

America proved to be the deciding military factor in the war.

Gen. Ludendorff ought to know something about it.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; and I made up my own mind about it from my own observations as I went over the different battle fields.
Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. MADDEN. I will.
Mr. WILSON of Illinois. The gentleman from Ohio has stated what the afternoon paper says Gen. Ludendorff said. In the same paper they say that Field Marshal Haig, in his final report of the war, failed to give America any credit for the winning of the war.
Mr. MADDEN. Yes; and that is the reason I am telling the truth, because nobody over there will.
Mr. FAIRFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. MADDEN. I will.
Mr. FAIRFIELD. What was the character of the Argonne Forest?
Mr. MADDEN. The forest is dense; it is mountainous, broken by the ravine I spoke of, with almost perpendicular sides looking over into the valley, 5 miles across, and surrounded by an amphitheater of hills several miles in length down the valley.
Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.
Mr. LAZARO. I have visited the Argonne Forest, and I am very much interested in the gentleman's address. Will not the gentleman tell the House something about the German dugouts, so that Members who have not had an opportunity of visiting there may know what the American boys were up against?
Mr. FESS. If the gentleman from Illinois will yield before he answers the gentleman from Louisiana, I want to say that Mrs. Humphrey Ward, a famous writer, has called attention to the fact that we lost only a few thousand, while the British loss was many, and France about 2,000,000, making a contrast that is perhaps not unfriendly, but indicates that they are being twitted a little by our statement that we turned the tide. Will not the gentleman indicate by something, of a statement of the short time we were in action, in contrast with the long time that they were in action, that there was a much briefer service on our part than on theirs?
Mr. MADDEN. I will answer both gentlemen. I wish to say that on the side of these hills, known as the Argonne Forest, the sides of the hills across the valley formed an amphitheater like the galleries around this Chamber; that myriads of Germans were in concrete dugouts and in tunnels, from which it would seem that it was impossible that they could be dislodged.

When the Seventy-seventh Division of the American Army marched up through the highway that passes along the ravine in the Argonne Forest, in the face of the fortified positions of the Germans, they did the most daring thing that was ever done by men anywhere in all the world. [Applause.] There was the Crown Prince of Germany in his concrete building at Montfaucon, the highest point of vantage from which he could see every movement along the battle field for miles. The Crown Prince of Bavaria was in a dugout in palatial form, with tunnels 50 feet below the ground to save him in case of danger. There was every facility for the protection of the German Army, and yet, realizing the importance of the situation, and knowing that the American Army was not expected to succeed, Gen. Pershing took the bull by the horns, ordered the movement, and successfully carried it out; he lined his men up on the valley, with the guns of the Germans pointed toward 810,000 men from the hillsides everywhere, with thousands of our men killed and wounded as they marched forward, and yet they marched up the hillsides of that amphitheater with the guns playing on them from every side, front and back, and drove the Germans into retreat. No greater losses were made in any other army than were made by the American Army for the period that we were engaged in active conflict. And we would have been engaged in an active conflict longer if it had not been for the courage, valor, bravery, and daring of our men. It was only because they had that that we were not in it longer; it was because they had it that the war ended. [Applause.]

I realize that we are not going to get any credit from any of the Allies abroad for what we did. They were glad to have us there when we went; but they did not want us to be conspicuous, except to fill the gaps, under their direction, and I am proud that Gen. Pershing had the courage to insist that we should fight as Americans under the command of Americans.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, is it possible that the nations that have received so much from us as did the Allies would give us no credit for what we did—would show us no gratitude at all?
Mr. MADDEN. I do not think they have.
Mr. FERRIS. What philosophy can create such a condition of mind as that?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know; I am going to try to tell about it a little as I go along, if the gentleman will excuse me for a moment. My time is about out.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed until he concludes his address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has five minutes remaining.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. MADDEN. I shall get through very quickly if they do not ask me too many questions.

Mr. SNYDER. The Indian Affairs appropriation bill is supposed to come on when the gentleman finishes. I will concede a reasonable amount of time.

Mr. MADDEN. Thirty minutes would do.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I renew my request for unanimous consent, that the gentleman may be permitted to conclude his address, which will take 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may be allowed to conclude his address, not to exceed 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. I was saying that at Montfaucon, one of the highest points of vantage on this battle field, was situated the Crown Prince of Germany. I happened to be able to get into his tower of observation, and while there I was glad to know that it was no longer the headquarters of the Crown Prince of Germany.

It was Gen. Pershing's idea that the only way to win the war was by driving the Germans into the open, and any person can see that it was impossible to win the war with the armies intrenched in dugouts and living in tunnels away from each other, although looking into each other's faces, and his daring and dash and initiative and the daring and dash and initiative and the valor and courage of the American soldier, who willingly faced the cannon from every hillside that surrounded the valley, must indicate that nothing in the world except such initiative could have won the war.

It was not my good fortune to go into Belgium, and hence I am unable to say what the conditions there are, but the towns that were destroyed in northern France were of no real consequence; they had no place of any general importance in the make-up of the country in which they were situated. The country itself, except here and there a fertile valley, is barren land, hills, rocks, and sand, not even good for grazing, and so I consider the damage done by the destruction of these towns is nothing that needs to be called to the special attention of the world for the purpose of reconstruction. The people who originally lived in these towns have gone to other places, settled down in the community life of the place to which they have gone, and they have no desire to return, as there is nothing to attract them to the places where they formerly lived. The good people here who are raising millions of dollars to reconstruct these towns are, in my judgment, mistaken. The French people themselves are not anxious to have the towns reconstructed. They do not want anybody's help.

If you get an idea that you want to reconstruct a town where nobody lives, without any population to go into the town, it would seem to be foolish to spend the money for that purpose. Most of the towns were located at places where they ought not to have been located. They never had any purpose in life, and the destruction of the town itself is of really no consequence whatever in the domestic policy of the French people.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I would like to ask the gentleman if he refers in that statement to such towns as Bapaume and Arras?

Mr. MADDEN. I was not there.

Mr. HASTINGS. Those are French towns.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does the gentleman refer to Rheims and Montdidier and such places?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. But Rheims is a place of 90,000 people, and another town, Noyon, was much destroyed.

Mr. MADDEN. There is no use of quarreling about it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I can not understand the gentleman's statement.

Mr. MADDEN. I think the gentleman ought to. I have said it plainly enough.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the coal lands at Lens.

Mr. MADDEN. That is all at the other end.

Mr. LINTHICUM. It is right in France; it is the Pittsburgh of France.

Mr. MADDEN. It is on the border.

Mr. HASTINGS. Did the gentleman go over the battle fields north of Paris—Cambrai, in the northern part of France?

Mr. MADDEN. I started at Belleau Woods.

Mr. HASTINGS. That is east of Paris. Did the gentleman visit those cities north of Paris, along the British battle front?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I just went on the American battle fronts.

Mr. HASTINGS. That includes Lens and Arras and those towns. Does the gentleman mean that some of them are entirely destroyed, where there were 25,000 population before the war?

Mr. MADDEN. I know; but there is nobody who wants the towns. I have talked with the French people about that, and they say that if anybody wants to go there they will build a house; but you do not want to build a whole town for one family, and as the families go there and their needs are shown, they will build a sufficient number of houses to take care of them.

GEN. PERSHING.

I suppose Gen. Pershing could easily have made himself popular with the Army. He probably could have made himself more popular with the American people than he has if he had organized a better system for the delivery of mails; but his only thought was victory. He devoted himself as a soldier to the task and he played no favorites, as far as I am able to see. He selected the men who, in his judgment, were best qualified to meet the demands of the case at the time. Generals were dismissed ruthlessly, others were promoted to take their places. Courage, initiative, and military genius seemed to be the object of his campaign; he was not looking for the plaudits of the people. I believe he is every inch a soldier. I believe he was eminently qualified for the task he had to perform. I think he performed it with wisdom and courage and unselfish devotion. I think that history will give him the place to which he is entitled when the story of his achievements are written by men of unprejudiced minds.

BATTLE OF VERDUN.

The battle of Verdun is one that ought not to be forgotten. It cost more lives perhaps than any other battle in the war.

Verdun is surrounded by great mountains leading out onto an expansive plain. These mountains are fortified almost impregnably, and how the Germans ever expected to take Verdun is more than I can see. In the city of Verdun there is a great citadel, known as the fort of Verdun. It is the back of the mountain facing the plain. In this citadel there is room for 10,000 reserve soldiers. They slept them and fed them and held them there during all the battle. Those who were brought in from the front to rest were taken to the citadel and new forces were supplied from the citadel to the front. The road leading from Verdun to Bar le Duc was the only road through which supplies could come. It is known as the Holy Road. The German and French lost an equal number of men in the battle of Verdun, and it is said that about 1,000,000 men on both sides were killed or wounded.

It looked to me as if there was no strategic importance to Verdun. I think the French themselves say that, but there is a feeling of reverence that surrounds Verdun which made the French fight to retain it. They said it helped to maintain the morale of the army.

My trip led me up to Diekirch, where the Thirty-third Division was quartered. There I met Gen. Pershing and Gen. Bell and witnessed the review of the Thirty-third Division. This is an all-Illinois division. It was a wonderful sight. This division had the right of the line in the Argonne-Meuse battle and captured the hill across the river from the forest.

And I want to tell the story of what I saw on the day of this review. There were 107 men lined up to receive the distinguished-service medal and the distinguished-service cross. I walked down the line and I saw Gen. Pershing as he presented these trophies of war, if that is what you want to call them, and here is what I saw: One sergeant was given the distinguished-service medal for killing 10 Germans. Another one was given the distinguished-service medal for killing 2 Germans and capturing 30. Another man was given the distinguished-service cross for killing 8 Germans, taking all the machine guns of a battery, and taking all the officers of the battery. Another man, a private, was given the distinguished-service cross for volunteering and successfully delivering messages through the enemy's line after five of his comrades had been killed in the attempt. Another man was given the service cross for going 400 yards in advance of his command and drawing the Germans' gunfire in order that they might be able to locate the guns. These are the acts of bravery that we can not realize; we can not realize what prompts men to do such service as this, and one had to be proud when one witnessed the recognition which they received for the service. I tell you it made tears

come to my eyes as I witnessed the presentation of these distinguished-service medals and crosses, and America has thousands and thousands of boys who have done similar things to this in the Army on the other side. [Applause.]

Luxemburg is a beautiful country and I am happy that the Germans did not decide to stand in Luxemburg and fight the allied forces, for it seems to me that with the hills pointing in every direction the troops would not be able to pass successfully through the valleys surrounded by these hills.

From Luxemburg I went into Germany, and the thing that impressed me most there was the uniformly well-dressed people. I could not help but reach the conclusion when I saw the hundreds of Germans on the highways, in the fields, in the villages, and in the cities so uniformly well dressed that they must be in a good physical condition, because people do not generally put all they have on their backs.

Germany seemed to be at work. The fields were well tilled; great piles of chemical fertilizer were to be found everywhere, and it was being spread upon the fields. The mills were smoking. The merchants seemed to be prosperous, and though the value of the mark had fallen to 8½ cents men seemed to be able to find employment everywhere at from 8 to 12 marks a day.

It is said that Germany is short on fats, but in the country districts I think it is fair to say that they are not short of food.

Another thing that impressed me in Germany is the feeling they have that we are not in possession of Germany as victors, but that we are there under contract; that the armistice was signed as the result of the President's 14-point suggestion.

The mills in France are idle; the machinery has been taken out by the Germans, but in eastern and western and southern France, which has not been occupied by the armies in battle, everything seems prosperous and beautiful, and that territory through which the war was fought being of less value no special harm was done except in the coal regions where the French coal was taken, and the loss of life and the terrible suffering.

One thing in France that is noticeable is that every woman is in mourning, and the thing to be most regretted, as I see it, is the unfriendly feeling which exists between the French people and the American soldier. It does not apply merely to the rank and file of the American soldier but it reaches up.

I noticed as I went through eastern, western, and southern France where our armies never fought that we have a large number of soldiers building roads, and I wondered whether it was entirely proper that our men should be employed in these activities, but in conversation with Gen. Pershing he assured me that it was necessary under our arrangement with France to maintain the roads wherever our armies were quartered, because we were using them extensively with our trucks to move supplies. My criticism of this is not so much on the fact that we are building the roads as that we are buying the material from the French people at a price just double what we pay in this country for the same material.

PEACE TERMS.

It seems a pity that the peace terms have not been agreed upon earlier. The failure to agree upon terms of peace leaves a measure of doubt in the minds of all the people abroad. I am more convinced than ever after a survey of the situation there that America should stand aloof from entangling alliances abroad. [Applause on Republican side.] It can not be possible for our people to mingle with the people there on equal terms; they do not think like we do. Invisible border lines make it necessary for them to be watchful of each other. They are suspicious, one nation of another. You can not make them otherwise. Their internal political hatreds are unchangeable.

The league of nations, which provides, if it should be approved here, for the defense of the political integrity and geographical boundaries of foreign nations, is likely to lead us into trouble. The nations that are being created are now at war with each other. They are likely to continue. They are fighting every day. It seems impossible to reconcile the conditions between them. The Balkan States must be recognized as the cradle of wars. Nobody could maintain their political integrity or geographical boundaries. My judgment is that America should not send her boys on to foreign territory for the purpose of maintaining their political integrity. [Applause on Republican side.] If the occasion arises when the honor of America is at stake at any time in the future, we should defend that honor in any way that is necessary [applause], and for that purpose I favor the universal military training of the youth of the land [applause], and the maintenance of a reserve from among the officers who went into this war from civil life, and the creation of a Navy commensurate with the importance of America's commerce, with but a reasonably small Army.

I think if we had fought the war to a finish and had not agreed upon an armistice upon promises that seem to be misunderstood, the peace terms would have been agreed to before this, and the world's safety would have been assured.

I am for peace, everlasting peace, and I think the way to obtain it, so far as America is concerned, is to meet our obligations as Americans by being prepared to meet the issue when it arises, and to refrain from entering into any contract in advance that will almost certainly involve us in war. [Applause.]

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2480, the Indian appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. In the temporary absence of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] will take the chair.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MADDEN). The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2480, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2480) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, before commencing the reading, I desire to say that there were several typographical errors found in the bill which we were reading on Saturday. We have had made what is known as a star print, and anyone who is reading the bill which we had on Saturday had better get a new one from the desk, as the Clerk will read from the new print of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think that would be in order.

Mr. SNYDER. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk when he begins to read, read from the new print.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the Clerk may read from the new print of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that would be a little irregular, to enact part of this bill from one print and part from another, and I trust the gentleman will not press his request. The star print, of course, will be all right to use to refer to——

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, there were several slight typographical errors only, which have been corrected, and no corrections have been made in any part of the bill which we have gone by; it is only in the part which we are about to read now, and I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection and let us go ahead.

Mr. WALSH. Well, I shall not object, but the gentleman is liable to get into deep water on that.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LONGWORTH). The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the paragraph last read, which was reserved at the time it was read on Saturday.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserved a point of order on the paragraph read.

Mr. WALSH. Beginning line 22, page 46, and ending line 4, page 48.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, the chairman understands that the section is subject to the point of order, and he does not desire to argue the point.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts make the point of order?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES.

SEC. 18. For expenses of administration of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, and the compensation of employees, $205,000, of which sum $20,000 shall be immediately available: *Provided*, That a report shall be made to Congress by the Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes, through the Secretary of the Interior, showing in detail the expenditure of all moneys appropriated by this provision: *Provided further*, That hereafter no part of said appropriation shall be used in forwarding the undisputed claims to be paid from individual moneys of restricted allottees, or their heirs, or in forwarding uncontested agricultural and mineral leases made by individual restricted Indian allottees, or their heirs, to the Secretary of the Interior for approval, but all such undisputed claims or uncontested leases now required to be approved under existing law by the Secretary of the

Interior shall be paid, approved, rejected, or disapproved by the Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma: *Provided, however*, That any party aggrieved by any decision or order of the Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma may appeal from the same to the Secretary of the Interior within 30 days from the date of said decision or order.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make the point of order on the proviso beginning in line 13, on page 48, to the end of the paragraph.

Mr. CARTER. The item is clearly subject to the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. CRAMTON. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no question but it is subject to the point of order, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order upon the words, "of which sum $20,000 shall be immediately available," lines 8 and 9.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order——

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I will withhold the point of order.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to appeal to the chairman not to make that point of order. The superintendent down there has very earnestly appealed to the members of the Oklahoma delegation, Mr. CARTER, and myself for this appropriation, and it was incorporated in an amendment offered in the Senate before. The truth about the matter is they had 265 employees in this office. A great many of them have had to be laid off and others will be unless this appropriation is passed before June 30, which will disorganize the force, and I sincerely trust the gentleman will not make that point of order against it, so that if this appropriation is finally passed it may properly be approved by, say, June 15, so that they will have 15 days between that time and June 30.

At any rate, if the appropriation is made, and it passes both Houses, and the superintendent down there knows that it is going to be available, he will make his arrangements accordingly. They have appealed to the members of the Committee on Indian Affairs and to the Oklahoma delegation in the most urgent manner, asking that this appropriation be made immediately available. And let me say now to the gentleman from Massachusetts that it was upon my motion, as the chairman of the committee will remember, in the committee, that these "immediately availables," generally speaking, were cut out from this bill before. And I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts that these appropriations, generally speaking, ought not to be made immediately available. But I appeal to him that in this particular case this money ought to be immediately available. A good many of those clerks now have been laid off, because they have not sufficient funds with which to pay them.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes; I will be pleased to do so.

Mr. SNYDER. Do I understand that simply if we pass this amendment here and leave the funds immediately available, they can immediately resume expenditure of the funds? Does not this bill have to be signed by the President?

Mr. HASTINGS. It has to be signed.

Mr. SNYDER. There is not any possibility of the President's signing this bill before the 1st of July.

Mr. HASTINGS. I think so. That is the hope, anyway, and if not, it does not hurt anything.

Here is what I want to say: That if this bill passes both Houses and the superintendent there has assurance that the President is going to sign it, he can make arrangements with his employees who are laid off to come back at some future day and go to work some 10 or 12 days before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. WALSH. Of course when this measure was considered in the House last January the same sum was sought to be made immediately available. I think it was in January, if I mistake not, and it was sought to have $20,000 immediately available then. Now, this measure will certainly not become a law until some time next month, and they certainly will not need $20,000 to be immediately available at that time.

Mr. HASTINGS. I think that is a larger sum than is absolutely necessary to be made available before June 30, but it will not hurt anything. I thought some money ought to be available, but I would not know just the exact amount to state in the bill in lieu of the $20,000.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will permit me, this language was stricken out by the committee, and we did not press it on the floor of the House. That was placed in in the Senate afterwards, and we agreed to it in conference.

Mr. WALSH. I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, the urgency of the situation, but I do not think by this sort of legislation upon an appropriation bill we ought to encourage—I do not know as it is misuse of public appropriations—but we ought to see to it that the various superintendents and bureaus and divisions of the Indian Office, in view of the enormous increase which we are making in these various items, confine themselves to the amount in this proviso. I do not believe, in view of the lateness of the passage of this bill and the short time that will intervene between the time when the entire sum will be available, we should differentiate between any of these items and make part of them immediately available, or any small proportion of them. That is the chief reason I am objecting to making it immediately available. If this is left in here we will undoubtedly have strong arguments brought to bear in the next Indian appropriation bill why part of this appropriation and others should be immediately available. And I therefore insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, has the Chair disposed of the point of order of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON]?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The Chair sustained the point of order.

Mr. CARTER. Then I have an amendment I want to offer to the section, if the point of order has been disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CARTER proposes the following amendment: Page 48, line 13, insert:

"*Provided further*, That no part of said appropriation shall be used in forwarding the undisputed claims to be paid from individual moneys of restricted allottees, or their heirs, or in forwarding uncontested agricultural and mineral leases (excluding oil and gas leases) made by individual restricted Indian allottees, or their heirs, to the Secretary of the Interior for approval, but all such undisputed claims or uncontested leases (except oil and gas leases) now required to be approved under existing law by the Secretary of the Interior shall (hereafter) be paid, approved, rejected, or disapproved by the Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma: *Provided, however*, That any party aggrieved by any decision or order of the Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma may appeal from the same to the Secretary of the Interior within 30 days from the date of said decision or order."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving a point of order, I understand that the amendment which the gentleman from Oklahoma now offers puts this matter in a form that is acceptable to him and also to his colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. CARTER. I have discussed it with my colleague, and he says this is acceptable.

Mr. CRAMTON. Then I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]——

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is proceeding out of order. I have no objection whatever, so far as I am concerned, that he should proceed out of order, but I think the rules of the House ought to be observed. If the gentleman will ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order——

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is that necessary?

Mr. SNYDER. I did not understand the request of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I move to strike out the last word. It is customary in the committee.

Mr. SNYDER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, we are trying to get through with this bill to-night, and I should like very much if we could confine the discussion to matters particularly connected with the measure. And I think if the gentleman does not desire to speak to the measure we will have to object.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, in the course of the discussion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] the point was brought out, or I believe the doubt was raised in the minds of a good many Members, that when the Meuse-Argonne offensive was commenced a hope was entertained that it would not be successful. I hope that no Member here really has that impression. I certainly desire to make it clear that if the gentleman from Illinois desired to convey such an impression he is entirely in error. Can you imagine an offensive of that magnitude and that importance, vital as it was to the success of this war, to have been commenced with the hope that it would not be successful? The Meuse-Argonne offensive was considered by the General Staff, by Gen. Foch; it was planned and prepared, and the sector of the Meuse-Argonne was given over to the American Army with the confident expectation that they would make good. [Applause.] They did make good.

Now, then, gentlemen, there is another matter which the gentleman from Illinois brought up, which I hope will not leave any erroneous impression, and that is as to the gratitude of the people of our allies. I do not know what the experience of the gentleman from Illinois has been in his short visit to France, but anyone who was there during the war, or anyone who was familiar with conditions, knows that this country has the eternal gratitude of the people of England, France, Belgium, Italy, and the rest of our allies. [Applause.]

Another thing which the gentleman from Illinois mentioned, which I desire to make clear, is the comparative achievements of the various armies of the Allies. The valor and the courage and the ability of the American soldier are so well known that they need not be repeated here day after day. It is unsoldierly, it is un-American, to boast and to make odious comparisons; and when you compare the activities of our Army with those of the armies of our Allies, you must take into consideration the fact that the armies of the Allies had been in those trenches for four years, and that our Army was young, fresh, and in better condition as to morale and strength; and in this connection I will say—and I believe I am voicing the sentiment of every man who took an active part in this war—that the American Army pays tribute to and respects the courage and the valor of the British, the French, the Belgians, and the Italian armies that fought at their side. [Applause.] It seems to me that it comes with rather bad taste for us here on the floor of this House to make any comparison of that kind.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman states that the armies of the Allies had been in the trenches for four years.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. GARD. As a matter of fact, they would have been there four years more if it had not been for American assistance?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Absolutely; and it is bad taste for us to make any comparisons here on the floor of this House. You will not hear an American soldier do it. That is the impression I wish to leave with you.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. UPSHAW. In the face of the widely published statement of Lloyd-George, that America did come into the war in the nick of time and helped to save the day, is it not conceivable that if there is anywhere any jealousy, it is but a petty military jealousy, which is not shared by the real leaders of England and France?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I can tell the gentleman that that jealousy does not exist, even in the military service; not even there.

Mr. UPSHAW. Another question—will the gentleman permit it?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. UPSHAW. Does not the gentleman think that if it was right for America to enter into a league of war with those great nations for her own safety and for the freedom and civilization of the world, would it not be right and sane for America to enter into a league of peace with these same nations and all other nations of like ideals to guarantee the fruits of the victory we have won?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Absolutely; and we are going to do it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay to the enrolled members of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma entitled under existing law to share in the funds of said tribes, or to their lawful heirs, out of any moneys belonging to said tribes in the United States Treasury, or deposited in any bank or held by any official under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, not to exceed $150 per capita, said payment to be made under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided*, That in cases where such enrolled members, or their heirs, are Indians who by reason of their degree of Indian blood belong to the restricted class, the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, withhold such payments and use the same for the benefit of such restricted Indians: *Provided further*, That the money paid to the enrolled members or their heirs, as provided herein, shall be exempt from any lien for attorneys' fees or other debt contracted prior to the passage of this act, except that the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, within 30 days after the passage of this act, to investigate the claim, not to exceed $200, growing out of a contract between John Calvin Gray as an enrolled member of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations and Henry W. Blair as attorney, and in case such claim is found to be valid and the contract approved in accordance with existing law, the said Secretary may, in his discretion, apply any amount that may be found due under this paragraph, or from any funds standing to the credit of said John Calvin Gray as an enrolled member of the Choctaw Nation to the payment of such fee, but the amounts due hereunder to other enrolled members of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations shall not be held in abeyance to this claim, but shall be paid promptly without reference thereto: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to use not to exceed $8,000 out of the Choctaw and Chickasaw tribal funds for the expenses and the compensation of all necessary employees for the distribution of the said per capita payments.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment from the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. SNYDER: Page 49, line 11, strike out "$150" and insert in lieu thereof "$200."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a short statement in regard to that. At the time of the hearings, when this bill was drawn, as gentlemen will note on page 269 of the hearings, it was believed that there was not sufficient money in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of both these nations to pay $200 per capita and retain sufficient necessary funds. There being some question as to whether there would be a sufficient sum, we made the amount $150. But since then we have been advised that there has been an addition to the amount in the Treasury to the credit of those nations, so that $200 per capita can be safely paid. And acting on the policy that the committee is endeavoring to follow, of getting the money which belongs to the Indians into the hands of the Indians as quickly as possible, and also to get the Indian free as quickly as possible, we offered that amendment.

In further support of it I desire to have two letters read, received from Commissioner Sells this morning, referring to this matter, and also referring to the matter of making citizens of Indians.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman has those letters read, I hope he will permit me to make a statement.

Mr. SNYDER. I would rather have the letters read first, and then the gentleman can be heard, if he desires.

Mr. CARTER. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the letters referred to will be read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Commissioner Sells on March 7 sent the following letter to all reservation superintendents having jurisdiction over allotted Indians. This broadens "the new declaration of policy" so as to include those of one-half Indian blood, and will greatly increase the number of Indians having full control of their property:

"DEAR MR. ———: You are requested to submit to this office at the earliest practicable date a list of all Indians of one-half or less Indian blood who are able-bodied and mentally competent, 21 years of age or over, together with a description of the land allotted to said Indians and the number of the allotment. It is intended to issue patents in fee simple to such Indians. Advise the office at once the approximate date when this list can be furnished.

"Sincerely, yours,

"CATO SELLS,
"*Commissioner.*

"Approved.

"FRANKLIN K. LANE,
"*Secretary.*"

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, April 17, 1917.

DECLARATION OF POLICY IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.

During the past four years the efforts of the administration of Indian affairs have been largely concentrated on the following fundamental activities: The betterment of health conditions of Indians, the suppression of the liquor traffic among them, the improvement of their industrial conditions, the further development of vocational training in their schools, and the protection of the Indians' property. Rapid progress has been made along all these lines, and the work thus reorganized and revitalized will go on with increased energy. With these activities and accomplishments well under way, we are now ready to take the next step in our administrative program.

The time has come for discontinuing guardianship of all competent Indians and giving even closer attention to the incompetent, that they may more speedily achieve competency.

Broadly speaking, a policy of greater liberalism will henceforth prevail in Indian administration, to the end that every Indian, as soon as he has been determined to be as competent to transact his own

business as the average white man, shall be given full control of his property and have all his lands and moneys turned over to him, after which he will no longer be a ward of the Government.

Pursuant to this policy, the following rules shall be observed:

1. Patents in fee: To all able-bodied adult Indians of less than one-half Indian blood there will be given, as far as may be under the law, full and complete control of all their property. Patents in fee shall be issued to all adult Indians of one-half or more Indian blood who may, after careful investigation, be found competent, provided that where deemed advisable patents in fee shall be withheld for not to exceed 40 acres as a home.

Indian students, when they are 21 years of age or over, who complete the full course of instruction in the Government schools, receive diplomas, and have demonstrated competency, will be so declared.

2. Sale of lands: A liberal ruling will be adopted in the matter of passing upon applications for the sale of inherited Indian lands where the applicants retain other lands, and the proceeds are to be used to improve the homesteads or for other equally good purposes. A more liberal ruling than has hitherto prevailed will hereafter be followed with regard to the applications of noncompetent Indians for the sale of their lands where they are old and feeble and need the proceeds for their support.

3. Certificates of competency: The rules which are made to apply in the granting of patents in fee and the sale of lands will be made equally applicable in the matter of issuing certificates of competency.

4. Individual Indian moneys: Indians will be given unrestricted control of all their individual Indian moneys upon issuance of patents in fee or certificates of competency. Strict limitations will not be placed upon the use of funds of the old, the indigent, and the invalid.

5. Pro rata shares—trust funds: As speedily as possible their pro rata shares in tribal trust or other funds shall be paid to all Indians who have been declared competent, unless the legal status of such funds prevents. Where practicable the pro rata shares of incompetent Indians will be withdrawn from the Treasury and placed in banks to their individual credit.

6. Elimination of ineligible pupils from the Government Indian schools: In many of our boarding schools Indian children are being educated at Government expense whose parents are amply able to pay for their education and have public school facilities at or near their homes. Such children shall not hereafter be enrolled in Government Indian schools supported by gratuity appropriations, except on payment of actual per capita cost and transportation.

These rules are hereby made effective, and all Indian Bureau administrative officers at Washington and in the field will be governed accordingly.

This is a new and far-reaching declaration of policy. It means the dawn of a new era in Indian administration. It means that the competent Indian will no longer be treated as half ward and half citizen. It means reduced appropriations by the Government and more self-respect and independence for the Indian. It means the ultimate absorption of the Indian race into the body politic of the Nation. It means, in short, the beginning of the end of the Indian problem.

In carrying out this policy I cherish the hope that all real friends of the Indian race will lend their aid and hearty cooperation.

CATO SELLS,
Commissioner.

Approved:

FRANKLIN K. LANE,
Secretary.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, with further reference to the amendment I have offered and to the communications which I received this morning——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. I beg to say that these letters are simply reproductions of statements which have been made to the committee, at least for the past four years, when the commissioner or assistant commissioner has been pressed to bring about a situation such as he says he is now ready to adopt, and my experience in the past has caused me to believe that nothing more will come of this than has come from the promises heretofore made unless we take some action to force the situation. About a year ago the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER], who was then chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, introduced a bill which would force this situation, and that bill has been before the commissioner for at least a year. That bill has been reintroduced at this session, and it will correct this situation; and if the membership of this House will support the gentleman from Oklahoma in that endeavor we shall not have to receive promises of this character in the future.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARD. Is it necessary to pass legislation to carry these recommendations into effect, or has the Department of the Interior the power now to do it?

Mr. SNYDER. The Department of the Interior has the power to do it, but it also has the power not to do it. We want to fix it so that the department will have the power to do it, and we want to take away from it the power not to do it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. In reference to this particular amendment, it seeks to increase the per capita from $150 to $200.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. There are sufficient funds for this——

Mr. SNYDER. I explained that.

Mr. HASTINGS. And if we find there are not sufficient funds, the language is "not to exceed $200"; but there are sufficient funds to make these payments.

Mr. SNYDER. My amendment has nothing to do with the letters which I presented in the time that I was discussing the amendment. The gentleman has correctly stated the fact, that there is a sufficient fund, and it should be distributed, and I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. FESS. In reference to the policy announced, there was contention the other day about whether a graduate of an Indian school could be graduated into citizenship and get rid of the status of a ward, and about the attitude of the Government toward an Indian who had property and the ability to take care of it, as to why he should be kept as a ward. Are we not to understand from this letter that the policy of the bureau is to do that?

Mr. SNYDER. That is what the commissioner says, but he has said it so many times before and has failed to do it that we have not much faith in the statement now.

Mr. FESS. I should think a statement like that—that a policy is being announced and yet is being ignored—ought to receive some drastic attention from Congress.

Mr. SNYDER. I should like to call your attention to the fact that neither one of these letters was received by any Member of this House, even though the letters are dated April 17.

Mr. FESS. It looks as though there is something wrong.

Mr. SNYDER. I received the letters to-day by special messenger from the department with the request that in view of the debate on Saturday the letters be read to-day.

Mr. FESS. Is the head of the bureau making an effort to ignore the Congress?

Mr. SNYDER. I think at present he is making an effort to recognize the Congress.

Mr. FESS. If he does that, then he will carry the policy into effect, will he not?

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will yield, I think the commissioner's letter, as I heard it read from the desk, announced the policy of removal of restrictions and the issuance of certificates of competency to Indians of half or less than half Indian blood "where found to be competent."

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. That is the bug under the chip. [Laughter.]

Mr. FESS. Who is the judge of the competency of the Indians?

Mr. CARTER. The commissioner and his agents. The commissioner may perhaps be pursuing what he deems to be a policy that is consistent with his pronouncement, but such action has not seemed to be sufficiently liberal to meet the views of committee members. The Committee on Indian Affairs have found many Indians who came before them who, to all intents and appearances, were perfectly competent, but who complained that they were still laboring under restrictions and under the effect of having trust patents rather than fee patents.

Mr. FESS. Why does not Congress cure the situation?

Mr. CARTER. That is what we are attempting to do with this bill I have mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CARTER. I ask recognition in my own right. I want to say something about the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER], and then I will have a few more words on this.

At the time that the Indian bill was reported last year the funds on hand would just about make a $200 per capita payment to the Choctaws and Chickasaws, and it was thought advisable by the committee to retain a portion of those funds for expenses that might be incurred in sales of land and collections of rentals, accounting, schools, and so forth. Since that time a part of the coal and asphalt deposits have been sold, and that has brought in large sums of money, which the commissioner this morning advised me were adequate to insure the payment of $200 per capita. Anyway the language says "not to exceed $200," so he can make a per capita payment of $100, $150, or $200, as the funds will warrant.

Now, with relation to this matter about which we have been having some discussion here, I think I have stated as plainly as I can the facts in the case. The bill that has passed to remove the restriction from certain Indians of less than half Indian blood should not be optional with anyone. It ought either to do the business or not do it, otherwise it may not be done. As I explained Saturday, if a man is of less than half Indian blood, that means that he must have had a mother

and a father both with white blood in their veins, otherwise he would not be of less than half Indian blood. If he had a mother and father both with white blood in their veins, then necessarily he must have been raised as a white person and not as an Indian. If he was half Indian, his mother might have been a full-blood Indian and his father a white man who deserted the mother soon after the child was born, and he might then have been raised as a full-blood Indian; but if he has less than half Indian blood—and I want to insist on that point and make it plain to the members of the committee—if a person is of less than half Indian blood the mother who raised him must have had white blood in her veins, and he must have had the civilizing influence of the Anglo-Saxon in his raising, and, of course, must have been educated. Therefore we ought not to leave the question of determining that man's competency to the discretion of anyone, especially after the Indians have done what they have in the war. They have furnished, mostly as volunteers in the recent war, a great deal larger per cent of soldiers than the white man furnished, and they have bought more Liberty bonds and contributed more to Red Cross and other war activities.

Therefore he is entitled to full citizenship. If he has less than half blood, he is entitled to have the restrictions removed, and I think the House will do no violence in going that far. When it comes to the Indian with more than half blood, I am content that some discretion shall be lodged in the Interior Department as to the competency; but when he has been raised as a white man I think he ought to be given full citizenship and all the rights of other American citizens.

The gentleman from Ohio asked me if there was any legislation. I repeat, I introduced a bill in the last session of Congress a year before that Congress adjourned. The bill was sent to the Indian Bureau, but up until we adjourned I received no report from the Indian Office. My bill provided for citizenship for all Indians, removing all restrictions of all Indians less than half blood and providing a competency commission, with one man of Indian blood, to investigate the competency of those of more than half blood. It is no new order, except that the bill made it mandatory on the commissioner to issue a certificate of competency to those with less than half blood.

Mr. HASTINGS. If the gentleman will yield, that is the law now with reference to the Five Civilized Tribes.

Mr. CARTER. Yes; a law that has worked successfully.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I understood when the letter was read that this wonderful, marvelous, far-reaching policy soon to be adopted is to reduce the appropriations necessary for the Indian Bureau. Has there been any communication along that line heretofore?

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will permit, this is not a marvelous new policy.

Mr. WALSH. That was my characterization.

Mr. CARTER. It has been the avowed policy of the Indian Bureau for many years, but many mixed-blood Indians still complain of inability to get relief.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. CARTER. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. The commissioner and assistant commissioner have stated that this was their policy for several years, and I think every member of the Indian Committee would agree that that has been their statement. The difficulty is that members of the Indian Committee who live on and near Indian reservations and those who have made trips of investigation do not agree that competent Indians have been given proper relief in the issuance of fee patents and certificates of competency. Replying specifically to inquiries made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, I will say that the gentleman in charge of this bill this morning and I immediately took notice of this paragraph in the letter with reference to reduction of expenditures. We agreed that this matter must be called to the attention of the department when their officials come before our committee to justify appropriations in the future. We will not fail to do this, and in order that our case may be strengthened as much as possible we should pass at this session my bill granting competency to all Indians of less than one-half Indian blood. If this is done, then we know we will turn loose and be rid of all that class without further ado.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. My State has no appropriation and no special interest in this bill. I have heard that there is or was a few years ago one lone Indian of full blood living in my State. He was of the Schaghtacoke Tribe and lived somewhere near the border line between the districts of my colleagues, Mr. GLYNN and Mr. MERRITT. He may have long since passed on to the happy hunting grounds. Connecticut is, however, interested in this matter as every other State in the Union is interested.

We who live off the Indian reservations have been watching this bill from year to year with some degree of alarm, as we have seen its total gradually creeping upward year after year. The amounts to be expended have been growing until in this bill they aggregate about a half a million dollars more than the current law. The reason for it, so far as I have heard stated, is the increase in prices, although this is a year after the war. The appropriations for the current year were made during the war.

Mr. SNYDER. Of course, the gentleman will not attempt to say that anything in the line of material that they have to purchase has been reduced in price.

Mr. TILSON. That may be true; but it seems to be a rather large percentage of increase. We have just heard a statement from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs read here that would seem to indicate the policy of the Indian Bureau to be to give full citizenship to the Indians and decrease appropriations. It seems to me that when the former very able chairman of this committee and the present very able chairman of the committee, representing the two sides of this Chamber, agree with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs something ought to be done.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. I want to say that I am so afraid the Commissioner of Indian Affairs does not agree. Let me read a paragraph of his letter:

> To all able-bodied adult Indians of less than one-half Indian blood there will be given, as far as may be under the law, full and complete control of their property. Patents in fee shall be issued to all adult Indians of one-half or more Indian blood who may, after careful investigation, be found competent, provided that where deemed advisable patents in fee shall be withheld, not to exceed 40 acres, as a home.

This letter is dated April 17, 1917. It took it two years and two months to get it here. If they only would carry out these recommendations it would result in good all around. No one objects to administering on real Indians, but these so-called Indians that are white neither desire nor deserve to be administered upon. They very much prefer to be let alone. If we are ever to have an end of the Indian problem the Government ought to want them let alone. I only hope it will be done.

Mr. HASTINGS. That letter was given to the press at the time all over the country.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, after all it seems that there is quite an agreement on both sides of this Chamber as to what ought to be done. If there is some inertia in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, or if some camouflage has been attempted in this communication, still if we agree about it here, and the other body and the Executive agree with us, we ought to be able to accomplish something.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me right there to read from a letter which I addressed the Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs? I wrote this letter to him after having heard him make an address at a church in this city on April 3, 1919. The letter is as follows:

APRIL 4, 1919.

HON. E. B. MERITT,
Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I was very agreeably surprised last night when you committed yourself and the Indian Bureau as favorable to the bill providing full citizenship to all American Indians.

You complained, however, that the Indian Bureau had no jurisdiction over legislation and therefore no responsibility in connection with the failure up to this date to enact this bill. You closed your remarks on this subject with a statement, which I think I quote verbatim, as follows:

"If Mr. CARTER will only have his bill passed which he introduced giving citizenship to all Indians, he will receive the unanimous plaudits of every member of the Indian Bureau."

Now, the facts in the case, as you are well aware, are that the Indian Bureau is responsible for Indian legislation to the extent that the Interior Department, by its agency, the said Indian Bureau, has for years assumed, and been accorded by Congress, jurisdiction to make recommendations for necessary Indian legislation. So far as the tenure of my chairmanship of this committee is concerned, no bill of any consequence has ever been favorably reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House without first submitting the measure to the Indian Bureau for report and recommendation. As a matter of fact, the very bill in question, H. R. 9253, was personally by me filed with the Indian Bureau for such report and recommendation on January 26, 1918, more than 13 months before the adjournment of the recent Congress. Another formal filing of this bill with the Indian Bureau was made by letter on February 28, 1918, more than 12 months before such adjournment, but up to this good hour no tidings have been received by this committee from the Indian Bureau, and no intimation of the position of the bureau on this subject has been disclosed to any member of the Committee on Indian Affairs until the statement made in your address last night.

Since none of the speakers at this meeting prior to the time of your address had made any attack on the Indian Bureau I hope it can certainly be assumed that your statement was not made as a political defense of the bureau, but represented the sincere sentiment of the Indian Bureau from the head thereof on down, and that as Acting Commissioner you would not give vent to such utterance unless you were, as it were, "speaking from the book."

I repeat, that after this long lapse of 15 months, I rejoice to be advised of the position of the bureau in connection with this matter. I shall reintroduce the bill on the day the next session of Congress convenes and on that same day will ask to have the measure again submitted to the Indian Bureau for report and recommendation, with an abiding faith that your asseveration will be made good and a favorable report on all the provisions of the measure immediately returned for the consideration of Congress.

Very respectfully, yours, ——— ———.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. I desire to say that that bill was introduced on that day, and that my good friend, the chairman of the committee, has been good enough to refer the bill to the Indian Bureau, as I stated it would be, so I presume we may expect some action on the measure at an early day.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, these two facts stand out: This bill has been growing in amount from year to year, and it carries this year and every year a large number of items for attorneys' fees. Yes, and a part of many items of appropriation are for the payment of employees. I suspect that in these items of the bill lies a good deal of the cause for the inertia. There is always great difficulty in eliminating items carrying appropriations for the payment of attorneys' fees and employees' salaries. This Congress ought not to be so much interested either in employees' salaries or in attorneys' fees as in meeting and solving this problem along rational lines. I hope that in the not too distant future we shall have a real solution of the Indian problem, putting the Indian in the way of becoming a useful citizen instead of a ward.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries and expenses of such attorneys and other employees as the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, deem necessary in probate matters affecting restricted allottees or their heirs in the Five Civilized Tribes and in the several tribes of the Quapaw Agency, and for the costs and other necessary expenses incident to suits instituted or conducted by such attorneys, $85,000.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of having read in my time an item from a newspaper under the date of Minneapolis, which seems rather apropos at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS.

Charges that the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs is "squeezing the blood" from the Indians whose affairs it administers, destroying the old high idealistic morals of the race, were made by Dr. Charles A. Eastman, president of the Society of American Indians, in an address at the "Little Theater" at the University of Minnesota last night.

Dr. Eastman, himself a full-blooded Sioux and a Dartmouth College man, is in Minneapolis to arrange for the meeting next fall of the national intertribal convention of the society.

The convention, Dr. Eastman said, will be a protest meeting and will call on Congress to abolish the bureau. The administration set up by treaty while the race was "serving an apprenticeship to civilization" has become maladministration that in another generation will make the Indians absolute anarchists, he asserted.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of inquiring of the chairman of the committee whether it is the purpose of the gentleman to strike out this item of $85,000, after having had read the newspaper article?

Mr. SNYDER. No; it is not.

Mr. GARD. Then what purpose is sought to be advanced?

Mr. SNYDER. Simply as an illumination of the discussion that is going on along the same line.

Mr. GARD. Do I understand the gentleman having charge of the bill agrees with the statement made in the newspaper?

Mr. SNYDER. I do not by any means.

Mr. GARD. Then what benefit is there in having it read?

Mr. SNYDER. I do, however, believe in a tremendous modification of the activities of the Indian Bureau.

Mr. GARD. But this is a drastic revocation, not a modification.

Mr. SNYDER. I appreciate that, that it is an elimination, which I would not approve of.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman does not approve of the article which he himself submitted to be read?

Mr. SNYDER. It is not necessary that I should approve an article that I send to the desk to have read which has appeared in the public print. That is not the rule here.

Mr. GARD. But the gentleman gives it a certain approval by its presentation.

Mr. SNYDER. I do not think I gave any such idea at all.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, just to make the observation that I happen to know Dr. Eastman. He has been at our institution of learning twice, and I have had the opportunity of sitting under the teaching of his philosophy and studying him at close range. I doubt very much whether this distinguished Indian, a graduate of an eastern college, who married a Caucasian girl, who has a great standing in the world, not only as an Indian but as a citizen of the country, would make a statement on his own authority that could not have substantial backing in facts. Therefore I think that much ought to be said on the floor of the House in regard to Dr. Eastman's statement.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to use not exceeding $10,000 of the proceeds of sales of unallotted lands and other tribal property belonging to any of the Five Civilized Tribes for payment of salaries of employees and other expenses of advertising and sale in connection with the further sales of such tribal lands and property, including the advertising and sale of the land within the segregated coal and asphalt area of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations or of the surface thereof as provided for in the act approved February 19, 1912, entitled "An act to provide for the sale of the surface of the segregated coal and asphalt lands of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, and for other purposes" (37 U. S. Stat. L., p. 67), and of the improvements thereon, which is hereby expressly authorized, and for other work necessary to a final settlement of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes: *Provided*, That not to exceed $2,500 of such amount may be used in connection with the collection of rents of unallotted lands and tribal buildings: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, no moneys shall be expended from tribal funds belonging to the Five Civilized Tribes, without specific appropriation by Congress, except as follows: Equalization of allotments, per capita and other payments authorized by law to individual members of the respective tribes, tribal and other Indian schools for the current fiscal year under existing law, salaries and contingent expenses of governors, chiefs, assistant chiefs, secretaries, interpreters, and mining trustees of the tribes for the current fiscal year at salaries at the rate heretofore paid, and one attorney each for the Choctaw, Chickasaw, and Creek Tribes employed under contract approved by the President, under existing law, for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to continue during the ensuing fiscal year the tribal and other schools among the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, and Seminole Tribes from the tribal funds of those nations, within his discretion and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby empowered, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, to expend funds of the Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek, and Seminole Nations available for school purposes under existing law for such repairs, improvements, or new buildings as he may deem essential for the proper conduct of the several schools of said tribes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order, simply to ask a question. Perhaps the gentleman from Oklahoma can state, as he is familiar with these tribes, how many attorneys act for them now.

Mr. CARTER. Attorneys?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. I did not catch the item.

Mr. WALSH. I see you make a change in the law by providing that the Choctaw, Chickasaw, and Creek Tribes shall have one attorney each. The current law just says, "attorneys of the tribes."

Mr. CARTER. Well, the Choctaws have one and the Chickasaws have one and the Creeks have one, and the Cherokees and the Seminoles have none. The Choctaws, Chickasaws, and Creeks have one attorney each, and the Seminoles and Cherokees have none. In the past, I think, the Creeks have had several men working under this appropriation as attorneys, but I will yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma who is from that district.

Mr. HASTINGS. It was the purpose of the legislation that each of those tribes may have one attorney who is employed by the chief and approved by the President of the United States. We felt like that was abused; they would make a contract with one attorney, and he would make a subcontract with others, so there were in fact some two or three or more employed, and this particular language was put in this bill so that they would be restricted to the employment of only one attorney. Now, let me say to the gentleman——

Mr. WALSH. This is a restriction.

Mr. HASTINGS. I was the last Cherokee tribal attorney and went out in 1914. The Cherokees do not have any tribal attorney. The other three tribes mentioned in the bill have tribal attorneys, and this bill provides for one each for them and they are to be employed as attorneys have in the past under existing law.

Mr. WALSH. This is restrictive in its nature?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes; it is restrictive.

Mr. CARTER. I may say the Choctaws and Chickasaws have not for some years had more than one attorney. The Creeks are the only tribe that have had more.

Mr. WALSH. You are now restricting them to one?

Mr. CARTER. One.

Mr. HASTINGS. Let me say to the gentleman the abuse that this amendment seeks to correct was that the Creeks complained that too much was paid out one year for expenses of the tribal attorney, which we thought ought to be cut down, and so it is restricted.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the point of order, I desire to make inquiry of those in charge of the bill relative to the tribal schools among the Choctaws, Chickasaws, Creeks, and Seminole Tribe entirely for my own information. What is the extent of the so-called tribal schools and how are they distinguished between schools which are recognized to be for the education of white children?

Mr. CARTER. The schools of the Five Civilized Tribes were taken over by section 10 of the act of April 26, 1906. Prior to that time the Five Civilized Tribes had operated their own schools with their own officials, mostly with their own teachers, paid out of their own funds, but under that act all the tribal schools were taken over by the Federal Government, and for a while all were kept in full swing. They have been reduced now until there are only two or three in the Choctaw Nation, if I remember correctly, and one in the Chickasaw Nation, and I believe one still in the Seminole——

Mr. HASTINGS. And three in the Creek Nation.

Mr. CARTER. But none in the Cherokee, so that is the extent of the tribal schools now. When the school proposition was first taken over by the Federal Government I think there was something more than $500,000 a year spent for tribal schools and now perhaps there is not exceeding $100,000.

Mr. GARD. Is the course of study similar to that pursued in schools for white children?

Mr. CARTER. Yes; but only a few of the boarding schools are still being continued, and the bureau attempts to confine them as much as possible to the full-blooded Indian, who is not yet sufficiently advanced to go to the public school.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to direct the attention of the chairman to the evident misspelling, on page 53, line 5, of the star print, of the word "Chickasaw."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will make the correction.

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, the gentleman from Ohio asked me yesterday something about the number of schools. I asked the department regarding it this morning, and was given these figures. There are 35 non-reservation boarding schools, 75 reservation schools, and 225 day schools at which Indian scholars are taught. They either belong to the Government or to the towns adjacent to where the Indians reside and for which the Government pays a per diem for the teaching of the Indian scholar.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman's information indicate the proportion of children that have school facilities?

Mr. SNYDER. It does not, but there are ample facilities in the boarding schools for all those who apply and for more. There are one or two exceptions. There is plenty of room to the extent that last year when the Carlisle School was taken over by the Government there was no difficulty whatever in placing those pupils at that school in boarding schools throughout the country.

Mr. FESS. There are Indian children, however, who do not have school facilities?

Mr. SNYDER. Oh, yes; plenty of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Stuart, Lewis, Gordon & Rutherford, out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States belonging to the Creek Nation, the sum of $7,000, being in full settlement of the claim of the said Stuart, Lewis, Gordon & Rutherford against the said Creek Nation for legal services rendered the said Creek Nation employed by authority of an act of the national council of the Creek Nation, approved January 7, 1898, the said sum of $7,000 having been appropriated in payment of said services by an act of the national council of the Creek Nation approved October 18, 1900.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. HASTINGS. I hope the gentleman will reserve the point of order for a moment.

Mr. WALSH. I will reserve it. If the gentleman will permit, before he begins I will ask him if this is not the subject of a special bill?

Mr. HASTINGS. And passed the House.

Mr. WALSH. Passed on the Unanimous-Consent Calendar in the last Congress?

Mr. HASTINGS. It passed the House in the Sixty-fourth Congress, but it did not pass the Senate. It failed because of want of time over there. But it has been favorably reported some two or three times from the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I can have the attention of the committee a moment. I want to say this: That the Five Civilized Tribes, of which the Creek Nation is one, went from the Southern States west of the Mississippi and located in what was then the Indian Territory, now the eastern part of Oklahoma, between 1830 and 1840. For 60 years the Government of the United States had no supervision whatever over the expenditures of the Five Civilized Tribes. I want to make that as an unqualified statement. The Cherokees, Creeks, Seminoles, Choctaws, and Chickasaws had their own governor, their own legislature, their own tribal schools. They divided up each country into counties; they elected their own officers, including county officers, and they paid the expenses without any supervision from the Government of the United States for 60 years, the same as the State of Delaware, the State of Connecticut, or the State of Massachusetts. I make that as an unqualified statement.

Let me say to the Members of the House that I am carried on the Cherokee tribal roll; that I am an Indian by blood; that I went to the tribal schools and to the Indian boarding schools, and that I have taught in the schools, and that I represented them, and therefore feel qualified to make the statement in reference to the Five Civilized Tribes.

I know that the Creeks appropriated during that time millions upon millions of dollars. And my friend from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], who has been on the committee for years and lives in an adjoining State, knows what I say is true. The Cherokees did the same thing. In 1894, for instance, we appropriated $6,000,000 and paid it out per capita. There is not a bit of question about that. Finally railroads were built through the country, cities and towns were located there, and finally the Government of the United States, by the act of March 3, 1893, sent a commission down to the Five Civilized Tribes to attempt to induce them to allot their lands and divide up the country in severalty and become citizens of the United States, with a view of bringing the Indian Territory in as a State of the Union. The commission was there for a number of years trying to negotiate with these tribes and had great difficulty in doing it. Finally the Creeks made an agreement, in 1897, which was ratified by the act of Congress of June 28, 1898. Then for the first time the Congress of the United States, with reference to these Five Civilized Tribes, put a clause into the law requiring the acts of the Creek councils to be approved by the President of the United States, and I have that law here before me.

Prior to the passage of that act in 1898 and during the time the commission was down there trying to negotiate this agreement there was a good deal of friction between the Government of the United States and those tribes, both before and after the agreement was made. Now, because of that Creek council, by an act of its legislature, when it had a right to do it, on January 7, 1898, when it could appropriate millions and millions of dollars without any restriction at all, authorized the employment of this firm of attorneys. It had the right to do it. It had employed attorneys for 60 years. They employed a firm of the most eminent lawyers in that part of the country. Judge Stuart, former partner of ex-Senator Bailey, was on the Federal bench of the Indian country, and Mr. Lewis was on the Federal bench of the Indian country, and Mr. Gordon is one of the leading lawyers in eastern Oklahoma, as is also Mr. Rutherford. None stand higher in their professions. They employed them to represent them before the courts and the commission down there. It resulted in a good many injunction suits being brought, and they had to try these suits. Now, as a matter of fact, they had to antagonize the department in some cases. No attorney could have properly represented them without doing it. It so happened that the Secretary of the Interior was Mr. Hitchcock at that time. After this firm of attorneys performed these services under legal contract the Creek council, after the attorneys had completed their work, passed an appropriation bill to pay them in accordance with the terms of the contract. It happened to be that that appropriation was after this act of Congress, namely, after June 27, 1898. The contract, mind you, was made under the act of the Creek council in January, 1898, when they had a right to enact it. And the council a year or two after this, after the services had been performed and the Creeks being entirely satisfied, appropriated the money.

As I have said, there had been some friction between these attorneys and the Secretary of the Interior. They went into

court and obtained injunctions in certain cases. But, anyhow, they afterwards went back to the Creek council, and the Creek council appropriated this amount; it then had to come up here for approval. I want to make this clear to the Members of the House. At the time this original act of the Creek Legislature was passed it had the right to enact it, and when they made the contract it was a legal one. And at the time there was no approval necessary by the President of the United States to the act. My good friend from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], who is very familiar with this question, will bear out what I say about it. This firm of attorneys, composed of the most eminent men in the country, was legally employed. It performed the services, the council appropriated the money, but because of this friction and because of the disagreement with the Secretary of the Interior, he recommended its disapproval, and it was disapproved.

Those are all the facts about the matter. I have brought the matter repeatedly to the attention of the Commitee on Indian Affairs, and every time that committee has favorably reported it, and when it came up on the floor of the House and attention of the minority leader [Mr. MANN] was directed to it, he agreed that it should be passed, and it was passed in this House, but it was sent over to the Senate too late, and no action was taken there, so that it was not considered there, although I may say I believe it was favorably reported over there a time or two. In fact, it was added to this bill as an amendment in the Senate.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. I will be glad to.

Mr. WALSH. Was this the scheme that was submitted to the Secretary of the Interior, and he failed to approve its payment?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALSH. The present Secretary?

Mr. HASTINGS. No; not the present Secretary. When we introduced a bill the present Secretary disapproved it on the ground that a Secretary 10 or 12 years ago had refused to approve it. The present Secretary said it had been disapproved by the department, and the department simply adhered to the old ruling previously made.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman has a number of claims relating to Indian matters, one of which is specifically disapproved in the report filed, in a letter disapproving the favorable reporting of the bill. Is this the claim?

Mr. HASTINGS. No, sir. It is another bill.

Mr. WALSH. Then I will withdraw the reservation.

Mr. HASTINGS. I thank the gentleman. It is a meritorious claim.

The CHAIRMAN. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the sum of $1,666.65 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the possession of the United States belonging to the Choctaw Tribe of Indians not otherwise appropriated, to reimburse William R. McIntosh for services rendered as coal and asphalt mining trustee for the Choctaw Nation during the months of October, November, and December, 1915, and January and February, 1916: *Provided*, That no part of such sum shall be payable to William R. McIntosh for which disbursement there is any authorization by existing law.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. I do so in order to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma a question with respect to this item. How does it come that Mr. McIntosh rendered these services as a trustee and received no compensation?

Mr. CARTER. William R. McIntosh is a Choctaw Indian, appointed under the act of July 1, 1902, which required the appointment of a Choctaw Indian. He was in the service at the time of the beginning of the first date set out in the item here, and his commission expired, but the commissioner failed to reappoint him until the later date. During all that time, however, William R. McIntosh served right along as mining trustee of the Choctaw Nation, and his reports were accepted by the department, but the comptroller ruled that because his commission for reappointment had not reached him during this period he could not be paid for that time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The reservation is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the sum of $392.60 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in possession of the United States belonging to the Chickasaw Tribe of Indians not otherwise appropriated, to reimburse Jacob B. Moore, of Ardmore, Okla., for probate expenses incurred and paid by him in the performance of his duty as attorney for the Chickasaws under a contract between him and Douglas H. Johnston, governor of the Chickasaw Nation, approved by the President of the United States December 1, 1913.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McKEOWN: On page 56, after the period in line 6, insert new paragraph, to read as follows:

"Whenever requested by any restricted allottee of the Five Civilized Tribes or his legal guardian, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to offer for sale to the highest bidder at public auction, after due advertisement of the same, such parcels of land described in said request, under such rules and regulations as he may promulgate: *Provided*, That there shall be retained not less than 40 acres of the best tillable land, to be designated by said allottees or their legal guardians and approved by the Secretary of the Interior as a permanent homestead, which shall be inalienable and nontaxable in perpetuity so long as the same is retained as a homestead by said allottee or his descendants: *Provided*, That soldiers of the war of 1917 and persons who become bona fide residents of said lands may purchase the same upon installments of interest and principal, payable annually, for a period not less than 5 years nor to exceed 20 years: *Provided*, That the money accruing from the sale of said lands of the said restricted Indians be paid to and be under the control of the Secretary of the Interior, to be disbursed in his discretion in making permanent improvements upon the homestead and equipping the same for occupancy and cultivation and for such other use and benefit of such restricted Indians as the Secretary of the Interior may deem best: *Provided further*, That said moneys when paid to said restricted Indians or their heirs shall be exempted from any lien for attorneys' fee or other debt contracted prior to the disbursing of the same."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma will no doubt concede the point of order.

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order on the amendment, and the Chair sustains it.

Mr. McKEOWN. I will be glad if the gentleman from Massachusetts would withhold it for a moment.

Mr. WALSH. I will withhold it.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment covers a matter that I discussed in the committee during the general debate. If this amendment is put on this bill, it will open up in the State of Oklahoma many thousands of acres of land that will enable bona fide farmers and soldiers of 1917 to buy for homes.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. McKEOWN. Certainly.

Mr. GARD. I notice the gentleman says "soldiers of 1917." I suppose he means American soldiers?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes; of course I meant that by that designation.

Now, the Secretary of the Interior has advocated a plan by which homes or lands can be secured for returning soldiers. As I stated in general debate, in the eastern side of Oklahoma there are Indians who have as high as 320 acres of land for themselves and 320 for their wives and 320 acres for each of their children. A man with a wife and eight children has approximately 3,000 acres of land. This land makes him absolutely land poor. He can not do anything with it. The Secretary of the Interior ties him up under the law until he can not lease it except for agricultural purposes for one year; that is, 160 acres of it known as his homestead. It is not taxable. The men who live in that country and who want to buy farms or land can not buy it. If you give these Indians 40 acres of land and selected, as provided in this amendment, out of the tillable land, and remove the restrictions from the Indians, the land can on their application be put up at auction to the highest bidder, so that a man who wants to own that land to live on it can buy it on terms, and you will thereby do much to relieve the conditions in that country and also give the soldier who wants to own his own home an opportunity to acquire it. It will enable him to own a home in a new and progressive State, that is progressing every day, and will one day be one of the leading States of the Union, and that can be done without a cent of cost to the United States Government, because the land is there, and all they have to do is to make the application.

I wish to direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that in view of the constitutional right of these Indians who have already received their allotments it will only be on their application. What harm can be done to the country if the Indian comes in and asks the Government to sell his surplus land for him and build up a homestead, and give an opportunity to those men who have for years wanted a home to obtain it, and give opportunity to these soldiers who are anxious to obtain homes to acquire them? Let us do it in a practical way and without cost. I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will withdraw his objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, this is too comprehensive a scheme to be taken up in this way. It should be carefully considered by the committee. I therefore renew my point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas offers an amendment.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask unanimous consent to go back to page 45 and offer the following amendment, which I think can be disposed of in a few moments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to return to page 45 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TILLMAN: Page 45, line 16, after the word "pupil," insert a new paragraph to read as follows:

"That the council of the Osage Indians in Oklahoma be authorized to elect or appoint a general tribal attorney to represent them in all legal matters affecting said tribe: *Provided*, That the salary of said attorney, to be paid out of the tribal funds, shall not exceed $10,000 per year: *And provided further*, That the Commissioner of Indian Affairs shall be denied the right to approve or override the election of said attorney."

Mr. WALSH. I reserve a point of order. I desire to ask the gentleman if this has received consideration of the members of the committee?

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes; and the committee are unanimously in favor of it. A like provision was in the bill as originally drawn, which bill was considered at the regular session. I think it went out on a point of order, and is subject now to a point of order if the gentleman insists upon it; but if the gentleman will kindly allow me a few minutes to argue the matter I desire to say that the council for the Osage people have for many years wanted to employ an attorney, and have elected an attorney two or three times to represent them, but the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for some reason has declined to approve this attorney.

The Osage Indians are the richest people per capita in the world. They participate in big business like the Steel Trust does. The Steel Trust no doubt, for the purpose of having a like amount of its business looked after by a legal adviser, would pay him $100,000 a year for doing no more and for assuming no more responsibility than would the attorney for the Osage Indians. There are about 2,200 of these Indians and their average family income is $20,000 a year. They have large holdings in oil and in gas and they are not permitted the privilege of employing an attorney to represent them annually. No other people in the wide world as wealthy as are these Indians are denied the right of employing a permanent legal counselor to look after their business generally and specially. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs insists that there is a superintendent at Pawhuska who gets $3,500 a year, as well as other bureau attorneys and agents, and asserts that they can look after intricate, delicate, and important legal matters that, I think, should be looked after by a high-priced and able attorney regularly employed by the Osages themselves and compensated by them out of their abundant tribal funds.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILLMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. CARTER. Is it not a fact that the Indians consider that at times their interests conflict with the views of the superintendent of Indian affairs, and rather than an attorney, is he not a tribunal before whom these matters are settled?

Mr. TILLMAN. That is very true; in fact, they are in conflict frequently as to what should be done.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TILLMAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. We are at the end of the Oklahoma items, and I want to talk about the amendment that was offered limiting the authority of the superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma.

There has been a good deal of discussion about the Oklahoma Indians and about the Five Civilized Tribes, and I only want to take up a moment or two to discuss it this afternoon.

The statement was made by my colleague, which was correct in so far as it went, that the amendment that was offered was agreeable to me. It is in the sense that I can not get any more and therefore have to take it. Everybody in Oklahoma knows, and I want to put it in the RECORD here, that I am earnestly in favor of the bill as originally reported. Now, let me talk to the House about that provision. In the Five Civilized Tribes there are 101,519 Indians. There are 41,823 Cherokees, 20,799 Choctaws, 6,304 Chickasaws, a little more than 18,800 Creeks, and about 3,200 Seminoles. Out of the 101,519 members of these tribes who are enrolled there are about 75,000 of them who are Indians by blood, and of the 75,000 Indians by blood there are 37,000 known as restricted Indians. In other words, they are Indians over whom the Government exercises some supervision. They have one-half or more Indian blood. It has been my contention and the contention of the Indians in Oklahoma that so far as their tribal affairs are concerned the department ought to retain supervision, because it ought to determine questions of general policy with reference to those tribes; but it has been our contention down there all the time that with reference to their individual moneys and their individual allotments that they ought to be approved by the superintendent to the Five Civilized Tribes. A good many Members of the House here do not know that we have a superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes, nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate; that he has employees numbering about 265 under him. They are all civil-service employees; they are all efficient, honest, able, competent men and women, and what we advocate, what the Indians of Oklahoma want and what the delegation contends for, and what I ask is that so far as the approval of contracts relating to individual Indians down there is concerned, that they go before the superintendent to the Five Civilized Tribes, with the right of appeal in contested matters. When I came to Congress if you bought out of a restricted Indian's money a pair of trace chains the transaction had to go before the local representative down there in Oklahoma and had to come from him up through the superintendent to the Five Civilized Tribes, and from the superintendent of the Five Civilized Tribes to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs up to the Secretary of the Interior, so that it took about six months to buy a set of chain harness for an Indian.

Another thing: If you wanted to lease a tract of agricultural land for more than one year, the homestead of one of these Indians, you had to go through exactly the same process. Now, when it comes up here the department has nothing other than the record that has been sent up by the local man down there. Suppose it is an agricultural lease. The land may be on the top of a hill, it may be uncleared land, it may be fertile land, it may be 40 miles from the railroad, or it may be near a railroad. The local man would know all that. Now, what we are contending for and what the Indians down there are contending for is that that matter ought to go before the local man down in Oklahoma, who is a civil-service employee, who is honest, capable, and efficient, and let him pass on it with the right of appeal to the Secretary of the Interior in case of contest. We think that ought to apply to oil leasing. Let me say to the Members of the House that I want to protect the Indians. I want to say that every single Indian in Oklahoma not under the influence of the department, not employed by the department, agrees with the Oklahoma delegation without any exception.

Now let me call attention to a few things—my friend thinks that he is protecting them. I want to say without fear of any contradiction that every one of the restricted leases by reason of the fact of these delays in going before the local superintendent and forwarding it to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior for approval is a detriment to the Indian. It is well known throughout Oklahoma that restricted leases in every case sell for less than a commercial lease. There is no doubt about it, because the Indian lessor suffers by reason of the delay and uncertainty. You are not helping the Indian by having it come up here because we appropriated $205,000 for the use of the superintendent, and out of that money he employs experts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Out of this money he employs oil experts and legal experts. Oil leases are made on the form prescribed by the Interior Department, and they use a form just like a notary uses for mortgages. The superintendent has oil experts scattered all through Oklahoma, and they report to the Superintendent of the Five Civilized Tribes as to the bonus value of any lease and all other facts with reference to it. So when it comes to Washington the Secretary of the Interior has no additional information, and he can not protect the Indians. I defy any man to successfully contradict that. Every time an Indian lease is put up against a commercial lease, on tracts of land side by side, the commercial lease brings more than the restricted lease.

Now, I am an Indian by blood. I went to their tribal schools and to their higher boarding school. I have represented them from 1892 to the time I came to Congress in 1914. I have represented them before the commission. I have tried their lawsuits the best I could in tribal courts, in the Federal courts, and up here in the courts in Washington. I have repre-

sented them under President Roosevelt, under President Taft, and under the present administration. God knows that I would suffer my right arm to be cut off before I would recommend any legislation I thought was detrimental to my own tribe. [Applause.] This legislation is in the interest of the Indians.

I know what these Indians want, I know what is best for them, and I never will vote while I am on the floor of this House for any legislation which I think is against the interests of my own flesh and blood. My family are of Indian blood, all carried on the rolls. I have done little else in all my life than to represent them. They have honored me much more than I deserve, and I would be an ingrate if I stood on the floor of this Congress to favor by legislation anything that was inclined to do them a wrong or injustice. I know that I represent the Indians, and I know that gentlemen from other States do not understand the situation. But every man who has gone to Oklahoma and investigated the matter agrees with me, and all members of the Indian Committee who have investigated the matter agree with me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. I thank the Members of the House, and I will have more to say about it later.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask to address the committee three minutes on this matter.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, we are endeavoring to get through with the bill, and there is really no question before the committee.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I want to add a few remarks to what my colleague [Mr. HASTINGS] has said on the matter and to indorse the position taken by him relative to oil and gas and other mineral leases on Indian lands being sent up here to be approved by the Interior Department. That is somewhat of a local matter. It is a matter in which our people alone are affected, and the requirement that these leases be sent to Washington for approval instead of being an assistance to the Indians whom you are trying to protect is a detriment. The action in striking out that amendment this afternoon is detrimental, my friends, not only to the Indians, but the business interests of all concerned. It only means more red tape. It means delay in carrying on business. For instance, if your constituent should come to my State and buy an oil lease from an Indian he would be compelled to delay the business operations until such time as that lease could be sent out from Muskogee to Washington, and all simply for going through a little bunch of red tape. Many persons who have been compelled to do this are put to large expense. The department perhaps is called upon to employ more clerks. I have heard you advocate retrenchment in expenditures this afternoon. This is an opportunity to cut out considerable red tape and expense. We are asking relief from this situation for business reasons; we are asking relief to protect the Indians. If I make a lease on his land to-morrow, while it is going through the red tape up here, my neighbor might drill within 200 feet of the Indian land and have two weeks or perhaps a month or a longer time in which to take from under the ground that which belongs to the Indian. This is by reason of the red tape. I hope that some means may be found to have the gentleman withdraw his point of order, in order that business may be facilitated and the Indian protected as well as the man who is dealing with the Indian.

The Clerk read as follows:

That where the issuance of trust patents for certain allotment selections on the Klamath Reservation, in Oregon, has been withheld for the reason that the lands so selected were found to be more valuable for their timber than for agricultural or grazing purposes, the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, is authorized to confirm such selections and to cause trust patents to be issued therefor under existing laws.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. Has this been considered by the Indian Committee? Is not this an amendment which was put on subsequent to the introduction of the bill at the last session?

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, this matter has been considered by the Indian Committee. This provision in this section was introduced by myself at the request of the Secretary of the Interior in a letter of April 25, 1917, to Mr. CARTER, the former chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs. The hearing was deferred for some time and finally a subcommittee of the Indian Committee reported favorably to the main committee at the last session too late to get the matter into the bill. It was inserted in the Senate. The Senate hearings of last session, at page 351, explain the matter.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order. What is the purpose of this legislation?

Mr. SINNOTT. This is explained in a letter of April 25, 1917, from the Secretary of the Interior to the chairman of the Indian Committee, Mr. CARTER. He states that the agricultural and grazing area of the Klamath Reservation were about 220,000 acres, all practically allotted. Many of the Indians under a misapprehension of their rights selected and improved timber areas for allotments, and the department held that under the law land could only be allotted to the Indians that was suitable for agriculture and grazing purposes; that timberland could not be allotted.

Mr. GARD. Under the existing law does it permit the alienation without action of the Secretary of the Interior? Suppose an Indian is given this allotment, can he dispose of it?

Mr. SINNOTT. No; he can not.

Mr. CARTER. He is given a trust patent.

Mr. SINNOTT. It is held in trust for 20 years.

Mr. GARD. It can not be sold by him?

Mr. SINNOTT. No.

Mr. GARD. Without the consent of the Department of the Interior. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the equipment and maintenance of the asylum for insane Indians at Canton, S. Dak., for incidental and all other expenses necessary for its proper conduct and management, including pay of employees, repairs, improvements, and for necessary expense of transporting insane Indians to and from said asylum, $45,000.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman if this institution takes care of all the insane Indians in the United States?

Mr. SNYDER. This is the only asylum for the insane Indians that the Government operates, and at the present time it has a capacity for taking care of all that have been presented to it.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Has the committee any information as to the number of inmates?

Mr. SNYDER. There are about 200.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I note on page 42 of the bill that three insane Indians were sent from South Dakota to a State institution. Why were they sent to a State institution and not to this insane asylum?

Mr. SNYDER. I am not able to inform the gentleman. Perhaps some other member of the committee can.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I also note that the three insane cases mentioned cost only $225 a year for each patient. If we can put the insane Indians in State institutions at $225 a year, why do we want to appropriate $45,000, which makes the cost about twice as much?

Mr. SNYDER. I do not think it is possible to put Indians from a reservation into a State asylum.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. But they were placed there.

Mr. SNYDER. They must be individual cases.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. There were three cases.

Mr. SNYDER. It must be by special contract or something of that sort.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. The instance to which the gentleman refers in the bill was merely the temporary care of those three Indians until they could be sent to this asylum.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. The section does not so state.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the fact. As a matter of fact also, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] made a point of order against the item, and it is no longer in the bill.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I understand that there are about 300,000 Indians in the country.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. And there are only 100 insane Indians out of 300,000? Is not this a very small percentage?

Mr. SNYDER. It seems there is a smaller number of insane in proportion to the whole number of Indians than of any other race. That was stated by the Assistant Commissioner of the Indian Bureau.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I would state that this asylum takes care mostly of those Indians who are not citizens of the United States. A great many of the 300,000 Indians are now citizens and have access to the State institutions for the insane.

Mr. SNYDER. I will say to the gentleman that this seems to be a splendid activity and one that ought to be continued.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States, within his discretion, the sum of $100,000 of the principal funds to the credit of the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians and to expend same for continuing the construction of lateral distributing systems to irrigate the allotted lands of the Uncompahgre, Uintah, and White River Utes, in Utah, and to maintain existing irrigation systems authorized under the act of June 21, 1906, to be immediately available.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the words "to be immediately available," line 11.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order against the language "to be immediately available." The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For support and civilization of Qui-nai-eltsd Quil-leh-utes, including pay of employees, $1,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the chairman of the committee give his attention? Is the spelling of the first word correct?

Mr. SNYDER. The chairman is unable to state whether it is correct or not, but the spelling is the same as in the current law.

Mr. CARTER. Will the Chair tell the Clerk to correct the spelling?

The CHAIRMAN. The reading clerk calls the attention of the Chair of the name of the first tribe mentioned as being incorrect.

Mr. HAYDEN. The name is incorrectly spelled.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will be authorized to correct the spelling of the word.

Mr. WALSH. We ought to know how it should be spelled.

Mr. HAYDEN. The current law carries it as "Qui-nai-elts."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will correct the spelling.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing construction and enlargement of the Wapato irrigation and drainage system, to make possible the utilization of the water supply provided by the act of August 1, 1914 (38 Stats. L., p. 604), for 40 acres of each Indian allotment under the Wapato irrigation project on the Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash., and such other water supply as may be available or obtainable for the irrigation of a total of 120,000 acres of allotted Indian lands on said reservation, $500,000, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That the entire cost of said irrigation and drainage system shall be reimbursed to the United States under the conditions and terms of the act of May 18, 1916.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the words "to be immediately available," line 16.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order just a moment to enable the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS] to make a statement?

Mr. WALSH. I will reserve it for a moment.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this is a matter of planning for the extension of irrigation work on this project which is necessary to be carried on very largely during the summer months, and if a little additional time could be given by making the amount immediately available it would enable the assembling of materials and the organization of work at a little earlier date and enable them to get more for their money by working at this time of the year than at a later period.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I will.

Mr. WALSH. I notice this is for continuing the construction. There is evidently a project under way.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. There is.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman think 10 days or 2 weeks' delay in making this available would seriously interfere with the work there?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The work is held up at this particular time, and this would enable the organization and beginning of the work. It would only be a short period, of course.

Mr. WALSH. Of course the gentleman understands that the funds would not be available until the act had been signed, and probably that will not be until the 15th or the 20th of June, from the advices we now have, and that would only be 10 or 15 days. I wondered if the gentleman thought that would seriously cripple the work there in any way.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. It would simply mean the saving of possibly two weeks, which would be valuable on account of their being better able to carry on the work during the summer.

Mr. WALSH. I will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I renew the reservation of the point of order made by the gentleman. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. FESS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. LONGWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2480, had come to no resolution thereon.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Agriculture I report the Agricultural appropriation bill and the report thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina reserves all points of order. The bill is referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

LEAVE TO SIT.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture, or such subcommittees as it may designate, shall have leave to sit during the Sixty-sixth Congress and during the recesses of that Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAUGEN. I move its adoption.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Iowa if it is his intention to call up the Agricultural appropriation bill if the Indian appropriation bill is disposed of to-day?

Mr. HAUGEN. When does the gentleman from New York think the Indian bill will be disposed of?

Mr. SNYDER. I have not any idea, but I should think somewhere about 5 o'clock.

Mr. HAUGEN. My intention was to call up the Agricultural bill immediately after the passage of the Indian bill and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration, with the understanding that nothing would be done but general debate, but if the Indian bill should run after 5 o'clock I take it we had better not call it up to-day.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield? Is this bill as it passed the last Congress?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is as introduced by the committee at the last session——

Mr. GARNER. By the Agricultural Committee?

Mr. HAUGEN. With a few amendments authorized in the committee.

Mr. GARNER. If the gentleman has a few amendments in there, I doubt whether the House would be willing to give unanimous consent for immediate consideration.

Mr. HAUGEN. We will take it up to-morrow anyway.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, pending that, may I further inquire of the gentleman from Iowa if the Indian appropriation bill is not disposed of by 5 o'clock, or if it is disposed of by 5 o'clock, does the gentleman from Iowa intend to go into debate upon the Agricultural appropriation bill? I wanted to get this information so as to accommodate gentlemen.

Mr. HAUGEN. I hardly think it is worth while to-day. We will not call it up to-day, but call it up to-morrow morning the first thing.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2480, the Indian appropriation bill, with Mr. LONGWORTH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill was read by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel the patent issued in the name of Davie Skootah, allottee No. 35, on the Lummi Reservation, Wash., and to reallot the lands under the provisions of the general allotment law to unallotted members of the Lummi Tribe in areas of not exceeding 10 acres each.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that. I would like to know if this was not the subject of a private bill on the Unanimous Consent Calendar at the last Congress and which was objected to?

Mr. HAYDEN. This item was included in the Indian appropriation bill as reported to the House in the last Congress, and passed the House after an explanation to the effect that but 80 acres of land was involved; that this Indian died without heirs; and it was necessary to have authority of law, so that the Secretary could reallot this land among other Indians. There was no objection to the bill at any time.

Mr. WALSH. Then this was not the bill that was reported on the Unanimous Consent Calendar?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, sir.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For beginning the construction of diversion dams and canal systems for irrigating 12,000 acres of Indian land adjacent to Toppenish and Simcoe Creeks, Yakima Indian Reservation, $75,000, to be immediately available, the total cost not to exceed $150,000: *Provided*, That the cost of the diversion dams and distributing systems shall be reimbursed to the United States by the owners of the lands irrigable thereunder in not to exceed 20 annual payments, and the Secretary of the Interior may fix operation and maintenance charges, which shall be paid as he may direct: *Provided*, That if any allottee shall receive patent in fee to his allotment before the amounts so charged against him shall have been paid to the United States, then such amount remaining unpaid shall be and become a lien upon his allotment, and the fact of such lien shall be recited in such patent and may be enforced by the Secretary of the Interior by foreclosure as a mortgage, and should any Indian sell any part of his allotment with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the amount of any unpaid charges against the land sold shall be and become a first lien thereon, and may be enforced by the Secretary of the Interior by foreclosure as a mortgage, and delivery of water to such land may be refused, within the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, until all dues are paid: *Provided further*, That no right to water or to the use of any irrigation ditch or other structure on said reservation shall rest or be allowed until the owner of the land to be irrigated as herein provided shall comply with such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, and he is hereby authorized to prescribed such rules and regulations as he may determine proper for making effective the foregoing provisions, and to require of owners of lands in fee such security for the reimbursement herein required as he may determine necessary, and to refuse delivery of water to any tract of land until the owners thereof shall have complied therewith.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the words "to be immediately available," in line 6, page 65.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from New York to the word "prescribed," in line 7. It should be "prescribe."

Mr. SNYDER. I was about to call the attention of the Chair to that word.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will make the correction.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Interior are hereby authorized and directed immediately to investigate, and to report to Congress at its next session, the advisability and necessity of acquiring, with a view to returning to the dispossessed Indians from the authorities of Pierce County, Wash., those several tracts of allotted Nisqually Indian lands, Nisqually Reservation, Wash., aggregating approximately 3,200 acres, which were acquired under a compromise agreement of April 18, 1918, between said Secretaries of War and the Interior for the sum of $78,400 from the said Nisqually Indians by said county of Pierce for War Department purposes, and which said lands were by decree of May 6, 1918, of the local State court awarded in fee to the said county of Pierce for the purpose of transferring title thereto to the War Department as an addition to Camp Lewis.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that. I would like to ask some member of the committee if it is necessary. What is the idea in the minds of the authorities?

Mr. HAYDEN. A military cantonment was established in the county of Pierce, in the State of Washington, and it was necessary to purchase lands from the various parties, including these Indians, and turn the same over to the United States, giving title to the Government to the land where the cantonment was located. A large area of land was acquired under this process. The Indians now say they prefer to have their land returned to them; and, since there is a large area there which is not needed for camp purposes, authorization was placed in the bill in the Senate, and the House conferees agreed to it, for an investigation by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Interior to see whether it would not be possible to return the lands to the Indians and let the Indians return the money awarded to them for the purchase price of it. In other words, the Indians would rather have their old homes than the money.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Secretary of War approve of this exchange?

Mr. HAYDEN. My recollection is that there was testimony before the Indian Committee of the Senate to the effect that the Senator from the State of Washington had inquired of the War Department and had been informed that at least not all of these lands were needed for War Department purposes. The language of this item provides for an investigation by the two Secretaries to determine whether the lands are needed by the War Department, and if not needed they are to be returned to the Indians and the moneys heretofore paid to the Indians to be returned to the county of Pierce.

Mr. WALSH. There is not anything about that last requirement in this paragraph as to the money being returned.

Mr. HAYDEN. Well, the provision describes the land and tells how much was paid for it.

Mr. WALSH. The intention is, I understand, if the lands are returned the money, or a greater portion of it, is to be returned to the United States?

Mr. HAYDEN. To Pierce County, in the State of Washington. This provision does nothing more than require an investigation to be made and a report to Congress relative to the matter.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the gentleman from Arizona whether it is not a rather unusual proceeding to have two Secretaries make an investigation? Is there not some duplication?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not necessarily. The Secretary of War now has control of this area of land for military purposes, it being a part of the cantonment grounds at Camp Lewis. It was acquired from the Nisqually Indians. The price asked for it was so high that the Secretary of War had to condemn this land. It is now claimed by the Indians that more land was taken at that time than was necessary, and they would prefer to have their land returned to them than keep the money that has been placed to their credit in the Treasury. The two Secretaries are to determine whether it is proper to give the lands back to the Indians and return the money. The Secretary of War is to report whether or not they are needed for military purposes any longer.

Mr. FESS. The Secretary of the Interior represents the Indians?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Secretary of the Interior represents the Indians in this transaction and therefore should be a party to the investigation.

Mr. GARD. Reserving the point of order, I desire to make an inquiry about the local State court award in fee to the county of Pierce. Does that mean that an action has been taken by the State court adverse to the United States and in the interest of these Indians?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. The Secretary of War, under authority granted him by law, went into the State court and condemned this land, seizing it for military purposes, saying that it was necessary that there should be a large area for maneuvering grounds in the vicinity of Camp Lewis. The Indians asked a higher price for their lands. So there was a condemnation proceeding, and the court of Pierce County acted in this case. The title of that land was in the county and the county deeded the land over to the United States.

Mr. GARD. For $78,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. For nothing, or a mere nominal consideration.

Mr. GARD. Now, when the United States gets it it pays $78,000 to Pierce County?

Mr. HAYDEN. Naturally the Interior Department will return the money to the county if the lands are given back to the Indians.

Mr. GARD. But the whole subject is merely a matter for investigation by those Secretaries?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; to be reported to the next Congress by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of War.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 23. For the support and education of 230 Indian pupils at the Indian school at Hayward, Wis., including pay of superintendent, $53,350; for general repairs and improvemnts, $8,000; in all, $61,350.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I direct attention to the misspelling of the word "improvements" on line 8.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the support and civilization of those portions of the Wisconsin Band of Pottawatomie Indians residing in the States of Wisconsin and Michigan, and to aid said Indians in establishing homes on the lands purchased for them under the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 30, 1913, $15,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, said sum to be immediately available and to be reimbursed to the United States out of the appropriation, when made, of the principal due as the proportionate share of said Indians in annuities and moneys of the Pottawatomie Tribe in which they have not shared as set forth in House Document No. 830 (60th Cong., 1st sess.), and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make a per capita payment of $50 to said Indians out of said funds: *Provided*, That no further expenditures be authorized or made under appropriations heretofore enacted making provisions for the purchase of land and the clearing of same for said Pottawatomie Indians.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the words "to be immediately available" on line 25 of page 67.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase of subsistence supplies in relieving cases of actual distress and suffering among those needy St. Croix Indians of Wisconsin whose cases are referred to in report of January 30, 1915, transmitted by the Secretary of the Interior to the House of Representatives March 3, 1915, pursuant to the provisions of the act of Congress of August 1, 1914 (38 Stats. L., pp. 582–605), and printed as House Document No. 1663, Sixty-third Congress, third session, $1,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. What authority of law is there for spending this money for relieving distress and suffering among these particular Indians? I do not think that was considered by the committee at all. It bears the earmarks of a Senate amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. That was a Senate amendment.

Mr. SNYDER. We had no hearings on that and have no information on it.

Mr. WALSH. I make a point of order on that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the construction of a road from the village of Odanah, in the Bad River Reservation, to the south line of said reservation, $20,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, said sum to be reimbursable from any funds now or hereafter placed in the Treasury to the credit of the Indians on the Bad River Reservation, to remain a charge and lien upon the lands and funds of said Indians until paid: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the construction of said road: *Provided further*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be expended until the Secretary of the Interior shall have obtained from the proper authorities of the State of Wisconsin satisfactory guaranties of the payment by the said State of at least one-half of the cost of the construction of said road.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that that paragraph is in the same situation as the previous one.

Mr. WALSH. It has not been considered by the House committee?

Mr. SNYDER. It has not been considered by the House committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York concede the point of order?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing the work of constructing an irrigation system within the diminished Shoshone or Wind Rive Reservation, in Wyoming, including the Big Wind River and Dry Creek Canals, and including the maintenance and operation of completed canals, $100,000, reimbursable in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1905.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, page 70, line 5, by striking out "$100,000" and inserting "$50,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 70, line 5, strike out "$100,000" and insert "$50,000."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I am under the impression that in the last appropriation bill the amount carried for this work was $50,000. While this money is reimbursable, in accordance with the act of 1905, it seems to me it would be wiser to continue the same annual sum in carrying on this irrigation system there.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I will state that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] appeared before our committee in connection with this item, and stated that in his opinion it would be of material advantage to prosecute this work to prompt completion, and therefore he asked for an increase in this amount. He said that if Congress appropriated but $50,000 and spread the expenditure over two years, the overhead expense for engineers and other high-priced help would be carried on for that longer time, while if the amount were doubled and the work carried on twice as fast, a distinct saving would be made. For that reason the committee agreed to an appropriation of $100,000 instead of $50,000 in this bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I think on another occasion, two years ago, the engineer made a statement similar to that about this item. There is no question but that this is a very feasible project, favorably considered by the committee heretofore.

Mr. WALSH. A minimum has been fixed for these projects, and it is contended that an economical expenditure can not be obtained unless $100,000 is appropriated?

Mr. HAYDEN. That was demonstrated with respect to this particular project by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. WALSH. What is the total estimate on this project?

Mr. HAYDEN. The total estimate of the additional cost to completion was $564,000. We are appropriating $100,000 this year, leaving a balance of $464,000.

Mr. WALSH. How long was it expected to take?

Mr. HAYDEN. If the full amount was made immediately available, and settlers could be found to take up the land, it might be economical to appropriate the entire amount at once, but the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] thought that at least $100,000 should be allowed this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk calls the attention of the Chair to the misspelling of the word "River" on line 2 of page 70. Without objection, the Clerk will be authorized to make the necessary correction.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuation of investigations, construction, operation, and maintenance, and incidental operations on a project for the irrigation of a portion of the conditionally ceded lands of the Wind River Reservation, Wyo., to be known as the Riverton project, $200,000, reimbursable in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1905: *Provided*, That the construction charge for the actual cost of said project shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior and divided equitably between the Indian land and public and private land irrigated by such project, and that the charge as fixed for said Indian lands shall be reimbursable in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1905, and that the charges as fixed for private and public land irrigated under such project shall be paid by the owner or entryman in accordance with the terms of payment of construction and maintenance charges as provided by the reclamation law and amendments thereto.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. To the entire paragraph?

Mr. GARD. To the entire paragraph, unless it is explained.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not believe that the paragraph is subject to a point of order. This is clearly in continuation of a public work now in process of construction. I shall be glad, however, to give the gentleman from Ohio all the information that I have on the subject.

Mr. GARD. I would like the gentleman to explain why in this appropriation bill we should take up matters in connection with the Wind River Reservation and apportion the charges on Indian lands and on private lands.

Mr. HAYDEN. This is the situation: Certain areas of the lands belonging to the Shoshones in Wyoming were ceded to the Federal Government; that is, areas that were not previously allotted to the Indians, with the result that, under this reclamation project there is a checkerboard of allotted Indian lands and lands sold to white settlers. Now, the economical and efficient operation of this irrigation project requires that the Indian lands and the private lands must be served with water together. It is also necessary that provision be made for the return of the money advanced for the construction of these works. That is the true explanation of the provisions of this paragraph.

Mr. GARD. Is there existing authority for the expenditure of any of this money for privately owned lands?

Mr. HAYDEN. No more than that the project has heretofore been adopted. It is a work in progress, and under the rules of the House we are entitled to appropriate money to continue construction. Water for irrigation could not be economically used

if the Indian lands should alone be appropriated for. The Indian would have to bear the entire cost, while the white man's land would lie waste. Combining the white man's and the Indian's land is the only way to carry on a feasible project.

Mr. GARD. I wanted to know whether this was a project to irrigate speculators' real estate under the guise of the Indian lands.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the gentleman will take the trouble to read the hearings, beginning on page 347, he will find an extended statement by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and a full explanation by Mr. Reed, chief engineer of the Indian irrigation service, both of whom were questioned in great detail by the committee. Their statements show that a number of white people bought Indian allotments with the idea of making homes upon the land. The only difference between their situation and that of homesteaders on the public domain is that they are compelled to buy Indian lands and pay the Indians for them. It is not a matter of speculation on the part of these settlers but an honest effort to make homes in what otherwise would be a desert region.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. If gentlemen will permit, there are alternate portions of land owned by men who have purchased allotments of the Indians. It is quite impossible to irrigate the Indian lands without also irrigating the white man's land. The purpose of this provision is to require the white settler to pay his pro rata share of this irrigation. The item is not subject to a point of order, because it is authorized by the general irrigation act of 1905, which authorizes the irrigation of Indian lands.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. GARD. There is no existing authority for an appropriation for such privately owned land as might lie near or contiguous to public land.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The condition of the land made it necessary to put in a provision so that the Indian's land could be irrigated and the settlers who are his neighbors be required to pay their share of the project.

Mr. GARD. I know nothing about the condition of the lands out there; but does the gentleman say that the project is one which is meritorious for the development of lands in this territory?

Mr. HASTINGS. There is no question about it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No doubt about it.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the proportionate share of the cost of constructing a diversion dam and for the construction of canals and laterals for the irrigation of Indian land on the ceded portion of the Wind River Reservation, Wyo., $50,000, to be immediately available, reimbursable under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the words in lines 2 and 3, page 71, "to be immediately available."

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing the work of constructing roads and bridges within the diminished Shoshone or Wind River Reservation, in Wyoming, $25,000, said sum to be reimbursed from any funds which are now or may hereafter be placed in the Treasury to the credit of said Indians, to remain a charge and lien upon the lands and funds of said Indians until paid.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Much has been said since the reading of the bill relative to the great advantage that has come to the Indians since they have been civilized under the care of our Government. They are now presidents of banks, of railroads, own large estates, and prominent in professional life. Nothing, however, has been mentioned about the Indian woman. It seems to me that in this great State of Wyoming, where woman suffrage has been so prominent for 25 years, and where the men have been influenced for the better, now living higher and nobler lives than previous to the date of suffrage, as was so eloquently expressed only a few days ago by the able Representative from that State—I would like to know if the chairman has any information as to whether the Indian squaws continue to work and till the land, as they did previously and thus enable their Indian husbands to hold the high positions which they have now conquered. Have the Indian women obtained the spirit of suffrage? Are they now studying literature, art, and social science. It seems to me if they are developing at all, they should be advanced in this great State of Wyoming. May I ask the chairman if his committee has any information relative to the mental standard of the Indian squaws?

Mr. SNYDER. The chairman is willing to advise the gentleman from Pennsylvania that, in his judgment, the most intelligent Indian that addressed the committee was an Indian woman. [Applause.]

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I would like to know if the Indian squaws of Wyoming are still working in the fields as they did previous to the enactment of woman suffrage. Are there now greater chances for the Indian women?

Mr. SNYDER. I do not think I can answer the question concerning the activity of the squaw in the field. My information is that if there is any advancement at all among the so-called ordinary Indians it is with the squaw and not with the buck. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I recall 30 years ago I crossed the State of Wyoming and camped for several days in the Shoshone Reservation. Indians came into the camp and offered beautifully bound Bibles for tobacco. Have the Indians under the influence of woman suffrage become so civilized that they give tobacco to the white man in exchange for Bibles?

Mr. SNYDER. Does the gentleman ask the question of me?

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Yes. Have the Indians advanced so that they appreciate the Bible more than they did 25 years ago?

Mr. SNYDER. I am unable to answer the gentleman's question intelligently, but I hope that they have.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WATSON]. He asked the question whether the Indian woman has been improved. I visited one of our Indian schools about two years ago. I accepted an invitation to have dinner with the pupils in the school. I sat at a table where a number of girls were seated, the girls ranging in ages from 17 to 19. This was at my request. I have not listened to a more intelligent discussion of current events at any table at which I have sat in 15 years than I listened to at that table. They did not know that they were to discuss current events at that time, because it was not arranged until five minutes before that anybody should have dinner with them at their table. They discussed men in this House and men in the other body. They discussed an official of the Government of the United States now residing in Paris with incisive intelligence. There was nothing that had escaped them. It was about the time we entered the war, and they knew of many reasons that had not been called to the attention of many Members of the House why we were in the war and why we should have been in it long before. Their brothers and their sweethearts were ready for service. They were as keenly alive to everything that was going on as any people with whom I have talked at any time since the war began. They were girls who will become the Indian women, the squaws, if you please, of the future.

I am asked in a stage whisper where this was. This was at the Haskell School, in Lawrence, Kans., about two years ago.

Some years ago I examined a number of Indians before a committee of this House. There sat behind me a woman who prompted me when I was cross-examining an obstreperous witness. I did not know who was prompting me. I had not seen the woman, but she was suggesting searching questions to me to put to the witness. As soon as we had adjourned for the recess I turned around and looked at her. She then introduced herself as the squaw of a man whom she introduced as her husband. She was an Indian woman residing in Oklahoma. I think that squaw man of hers obeyed orders strictly. I do not think she carried the burdens for him or tilled the fields or carried the game. I think he did his part.

The Indian women are developing. They play the piano and they paint pictures and they cook a meal as well as it can be cooked by anyone. They are studying modern methods of doing everything in our schools and, I think, are developing as rapidly as their brothers, if not more so. The Indian woman is advancing.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to hear the statement of the gentleman from Kansas.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 27. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, authorized and empowered, under general regulations to be fixed by him and under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe not inconsistent with the terms of this act, to lease to citizens of the United States, or to any association of such persons, or to any corporation organized under the laws of the United States, or of any State or Territory thereof, any part of the unallotted lands within any Indian reservation within the States of Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Washington, or Wyoming heretofore withdrawn from entry under the mining laws for the purpose of mining for deposits of gold, silver, copper, and other valuable metalliferous minerals, which leases shall be irrevocable, except as herein provided, but which may be declared null and void upon breach of any of their terms.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. This entire section is all new legislation, and confers new powers upon the Secretary of the Interior. I believe it is very similar to a measure that was introduced in the last Congress by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN],

which he succeeded in having passed. In view of its importance I think we should be assured that the Government is properly safeguarded, and before I withdraw the reservation of the point of order I should like to hear from some member of the committee or from the gentleman from Arizona himself. I wish the gentleman would state how this compares with the legislation heretofore passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am very familiar with this legislation which authorizes mining for metalliferous minerals on Indian reservations, having twice passed similar bills through the House, and this being the fourth time it has been under consideration by this body. This section was first passed as a Senate amendment, and then adopted by the House as a part of the conference report in the last session. The section shows all of the amendments made in conference. Those changes being to change the word "act" to "section" wherever it appeared; to reduce the leasing period from 30 years to 20 years, which conforms with the term in the general leasing bill; to make the payment of royalties and rentals in each case a minimum amount—that is to say, not less than 25 cents an acre for the first year, 50 cents an acre for the second year, and $1 an acre for all years there are thereafter; and to provide for royalties of not less than 5 per cent. The committee will note that this legislation provides for minimum rates only, it being within the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior to charge the maximum—to go as high as he sees fit.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Was this measure considered or discussed at all by the Committee on Indian Affairs prior to the bill being reported to the House at this session?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; because it is practically the same bill that was reported favorably by this committee in the last Congress and placed on the calendar. We have considered nothing but the Indian appropriation bill, of which this section is a part.

Mr. WALSH. This measure is somewhat different than the bill reported out by the Committee on Indian Affairs in the Sixty-fifth Congress.

Mr. HAYDEN. Only in the respect that I have just mentioned.

Mr. WALSH. It is somewhat shorter than the bill which was reported out.

Mr. HAYDEN. This section contains the same number of paragraphs as the bill which was reported in the last Congress and practically the same language.

Mr. WALSH. The same number of paragraphs, but there are two or three paragraphs that are much shorter in the measure passed in the last Congress. Does the gentleman think that the Government is properly safeguarded by the phraseology—

That leases under this act shall be for a period of 20 years, with the preferential right in the lessee to renew the same for successive periods of 10 years, upon such reasonable terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, unless otherwise provided by law at the time of the expiration of such periods.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; that leaves the whole matter entirely in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior, and it is his duty to safeguard the interests of the Indians and the Government.

Mr. WALSH. The terms and conditions of the renewal will be a part of the lease, will they not?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the lessee will have a preferential right to apply for a new lease at the end of each 10-year period, if the deposits are not worked out by that time.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; but of course the terms and conditions of the renewal will be stated at the time he takes his lease for 20 years.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is not my understanding that such would be the case either in this bill or any of the other leasing bills which have passed this House so many times, this being an identical copy of the language used in those bills, without any change whatsoever.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman expect a man with capital to invest will go and take a lease for 20 years under this bill and enter on the nineteenth year of his lease, and then the Secretary of the Interior might come in and make a lot of regulations and rules which would make it inadvisable for him to renew his lease?

Mr. HAYDEN. The only preference the lessee would have, all other things being equal, is that if he desired a renewal he would obtain a new lease, rather than some one else, under the conditions prescribed by the Secretary.

Mr. WALSH. Well, it is confined to eight or nine States. Has the gentleman any information as to how much mineral lands, how many acres, there are comprised within those nine States?

Mr. HAYDEN. There are about 30,000,000 acres of unallotted Indian land in the States to which the law would be applicable. I gave the exact figures in my report upon the bill in the last Congress.

Mr. WALSH. Is it fair to assume some survey or investigation has been made, the result of which has been to include only those States and none of the others?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the bill as originally introduced applied to the State of Arizona alone. At the request of a number of gentlemen in the House who have large areas of unallotted Indian lands within their States the bill was made general, to cover the entire United States.

Mr. WALSH. But it does not cover all the United States.

Mr. HAYDEN. Objection was made to including the entire United States by certain Senators in another body, who were opposed to any kind of a lease law whatsoever, and their States were eliminated from the bill. So instead of making it general, the bill applies to the States named herein, which is satisfactory to the delegations in the House and Senate from those States.

Mr. WALSH. Well, what is the purpose, for instance, of including the State of Montana?

Mr. HAYDEN. The State of Montana contains very large areas of Indian lands, parts of which contain mineral but which can not now be mined, because there is no authority of law to do so.

Mr. WALSH. What kind of minerals?

Mr. HAYDEN. Gold, silver, and other metalliferous minerals. Montana is a great mining State, as the gentleman well knows.

Mr. WALSH. But what kind of minerals are upon Indian reservations in Montana?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no specific information at hand, but it was represented to me by the Representatives from Montana that they desired to have whatever minerals there were in their Indian reservations opened to mining under the terms of this law.

Mr. WALSH. But originally this legislation was proposed simply for the State of Arizona, because in that State there are the largest tracts of metalliferous land within Indian reservations.

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman is correct, but upon making his report upon the bill the Secretary of the Interior recommended it be made general, and the same request was made by Representatives from these States in the House of Representatives, and so your committee acted accordingly.

Mr. WALSH. Now, these leases, I notice in the first paragraph, are to be irrevocable, except as herein provided.

Mr. HAYDEN. Which was copied from the language used in the general leasing bill. A lease may only be revoked under the terms of the paragraph, beginning in line 19, page 76—

That any lease granted under this section may be forfeited and canceled by appropriate proceedings in the United States district court for the district in which said property or some parts thereof be situated—

And so forth.

Mr. WALSH. That is, of course, for a breach of the lease?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Whenever the lessee, after reasonable notice in writing, as prescribed in the lease, shall fail to comply with the terms of this section or with such conditions not inconsistent herewith as may be specifically recited in the lease.

Mr. WALSH. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat doubtful of the propriety of adding this measure to the general appropriation bill for the Indian Bureau, but I am willing to take the judgment of the gentleman from Arizona, who has been insisting upon this for several years, and I will withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve a point of order, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of asking a question of the gentleman from Arizona. I notice that this bill provides that the royalty shall not be less than 5 per cent of the net output. Is that the usual royalty?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the minimum royalty.

Mr. BLANTON. Is that the usual royalty in the gentleman's State with respect to private concerns?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is with respect to low-grade copper ores.

Mr. BLANTON. Is not the usual royalty higher than that, and does not that apply to the gross output instead of the net output?

Mr. HAYDEN. The usual royalty paid on a metalliferous mining lease is based upon the net and not the gross value of the ore. There is no reason why the Secretary of the Interior may not provide in advance for a sliding scale of royalty based on the metallic content of the ores, in the same manner as

freight charges are now collected by the railroads on the ore shipped to the smelters. The miner loads his ore on the cars and ships it to the smelter, and the bill of lading shows nothing much except that it is a carload of ore. The smelter returns show the value of the ore, and the freight rate is based upon that, the richer the ore the higher the freight rate. If the railroad companies can collect their freight on such a sliding scale there is no reason why the royalty to be paid to the Indians can not be provided for in the same way.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not the judgment and opinion of the gentleman that with this minimum royalty fixed in this bill the Secretary of the Interior will accept it as the judgment of Congress in fixing royalty?

Mr. HAYDEN. On the contrary, if the gentleman has had any experience at all with the administration of Indian affairs he will find that the representatives of the Indian Office are very zealous indeed that the Indian shall receive even more than he is entitled to, in order to make a record for themselves. I have no fear of that at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That leases under this act shall be for a period of 30 years, with the preferential right in the lessee to renew the same for successive periods of 10 years upon such reasonable terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, unless otherwise provided by law at the time of the expiration of such periods: *Provided*, That the lessee may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, be permitted at any time to make written relinquishment of all rights under such a lease and, upon acceptance thereof, be thereby relieved of all future obligations under said lease.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to ask just a question. I notice that the Clerk read "section," and the bill I have reads "act."

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman has the star print of the bill.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, what I desire to know is whether there is any change in this particular paragraph, and as I assume this is all a part of one enactment and should be subject at any time to a point of order, it provides for a comprehensive piece of legislation. What I particularly wanted to know was about the leases under this act, and whether that is the same language as contained in the mining law the House passed in the last Congress?

Mr. HAYDEN. Exactly so. It was copied from that bill.

Mr. GARD. Thirty years?

Mr. HAYDEN. Twenty years. The gentleman has not the bill that was agreed to in the committee.

Mr. GARD. The committee print is for 30 years.

Mr. HAYDEN. The bill as reported provides for 20 years. The term was so reduced in conference. That is the reason for the change.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman explain whether there is any change made in the bill I have, the completed and proper bill, in regard to the matter of timber on this land?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no change in that regard. The principal differences between the bill you have and the corrected print is that wherever the word "section" appears it has been changed to "act," and that in line 10, page 76, the leasing period was reduced to 20 years, that being the period agreed to in conference between the House and the Senate when the bill was acted upon in the last session.

Mr. GARD. Advancing a little, on page 77, for the purpose of information at this time, I notice there is no reservation for cutting of timber by the Secretary of the Interior, but merely by the superintendent of the reservation. Is that a proper regulation?

Mr. HAYDEN. It surely should not be necessary for the purpose of securing a little mine timber to refer the application to Washington, 3,000 miles away from the reservation.

Mr. GARD. It is not mine timber. It provides that no timber shall be cut on the reservation.

Mr. HAYDEN. That change was made in the Senate. Under the general mining law a miner has the right to go on the public domain and cut timber necessary for mining purposes. The Senator who offered this amendment wanted to be sure that no such right would be granted by this bill except by permission of the superintendent of the reservation, and upon payment of the fair value thereof.

Mr. GARD. I think no such authority should be given in this bill for cutting timber.

Mr. HAYDEN. The timber referred to is to be used only for mining purposes.

Mr. GARD. It does not state that.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the gentleman will offer an amendment to that effect I shall accept it.

Mr. GARD. I will offer it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the reservation is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That in addition to areas of mineral land to be included in leases under this act the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, may grant to the lessee the right to use, during the life of the lease, subject to the payment of an annual rental of not less than $1 per acre, a tract of unoccupied land, not exceeding 80 acres in area, for camp sites, milling, smelting, and refining works, and for other purposes connected with and necessary to the proper development and use of the deposits covered by the lease.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that paragraph.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to line 21, to change the word "act" to the word "section," in order to perfect the text.

Mr. WALSH. I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman will recall that I was opposed to permitting 80 acres of land to be taken adjacent to these mineral lands for camp sites for smelters.

Mr. HAYDEN. I find upon an examination of the potash law passed last year that that area was limited to 40 acres. If the gentleman wants to offer an amendment reducing that to 40 acres, I will accept it.

Mr. WALSH. I will offer an amendment after the gentleman corrects the word he referred to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAYDEN offers an amendment: Page 75, line 21, strike out the word "act" and insert in lieu thereof the word "section."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the word "eighty," in line 25, and inserting the word "forty."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Amend, line 25, page 75, by striking out the word "eighty" and inserting the word "forty."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to correct the spelling of the first word in line 25, page 75.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will be authorized to make the correction.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, in making any lease under this section, may reserve to the United States the right to lease, sell, or otherwise dispose of the surface of the lands embraced within such lease under existing law or laws hereafter enacted, in so far as said surface is not necessary for use of the lessee in extracting and removing the deposits therein: *Provided*, That the said Secretary, during the life of the lease, is hereby authorized to issue such permits for easements herein provided to be reserved.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. What is the idea of permitting the Secretary of the Interior to sell the surface of these lands when the deposits are under lease?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is a very common practice in a mining country, and it might be of immense value to the Indians.

Mr. WALSH. It is not a common practice, however, on reservation land.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is a common usage on coal lands in Oklahoma. Where minerals are under the ground a town might be located on the surface where the miners would live who mine the deposits, and such land could be sold to the great benefit of the Indians. If the surface is segregated from the minerals under the ground and the Secretary has the right to lease or sell the surface, he may obtain very high values for the land, which otherwise would accrue to the advantage of the lessees.

Mr. CARTER. In Oklahoma the surface of our coal land has brought about 60 or 70 per cent, that part that has been sold, of the amount brought by the mineral itself. That is, in known and developed coal fields.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; but it seems to me that if you permit that to be done with Indian reservation land, you might get a lease to operate for the minerals beneath the surface for 20 years,

and immediately after the lease is signed and operations have begun the Secretary of the Interior would sell the surface of the land and they might exhaust the minerals beneath the surface of the land inside of 10 or 15 years and cease operations, and then move out; and then you would find that the Indian reservations embraced within that area had been sold and no longer exist. Now, I doubt the propriety of conferring that authority upon the Secretary of the Interior. I think if they are going to be permitted to operate beneath the surface, they might be permitted to lease, but not to sell, because they might expect to be operating there for a number of years, and then the Secretary of the Interior would have sold the surface and by that much would have decreased the area of that Indian reservation.

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman seeks to amend by striking out, in line 5, the words "sell or otherwise dispose of"?

Mr. WALSH. Yes. I think that would be a protective amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the gentleman will offer his amendment, I shall accept it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order and move to amend, in line 5, page 76, by striking out the words "sell or otherwise dispose of."

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. GARD. Does the gentleman propose by his amendment to limit it to the time of the lease?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WALSH offers the following amendment: Page 76, line 5, strike out the words "sell, or otherwise dispose of."

Mr. GARD. The question I asked was whether there was to by any time in the lease. The gentleman uses the word "lease," but does not state any period of time for which it may run, whereas the other lease provides a 20-year limit.

Mr. WALSH. Well, I suppose that situation might be corrected by a further amendment, after these words are stricken out, by inserting there the words "for a period not exceeding the lease of the mineral land."

Mr. GARD. Does not the gentleman think that should be done? I simply suggest that.

Mr. WALSH. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to further amend by inserting after the word "lease," in line 5, page 76, the words "for a term not exceeding that of the mineral lease."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 76, line 5, after the word "lease," insert the words "for a term not exceeding that of the mineral lease."

Mr. GARD. The mineral lease hereinafter authorized.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is not necessary. It refers to that in the particular paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, on page 77, line 26, after the word "except," insert the words "for mining purposes, and then only," so that the section as amended will read:

That no timber shall be cut upon the reservation by the lessee except for mining purposes, and then only after first obtaining a permit from the superintendent of the reservation and upon payment of the fair value thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARD: Page 77, line 26, after the word "except," insert the words "for mining purposes, and then only."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice that on page 77 there is language providing for the payment of 25 cents per acre, 50 cents per acre, and $1 per acre, depending on the years in which it is to be paid; and it provides also that all moneys paid for rentals by the acre shall be credited on the royalties charged at 5 per cent. Now, if the rent paid per acre is to be deducted from the royalty charge, and the lessee is permitted to cut the timber from the surface of the land, even though it may be only for mining purposes, it may well be that he will cut more timber each year from the land than the rent per acre will amount to; and I rather think that if he is permitted to cut the timber he ought not to be given any credit for the amount paid for the rent for the surface of the land, for it will undoubtedly be the case in any event, without respect to what timber he may cut, that he will do some damage to the surface of the land, and perhaps a good deal more damage than the rent will amount to.

Mr. HAYDEN. He can not cut any timber except upon permission of the superintendent and upon payment of the fair value thereof. He must pay for the timber in any instance.

Mr. MADDEN. Where does it say that?

Mr. HAYDEN. On page 78, at the top of the page—

And upon payment of the fair value thereof.

Mr. MADDEN. All right then. Let us assume that he pays a fair value for the timber, and then let us assume that the cutting of the timber will be a damage to the surface of the land as well; and then if we assume that the amount paid for rent is to be taken from the royalty, the royalty is reduced by that amount; and it may be that regardless of the question of timber the surface of the land will be more or less injured where these mining claims are operated, and I do not believe that the lessee ought to be permitted to take credit on his royalty.

Mr. HAYDEN. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that I copied this language directly and exactly from the general leasing bill which passed this House in the last three Congresses, and the theory of that bill is that the operator should pay the royalty whenever he is operating his mine, but that when he does not operate it there should be a rental for the use of the land which is in the nature of a penalty for not doing any work on the property. That is the whole idea, and that is why we followed that plan in this bill and the other leasing bills.

Mr. MADDEN. I assumed that that was the reason why the rental charge was made, but it does not say so in this bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. It certainly does.

Mr. MADDEN. Where does it say so? Read it. It does not say that the rent shall be paid only when he is not operating the mine.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. MADDEN. But it does not say so.

Mr. HAYDEN. This bill says that there shall be a rental of not less than 25 cents, 50 cents, or $1 an acre, according to the year, except that the rental shall be credited against the royalty accrued for that year.

Mr. MADDEN. Sure.

Mr. HAYDEN. If there is no royalty, there is the rental to be paid.

Mr. MADDEN. He pays the rental anyhow.

Mr. HAYDEN. The practical effect is what we are getting at.

Mr. MADDEN. It reduces the royalty by the amount of the rent.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the usual custom.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think it is a good proposition.

Mr. HAYDEN. That question was debated fully in the last three Congresses, and this policy was adopted in the coal, oil, and gas leasing bill, and this provision is copied from that general bill.

Mr. MADDEN. But the mere fact that it was adopted previously does not necessarily make it good practice. If you foreclose a question because it has been settled once, and if no new idea can be injected into it, why, then, the world stops and you make no progress at all.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman from Illinois will yield to me for a moment——

Mr. MADDEN. I am always delighted to yield to the gentleman, who is always very clever.

Mr. CARTER. I will say that the same policy has been followed with reference to the leasing of the coal lands of the Choctaws and Chickasaws in Oklahoma. They lease their lands in tracts of 960 acres. They require a royalty per ton, to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, and require an advance royalty of $100 for the first year, $300 for the second year, and $500 for the third and each year thereafter so long as any mining is done upon the property. Then if the coal is mined thereafter during the period of the lease the advance royalty is applied at the ton basis on the coal mined.

Mr. MADDEN. I understand that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. I understand that to be the case; and I understand that a man who enters upon the mining of coal may want a lot of property adjacent to the mine that he is operating, and he is not ready to enter upon it; but in the case of mines such as are provided for in this bill the presumption is that the lease is made by a man who undertakes to enter upon the active work of mining at once. He has charge of the surface of the property, and in the other case the owner of the property still has charge of the surface. They are not alike, and it seems to me if we charge a rental fee per acre that that is to be definite and decisive and it ought not under any circumstances to be deducted from the royalties.

Mr. CARTER. That would be true if the lessee received any revenue from the property outside of the coal mine.

Mr. MADDEN. Whether he does or not, he has control of the property and can prevent the owner of the property from using it for any other purpose. He may destroy the surface of the property after he begins to mine, and the value of the property when the mining operation is completed may not be worth much of anything. In the meantime the owner of the property has been reimbursed to the extent of the rental paid, and this ought not to be in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 20 to make a correction which I promised the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] I would do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona asks unanimous consent to return to page 20 for the purpose of making a correction. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYDEN. It refers to the Thirty-fifth Statutes at Large, page 70, and it should be page 77.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will be authorized to make the change.

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following as a new section.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add as a new section:

"That during the present session of Congress those members of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House of Representatives, not less than five in number, who are Members of the Sixty-sixth Congress, are authorized to conduct hearings and investigate the conduct of the Indian Service, at Washington, D. C., and elsewhere, and the sum of $15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available, is hereby appropriated for expenses incident thereto. The said committee is hereby authorized and empowered to examine into the conduct and management of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and all its branches and agencies, their organization and administration, to examine all books, documents, and papers in the said Bureau of Indian Affairs, its branches or agencies, relating to the administration of the business of said bureau, and shall have and is hereby granted authority to subpœna witnesses, compel their attendance, administer oaths, and to demand any and all books, documents, and papers of whatever nature relating to the affairs of Indians as conducted by said bureau, its branches and agencies. Said committee is hereby authorized to employ such clerical and other assistance, including stenographers, as said committee may deem necessary in the proper prosecution of its work: *Provided*, That stenographers so employed shall not receive for their services exceeding $1 per printed page."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that an amendment should be made. The amendment reads "during this session," and it seems to me it ought to be "during this Congress."

Mr. SNYDER. I will accept that modification.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be modified accordingly.

There was no objection.

Mr. DYER. Might I not suggest that there should be another change, and refer to the present Members of Congress instead of to the Sixty-sixth Congress?

Mr. SNYDER. The whole amendment was drawn to cover the Sixty-sixth Congress.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, there is some doubt as to whether my reservation of a point of order is in order, and I will withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York as modified.

The question was considered, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LONGWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2480) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

There was no demand for a separate vote, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SNYDER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. HUTCHINSON, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence indefinitely on account of illness in his family.

COMMITTEE ON WATER POWER.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the appointment of the following members of the Committee on Water Power.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ESCH, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. WINSLOW, Mr. SINNOTT, Mr. SMITH of Idaho, Mr. ELSTON, Mr. HAUGEN, Mr. MCLAUGHLIN of Michigan, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. SIMS, Mr. DOREMUS, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. FERRIS, Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, Mr. RAKER, Mr. LEVER, Mr. LEE of Georgia, and Mr. CANDLER.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 27, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of Agriculture submitting revised estimates of appropriations required by the Office of Farm Management for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 57); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for inclusion in the general deficiency bill for operating public buildings, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 58); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Acting Secretary of State submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Finland from June 16, 1919, to June 30, 1920, inclusive (H. Doc. No. 59); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 3075) to prohibit the employment of any person who is not a citizen of the United States as radio operator or telegrapher on any vessel of the United States engaged in interstate or foreign commerce and to establish the age of radio operators; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3076) to amend section 8 of the act approved June 26, 1906, entitled "An act for the protection and regulation of the fisheries of Alaska"; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3077) to provide for old-age pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3078) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the lading or unlading of vessels at night, the preliminary entry of vessels, and for other purposes," approved February 13, 1911; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3079) to provide for the establishment of a division of civic training in the Bureau of Education; to the Committee on Education.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3080) to commission acting assistant or contract surgeons of the United States Army who have served in the Army for a period of at least three months to be first lieutenants in the United States Medical Reserve Corps, and to add to the Medical Corps of the Army in case of necessity; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3081) for the erection of new buildings for the Golden Gate Life-Saving Station, at San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3082) to make further provision for the organization of native troops in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3083) to provide for the admission into soldiers and sailors' homes of persons who have served in the Army or the Navy of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 3084) providing for the discharge of sailors and marines who enlisted since April 7, 1917, and before November 11, 1918; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TEMPLE: A bill (H. R. 3085) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the trustees of the Carnegie Free Library, of Beaver Falls, Beaver County, Pa., one small cannon or machine gun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3086) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Charleroi, county of Washington, State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3087) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Beaver Falls, county of Beaver, State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3088) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of New Brighton, county of Beaver, State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3089) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of New Castle, county of Lawrence, State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3090) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Volant, county of Lawrence, State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3091) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of McDonald, county of Washington, State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3092) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of West Middleton, county of Washington, State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 3093) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Broadalbin, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLACK: A bill (H. R. 3094) to increase the limit of cost of the public building at Paris, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 3095) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and cannon balls, to the village of Loudonville, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 3096) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Buffalo, N. Y., three German cannons or fieldpieces, with accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3097) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the village of Marilla, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3098) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to Elmo, State of New York; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3099) donating a captured German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage and projectiles, to the village of Clarence, State of New York; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3100) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Lancaster, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3101) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Depew, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3102) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Williamsville, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3103) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Akron, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3104) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Alden, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 3105) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Greenville, Muhlenburg County, State of Kentucky, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3106) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Bowling Green, county of Warren, State of Kentucky, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3107) to correct the military record and provide for the granting of pensions to survivors of certain battalions of Kentucky Militia; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3108) to regulate the sale of unstemmed leaf tobacco in the hand; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3109) for the benefit of railway postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3110) establishing a Mammoth Cave National Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3111) for the erection of a public building at Russellville, Logan County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 3112) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Easton, Md.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3113) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Snow Hill, Md., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3114) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Salisbury, Md., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3115) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Princess Anne, Md., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3116) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Elkton, Md., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3117) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Easton, Md., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3118) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Denton, Md., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3119) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chestertown, Md., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3120) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Centersville, Md., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3121) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cambridge, Md., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3122) to provide for the equitable distribution of captured war devices and trophies to the States and Territories of the United States and to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3123) to provide for the erection of a public building at Corapolis, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3124) to provide for the erection of a public building at Duquesne, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3125) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal Building at McKees Rocks, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 3126) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Elsberry, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3127) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mexico, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3128) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Bowling Green, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3129) providing for the raising of the Government dike opposite Clarksville, Mo.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 3130) for the erection of a public building at Medford, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3131) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Wakefield, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 3132) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Great Barrington, Mass; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3133) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Adams, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITHWICK: A bill (H. R. 3134) for the erection of a public post-office building at De Funiak Springs, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3135) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Apalachicola, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEBSTER: A bill (H. R. 3136) to amend section 4 of the act to regulate commerce passed February 4, 1887, and subsequent amendments thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3137) to authorize the payment of certain taxes to Stevens and Ferry Counties, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 3138) to create an additional judge in the southern district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3139) providing for the marking and protection of the battle field known as Dades massacre, in Sumter County, Fla., and for the erection of a monument thereon; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 3140) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Sheffield, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3141) to increase the limit of cost of public building at Decatur, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3142) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Athens, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 3143) to provide for further educational facilities by requiring the War Department to loan certain machine tools not in use for Government purposes to trade and technical schools and universities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 3144) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Wilkesville, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 3145) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Spencer, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 3146) to establish a workers' home board for the purpose of making loans to workers with which to build or buy their homes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 3147) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Spruce Pine, in the State of North Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage and suitable complement of projectiles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 3148) to provide for a site and public building at Clearwater, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 3149) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. IRELAND: A bill (H. R. 3150) extending the benefits of the $60 bonus provided under Title XIV, section 1406, of an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes," approved February 24, 1919, to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 3151) to construct and equip a lighthouse depot for the eighth lighthouse district at New Orleans, La., or vicinity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARDY of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 3152) for the erection of a post-office building at Monte Vista, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 3153) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cisco, in the county of Eastland, in the State of Texas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SIEGEL: A bill (H. R. 3154) regulating the salaries of Army field clerks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 3155) further extending the time for the repayment of certain Spanish War revenue taxes erroneously collected; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 3156) to provide employment and rural homes for those who have served with the military and naval forces through the reclamation of lands, to be known as the national soldier settlement act; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 3158) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building thereon at Bishop, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3159) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Holtville, Calif., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAGEE: A bill (H. R. 3160) to amend an act providing for the erection of a public building at Syracuse, N. Y., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 3161) for the erection of a public building in the city of Everett, in the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3162) for the erection of a public building in the city of Malden, in the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3163) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Malden, in the State of Massachusetts, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 3164) to regulate pawnbrokers and their business in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 3165) to provide for appointment to places under the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3166) for equipment and maintenance allowance for carriers on rural free delivery routes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3167) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Blytheville, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3168) authorizing the establishment of rural routes in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3169) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3170) to authorize the payment of 50 per cent of the proceeds arising from the sale of timber from the national forest reserves in the State of Arkansas to the promotion of agriculture, domestic economy, animal husbandry, and dairying within the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3171) to amend the practice and procedure in Federal courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3172) to make eligible for appointment ex-soldiers of the Union and Confederate armies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3173) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Wynne, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3174) to increase the salary of the clerk of the district attorney for the eastern district of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3175) to authorize the drainage of certain lands in the State of Arkansas, counties of Mississippi and Poinsett; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 3176) to provide for a site and public building at Fort Myers, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3177) to provide for a site and public building at Plant City, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: A bill (H. R. 3178) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Throop College of Technology, Pasadena, Calif., one captured German aeroplane for scientific purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 3179) to further regulate interstate and foreign commerce by prohibiting interstate transportation of the products of convict labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 3180) providing for a refund to certain officers of the Naval Reserve Corps by the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 3181) to authorize the purchase for site and the erection, completion, and equipping of a Federal building at Fort Wayne, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 3182) to create a Federal power commission and to define its powers and duties, to provide for the improvement of navigation, for the development of water power, for the use of lands of the United States in relation thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Water Power.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 3183) to create a Federal power commission and to define its powers and duties, to provide for the improvement of navigation, for the development of water power, for the use of the lands of the United States in relation thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Water Power.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 3184) to create a Federal power commission and to define its powers and duties, to provide for the improvement of navigation, for the development of water power, for the use of the lands of the United States in relation thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Water Power.

By Mr. ALMON: Resolution (H. Res. 54) providing for printing additional copies of soil survey of Lauderdale County, Ala.; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. MASON: Resolution (H. Res. 55) expressing the opinion of the House of Representatives that the treaty of peace should be ratified at once; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: Resolution (H. Res. 56) to pay B. F. Estopinal, clerk to the late Hon. Albert Estopinal, one month's salary; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. PARK: Resolution (H. Res. 57) providing for the appointment of minority employees; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Resolution (H. Res. 58) authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to sit during sessions and recesses of the Sixty-sixth Congress.

By Mr. CARAWAY: Resolution (H. Res. 59) to investigate cotton exchanges; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MONDELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 67) tendering the thanks of Congress to those who served or gave others to the service of the country in the Great War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 68) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan necessary tents and equipment for use at the celebration in honor of the returning soldiers and sailors of Wisconsin, to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., during September, 1919; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 69) providing for an investigation of the various press or publicity bureaus of the various departments, bureaus, boards, or commissions of the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 3185) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Linn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 3186) granting a pension to Arthur Gross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3187) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 3188) granting a pension to Ruth Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3189) granting a pension to Margrett Mabery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3190) granting a pension to Thomas W. Breckenridge; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3191) granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Beck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3192) granting an increase of pension to James W. Sparks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3193) granting an increase of pension to William R. Boren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3194) granting an increase of pension to Jacob McKnight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3195) granting an increase of pension to John M. Thorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3196) granting an increase of pension to Horace B. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3197) granting an increase of pension to John Small; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3198) for the relief of Henry P. Grant, of Phillips County, Ark.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 3199) to remove the charge of desertion from the name of George W. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 3200) to appoint Lieut. Commander Richard Drace White a commander on the active list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3201) for the relief of E. F. Mathews; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3202) granting an increase of pension to Annie Dougherty; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3203) granting an increase of pension to Augustus W. Connor; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3204) granting a pension to Florence G. Tuttle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3205) granting an increase of pension to Wilhelmine Gaebler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COADY: A bill (H. R. 3206) granting a pension to Margaret A. Gilmore; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3207) for the relief of William Sennhenn and Borris M. Spector; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 3208) granting a pension to Robert J. Phinney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 3209) for the relief of W. H. Overocker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 3210) for the relief of Joseph A. Prat; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3211) for the relief of Emma J. Spear; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3212) for the relief of legal representative of George E. Payne, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3213) for the relief of George M. Leahy, receiver of the New Orleans Mechanics' Society of New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3214) for the relief of the legal representative of Lapene & Ferré; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3215) for the relief of I. C. Johnson, jr.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3216) for the relief of the heirs of Isabelle Ann Fluker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3217) for the relief of Celeste Doussan Bisset; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3218) granting a pension to Henry Rudolph; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3219) granting a pension to James A. Coyne; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3220) granting a pension to Widow Emma Golden; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 3221) granting a pension to Elmer Wagar; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 3222) granting a pension to Maurice Leahy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3223) granting a pension to William A. Collins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3224) granting a pension to Martin Tahaney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3225) granting a pension to James R. Phillips; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3226) granting a pension to Harry Scott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3227) granting relief to Columbus Shannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3228) for the relief of Jacob Ehla, alias Jacob Eby, alias John Ihle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3229) to correct the military record of Algernon N. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 3230) to correct the military record of Charles Trougott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3231) for the relief of Belle Rush; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 3232) granting an increase of pension to John W. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 3233) granting an increase of pension to George W. Bagley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 3234) for the relief of the Buffalo River Zinc Mining Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: A bill (H. R. 3235) authorizing the President to appoint D. G. Barr a second lieutenant in the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 3236) granting a pension to Henrietta I. Machenheimer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3237) granting a pension to Emma Lee Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 3238) authorizing the President of the United States to restore to the active list Daniel Moriarty, chief boatswain, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3239) granting a pension to Katie Noblitt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3240) granting a pension to Maxwell Gray; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3241) granting a pension to John H. Simmons; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3242) granting a pension to Robert F. Tietz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3243) granting a pension to Charles A Lyon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3244) granting a pension to John Haight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3245) granting an increase of pension to John McMahon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3246) granting an increase of pension to Mary Leahy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3247) granting an increase of pension to Jerome McWethy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3248) granting an increase of pension to Arthur Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3249) for the relief of the minor nephews of Owen F. Solomon, first lieutenant, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3250) for the relief of James Ross; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3251) for the relief of George F. Stedman; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3252) for the relief of Patrick McNamee; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3253) for the relief of David Walker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3254) for the relief of Horatio S. Turrell, alias Horatio Seaward; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3255) for the relief of Jasper J. Henry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3256) for the relief of Thomas Ford; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3257) for the relief of Mary Curtin, widow of Michael Curtin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 3258) for the relief of Julius Jonas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POU: A bill (H. R. 3259) for the relief of T. L. Love, surviving partner of Robert Love & Son; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 3260) granting an increase of pension to Marvin Waldorph; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: A bill (H. R. 3261) granting a pension to Eva L. Woollacott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3262) granting a pension to Margaret Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHODES: A bill (H. R. 3263) granting an increase of pension to Hugh L. Dicus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3264) granting an increase of pension to Francis Cortois; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITHWICK: A bill (H. R. 3265) to relieve the estate of Thomas H. Hall, deceased, late postmaster at Panacea, Fla., and the bondsmen of said Thomas H. Hall of the payment of money alleged to have been misappropriated by a clerk in said office; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 3266) granting a pension to Ulysus G. Hunt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3267) granting a pension to Henry T. Kinkade; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3268) granting a pension to Filen Whalin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VAILE: A bill (H. R. 3269) granting an increase of pension to George C. Hazeltine; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3270) granting an increase of pension to Carolina M. Anthony; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 3271) granting a pension to George Milams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 3272) granting a pension to Thomas C. Nation; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 3273) granting an increase of pension to William Burgess; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 70) to pay to Silas McElroy, of Cleveland, Ohio, the sum of $10,000 for injuries received while in the service of the Government; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Letter from the International Defense Association of Mexico, relating to Mexican Affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), resolution of sympathy adopted by the State Council of Maryland, Daughters of America, upon the death, May 13, 1919, of the Hon. John Lawson Burnett, of Gadsden, Ala.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of Sara J. Darr, president, and Anna Marden Deyo, secretary, Woman's Christian Temperance Union of California, protesting against lifting the ban from wine and beer and for enforcement of war-time prohibition and constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of California Conference Free Methodist Church, opposing repeal of prohibition war measure or change in present law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOHER: Petition of W. M. Hartley, J. D. Simpson, and 400 other citizens of Platte and Andrew Counties, Mo., asking for repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOPLEY: Petition of residents of Joliet, Ill., asking for repeal of section 904, revenue law of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: Petition with 35 signers of Bates County, Mo., asking for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, asking for enforcement of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, relating to protection of lives and property of aliens, a new oriental policy bringing our laws into harmony with treaties with China, and a policy in the restriction of immigration with regard for the interest of all the nations concerned; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, asking that a Federal law be enacted for the suppression of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry farmers, voters, and taxpayers of Loyal, Wis., asking for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of Edwin E. Shaeffer and Fred Steinmetz, both of route 4, Lititz, Pa., asking repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRISON: Petition of citizens of Virginia, asking congressional consideration of conditions in Korea under Japanese rule; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HERSEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Aroostook, Penobscot, and Piscataquis Counties, in Maine, asking for repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERSMAN: Petition of California Almond Growers' Exchange, praying for passage of legislation making appropriation to investigate the culture of the almond, walnut, and other nuts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions adopted by the California Bean Growers' Association, praying for passage of legislation placing a high protective tariff on foreign grown beans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petition of Highgrove Methodist Episcopal Church, California, and San Antonio Heights Church, Upland, Calif., protesting against lifting the ban on beer and wine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Protestant churches of Santa Ana; Central Christian Church, San Diego; and First Methodist Episcopal Church, Hemet, all in the State of California, against lifting ban on beer and wine, and urging support of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Meyer Fur Co., Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against luxury tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of members of the Pacific Coast Section, National Electric Light Association, disapproving of the proposed establishment of a standard of ethics by the Bureau of Standards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of board of trustees of city of Glendale, for speedy return of telephone lines and systems to private ownership; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Retail Shoe Dealers' Association of San Diego, Calif., protesting against the luxury tax on shoes and urging its repeal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of enginemen working on the Arizona division of the Santa Fe coast lines, strongly in favor of immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McGLENNON: Petition of citizens assembled in Harrison, N. J., for absolute equality, political liberty, and religious freedom to all men, Jews and Christians alike, in all countries signatories of the treaty of peace, particularly in the countries which will be created as a result of the World War; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: Petition of sundry citizens of Nebraska, asking for immediate repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: Petition of International Brotherhood of Boilermakers and Helpers, Local No. 170, Richmond, Va., for Government ownership of railways; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Philadelphia Produce Exchange, protesting against certain activities of the Bureau of Markets; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of Pittsburgh Council of the Churches of Christ, W. I. Wishart, president, protesting against the recommendation made by President Wilson for the repeal of the prohibitory act of November 21, 1918, in so far as it applies to wines and beers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Grange of Bernhards Bay, N. Y., protesting against the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of S. Wechsilblatt, furrier, New York, asking for repeal of luxury tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of B. Harris, importer of furs and skins, New York, asking for repeal of luxury tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Grass, Friedman & Co. (Inc.), manufacturing furriers and fur novelties, New York, asking for repeal of subdivision 19, section 900, title 9, of the revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, favoring the enactment of legislation which will provide an adequate and effective budget system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAIGE: Petition of Charles H. Trowbridge, of Oakham, and other residents of third district of Massachusetts, for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of M. M. Waldron and sundry citizens of Pittston, Me., asking for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of E. C. Mathews and sundry other citizens of Waterville, Me., asking for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Arthur N. Ward and sundry other citizens of Winslow, Me., asking for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: Resolutions of Pearl Lodge, Odd Fellows, favoring league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ of America, urging the passage of legislation for the suppression of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Twenty-seventh Infantry Auxiliary, asking for immediate return of our soldiers from Siberia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, for the restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of H. C. Capwell Co., Oakland, Calif., urging the repeal of the so-called luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, telegram from president of Womans Christian Temperance Union, San Francisco, Calif., protesting against the lifting of the ban on beer and wines; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, urging the incorporation of certain clauses relative to religious freedom, etc., in the covenant of the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: Resolution of the trustees of the city of Glendale, Calif., favoring prompt return of the telephone lines to their owners; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of seven missionary societies of Long Beach, Calif., favoring enforcement of war-prohibition act; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, protests of Friends' Church of Huntington Park, and First Universalist Church, and Lake Avenue Methodist Church, of Pasadena, all in the State of California, against repeal of war-prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RHODES: Petition of Master House Painters and Decorators' Association of St. Louis, Mo., demanding an increase on second-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of S. Wechselblatt, of New York City, urging repeal of the 10 per cent tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of American Constitutional League and Southern States Woman Suffrage Conference on Woman Suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of Postal Telegraph-Cable Co., urging the immediate return of telegraph and telephone systems to their owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Lang & Klein, Freundlich & Matler Co., and B. Harris, all of New York, urging the repeal of 10 per cent tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Jewelers' Vigilance Committee (Inc.), urging the repeal of Title IX, sections 900–907, inclusive, revenue-tax law, 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Twenty-seventh Infantry Auxiliary, urging the return to the United States of all soldiers serving as part of the American Expeditionary Forces in Siberia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, for the suppression of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, for adequate protection of the lives and property of aliens and policy in the restriction of immigration based on a just and equitable regard of all of the nations concerned; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, requesting the incorporation of a clause into the covenant of the league of nations guaranteeing freedom of religious belief; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Self-Determination League of Liberty, with headquarters in New York City, relative to war-time prohibition; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of H. E. Huntley, of Corfu, N. Y., and 25 other residents of that vicinity, urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Merton Phelps, of Caledonia, N. Y., and 18 other residents of that vicinity, urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Mrs. A. B. Johnson, of Caledonia, N. Y., and 12 other residents of that vicinity, urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHALL: Petition of H. S. Neill and others, of Eden Prairie, Minn., for repeal of daylight-saving plan; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Joseph Frumkin and others, of Minneapolis, Minn., to provide for the national ownership and Government operation of all railroads in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: Resolution passed by the members of the Italian Chamber of Commerce of New York, approving the repealing of act restricting the manufacture, import, and sale of wines and beer on and after July 1, 1919; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: Petition of Board of Foreign Missions of Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America, asking repeal of war-time act affecting the manufacture and sale of beer and wine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *May 27, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite Spirit, our Heavenly Father, in whom is all wisdom, power, and goodness, we humbly pray that Thy holy influence may be exerted on the mind and heart of man, that all evil may give way to the good in him and Thy kingdom come and Thy will be done in earth as in heaven; that life at its best, in thought and deed, may live and evil die to the good of the world and to Thy glory in Christ, who gave His life that man might live and enjoy every blessing. In His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have rereferred from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service the bill (H. R. 261) for the retirement of civil-service employees. This rereference has the consent of the introducer of the bill and the chairman and, as far as I know, every member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to rerefer the bill referred to from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for rereference of the bill H. R. 1235, the minimum-wage bill, from the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service to the Committee on Labor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the bill just specified, the minimum-wage bill, be rereferred from the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service to the Committee on Labor. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL CLERKS.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I call up privileged House resolution 40, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 40.

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives from date of their appointment, not earlier than May 1, 1919, until otherwise provided by law for the services of a clerk, an assistant clerk, and a messenger, compensation at the rate of $2,500, $1,500, and $1,000 per annum, respectively, the said clerks and messenger to be appointed by and to be under the direction and control of the majority floor leader.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, this corresponds with the help now controlled by the minority leader?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Exactly?

Mr. IRELAND. No.

Mr. GARNER. Why the difference?

Mr. IRELAND. There is a difference in the salary of the assistant clerk to the minority leader, which was provided for in the legislative appropriation bill. It is my opinion that this discrepancy will be corrected within a few days, but as to that I am giving only my individual opinion.

Mr. GARNER. Why is this dated back to May 1?

Mr. IRELAND. Because one of the appointments was made on May 2, I think—though I will not be positive as to that—prior to the opening of Congress, and one about the middle of the month.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman means that these employees were arranged for? Of course, the House had not authorized anything of that kind.

Mr. IRELAND. No; certainly not.

Mr. GARNER. I presume the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] needed them at that time.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I found that there were some matters that needed attention and the assistance of a clerk. I took the responsibility of hiring a clerk at the first of the month and then another one about the middle of the month.

Mr. GARNER. And it is the gentleman's understanding that the Committee on Accounts does intend to equalize the salaries of the minority and majority employees?

Mr. IRELAND. I am not at liberty to speak for the committee. I can only give the gentleman my individual opinion, and my opinion is that it does.

Mr. GARNER. It seems to me that the gentleman introducing the resolution ought to be prepared to speak for the committee if he expects the House to support the resolution. Each one of these gentlemen, the minority and majority leaders, ought to have the same amount of help, and they ought to be paid the same amount of money.

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. As I understand it, the clerk receives $2,500, the assistant clerk $1,200, and the messenger $1,000.

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. And the gentleman is now proposing to raise the pay of the assistant clerk for the majority leader from $1,200 to $1,500. If it is necessary to have a clerk at $1,500, it occurs to me that it is necessary for the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] to have one at that price. I call attention to it because the gentleman's committee being in power it ought to do the fair thing.

Mr. IRELAND. I think the gentleman is entirely correct. The reason for that might be found in the fact that possibly a year or two ago you might secure an assistant clerk for less money than you can to-day. I have every confidence that this discrepancy will be taken care of, but I am only giving the gentleman my individual opinion and not speaking officially for the committee. I am not privileged to speak for them in that sense.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain that the ranking minority member of the Committee on Accounts has prepared and on yesterday introduced a resolution providing that the pay of the clerks to the minority leader shall conform to that of the majority, and further providing for pay for the month of June. The legislative bill provides only for compensation to begin the 1st of July, but in order that he may have the benefit of these clerks during the month of June provision will be made in conformity with the other. That will be brought up before the Committee on Accounts at its next meeting.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE TRANSATLANTIC FLIGHT.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for five minutes on a subject which I know will meet the approval of every Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, in the advance of science and the achievements of industry, the genius of America in the triumphs of peace shines forth with a brilliancy as resplendent as the victories of war, where the spirit of America, transmuted into the blood of heroes, has brought to the Nation glory everlasting. [Applause.]

America has given to the world its greatest inventions and mankind pays us tribute for the most potential benefits rendered humanity. A few years ago two Americans, following in the footsteps of one who died before the successful demonstration of the convictions of a lifetime, brought forth the airplane, and the hope of centuries became the reality of the present. The

dream and the achievement were united by the triumph of the Wright brothers. [Applause.]

I have just received a message from the Navy Department that I know will bring pride and gratification to you, my colleagues, and to every citizen of our Republic, for it presages the successful termination of the efforts of the American Navy to be the first to carry the flag across the seas in an airship designed by American engineers, constructed by American workmen, propelled by American motors, and manned by American officers. As an American was the first to fly across the land, so when this day's sun goes down it will be an American who will be the first to have flown across the ocean. [Applause.]

Lieut. A. C. Read, accompanied by Lieut. Stone, Lieut. Breese, Lieut. Hinton, and Ensign Rodd, left the Azores this morning at 10.18 a. m. Greenwich time—9.18 local time—and messages already received from stations en route report that the NC–4 has already passed stations Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, speeding at the rate of about 90 miles per hour, with weather conditions favorable. [Applause.]

In order to appropriately commend the event and reward those who have brought this new honor to our country, I have introduced a bill recognizing the bravery and courage of these gallant officers, as well as Commander J. H. Towers and Lieut. Commander P. N. L. Bellinger.

DESCRIPTION AND FLIGHT OF NC–4.

Wing spread	feet	126
Length over all	do	68
Length of boat hull	do	40
Flying weight	pounds	28,000
Propelled by 4 Liberty motors, developing about	horsepower	1,600
Speed, per hour, about	miles	90
Crew	number	5
Capacity of gasoline	gallons	1,100
First leg, Rockaway to Halifax	miles	900
Second leg, Halifax to Newfoundland	do	750
Third leg, Newfoundland to Azores	do	1,250
Fourth leg, Azores to Lisbon	do	800
Total	do	3,700

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I introduced a bill (H. R. 274) to provide capital for the development of land colonization for soldiers, sailors, and marines, but by mistake it was referred to the Committee on Appropriations. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The committees have been consulted, and I understand that there is no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman postpone his request and bring it up to-morrow in order to give the Chair an opportunity to look into the matter?

Mr. KNUTSON. I will.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and, pending that, I desire the attention of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] in reference to fixing time for general debate.

Mr. LEVER. What time does the gentleman suggest?

Mr. HAUGEN. I have very few requests for time and would suggest a short time.

Mr. LEVER. I have only two requests myself, and I suggest to the gentleman an hour and a half on a side. As far as I am concerned, I do not think we will use that much on this side.

Mr. HAUGEN. It is most likely this side will be in a position to yield time to the other side, and I would suggest an hour on each side would be sufficient, and I shall accommodate gentlemen as far as I can, for, as I say, I have very few requests.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it proposed to offer an amendment repealing the daylight-saving law? Is that in the bill?

Mr. HAUGEN. It will be offered as an amendment to the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will there be some general debate allowed on that?

Mr. HAUGEN. Time will be given to discuss that under the five-minute rule, undoubtedly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I take it there will be perhaps more requests for time on that than on any other feature of the bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. Discussion can be had on it when the item is reached.

Mr. LEVER. I have one or two requests, just made in the last few moments, and I think the gentleman had better have an hour and a half on each side, although I do not think we will use it. I am afraid I can not get along with an hour on a side.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will.

Mr. DYER. I desire to inquire of the gentleman from South Carolina if this bill as presented in this Congress is the same as was presented in the last Congress and which the House passed?

Mr. LEVER. It is the identical bill reported by the committee in the last Congress with the exception of a few rather unimportant amendments.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, then, that the time be limited not to exceed three hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from South Carolina and myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill, and, pending that, asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to three hours, one-half of that time to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from South Carolina. Is there objection to the unanimous consent? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The question is on going into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3157, the Agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. MADDEN in the chair. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for an hour and a half.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from South Carolina to use part of his time.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I understand that there is very likely to be an effort made to place upon this Agricultural appropriation bill a rider seeking to appropriate $10,000,000 for the United States Employment Service without providing for any restrictions on expenditures. If there should be such an effort, I want to give notice now that I expect to make a point of order against it, and I expect to make a point of order against every such rider that may be offered in this Congress to any appropriation bill. I have no objection to letting that subject come up in the proper way, for proper legislation to be offered and properly considered, so that we may be given a chance to place some restrictions upon the expenditure of this money and not leave it entirely to the department unrestricted. There was an attempt in the closing hours of the last Congress to place such a rider upon an appropriation bill, a proposition to appropriate $10,000,000 and turn it over to the Director of this Employment Service without any restrictions or limitations. I then placed in the RECORD facts showing that there was in the employ in this Government in this particular department here in Washington alone 513 men drawing big salaries from $6,000 per year down, aggregating nearly $900,000 per annum.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman does not desire to convey the impression that the Committee on Agriculture is going to offer this proposition?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I do not, because the committee brings the bill without that proposition in it, and I assume therefore that the committee is against placing this proposition in the bill.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield? Can not the gentleman trust the committee to take care——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma should address the Chair and obtain the consent of the gentleman from Texas——

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will as soon as I give vent to the expression of a few remarks I desire to make, as I have only 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I will state that I will go as far as any Member of this Congress to provide a proper employment agency service that will do equal justice to every laborer in this land alike. I will not just pick out as special favorites of this Government the 3,000,000 members of the particular organizations that are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

The agents of this Employment Service went all through my district and through my State and induced good laborers to leave their home and come East upon the promise that they would be paid their railroad transportation and expenses. And after $500,000 had been turned over by this Congress to this Employment Service for that particular purpose we have Mr. Densmore stating in the record of the hearings on the deficiency bill that he had spent very little of this sum and that it was unnecessary. I have in my office letter after letter from good citizens of my district, who say that they came East to work for the Government on such a promise and had been denied transportation and had to borrow money to get back home. I have placed in the RECORD facts showing that the heads of these 513 officials of this particular Employment Service here in Washington, in case that $10,000,000 appropriation had been passed, intended to raise their salaries in substantial amounts, the director of this Employment Service intending to increase his salary up to $7,500, and to increase the salaries of the other leaders in like proportion.

If proper legislation is offered here to give Members of Congress a chance to place reasonable restrictions on such a measure, then I say I will go as far as any of you will go to establish a free employment service that will help alike all the laborers of this country.

Now I yield to my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER], if he is in the Hall, or to any other gentleman.

Mr. CANDLER. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. CANDLER. I just want to state that there is no amendment proposed to this bill for the establishment of this service, and there has been no suggestion of the kind in the committee and nothing of that kind was contemplated.

Mr. BLANTON. I presumed that you could give some credence to what appears in the newspapers of Washington. If that is not well taken, I am wasting time.

Mr. RUBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. RUBEY. Does not the gentleman know that such an amendment will be subject to a point of order and by objecting he could stop it?

Mr. BLANTON. And that is just what I am giving notice of now, that I intend to stop it. Every time such a proposition is offered as a rider on an appropriation bill in this Congress I intend to do my best to be present and knock it out on a point of order, and therefore if any Member of Congress expects to get this proposed legislation passed it must be done by a proper bill, inaugurating proper legislation, and affording us an opportunity to safeguard it with wholesome restrictions.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back whatever time I have remaining to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, we as Americans have reason to be very proud and happy. We are citizens of the greatest Government on the globe. Our country is really the head servant in the great household of the world. Truly can we say "we are the heirs of all the ages in the foremost files of time." Time was in our brief history when the question of secession had not been settled, when New England States held to the view that they could withdraw from the Union if they saw fit to do so, and when the States of the South held to the same opinion there came about division amongst our people, our fathers of the South holding that they had a right to withdraw from the Federal Government. The fathers in the North held to the contrary view, and, as Dr. Ellis, a northern man, said in his history of our country, the question of secession was never authoritatively settled until the war settled it.

Gentlemen, it was settled by the war and settled for all time. Long after Lee had surrendered at Appomattox a South American chief asked a Confederate soldier why it was that the South had not been stirring up revolutions against the Federal Government during the years following the war, and the Confederate soldier said when Lee surrendered to Gen. Grant at Appomattox he plighted not only his own faith but the faith of every Confederate soldier and the faith of their children and their children's children through all the years to come. [Applause.]

And the war was over and the everlasting status of the Union was fixed. The question of secession was settled and we had an indissoluble Union of indestructible States.

Following that war I saw the sons of the men in gray and the sons of the men in blue marshaled beneath that flag in the War with Spain. I saw Gen. Joe Wheeler, of Confederate fame, and Gen. Oates, of my State, Gen. Grant, and Gen. Shafter, of the North, fighting side by side on foreign soil. [Applause.] Then, in 1914, when the greatest war that ever cursed the world came upon us—came like a thunderclap from a clear sky—and the Old World stood awe-struck before the mighty march of the mad monarch of Germany, I saw that monarch finally insult our flag; and when he did every State in this Union rallied to its support; sons of Confederate soldiers and sons of Federal soldiers of the sixties went into our camps and were trained together and upon the far-flung battle line of France carried Old Glory to victory. They carried it across a sea thick with floating mines and swarming with submarines.

They unfurled it against an army whose mighty forbears had conquered imperial Rome. They unfurled it against an army whose seasoned warriors had held back for three years the mighty armies of the people of Napoleon and Wellington. They unfurled it against the deadliest war machine every devised by the genius of man. They planted it over the ramparts of soldiers trained as no soldiers had ever been. They brought it back radiant with victory and covered all over with the glory of their valor. [Applause.] Gentlemen, we are reunited in heart and purpose, with one country—America—incarnated with the spirit of liberty. Our hearts and our hopes are all with thee. [Applause.]

Let us in the days that are to come do nothing to disturb or weaken the composite strength and solidarity of our united American people. Let East and West and North and South all work together for the good of each, and each for the good of all. [Applause.]

Let us as Members of the American Congress contribute to the unity of purpose and concerted action necessary to keep America at the forefront of the nations of the earth. [Applause.] Let us contribute to her strength and her glory, and do nothing to weaken her, nothing to cause bitterness between the sections. Surely, gentlemen, the time has come when we whole-hearted Americans all can forget the bitterness that divided us in the dead and buried past. Surely we can now work together for the good of our common country. Wherever distress comes, it matters not in what section of the country, let us as Americans go to the rescue in the spirit and faith of real Americans. [Applause.]

I want to bring to the attention of this House briefly this morning a condition that the World War produced in the southern section of this great country. In 1914, when the war broke out and submarines infested the seas, ships refused to take our cotton, the great money crop of the Southern States. The price fell from 14 cents to 6 cents a pound, which price was from 4 to 6 cents below the cost of production at that time. The South was in great distress. Her Members here, myself in the number, sought to get some measure of relief from the Government. The war itself had not yet reached us. It was said then in Congress that we had produced a big crop, and that there was no relief to be had for us. There was real distress amongst our people, our losses were tremendous, and we are just now recovering from the losses that we sustained in 1914. There was no governmental aid and our people took their losses and went on as best they could. They commenced to diversify their crops and to practice crop rotation.

We had been wedded to the one-crop system of producing cotton alone so long, depending solely upon cotton for everything, that we had almost forgotten how to grow any other crop. But in 1917 and 1918, when our country was involved in the World War, the President called upon our farmers to increase their cotton production, and the South, mindful of her losses on cotton in 1914 and 1915, and having already launched upon a diversified farming program, turned around and planted more cotton acreage in 1918 than ever before. Responding to the call of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the South put forth the greatest effort to make a big cotton crop. But the boll weevil interfered and the drought in Texas interfered and cut down that crop to less than 12,000,000 bales.

Now, gentlemen, I must say that if the boll weevil had not interfered and the drought had not come, God only knows what suffering the people of the South would have experienced in the sale of the cotton crop of 1918. When the President suggested that more wheat should be produced, I favored fixing a minimum price to the producers, a price that would be profitable to them. The President recommended $2.26, and that price was fixed. I reminded the Committee on Agriculture, when this matter was

before us, that in 1914 we had produced a big crop of cotton and had lost millions of money on it, and that the wheat growers ought not to be encouraged to plant a big crop and then be left in the lurch as we were; and we provided a price below which it could not go. The price could go no lower than $2.26. It could go higher; and our wheat farmers were taken care of.

Now, then, when the armistice was signed in November, 1918, a small cotton crop was coming on and the world's demand was greater than the supply. The law of supply and demand justified a price above 30 cents for cotton. What happened? Why, our British spinners and some of the spinners amongst the other Allies got their heads together with some of our American spinners and combined their forces to depress the price of American cotton. They had been too busy with war work up to that time to form a combination to manipulate cotton prices. They were on tiptoe; the world was on fire. The mighty drive was on. Cotton had gone to 37 cents under these circumstances, handicapped and hampered as it was in many ways. But when the armistice was signed these speculators and spinners, foreign and domestic, said, "We must get together and beat down the price of cotton." They got together and they broke the exchange price $30 a bale in 40 days. This constituted a loss of $300,000,000 on the crop of 1918.

Now, gentlemen, let me ask you in all fairness and candor, what was the South to do under those circumstances? Would you have put your cotton on the market when it was going down like that and when to sell it meant the loss of all your profits? No. You would not do that if you were a good business man. Then, what was necessary to be done? We were forced to hold it and keep it off the market. If men by a combination in a gambling deal destroy the value of your property overnight, beating the price down and down, are you going to play into their hands and throw your produce on the market, or are you going to say, "No; I will refuse to sell. The law of supply and demand warrants a much better price, and I must have a better price or my year's work and investments are all lost"?

Good sense and sound business judgment suggested to the cotton farmer to hold his cotton off the market.

Now, then, what else was necessary? Concerted action. It was necessary to let it be known all over the cotton belt that farmers were determined to hold their cotton until the price would yield a profit. So we had concerted action, and the cotton-holding movement became general. The bankers and merchants backed the farmers as never before, and when these three forces united—farmers, merchants, and bankers—the cotton-holding movement was an assured success. [Applause.] Were we not justified in standing together to prevent the sacrifice of our money crop? There was no earthly way for us to receive a profit except by uniting our forces and standing together and holding together.

Now, what happened on the cotton exchange? These foreign spinners, with some of our domestic spinners, sold the cotton market short. You gentlemen understand what that means—selling something that you have not got and beating down the price of that which the farmer has got. What was the cotton farmer to do? Let the robber band take his cotton? It was only another form of robbery. What would you do if a burglar came to your house to take your property? You would at least keep him out if you could. You would prevent him from taking your property away if it were in your power to do so. What was the farmer to do when they knocked down the value of his cotton from 37 cents to 22 cents a pound, involving a loss of $75 a bale? What was the cotton producer to do then but hold his cotton and refuse to sell? Good business judgment suggested that he hold. His right to have a living profit justified him in holding. Our cotton farmers had to borrow money to pay for Liberty bonds. They had to use their cotton in that transaction, and they borrowed money on their warehouse receipts and paid for their Liberty bonds, while their boys were fighting for our country on a foreign field. [Applause.]

Then, what did these speculators do? They said, "We will beat the price down so low that the banks will get uneasy and call the loans, then the producer will be forced to sell his cotton." Not only that, they called upon the Federal Government to withdraw support of the local banks and turn over this agricultural army in the cotton-producing States to these highwaymen who were undertaking to rob them of the fruits of their toil. But the President would not permit that.

Now, gentlemen, what else happened? The spinners of the United States said, "We are not going to use anything like the amount of cotton that we used last year. Our consumptive demand will be less than last year." The embargo on cotton to Germany and Austria was still in force, and there were restrictions of the cotton trade to the neutrals surrounding those countries. Cotton shipments were still hampered by allied restrictions and there was a combination operating to rob the cotton producer here at home.

I ask you again, gentlemen, what was the producer to do? He was holding cotton for a price that would yield a profit. The planting time was coming on; conditions were not like they were in the spring of 1918. At that time he did not have any cotton of the previous crop to amount to anything, but this time he had cotton. If he sold it he obtained no profit. If he held it he had a chance to sell for a profit later on. Now, what did good business judgment suggest to the producer? To diversify, to put some of his acres in corn, peas, hay, peanuts, alfalfa, and other things and to put less acreage in cotton. What does the Steel Corporation do when its supply is too great for the demand? It curtails its production. What did the lumbermen do recently? They said they had too much lumber. They shut down and curtailed their production.

What should the cotton producer do when our spinners had told him that they would not consume as much cotton as they did in 1918, and when he was holding some of his previous crop at the planting time of the 1919 crop? Curtail his production, of course. I said on this floor in December, January, and February that we were not going to sell at the prices manufactured on the exchanges, and that we intended to hold until we could get a fair price for our cotton. I said here repeatedly that we were going to reduce our cotton acreage, and we have done so.

We have held the remainder of the 1918 cotton crop under very trying circumstances. But we have seen it go back a little above the cost of production. It is now above 30 cents a pound. It costs between 24 and 28 cents to produce it. There never was a crop produced at such high cost as the American cotton crop of 1918. Why, we used to buy your western mules for $100 apiece. I saw a pair of them sold in my town Christmas for $800. So when we get a good price for cotton, we are able to pay you more for your corn and your wheat and your live stock, and we are able to pay more for what we buy from the East and the North.

When we announced our purpose to reduce cotton acreage a howl went up from speculators and spectacular politicians. Gov. Allen, of Kansas, took our people terribly to task for trying to provide for their own households by doing that which would cause them to obtain a price for their cotton that would yield a profit. He said we were trading on the misery of the world by reducing our cotton acreage. Was he justified in making such a statement? The facts in the case do not support his bitter tirade against a people whose only offense is they have used their sense and their strength to provide for their own households and prevent the sacrifice of their property. I do not know how this governor came to be invited to a conference of cotton growers and their friends.

I suppose that our people, feeling that there should be—and there is—a bond of sympathy between the agricultural South and the agricultural West, felt that the governor of a great Western State like Kansas would be interested to some extent in seeing the farmers of the sister section enjoy some measure of prosperity; that he would have a feeling of sympathy for the farmers of the South as they struggled to prevent the sacrifice of their cotton crop. But no, no; this governor sent them a mean and bitter reply to their kind and courteous invitation. He told them that he had no sympathy with what they were doing and accused these earnest and faithful American citizens who were trying to prevent misery in their own families of "trading on the misery of the world."

Gentlemen, I have seen white girls and grown white women picking cotton, trying to aid father and husband in gathering the crop without adding any more to the cost of making and gathering in the hope of getting a little profit. Last fall the cotton fields were white, labor was scarce and high, and in many instances could not be had.

Our farmers paid as high as $30 to pick a bale of cotton after it was made. That is $2 a hundred pounds in the seed. It takes 1,500 pounds to make a 500 pound bale.

Thirty dollars to gather a bale of cotton and get it ready for the gin in 1918, and I saw cotton sell for $30 a bale in 1914. That is the condition that confronted us last year, gentlemen. Talk about trading on the misery of the world. Why, here was a combination of foreign spinners aided by some of our spinners doing all in their power to beat down the price of cotton. Speculators and cotton merchants of Europe and America were in the game. They were trying to buy American cotton at a low price and then sell it to Germany and Austria and the neutral countries at a high price.

We felt that the man who produced it was entitled to a fair price and a living profit, and we announced to the world that we intended to hold the cotton we had for a profitable price and

reduce the cotton acreage for this year; that we were going to raise more corn and oats and hay, and so forth. We had been selling cotton to buy corn and meat and flour and potatoes and lard and syrup; in fact, we had been selling cotton in times past to buy everything that we consumed, and we owed money for it in the fall of the year in the heart of the cotton-selling season, and the merchant said to the farmer, "You must sell your cotton. I hate to call on you now, but I need the money that you owe me," and the farmer said, "All right. I regret to sell now. The price is unprofitable, but I realize that I owe you for everything I have eaten, for all of my home supplies, and I will bring in my cotton," and he put it on the market when the price was unsatisfactory and unprofitable.

So the farmer said, "I am going to quit the one-crop business. I am going to produce my own corn and meat and other food and feed supplies and be prepared to hold or sell my cotton just as market conditions justify. Henceforth I am going to exercise my price-fixing power. Everybody who sells me anything fixes the price on what I have to buy"; and that is true. The manufacturer takes the farmer's cotton and makes it into cloth and he tells the merchant how much he is going to charge him for the finished product, and the merchant tells the farmer how much he must pay for the cotton cloth that he buys. Well, the bale of cotton is the farmer's finished product. Why should he not have the right to count the cost of production, and add to that figure a reasonable profit, and tell the buying world the price that he must have in order to derive a profit on the fruits of his toil? [Applause.]

That, gentlemen of the House, is all that the farmers of the South have been trying to do. I talked to a man here yesterday who said to me, "If cotton goes to 35 cents, I will just about come out even on my cotton." Even 35 cents will not yield a satisfactory profit on the cotton produced in 1918. Why, our friends in other sections hear about cotton selling for 32 cents, the price to-day. That does not mean the whole crop. That simply means the top-notch price for the highest grade, and there are 10 grades, and the buyers make a difference in the grades of $5, $10, $15, $20, $30, and $40 a bale. This is unfair and I am going to give my attention to this evil.

I will tell you very frankly if we do not get above 32 cents on the average for the remainder of the 1918 crop, we are going to be seriously hurt. The governor of Kansas did not know the facts and he should have at least remained silent. We announced to the world that it was necessary to reduce the cotton acreage this year because we were holding some of the last year's crop at the planting time. What would you think of a man who had produced 100 bales last year and was holding 50 bales at the planting time this year, putting in the same number of acres in the effort to produce another 100 bales of cotton, when he could not sell the 50 on hand for a profitable price? [Applause.]

Everybody except Gov. Allen would very properly regard him as an ignoramus. What was the cotton producer to do when the price was unprofitable but hold his cotton and refuse to sell? And when holding at the planting time, the sensible thing to do was to reduce his cotton acreage, and he did. The holding of cotton and the reduction of cotton acreage have at last broken the power of the unholy alliance between certain cotton merchants, speculators, and spinners who were trying to beat down the price and buy cheaply the remainder of the cotton crop of the United States. At last the law of supply and demand is having a chance to operate, and prices are more agreeable.

I am told that the spinners of Great Britain sold 800,000 bales short on the exchange in January and transferred it to February and then to March. Gentlemen, that was unfair. It was robbery. They did not have a pound of cotton, and yet that so-called cotton hung over the head of the southern farmer like the sword of Damocles. What was the cotton producer to do? Was he to cowardly submit in silence to those who had planned to rob him of the fruits of his labor? No, no, gentlemen. It was his duty to fight, and he fought. In every speech that I made in the cotton belt I called upon the farmers, merchants, and bankers to hold the line as their boys held it on the battle front in France. [Applause.] And they held the line against the largest combination of bear speculators that ever operated in the cotton markets of the United States. The speculators were trying to make a "killing" in profits, while the producer was battling for a fair price, a profitable price.

Gov. Allen did not stop with his bitter and discourteous note to the cotton growers of the United States. He called upon the Attorney General here in Washington to prosecute the cotton producers for reducing their cotton acreage. He invoked the aid of the Federal Government in his effort to deprive the cotton producers of my country of the fair means that they had employed to obtain a price that would yield a profit on the cotton that they had and on the crop to be produced this year.

So far as I know, he is the only governor in the whole United States who took such an unfair stand. The wheat growers of Kansas and other States, by my vote and yours and other men here from the cotton-growing States, had guaranteed to them $2.26 a bushel, below which no exchange gambler could drive the price. That wall stood between the Kansas wheat grower and all losses. In November, after the war was over and the spring wheat had not been planted, we voted, as the President requested, to continue the guaranteed price. I have sometimes wondered if we had had a good price guaranteed on cotton whether after the war had ended in November and planting time for cotton had not arrived if some of our brethren in the other sections would have favored giving to the cotton grower a guaranteed price, after the war was over, on a crop not yet planted.

But I voted for the guaranteed wheat price. I do not believe that I have any prejudice against any section of my country. I do not believe that any man can point to a vote that I have ever cast that would indicate that I would vote for a thing for my own section that I would withhold from another section. I hope that I am big and broad enough and a good enough American to vote as an American should vote upon all these questions. [Applause.]

I think it was right and proper to provide this safeguard for the wheat grower. I am not complaining about that, but ill does it become the governor of Kansas to sit behind $2.26 wheat and say to the farmers of the cotton-growing States, with the price of their cotton going down, down, and down, with bankruptcy staring them in the face, that they are "trading on the misery of the world" when they are employing the only means at their command to prevent the sacrifice of their property and want and suffering in their families. [Applause.]

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ANTHONY. Does the gentleman know that when he voted to fix the price of wheat to the Kansas farmers he fixed it at a dollar below the market value?

Mr. HEFLIN. We only fixed a minimum price and left it open upward to the sky. A preponderance of the testimony before our committee was in favor of $1.50 a bushel as the minimum price.

Mr. Chairman, I recall a time when the Kansas farmers produced so much corn and the price was so unsatisfactory that in order to get rid of the corn on hand and not have it at the selling time of the next crop they burned it and filled gullies with it. What would the governor of Kansas have done if we had burned cotton instead of holding what we had and reducing cotton acreage this year? [Laughter.]

As I have said, we announced to the world that we would reduce our cotton acreage. "What are you doing?" some one asked. "We are reducing our cotton acreage" was the answer. "What for?" "Why, we have got some of our last year's crop," the farmer said, "and this is planting time." "Well, why not produce as much as you did last year?" "Why, the spinners of the United States said they were not going to use as much cotton this year as they did last year, and we can not get any cotton into Germany and Austria, although the grain and meat of western farmers are going to both Germany and Austria now. We do not know when the peace conference will adjourn, and we deem it wise to reduce our cotton acreage and do what we can to obtain a profit on the remainder of this crop and on the one to be made this year."

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Reverting to the price fixed on wheat, the gentleman will agree that the minimum price became the maximum price.

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not know about that.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, yes; the gentleman can not cite a single instance where wheat went above the minimum price.

Mr. HEFLIN. Well, I do remember that when the war was over the wheat growers were exceedingly anxious to have us continue the $2.26 price. I voted to leave it as it was. I am making no complaint about that, I will say to my good friend from Minnesota. I have been talking about the position of a governor of a Western State who did not understand the situation in the cotton-growing States, but who has misrepresented the attitude of the cotton growers of my section. The South was justified in the stand she took. She had to do as she did to prevent tremendous losses on both the crop of 1918 and the crop of 1919. The farmer holding 10 bales of cotton against a combination of spinners and speculators—a combination that was asking the Government to withdraw the financial aid properly and legitimately furnished by the Federal reserve banks—was forced to hold his cotton and reduce his acreage in order to save himself from heavy losses. [Ap-

plause.] The New York Commercial said that the speculators' purpose was to beat down the price so low that the local banks would call their loans and force the producer to sell his cotton.

Now, gentlemen, let me say in this connection that there is not enough cotton in the United States to supply the domestic and foreign demand.

But you ask, "Then why are you reducing your cotton acreage?" And we answer that the buyers and spinners would not pay the price that justified us in putting in the same acreage, and in the absence of such an inducement we decided to pursue the course that seemed to us best. They would not pay us the price warranted by the law of supply and demand, and we had to use every precaution to safeguard our interests.

The producer can not be expected to deliberately plan to produce more than the consuming public demands, and in the absence of a guaranteed price he must use his own judgment as to how much he will try to produce of this product or that. If the buying public finds that he is arranging to cut down his acreage and curtail production, then it should offer him such prices as will make it profitable to increase production. Some gentlemen here ask why we did not fix the price on cotton? I will tell you. Because we knew that the price fixed by Congress would not be a price that would give us a profit. I talked to a number of friends upon that side, and northern Democrats as well. I told all of them that the average price would have to be above 30 cents, and they all hooted at the idea. I never talked to a man outside of the cotton States who favored a price above 20 cents a pound. One Member introduced a bill putting the price at 15 cents, and he was a Democrat. A Republican had introduced a bill fixing it at 20 cents, and the plan was, it was said, to compromise between these two gentlemen who came from States that did not produce a single pound of cotton, and give us 17½ cents and not over 20 cents a pound. I said, "Father, deliver us from these two friends of ours." [Laughter.]

Seventeen and a half cents! Let me say to gentlemen here to-day that if the price had been fixed at even 25 cents the cotton growers would have been bankrupt. I know that some of you did not understand the situation, and that was what we were afraid of in the matter of fixing a price.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER. I am very much interested in what the gentleman has said. I would like to inquire what it costs the farmer in the South to produce cotton.

Mr. HEFLIN. I wrote to many producers and to officials in various cotton-producing States, and I asked them to have the producers write me regarding the cost of production. Every letter I received stated that it cost from 24 to 28 cents a pound to produce the 1918 cotton crop. Let me give you a few of the things used by the cotton farmer—things that enter into the cost of cotton production.

Comparison of prices of farming supplies.

Articles.	Prices previous to war.	Prices last year and now.
Heel bolts	6 for 25 cents	20 cents each.
Clevis	do	Do.
Singletrees	20 to 25 cents each	60 to 65 cents each.
Lines	10 to 15 cents per pair	60 to 65 cents per pair.
Traces	40 to 60 cents per pair	$1.25 to $1.50 per pair.
Back bands	25 to 40 cents each	85 cents to $1.25 each.
Collar pads	20 to 25 cents each	60 to 75 cents each.
Cotton collars	60 to 75 cents each	$1.25 to $1.75 each.
Hames	50 to 75 cents each	Do.
Bridles	75 cents to $1.25 each	$2 to $4 each.
Leather collars	$1.50 to $2 each	$5 to $7.50 each.
Plow handles	20 to 25 cents each	60 to 75 cents each.
Plow stock	90 cents to $1 each	$2.50 each.
Turn plows	$7 to $8 each	$12.50 to $16 each.
Plow blades	3 cents per pound	10 cents per pound.
Mule and horse shoes	3¾ to 4 cents per pound	7½ to 8½ cents per pound.
Common wire nails	2½ cents per pound	5 to 6 cents per pound.
Buggy harness	$9 to $15 per set	$25 to $40 per set.
Buggies	$60 to $80 each	$125 to $165 each.
Wagons, 2-horse	$55 to $60 each	$125 to $140 each.
Common cotton planter	$3 each	$7 to $7.50 each.
Common cultivator	$4 each	$7 to $9.50 each.
Scovil hoes	30 to 35 cents each	85 cents to $1 each.
Common Guano horns	10 to 12½ cents each	35 cents each.

The cost of labor, live stock, fertilizers, agricultural implements, food, and feed made the 1918 cotton crop the costliest cotton crop that we ever produced. We had to hold cotton or lose the whole year's investment and labor.

I passed a farmer's dwelling in my home county last Christmas. I saw three fine hogs dressed and ready for the smokehouse. I saw 10 or 12 half-grown hogs rooting around in a potato patch, and I saw 8 or 10 stacks of hay back of the horse lot. This farmer's barn was full of fodder and his crib was full of corn, and he had 10 bales of cotton under a shelter. That was one of the most beautiful pictures that I have ever seen in the cotton-growing States, a picture full of meaning. I said to the gentleman with me, "Those three hogs dressed and hanging up there, those hogs rooting around in the potato patch, those stacks of hay, and the fodder in the barn and the corn in the crib are all helping the farmer to keep his cotton off the market until the price will yield a profit."

On account of the high cost of cotton production in 1918 and the unprofitable price obtaining at the planting time this year, our farmers decided that they would produce more corn and peas and peanuts than they produced last year, so they reduced their cotton acreage. They are also raising more cattle and hogs than ever before.

The fact is the most prosperous farmers in the South to-day are those who are practicing diversified farming and who are raising cattle and hogs. Farmers in my district and in other districts in Alabama have shipped in the last few months several carloads of hogs and cattle from their farms. This is true on a larger scale in many of the other Southern States. There are more hogs and cattle in the South to-day than ever before. The one-crop idea is gone. The South has not only become the land of diversified farming, but it is fast becoming a great cattle-producing country. The McQueen-Smith farm in Autauga County, in my district, shipped out 15 carloads of cattle about six weeks ago. Six or seven years ago that county was given over entirely to the production of cotton.

Gentlemen, we are through with the one-crop idea in the South; and if it takes the reduction of cotton acreage to insure the producer a profit on the cotton already made, we reserve the right from time to time to reduce the acreage, and this will in all probability be done by our farmers without even consulting Gov. Allen. What did the Government guarantee the wheat price for? So that wheat production would be profitable and thus make sure that we would have the vast quantity of wheat necessary for our people and for war purposes. What did Gifford Pinchot say was necessary to make a big wheat crop? To guarantee a good price to the producer.

We did not expect the producer of wheat to send his boy abroad to fight and to die and then impoverish himself and family here at home. We expected him to have a profit on his produce. Some of these pompous profiteers who made their millions out of war munitions have dared to criticize the cotton producers of the United States for asking for a profitable price for their cotton. The cotton producer is entitled to a living profit just as much as the wheat producer or the corn grower is. I am in full sympathy with the grain farmers of the West. They are going to have the same trouble with grain exchanges when the guaranteed wheat price is gone that we have had with the cotton exchanges. I commenced the fight here last December to cut down the 21 grades of cotton then tenderable on the exchanges, and Senator SMITH of South Carolina began the fight in the Senate. We succeeded in cutting down the "robber list" to 10 grades. I stand ready to help the grain growers of the West to secure a fair deal on the grain exchanges of the United States. [Applause.] You can count on every vote from the cotton-growing States to help you to cut down technical grades hatched out by grain speculators, so that the true relation between futures and spot prices will be maintained.

That was the trouble with cotton. The exchange price of cotton was driven down $30 a bale below the spot price in the open markets of the country. And I repeat, gentlemen, that if the producer had not kept his cotton off the market during those times, his losses would have been tremendous. Distress and financial embarrassment would have come to the farmers of the cotton-growing States. Congress cut the cotton grades from 21 to 10. These are more grades than the average crop requires, but it is much harder for crooks to manipulate 10 grades than it was to manipulate 21 grades of stuff from dog-tail cotton to middling fair, and spot prices and future prices have come nearer together, and we are getting a fairer deal now than we did under the old system.

All that we ask is a fair price and a fair profit. All honest men will admit that we are entitled to that. Cotton is one of the most serviceable crops in the world. Do you know what they are doing with it? They are making suitcases out of it which are just as serviceable as leather. They are making shoes out of it, hats, and all kinds of wearing apparel; they are making sole leather out of it to be worn about the house. They are making out of cotton a substitute for leather to cover buggies and automobiles. They are using it for auto tops and tires.

It floats in the flag of our country, and it goes into the uniforms of our soldiers. It is the powder behind the bullet and the greatest explosive power in the world. [Applause.]

It is a substitute for silk, linen, and wool, but none of these can take the place of cotton. No wonder the price is higher than it used to be, for it is being put to uses now that we never dreamed of in the old days. Let me call to your attention a statement that I made here in February to show you the value of the finished product made from cotton. In 1912 Great Britain paid $401,000,000 for her supply of raw cotton. She made up that cotton into cloth, supplied all the United Kingdom, and sold the surplus outside for $611,000,000, $210,000,000 more than the raw material cost at the outset. That gives you an idea of about what the value of the finished product is. In 1918 Great Britain paid around 50 cents a pound for her cotton, and the official report shows that she declared the biggest dividend in the history of the cotton-spinning industry of Great Britain. Now, gentlemen, surely the cotton producer of the United States is entitled to a fair deal and a living profit. [Applause.]

Mr. UPSHAW. Good!

Mr. HEFLIN. The New York Commercial had an editorial some weeks ago saying that a certain cotton man had said that if the producer should get the price warranted by the price of cotton goods he would be receiving from 70 to 80 cents a pound for cotton, and that is true. Let no one condemn the great army of cotton producers of the United States for insisting upon a profitable price for their cotton, and let no man who comes from a section where, in order to protect the farmer from losses on his incoming corn crop, it was found necessary to burn the corn on hand, damn the cotton producer for cutting down his cotton acreage in order to save himself from heavy losses on his cotton. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. HEFLIN. The people of the cotton-growing States have done their part nobly and well in the great war just ended.

They have responded with enthusiasm to every call of the country. Our boys have fought by your boys, and the sections have been drawn closer and closer together by their comradeship in arms. Go ask the soldiers of Iowa and New York about the courage and valor of the Alabama boys. Fighting side by side, and fighting to the death, these men became affectionately fond of each other. They are bound together by the ties of mutual respect, love, and comradeship that no power on this earth can ever break. [Applause.] We are proud of the part that our boys have played in the service of our country. Gen. Crowder, writing to me in October last, said:

> You will note that the 12 Southern States listed in column 1 have furnished a higher percentage of strength in class 1 men and have therefore contributed in heavier proportion to total population than the 12 Northern States in column 2 and 12 Western States in column 3 and 12 Middle Western States in column 4.

When the integrity and sovereignty represented by Old Glory was challenged, and the civilization of the world was at stake, and Germany was holding the Old World at bay, the descendants of the men who followed Stonewall Jackson and Robert Lee took their places with the sons of the men who followed Grant and the brave commanders under him, and, side by side, defended the Nation on the far-flung battle lines of France. [Applause.] They fought together and saved the day together. I do not hesitate to say here and elsewhere that we struck the decisive blow; we ended the war in victory. All praise to our brave Allies. But for us the war would not have been won. I repeat, America, this young giant of the West, struck the decisive blow. It was her genius that timed that blow, her leadership that directed it, and her brave sons who drove back the murderous Hun, and when the war ended they were marching toward Berlin through the gates of Sedan. [Applause.] That is where they were going. [Applause.]

Americans all, let us now at the end of this great war, as the curtain goes down on the bloodiest conflict in human history—let us, I say, joint guardians of American ideals and institutions, reconsecrate ourselves to the highest and best interests of our common country. [Applause.] Let us henceforth contribute to the strength and solidarity of the American people. Let us refuse to listen to any man who attempts to array one section of our country against another. [Applause.] Let us stand together, and facing the future with heads erect and light on all our faces lift our eyes toward the skyland and the stars and thank God that we are American citizens, with one heart, one hope, one country, and one flag. [Loud applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much I am not in voice or in condition to speak at this time. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] has called to mind a subject that I would be glad to discuss at some length, and perhaps may at some future time. The reference which he made to the services of the Iowa troops and Alabama troops will well be understood by all who have lived in my district. The One hundred and sixty-eighth Iowa, which was recruited in my district, knows well the Alabama regiment which fought along with it. The Alabama regiment almost invariably was upon the right of the Iowa regiment. Side by side they endured the cold and wet of the trenches; side by side they slept under the cold rains of France with nothing to protect them but the skies; side by side they charged upon the German machine guns; side by side they brought back prisoners and artillery; side by side they struggled from almost the beginning of the contest on the part of the American troops until a glorious triumph crowned the American arms. [Applause.] Iowa is proud of the Alabama regiment. A friendship and a comradeship grew up between them which will never be forgotten.

Both respected each other. Each was ready to share, whenever occasion made necessary, their somewhat scanty rations. For this reunion on the fields of France, when the men of the North and the men of the South were ready and anxious to meet the common foe on the field of battle and crush the most arrogant military autocracy that ever attempted to dominate this earth, let us all be thankful, and let us hope that it will tend to produce a feeling of common unity, common patriotism, and a common love of this flag here, and a common love of our common country. [Applause.]

But all this, after all, has little to do with the main question which is discussed by the gentleman from Alabama. I do not know what remedy he proposes for the cotton situation, because I did not understand him to offer any. I do not know whether he expected that we would put a price on cotton now above that which it has maintained in the market or not.

I do remember quite well when the subject was before this House at a previous time he was not in favor of fixing the price on cotton, but, on the contrary, stood ready to resist any attempt of that kind. And if the gentleman means to intimate there was any unfairness here on the part of this House in putting the price upon wheat while none was put upon cotton, let me call his attention and that of Members now sitting here who were not present at the time it was done to the exact situation.

It is true there was a minimum price fixed upon wheat, and a minimum price only, but the real intention was, as everyone understood, to make that minimum price the maximum price, and it was, in fact, made the maximum price. We created a Federal board, which was the only purchaser of wheat. It paid nothing except the minimum price, and not one cent above that. Nobody else could buy wheat if they desired. Hence, a minimum price became the maximum price, and if the price of wheat had not been fixed it would have gone to at least $5 a bushel, in the opinion of all persons who are competent to judge with reference to the matter. Now, I do not say this simply because I voted to fix the price upon wheat, for the people of my district are not interested particularly in wheat, as it is not their main crop, and they have never cared whether any price was fixed on wheat or not. So I believe I can view the matter with an entirely unprejudiced mind. We fixed the price on wheat with the intention that an exorbitant and unreasonable price should not be demanded by the profiteers, or even by the farmer himself, for it greatly restricted the opportunity of the farmer. And then all the farmer asked in the end, when we passed our last bill, was, that having promised him this price and induced him to prepare his ground and make ready for his crop, to proceed with his operations; and, having done all this, the Government should not take away the price it had guaranteed him under those circumstances. For that reason we maintained the price as it is now. And yet under the circumstances, considering the foreign demand, it is not likely, as it would seem at the present time, that the price is anything more than the natural one which would have resulted in any event.

Now, so far as cotton is concerned, it is true that it enters into a great variety of articles, and I understood the gentleman from Alabama mentioned the fact that it went into the soldier's uniform. Well, I am very sorry it did, under this administration. Too much of it, indeed, went into the soldier's uniform. And the gentleman referred also to the time we burned corn in the Western States. I think he said some-

thing about burning wheat, but I do not think we got as far as that.

But this burning of corn, the gentleman will remember, was at a time when another Democratic administration was controlling the destinies of this country. And that is the only time I ever knew that any corn was burned in this country. I do not think there is any danger we will ever get so far as to burn cotton, although, if the gentleman's constituency is suffering, they are suffering not through any fault or direction of the Members upon this side, to whom he seemed to direct his remarks, but solely because the administration is not doing its duty. If there has been some conspiracy in New York or elsewhere to beat down the price of cotton, the Department of Justice ought to take hold of the matter. The administration ought to handle those who are guilty of such conduct. But for some reason, as we all well know, there has been no particular disturbance either of those who attempted to force up prices during this administration or those who attempted to lower them. And there we stand. So I hope, if the gentleman has any complaint to make about the situation, with reference to cotton, he will present it down at the White House when the party who usually resides there gets back home, instead of presenting it to the Members upon this side. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I want to sound a friendly note of warning to Republicans and Democrats alike, and particularly to the gentlemen in charge of appropriation bills.

Yesterday the House passed the Indian appropriation bill, which, instead of being reduced in the aggregate from what it had been as reported at the preceding Congress, carried $600,000 more than when it passed the House in the first instance. That was not economy.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have but five minutes, but I will yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Just a question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not that properly illustrate Republican retrenchment?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thought the gentleman's question would be political, but what I have to say will be of as much interest to him as it will be to the Republicans. Most of the waste and extravagance about which we are complaining came from the Democratic Party while it was in power here, and I had hoped the Republican Party would correct the waste and extravagance.

I rose, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of calling the attention of my Democratic friends, as well as my Republican friends, to the fact that the Indian appropriation bill, which passed the last Congress and failed in the Senate, carried $600,000 more yesterday than it did when it passed the last time. That was not economy, and I care not whether it comes from a Republican committee or a Democratic committee.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield just for one word?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. It is true that it did carry more, but it was largely due to the fact that all of the items that are covered by the Indian Bureau were in the bill, including the distribution of tribal funds to the Indians, which was more than the whole $600,000 increase, and did not include economic management of the department.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If it referred to other than Government funds, the criticism may not apply particularly, but I assume that the bill as it passed the House yesterday was substantially the same bill, except in the aggregate $600,000 more was provided for in the bill than was the case previously.

Mr. SNYDER. If the gentleman will examine the RECORD of January 23, he will see that in the item covered by that bill economies were practiced and items cut down and not increased.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The Indian appropriation bill is a bill which sometimes may be looked upon with suspicion, because, after all, it is a special-interest bill, a bill pertaining to certain sections of the country, a bill which relates to a certain class of people, and it has very warm friends on the floor of the House who will do everything on earth to obtain the appropriations that they desire in that bill. Hence, taking it for example, I would like to say to any committee or any member of a committee, whether on the Republican side or on the Democratic side, that we are now facing the largest expenditures the Government has ever incurred, and it is time to retrench, no matter what bill we begin with. It so happened that the Indian appropriation bill, which we passed yesterday, was the first one we tackled.

I am glad the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] made the statement he did, because I know he is going to do his work conscientiously. But I beg all members of appropriating committees on both sides of the House to cut and cut and cut wherever they can hereafter, whether on the Indian appropriation bill or any other appropriation bill. [Applause.] It will be absolutely necessary to do that, or the people of this country will be steeped in such taxation as they will never be able to meet.

To-day we have the Agricultural appropriation bill, and it is much worse than the Indian appropriation bill. I assume it comes forward due to the desire to hasten the passage of these appropriation bills in order that we will not have to pass extending resolutions before the 1st of July. I also assume that it is due in large degree to the absence from the country of the President of the United States and the necessity for obtaining his signature that we will pass these bills without the ordinary scrutiny. We certainly did that in the House on the Indian appropriation bill. But here comes the Agricultural appropriation bill. I want to say to the newcomers in this House that the Agricultural bill is one of the greatest offenders that comes upon us. Much has been said about river and harbor bills being extravagant, but if you go into the details of the Agricultural appropriation bill you will find that the practical farmers of this country, instead of getting any marked benefit from this bill, are simply contributing, through the taxes they pay, to the employment of thousands and thousands of so-called experts who go around the country and tell the farmer how to farm.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Has the gentleman analyzed the present bill sufficiently to separate the items for the pay of experts, to which he refers, from other items which might directly affect the welfare of the farmers; that is, the proportionate parts of the two types of expenditures as covered in the present bill?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have made no careful analysis of the different classes of items in the bill, but——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] has made a very careful analysis. But I will say that the information I have is that the Department of Agriculture, which is a comparatively new department, having started bureau after bureau with a small appropriation, and having built up those bureaus by increased appropriations which it has demanded from Congress year after year, has finally gotten to the position where, instead of spending $31,000,000, as this bill proposes to appropriate for the benefit of the farmer, it spends that $31,000,000 to employ more than 18,000 men and women to go about the country and educate the farmer in his work. Gentlemen may say no as to that, because very many gentlemen have heretofore been interested in obtaining employment for constituents in that department and its many bureaus and employment for gentlemen residing in their own vicinity.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Do those 18,000 employees referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania include those who were put on the roll about the beginning of the war as a war measure, calling for the employment of 10,000 or 12,000 employees?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think that is true as to many of them, that they were put on about the time the war broke out, and all of them have served here in the United States, because we were told that the most patriotic work they could do during the war was to remain in the field here, telling farmers how to do their work, so that the soldiers on the other side would get their necessary food. We kept them here until the streets of Washington were so congested as to be almost impassible; there were so many clerks employed during the war.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Is it not true that when these employees were placed there they were so placed merely as a war measure, and that the Congress and the country were left under the impression that their services would be dispensed with as soon as the war was over?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That was our understanding, that every department here was stocked up during the war, with

the expectation that the moment the war was over these men and women would return to their former occupations and that Washington would be free from the overplus which for two years has been engaged in the happy pastime of walking our streets and crowding our boarding houses until the end of the month, when the warrant comes around.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Has the gentleman from Pennsylvania any information as to whether or not the eight or nine thousand special employees known as "war employees" are carried in the present bill?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think they are carried in this bill, but I would prefer to have the chairman of the committee answer that question.

Mr. HAUGEN. When the gentleman from Pennsylvania finishes I will make a statement.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Iowa has always been very fair about statements. My statement is accurate, however, that the number of employees in the Department of Agriculture to-day is more than 18,000. Is not that correct? Here is the chairman of the committee. Let us have a statement from him.

Mr. HAUGEN. The amount carried by the regular appropriation for the current year is $27,875,353. The emergency bill, or the so-called food-production bill, carried $11,031,863. The bill introduced and under consideration at the present time is identical with the bill introduced by the committee and presented to the House at the last session of Congress. The bill now under consideration carries $31,691,562, which is an apparent increase of $3,816,209, but as $2,107,880 represents a transfer from the food-production act there is an actual increase of $1,708,329 over the regular appropriation made. In other words, we have taken over $2,107,880 of the war work that was carried on under the food-production act.

The committee have reported the bill exactly as it was reported by the Committee on Agriculture in the last Congress.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There were no new hearings?

Mr. HAUGEN. No; and there is nothing new in the bill, but the committee have authorized the chairman to offer amendments aggregating $961,780.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Increase?

Mr. HAUGEN. Increase, the principal item being $500,000 for the campaign for the eradication of tuberculosis, $250,000 to combat the corn borer, which is manifesting itself in New York and Massachusetts and other sections.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I have 10 minutes?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa yields to the gentleman from Pennsylvania 10 minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I know the gentleman wants to help us in this matter.

Mr. HAUGEN. I desire to say that I am heartily in accord with the sentiment expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania as to the necessity for economy, and that every effort should be made to reduce appropriations wherever it is possible. But the situation was this: The committee held hearings last winter. Consideration was given to those hearings, and in view of the fact that we should pass the appropriation bill so that the money may be available for the department it was thought best not to open any further hearings, but to rely upon the judgment of the committee of the former Congress.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is the Food Administration still in existence?

Mr. HAUGEN. I presume certain branches of it are.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That part of it which keeps the signs up in all the prominent hotels, advising that they observe Mr. Hoover's regulations, has not been dispensed with, because the hotels charge the same high prices as if Mr. Hoover were here. But may I ask whether the employees covered by the appropriation made to the Food Administration were carried over to the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. HAUGEN. I think not. Certain functions have been transferred to the Department of Agriculture, and an appropriation of $35,000 has been estimated and agreed to by the committee to take care of the work of the wool division of the War Industries Board.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Certain work of the Food Administration has been taken over by the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. HAUGEN. That has been suggested.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And to that extent appropriations for the Food Administration are now unnecessary?

Mr. HAUGEN. For that particular work.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But the Department of Agriculture will continue the work?

Mr. HAUGEN. It will, if the House so authorizes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask again whether or not the Food Administration employees have been carried over into the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. HAUGEN. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Now, gentlemen, the net result is that this agricultural bill is brought in by the committee in good faith on the strength of the hearings had in the last Congress, without any additional hearings, because the committee feels the necessity of passing this bill immediately and getting it over to the Senate, in order that these appropriations may be available for next year and that no extension resolution may be necessary. To that extent, in the matter of haste, the committee perhaps is to be commended; but my point is this, that unless our committees begin to go into details with regard to these expenditures, we are going to run up against troublous times in the Republican Party, as the Democrats ran up against troublous times up to the time they let go their power. [Applause.] That side of the House has dumped upon this side of the House the greatest responsibility that one party could have laid upon another. I am not raising this question for political reasons, but the fact is, gentlemen, that we passed a revenue bill here that was presumed to provide $6,000,000,000 for this current year ending June 30 next, and that bill was jiggered—if anybody knows what that term means, he will understand what I mean—that bill was so manipulated on the other side of the Capitol that it provided for only $4,000,000,000 for the next fiscal year. Yet the ranking Democratic member of the Ways and Means Committee this morning made the statement that our expenses next year, as shown by the present appropriations, would run up to over $7,000,000,000 in round figures. I have just called upon the Appropriations Committee and find that, according to the estimates already in, our appropriations next year are going to run between $9,000,000,000 and $10,000,000,000. Now, you have got a revenue bill that will provide $4,000,000,000, or $6,000,000,000 short. You had great difficulty in selling your $4,500,000,000 of Victory loan to people supposed to be intensely patriotic.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; I yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. The Secretary of the Treasury assured the country that this fifth Liberty loan was the last Liberty loan.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. He made that statement.

Mr. FESS. I have been looking over the authorizations already made——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But I will say to the gentleman that statement was made by the new Secretary of the Treasury, who perhaps was a little more careful in his statement than was his predecessor, who helped unload one loan after another upon the people of the United States to such an extent that some of us doubted when we would ever be able to meet the obligations that were being incurred.

Mr. FESS. If the gentleman will permit, that is precisely the reason of my question—how are we going to get the money to pay this accumulated debt?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The present Secretary of the Treasury has wonderful faith in the Federal Reserve System of the United States, and it may be——

Mr. FESS. Is it to be done by the printing press?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have indicated the difference between the $4,000,000,000 of revenue, as estimated, and the $10,000,000,000 of prospective expenditures, which will be $6,000,000,000. If the Secretary calls for no more public-loan subscriptions, probably it will be necessary to issue more notes, which the bankers of the country who hold the people's money will have to make good, or the taxes will have to be increased.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman suggests that the Government had great difficulty in putting over the fifth Victory loan among the people "supposed" to be patriotic. I would like to call attention to the fact that the people whom he "supposes" to be patriotic were patriotic enough to oversubscribe the loan nearly a billion dollars. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That did not come from all sections of the country. There were two districts that did not make up their quota, but I will not call attention to those two districts. I will say this as to patriotism, since the gentleman has raised the question: I think the boy that volunteered for the

service, or accepted the draft in good faith, donned his uniform, and went to the other side of the water at $30 a month was a patriot.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no difference between the gentleman and me on that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But when it comes to the man that went into the Agricultural Department, or any other department, at a good salary and helped there while war was going on, there is a slight difference. When it comes to the man who buys a Victory bond or a Liberty bond, setting up his patriotism against that of the soldier, I am a little skeptical. He has simply made the best investment on earth, I do not care from what section of the country he comes. [Applause.] He was not baring his breast to the enemy; he was doing a safe and shrewd business. There was no special patriotism in that; it was sound business. If the gentleman's State was so prosperous, if the gentleman's State raised certain commodities that went abroad in large quantities so that they could buy Liberty bonds and lay them away in a safe when other men were laying down their lives, it was fortunate, that is all.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not rise to interrogate the gentleman in order to compare the patriotism of those who bought bonds and those who fought. I can assure the gentleman that the people of my State did their full share both of fighting and buying bonds.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I made the comparison because the gentleman was trying to put me in a hole on the subject of patriotism. The gentleman from Kentucky, brilliant as he is, must get up earlier in the morning than 6 o'clock to do that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say to the gentleman that I was not trying to put him in a hole. I was trying to help him out of one.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I regret that I can not let the gentleman inject any more eloquence into my speech.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have great respect for the gentleman's regrets, and therefore I will desist.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A Member, a new Member, by the way, called my attention to page 12 of this bill. I will not point out any particular bureau, but it was the Bureau of Animal Industry. That will show how this money is to be spent. Take lines 14, 15, and 16, page 12. Here are appropriations that run up to $495,000. There are a lot of things to be done, and then comes a blanket authority to an individual bureau chief to do as he pleases—to prepare and disseminate reports of animal industry. There is no limitation; he may send out reports until the wastebaskets are full, and the farmer back yonder pays the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield me five minutes more?

Mr. HAUGEN. I can not; the time is assigned.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield me three minutes?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will yield the gentleman three minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Look through the bill, and you will find ample evidence of what I have been trying to point out. I want to call attention of Republicans and Democrats alike to the fact that we can not possibly, by any rule of mathematics or otherwise, continue to increase appropriations the way we have been doing in these two bills and at the same time reduce taxes. It must be one thing or the other. I have come from a meeting this morning where we gave serious thought to the question of taxes. Almost everybody that is taxed wants to be relieved. We passed a bill through the Committee on Ways and Means, which will be reported shortly, providing that the luxury taxes, so called, shall come down. That is easy. People will applaud it. It relieves the people of a great deal of annoyance. They say the war is over and they ought not to be taxed, but the war has got to be paid for and taxes must continue. We will take $85,000,000 out of the Treasury by this repeal of the luxury tax. Some say it is annoying to be taxed on ice cream and soda, but you will reduce the taxes $21,000,000 if that comes down. Meanwhile we lose a billion dollars on spirituous liquors.

Some say that it is burdensome to pay the taxes on furs. If we cut that down and candies and several other articles, probably $100,000,000 additional will come off. Somebody says it is wrong to tax automobiles, automobile parts, and so forth. If that is so and we take that off, we lose several hundred million dollars more. Why, gentlemen, if we put on as a substitute the highest protective tariff that this side of the House can stand, we will not raise more than three or four hundred million dollars of revenue. So we can not expect the customs tax will pull the taxpayers out of this hole. Six billions of dollars will not be paid without direct taxation in some form. We must be cautious in passing appropriation bills and retrench wherever we can, since tremendous bills are to be met. We can not escape the great obligations levied upon this country by the administration conducting this war, in the name of war, and must be prepared to pay sooner or later. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to a paragraph in the Agricultural bill approved March 4, 1917. That was the last act passed, and it contains a paragraph as follows:

> To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make studies of cooperation among the farmers of the United States in matters of rural credits and of other forms of cooperation in rural communities, etc., $30,760.

The bill passed by the House February 1, 1918, changed that paragraph to read as follows:

> To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make studies of cooperation among farmers in the United States.

It will be observed that that bill omitted the words "in matters of rural credits and of other forms of cooperation in rural communities."

When that bill was up before the House at the last Congress I interrogated the then chairman of the committee as to why he omitted those words from the bill. I forget what explanation he made, but it was not satisfactory to me. I was in hopes that when the Republicans came in charge of the bill they would reinstate the old form and leave at least a small appropriation there whereby the Department of Agriculture might continue its investigations of rural credits. I do not want to criticize the Republican or Democratic members of the committee.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted, I would say that the Republican members of the committee believe in investigation, but they also believe in getting results from investigations. We do not desire to encourage investigations that yield no results. I do not believe the gentleman can point out any results of the investigations that have already been made, with all due respect to the gentlemen who have been carrying them on, and they are most excellent people. We have now the Farm Loan Banking System and various other organizations, whose functions it ought to be to make these investigations.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, the explanation of the chairman of the committee is not satisfactory to me, and certainly is not logical. He merely waves this aside by saying that the Agricultural Department was not getting results. I do not think that is fair. I hold here the last report of the Secretary of Agriculture in which he says that the question of rural credits has been investigated. Some of you gentlemen here are new, and I wish to remind you that in 1912 both political parties of this Nation adopted very strong resolutions in favor of giving the farmer as good a system of credits as commercial and manufacturing interests have. The Republicans especially had a very strong and positive declaration. Following that up under a Democratic Congress the Federal farm-loan act was passed, but I call attention to the fact that that provides only for what we call farm-mortgage loans—loans which must be secured by a mortgage on a farm. Everyone who has studied this question of rural credits, who has studied the splendid system they have in some of the European countries, knows that personal farm credit is fully as important, if not more so, to the farmer than farm-mortgage credit. So that the Democratic Congress proceeded only halfway or hardly halfway. I was surprised when this bill came up last session of Congress when I found that the committee had apparently abandoned the farmer in their effort to have a complete system of both farm mortgage and personal credit. If the Republicans keep faith with their platform declarations they will enact legislation on this subject at this session of Congress.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. For a question.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Is it not possible for personal credit to be secured in localities where banks are located, if the personal credit could be justified?

Mr. MORGAN. I will say to the gentleman that in most of the European countries they have a special system of personal farm credits for the farmer. Every man who has seriously studied that question knows that our banks that are known as commercial banks serve largely commerce and trade and manufacturing and do not serve agriculture, as they should. Everyone who has studied the question knows that if we wish to do something to make farming profitable, if we wish to do something that will aid in developing and expanding agricultural interests, we ought to comply with our platforms of 1912 and of 1916 and enact at this session of Congress a personal-credit bill. We should give the farmers a system of credit so that they can expand their business. I hope the Republicans, before we come to consider this bill, will take this matter seriously

under consideration and revive the question. If the Agricultural Department is not doing the work, let us do something to see to it that it does do it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Do I understand the gentleman to say that there are sections of the country where the farmer can not obtain credit on loans when he has due security to offer?

Mr. MORGAN. Here is the report of the Secretary of Agriculture. He reports that 60 per cent of the farmers of the United States are compelled to use credit from dealers; that is to say, they can not get money from the banks. The men who furnish supplies to them with which to produce their crops give them credit and charge them exorbitant rates of interest. There is no adequate facilities for personal credit for the farmers of this Nation. The banks in existence largely serve commerce and not the farmer.

Mr. WALSH. What does the gentleman propose as a remedy? He does not propose to extend credit unless a man has security?

Mr. MORGAN. Oh, no. I do not want to give the farmer one penny. I want to give them facilities, organizations, corporations, so that they will have access to the great credit resources of the country. The Federal Reserve System is not doing justice to the farmers of the country. I hope that the Republicans especially will look into this matter. Let us see if we can not revive and restore this interest in agricultural credit in this country. Let the Agricultural Department be authorized to continue its investigation of rural credits, and let there be appropriations made therefor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

By unanimous consent, Mr. MORGAN was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS].

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Iowa for his courtesy in yielding me this time. I desire to make an announcement supplementing the announcement I made this morning in reference to the NC-4, now on her way from the Azores to Lisbon. I have just received a message from the Navy Department stating that—

> The NC-4 has passed station 9. Weather clearing and wind nearly west. Favorable flying conditions; should continue over Wednesday. Have nothing definite about speed, but think approximately 80 miles.

We have those stations about every 50 miles from the Azores to Lisbon, and unless something unforeseen occurs NC-4 will be in Lisbon some time between 5 and 6 o'clock this afternoon. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD].

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, my attention was called this morning very sharply to the address delivered here in regard to the condition of the South. I enjoyed very much the preface to that discussion, and I am in hearty accord with it. I think the day has come when men on both sides of this Chamber will not only be willing to think in terms of nationality but be anxious to perform in harmony with their thinking. The agricultural problems of the country are to be among the most important problems that shall attract our attention in the next few years. I wondered as I listened to that speech whether there was any other section of the country that for 50 years had apparently been static. I understand there is a new South, that wonderful transitions have been made, and yet there has been developed but very little of diversified industry. Still, cotton is king; still, it required an exigency of a great and overwhelming, a too tragic experience of the world, to startle the people of the South into diversified farming. It would seem that only a combination which beats down the price of cotton is the occasion for continuing diversified industry in that section of our country. When I think of the agricultural regions of the Middle West of this country, I think of the farming, of the manufacturing towns, of the various productions where not all the interest of any considerable area is limited to the production of a single crop. With others of this House, my own heart goes out to the Southland.

I understand the trouble that came through the period of reconstruction. I have read how a great and intelligent people were temporarily subordinate to the control of an ignorant and irresponsible people, and into my own mind and heart there was born a respect and love and confidence and hope that somehow, some way, the South would see that its static condition along the lines of industry ought not continuously to obtain. They have been static politically, and their static condition politically has grown out of a static condition socially, and the two combined has made their economic condition a static condition. Is there no hope that a great country, magnificent in resources, wonderful in its possibilities, shall not rise and vie in strength and richness with equal areas in the North? Let me say, incidentally, men, that my own thought is not in harmony with the flippant, often unkind, and, I think, sometimes despicable, comparison invidiously with what the South was able to do in its contribution to the war, for somehow, rising above such feeling as may be born of partisanship and of sectionalism, I think the time has come when men should begin to think in terms of the whole country, and only as a whole country. [Applause.] Yet I recognize that the static condition is due to a political philosophy and social condition that can only be shaken when men who have been able to take the initiative all over this country will see that not for all time shall the South be denominated as solid. I am not speaking now in any political sense, except to analyze the situation. It may be that it will never be possible to build a Republican organization in the Southern States, and so free them from the iniquitous practices that are growing up among themselves, and that in the heat and danger of political fights among themselves will have the effect ultimately of lowering that standard which I have always been led to believe obtained among Southern gentlemen. Men have said to me, "We could not submit absolutely to the domination of the Negro, with his ignorance," and few men understanding the historic past but would be willing to admit it, but, in turn, I said to a friend of mine, "the time must come when a great body of the people of this country, realizing that only a fair share of power should go with the votes cast, may have to free the South by limiting its representation to the votes cast." And when that time shall come the South will be free, and not static, politically. When that time comes the South will not have as a reflection that there had never been any change in more than 50 years. There is not a section of the great North anywhere but that inroads have been made by the Democratic Party. That party can always have a hearing in every Northern State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. May I have two minutes more?

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. But there is one section in which a single party has been solid for 50 years. It may be that if the question of representation should be properly put, and the South should be free, political propaganda, which involves the interest of the whole country, will find as respectful a hearing in the South as anywhere else in this country.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to my colleague [Mr. STEVENSON].

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I was very much impressed with some of the statements just made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD]. He deplores the static condition of the South politically and from a business standpoint. That static condition possibly does not appeal to him, but certainly from a political standpoint and from a patriotic standpoint it ought to appeal to people who are loyal to the institutions of this country and who are loyal to the people who carry the enforcement of the law as their responsibility.

When has there ever appeared a headline in a newspaper showing the mailing out to those charged with the maintenance of the dignity of the law bombs designed to destroy human life and destroy the ability of humanity to care for itself as emanating from many Southern States? And yet within the last few weeks, within the confines of the great metropolis of this country, whose static condition, I have no doubt, appeals to the gentleman from Indiana, we have seen bombs mailed to law-abiding people in every section of this country, including a distinguished Member of this House who faithfully discharged his duties here and who was mailed a bomb because, forsooth, he was attempting to prevent the destruction of the pure and static condition of our race in this country by the prevention of undesirable immigrants being brought in here.

Now, the gentleman made another statement, and in this he is entirely inaccurate. He stated that the South was turned over to the dominance of an irresponsible and ignorant constituency in the days of reconstruction. He has misread his history again. It was turned over to the dominance of the irresponsible and conscienceless carpetbaggers who came from those States where conditions are not so static to-day and who dominated the colored man and used him as a tool with which to oppress and rob those people who had any stake in this Government. It was not the ignorant colored man. It was the depraved and debased

carpetbagger who made the South sweat blood for her stand in that war of the sixties. One of them, elected from my State and the district which I represent upon the floor of this House, acknowledged that he sold a cadetship at Annapolis for $2,000 and one at West Point for $2,500, and he was promptly expelled by this House, only to be reelected by the same constituency who had elected him before, and he was sent back here to have the door shut in his face.

Those were the people. Do not lay the misfortunes of the South upon the poor colored man, who has made a good citizen since he and we have shaken off the shackles of those people from our hands. And we thank God that to-day we are one with the people of the North. When Congress issued medals the other day for the men who had distinguished themselves on the fields of France, the State of South Carolina, out of a total of 43 medals issued, received 7, and thereby demonstrated that the condition of the people of the South is still maintained in its gallantry and its chivalry, and that it maintains itself under the flag of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has 27 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVER. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER]. [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, it is not my purpose to detain you a great length of time, for the reason that we are anxious to secure the passage of this bill at the earliest moment. Therefore I may not occupy the full time which has been so generously accorded to me by my distinguished colleague and friend from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

I desire to call attention in the outset to the fact that this bill as presented to the House at the present time is the bill which was presented to the former session of Congress and which received at that time the unanimous indorsement of Democrats and Republicans on the Agricultural Committee. It has received this time the unanimous indorsement of the members of the committee, both Democrats and Republicans, and, therefore, so far as we are concerned, this bill is presented to you with our unanimous request that it receive your prompt consideration and be passed at the earliest possible moment.

I am glad to say that this is the usual condition which exists in the Agricultural Committee, of course the greatest committee in the House of Representatives, because more Members want to be assigned to it than any other committee. We have no politics in it, and hence we are enabled to get together and present to the House a bill which has heretofore received practically the unanimous support of all the members of the committee and the Members on the floor of the House regardless of the center aisle which divides the political parties. I feel confident and sure that this bill will receive the same generous treatment at your hands that former bills have received in other sessions of the Congress of the United States, both Democratic and Republican. I must confess I was somewhat surprised when I heard the discordant note of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], my good friend, and a farmer from the "city of Philadelphia," attack the bill as he did to-day. He does that periodically on the floor of this House, and attacks the extravagance contained in the agricultural bill, but we do not hear him so often attack the seeming, if not real, extravagance that occurs in other bills that come on this floor for the benefit of other sections of the country or are confined to some section of the country, and which does not reach all sections of the country, as does the agricultural bill. There is no sectionalism, no favoritism, no extravagance in this bill presented at this time. When you take the appropriations which are made for other activities of the Government of the United States and compare them with the appropriations made in the agricultural bill and for the Agricultural Department, you will find that the latter are absolutely infinitesimal in comparison with the others.

If there is to be any enlargement of appropriations anywhere, I say it should be for the purpose of the activities of the Agricultural Department, that go to benefit the farmers of the United States of America. The truth of it is that these other departments would disappear from the Government of the United States, this great Republic itself would crumble and go out of existence, if it were not for the activities of the farmers of the United States of America. [Applause.] They stand beneath the whole structure. Everything is on their backs, and they are long suffering and forbearing and will continue to be in the future, but I beg you not to put upon them additional burdens—"grievances to be borne." They deserve better at your hands. [Great applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER. I always yield with great pleasure to my friend, for I am personally very fond of him and he is a very useful Member of this House. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Did not my good friend say on one occasion that the universe would crumble and come to an end if we did not make an appropriation for the Tombigbee River?

Mr. CANDLER. Oh, no; I did not say that. I am liable to say anything and everything about the Tombigbee, and it all would be deserved, but it was not necessary to say it. The Tombigbee River, with its magic, necessity, and beauty, pervades this country and even foreign countries, and because of the merit of its necessary improvement in the interest of navigation it speaks for itself. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I was only bringing the gentleman back to his first love. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANDLER. I have never deserted my first love, nor my second—the improvement of the Tombigbee. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is a great believer in internal improvements. I invite him to a name of immortality in helping me to improve the Tombigbee. Will you join me? If you will I will give you first place on the scroll of fame. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has two excellent traits of character.

Mr. CANDLER. I am delighted to have the commendation of my good friend. I wish he were as generous to the farmers of this country as he is to me, and would quit criticizing this bill. [Laughter.]

My friend from South Carolina, Mr. STEVENSON, expressed surprise, and I was surprised at the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD]. We are always glad, under all circumstances, to have gentlemen discuss us from the South and our conditions if they have information and discuss us fairly. We have never apologized for our actions in reference to the conditions that exist among us, because we have always been true to the fundamental principles upon which this great Republic was established. Thomas Jefferson, of Virginia, wrote the Declaration of Independence, and James Madison, from the South, is the recognized father of the Constitution of the United States. We have stood upon the principles announced in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution from that time until now, and we propose to stand by them in the years to come. [Applause.] The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD] talked about the "static conditions" that exist among us. Those "static conditions" that he speaks of are for the glory of the Republic, and there is no section of this country that possesses more patriotism and desires more to build up this great Republic than the people of the South. [Applause.] The call has never gone forth for aid amid difficulties and trials and misfortunes when the people of the South have not at all times responded, and they will continue to respond in the years to come. [Applause.] It is true that we have had occasion sometimes to take care of our peculiar conditions in the interest of civilization, in the interest of humanity, and in the interest of this great Republic and the principles upon which it was founded, and in doing so we have stood by and demonstrated our patriotism and have never cast one single blot or blemish upon it from the time of the Declaration of Independence until now. [Applause.]

I will reflect upon the advice of the gentleman from Indiana, but while doing so I will further consider very much whether he has ever personally investigated the conditions existing in the South. To what extent has he witnessed them himself? How often has he come among us? We have never had anybody, no matter how radical they were, come among us, whether in high position or more humble situation, and associate with us who has not promptly come to look at things from our viewpoint and who has not stood by us in the difficulties by which we are surrounded; and if the gentleman from Indiana would come South and associate with us a little while and investigate personally the conditions that exist among us, I doubt—in fact, I feel sure—he would not express the views he has expressed to-day on the floor of this House. If he did, he would be expressing views contrary to those who have heretofore visited us and of those who have transplanted themselves among us and become our fellow citizens in the Southland. [Applause.]

I do not want to detain you, gentlemen, but let me say again that this bill is not justly subject to criticism, such as that made by my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD]. This bill presents

the consensus of opinion of the members of the Committee on Agriculture as we labored together for the development of all this country, without regard to sections, without regard to localities. We are all trying to help our great country, and we from the Southland upon this committee, as I am sure the chairman of the committee [Mr. HAUGEN] will testify, are just as active, just as energetic, and just as persistent in taking care of the interests of one section of the country as we are in taking care of the interests of other sections. We all join together and work together for the development of our country, for the glory of this great Republic, and for the prosperity and happiness of all of our people. [Applause.] What we desire to do is to bring about those conditions, by the appropriations we make here, which will promote common benefit wherever it may be, and what we desire, above everything else, is to bring about the greatest results for the prosperity and development of the whole country. [Applause.] Let us forget any one section of the country. Let us remember that we all stand together to-day as never a people stood before beneath this beautiful flag that is unfurled above our Speaker when he sits in the Speaker's chair, and let us remember that we represent not one section or one district, as it may be, but the whole Republic of the United States of America. [Applause.] Let us stand together, one and all, for the advancement of our country, its prosperity, its welfare, and the happiness of all the people dwelling beneath one flag unfurled over the greatest Republic ever known in the history of mankind. Let us stand for "an indissoluble Union of indestructible States," bearing allegiance to the Stars and Stripes, the emblem of liberty, our country's glory, in deed and in truth. We stand together to-day, the sons of this Republic all over this land without division, and although you gentlemen over there may have the majority this time, we shall stand with you whenever you stand for the advancement and the good of this Republic, the happiness of the people, and the glory of God who rules over us all. [Great applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I want to subscribe to the splendid sentiments just uttered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] and at the same time to invite the attention of this Congress to the fact that we in this country, where we are preaching the leadership of patriotism, do not give equal justice and equal rights to all the people of this country. We heard over in the Senate yesterday the distinguished Senator from Missouri speak in reference to the league of nations, when he called attention to the fact that if we adopt the league of nations, then we have within ourselves and as parts of the governing body of this league of nations countries whose people are in large part illiterate. I would like to invite the attention of this House to the fact that in this country, in the United States, here on the mainland, we have thousands and thousands of people who are illiterate, people who can not read or who can not write. We need in this country a practicing of the patriotic sentiments of the gentleman from Mississippi, whom I esteem so highly. In every State of this Union men should be protected in their rights of citizenship and in their right of free opportunity to live. We ought to wipe out in this country once and for all the horrible crime of lynching that prevails in some of the States of this Union. It is winked at by the authorities, and yet we say we are a great Nation, a Nation which protects all the people equally and fairly.

But I want to invite your attention for a moment to one supposed portion of this country of ours and to the need of education there. I am not speaking now of the mainland of the United States, but calling your attention to a portion of this country which we took in and made a part of the United States under the treaty with Spain, the little island of Porto Rico. In the mail this morning I received a petition, as probably all of you gentlemen received it, from the commissioner of education of Porto Rico.

A short time ago, with other Members of Congress, I visited Porto Rico, and we found there this beautiful little island, 100 miles long and 30 miles wide, having a population of 1,225,000 people. We found the flag of the United States floating over the island of Porto Rico. We found there a governor presiding over the destinies of that island, appointed and sent there from the State of Kentucky. We found there other officials appointed from the United States and sent there to rule the people of Porto Rico. Yet we found also that while we acclaimed the people of Porto Rico as citizens of the United States, yet they are not in fact citizens of the United States because they do not have the protection of the Constitution of the United States in full. In other words, gentlemen, we have there, under the great flag that we love so dearly, what is in effect a colony in the island of Porto Rico, almost the same in principle as the condition which caused us to declare our independence of England years ago and to fight the war for the establishment here of a free nation. We are attempting to rule the people of Porto Rico, but we are not doing half justice to those people, who are unable to make demands upon us. We have there a million and a quarter of people, and they have appealed to us in this petition that came to you and to me this morning for an opportunity to learn to read and to write, a petition for education. They say, and we found it to be true when we visited that island some weeks ago, that they have in Porto Rico 427,666 children of school age and only 164,005 children were permitted to attend schools during the past year. Think of that, with our flag floating over them and our great wealth and our responsibility to the people of Porto Rico, because we took them in under the treaty of Spain without consulting them. Yet the greatest thing in all the world that makes men intelligent and makes them worthy of citizenship in this country, the opportunity to be educated, the opportunity to go to school at all, the opportunity to have teachers, we are in effect denying to the children of Porto Rico. Shall we continue that denial or shall we, the House of Representatives, take action to provide money adequate for the education of these poor children?

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. What prevents the other children of school age from receiving the advantages of an education?

Mr. DYER. They have no schoolhouses; they have no teachers; there is no money to provide schoolhouses and teachers, and the United States of America, sending its billions to every land, as we have done and have been able to do, the richest Nation in the world, has undertaken to protect and care for Porto Rico under our flag without giving her people the full rights of citizenship, and denying them a right to which they are entitled under a free government, because when we fail to appropriate the money to educate these children we are denying them an education.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Are the revenues of Porto Rico insufficient to meet the requirements of education in the line suggested?

Mr. DYER. They are, and they need assistance from this Government. They need assistance from the Treasury of the United States, and we ought to give it freely because of our responsibility. In other words, we should do our duty to Porto Rico in the way of educating its people. We should help in other respects that are just and right, or we should haul down the flag of the United States from Porto Rico and let those people have an independent government. I believe they could do as well as we are doing by them under present circumstances. Our prime duty is to appropriate money to provide teachers, to provide schoolhouses, and I believe that in this Congress under the leadership of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education, Dr. FESS, who sits here to-day, this committee will go into this matter and will report a provision for the education of these children who to-day are denied an opportunity even to go into a schoolhouse, and that they will find a ready response on behalf of the Congress of the United States, and that we will help to educate these children. Gentlemen, the greatest thing in all the world to make citizens worthy of themselves, worthy American citizens, is education. We have need to do that here in our mainland in many respects, and we have need for it especially in Porto Rico.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that this petition which has come to this Congress on behalf of the commissioner of education of the island of Porto Rico, approved by the Governor of Porto Rico, may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The petition is as follows:

A petition presented in behalf of the children of Porto Rico and requesting Federal aid for public education.

To the President and the Congress of the United States:

Your petitioner, the Commissioner of Education of Porto Rico, in behalf of the children of Porto Rico, respectfully presents the following facts concerning public education:

First. That at the present time there are pending before the Congress of the United States three bills making provision for Federal aid to public education; namely, the Towner bill, the Smith bill, and the Bankhead bill; that none of the Federal aid specified in the aforesaid bills or in the Smith-Hughes Act concerning Federal aid for vocational education is made applicable to Porto Rico.

Second. That the people of Porto Rico, numbering 1,224,000 persons, are American citizens by virtue of an act of Congress to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes, approved March 2, 1917.

Third. That according to the Federal census of 1910 the percentage of adult illiteracy in Porto Rico was 66.5; that the present estimated percentage of adult illiteracy is 54.

Fourth. That at the present time there are in Porto Rico 427,666 children of legal school age—i. e., between the ages of 5 and 18 years, and 215,819 children of compulsory school age—i. e., between 8 and 14 years; that of the aforesaid number 164,005 children have attended the public schools during the current year, and that more children can not be admitted for lack of teachers and facilities.

Fifth. That the total annual school expenditures have increased from $288,098 in 1899 to $2,325,802 in 1918; that the expenditure per pupil has increased from $9.88 to $15.39 for all grades of schools, including the cost of erecting new buildings; that the expenditure per inhabitant has increased from 30 cents in 1899 to $1.93 in 1918; that the per capita cost of education per pupil for all grades of schools in the United States in 1916 was $39.37 and for public elementary schools $29.55, or more than twice the amount expended per pupil for elementary education in Porto Rico, which was $14.16 and only $11.81, not including the cost of new buildings; that the per capita wealth of the people of Porto Rico, based on the total assessed valuation of property, is $199, whereas the per capita wealth of the people of the United States in 1916, as estimated by the Department of Commerce, is $2,200; that the resources of the people of Porto Rico are not sufficient to meet their educational needs and requirements.

Sixth. That at the present time there are employed 2,981 teachers in all grades of public schools, including the university; that the salaries paid during the current year are as follows: Rural teachers, $40 per month; graded teachers, $60 per month; teachers of manual training, home economics, and agriculture, $80 per month; teachers of English, $75 per month, with no allowance for traveling expenses to and from the United States; high-school teachers, not including principals, from $80 to $120 per month; that these salaries are entirely inadequate, as is shown by the fact that in the rural teaching force alone there were 730 changes last year; that because of these low salaries it has become increasingly difficult to secure properly trained teachers, and especially teachers from the United States, and that as a result the number of teachers who speak English correctly is comparatively small at the present time; that few of the teachers have received sufficient professional training; that in order to provide proper facilities for all the children not in school at the present time 4,000 additional teachers carefully trained and adequately paid are necessary.

Seventh. That when the change of sovereignty occurred there was not a single public-school building erected for school purposes in Porto Rico; that at the present time there are 549 publicly owned buildings; that 1,200 schools are installed in rented buildings, few of which meet the necessary hygienic requirements; that to provide facilities for all the children not in school 5,200 additional modern schoolrooms are necessary.

Now, therefore, in view of the foregoing facts, I, the undersigned commissioner of education, in behalf of the school children of Porto Rico, and especially in the interests of the 250,000 children of school age who are not in school at present, most earnestly pray the President and the Congress of the United States that a special law be enacted giving Federal aid for the support of public education in Porto Rico; that an appropriation of $2,000,000 per annum be granted for a period of 20 years; that this money be made available for the payment of the salaries of teachers, supervisors, and the necessary administrative staff, for the erection of school buildings, for the purchase of furniture and equipment, for the training of teachers, for scholarships for promising young persons who desire to become teachers, for textbooks and school supplies, for the payment of traveling expenses of teachers from the United States, and for contingent expenses, in order that Porto Rico may speedily solve the question of illiteracy; that the rising generation may obtain a good knowledge of the English as well as of the Spanish language; that equal educational opportunities may be provided for the masses, that these American citizens may be fully prepared for the duties of citizenship; and finally that democracy may be made safe in Porto Rico.

Very respectfully submitted.

(Signed) PAUL G. MILLER,
Commissioner of Education.

Approved.

(Signed) ARTHUR YAGER,
Governor of Porto Rico.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, the observations made a while ago by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] called forth an inquiry by myself, on the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury, that the fifth Liberty loan would be the last loan floated. The accuracy of the Secretary of the Treasury and his well-known reputation against overstatement have led me to inquire about the finances, and whether we are assured that the charges upon the Treasury are going to be greatly reduced, or how we are going to find funds to pay the charges if not reduced. without another loan.

By May 1 the fifth Liberty loan had already been drawn upon or anticipated, leaving but $2,226,000,000. That fund can not be increased in any way outside of another loan except through the customs duties and the income and excess-profits tax. We have the estimates offered that this income can not go beyond the $4,000,000,000 mark. In looking over the monthly expenditures beginning with December last, these are the figures:

December, $2,060,000,000.

January, 1919, $1,962,000,000, in round numbers.

February, $1,189,000,000.

March, $1,380,000,000.

April, $1,425,000,000.

Up to the 20th of this month, $730,000,000.

The monthly charge on the Treasury is about $1,400,000,000. I read from the last report, the May report, of the Federal Reserve Board:

Practically the entire income and funds of department will be needed for the purposes of the steadily recurring demands brought to bear upon it for maturing indebtedness and for current expenditures, which are now running at about $1,400,000,000 per month. Any further increase in expenses will, accordingly, have to be made from proceeds of new financing, involving the sale of additional notes or bonds, as circumstances may require.

In making the estimates here I note that on the 1st of May $2,226,000,000 is the available fund; the running expenses per month, $1,400,000,000. Two months under current expenses will absorb the total amount of that which remains in the fifth Liberty loan. There will be eight months to run. If the charge upon the Treasury is a billion a month, there will be in sight a demand of at least $5,500,000,000, for which I do not see any source of income. If my figures are wrong, I would like to be corrected. The Secretary of the Treasury says there will be no other loan. How are we going to get this money?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will yield to my colleague.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman is referring not to the fiscal year of 1920 but to 1919?

Mr. FESS. I am.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Therefore, if there is a deficit amounting to anything like the figures the gentleman has mentioned, he is not counting in the deficit of six-odd billion dollars in 1920. That is the difference between the total revenue from taxes, which will be $4,000,000,000, and the actual expenses of 1920, which will be in the neighborhood of $10,000,000,000.

Mr. FESS. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Ohio. In going into this it seems to me there was something like $11,000,000,000 that must be found somewhere.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There were some things I intended to say this morning which I was unable to reach on account of lapse of time. It has been said that we might get this money from two sources of revenue, one a return of interest on foreign loans and another from salvage. I want to call attention to the fact that the salvage will not be so great an item, since we are selling more goods very cheap both at home and abroad.

Mr. FESS. I thank the gentleman for the observation. I hope our people will not become so mushy that they will want to cancel our foreign loans. We hear that from various quarters. Secondly, I hope and believe that the Government will be careful in the salvage not to waste property in the possession of the Government that otherwise would be a total loss. I recognize these two sources, but they are not going to be very large in comparison to what we need.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman will pardon another interruption.

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Did the gentleman ascertain at what rate we were loaning money to the Allies?

Mr. FESS. Two hundred and twenty million dollars in March alone.

Mr. LONGWORTH. An average of about $500,000,000 a month.

Mr. FESS. I have not that information.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think that is so.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield, I think this ought to go in in connection with the gentleman's statement. We have now loaned approximately $10,000,000,000 to the Allies, and the Committee on Ways and Means has refused to increase the loaning power of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman will pardon me; they have refused to increase it for other than war purposes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. LONGWORTH. They have the power to increase it for war purposes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thought it was fair to state that the Ways and Means Committee at present has set its face against any further foreign loans.

Mr. FESS. Now, if the committee will permit the suggestion, there must be some way by which this will be put on the market. I would like to have the attention of the committee for a moment. At the close of the Civil War our per capita circulation was $16. At the opening of this war our per capita was $34. To-day it is $56. Does that mean anything? The virtue of the Federal Reserve System is to prevent crises; and in time of war the Federal Reserve Board, in order to prevent the tying up of the money market in the riot of expenditure that war induces, will meet the demand by increasing the issue of Federal reserve notes. I do not think there is any possibility of reducing substantially the cost of living until this inflated credit, as well as inflated currency, can be deflated. That no one will appreciate more than my friend from Arkansas, who is on the Banking and Currency Committee. But there is no possibility, as I see, in deflating the currency or the credit suddenly. It will

probably take 10 years. I can not see any hope of greatly increasing the purchasing power of the dollar except by gradually reducing the cost of living. We in Congress are facing a problem that is serious, and I think that all Members on both sides ought to join a campaign to reduce extravagance as much as possible.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, on page 29 of the committee's report they serve notice that an amendment will be introduced to repeal the law known as the daylight-saving act. This comes rather sudden. There was no previous notice given of this, and there were no hearings held by the committee. Of course, I fully realize that anything which concerns such a small hamlet as New York City has no bearing whatever when the wants and demands of the farmers of the country are made known.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, that used to be so, but it has not been so since the gentleman from New York arrived.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Well, I am very glad to know that the farmers have even converted the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, who used to be on guard here against the agrarian movement in this country.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Oh, no; I have always been in favor of the legitimate farmer.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Of the legitimate farmer—we all are. It is stated by gentlemen advocating this repeal that they are doing so upon the demand of the farmer. All we ask is that this matter may be decided upon its merits; that hearings may be had; that the committee may hear the facts on both sides of the question; and that this House may have an opportunity to vote upon it squarely and that it be not tacked on as a rider on the Agricultural appropriation bill. I am informed by the learned parliamentarians on my side of the House that this amendment is subject to a point of order, but I am likewise informed that they expect to bring in a rule to make it in order. I do not hesitate to say that it will be a very poor beginning, at the very start of this Congress, for our party to start the steam roller working. If that is the way you are going to commence, if that is the way we are going to conduct this House, simply because we are in the majority, then I fear that I am sitting in the wrong pew.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman inform me who informed him that a rule to that effect would be brought in?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does the gentleman press the question?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes; I should like to know.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The chairman of the Committee on Rules. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is the chairman of the Committee on Rules in the House?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; I think he is out passing on the rule now—oh, no; there he sits. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The State of New York passed legislation to meet this Federal legislation, and we have now enacted and upon our statute books a law fixing a time in accordance with the Federal act, and if this is railroaded through the House at this time and becomes a law, our legislature not being in session, we will have a conflict of time between the State of New York and the rest of the country. I believe also that the State of Michigan has enacted similar legislation. They tell me that the farmer objects to getting up early.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman tell me who told him that?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I believe now that I am quite right about that, judging from the protests coming from my farmer colleagues.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BAER].

Mr. BAER. An eminent ex-Senator from the State of Illinois stated the other day that the farmers object to this law because the roosters do not wear wrist watches.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is about in keeping with some of the demands of the farmers.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that it is impossible for the farmers to get out to their hay and harvest fields until 8 o'clock in the morning? They have to wait until the dew is off before they can go to work under this new arrangement, and the hired man wants to start under the old time and quit under the new time.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There is no objection to the farmers getting up or commencing work any time they desire.

Mr. Chairman, I am not familiar with the dew in certain parts of Minnesota, but I am aware of this fact, that whatever the farmer wants, whether it be capricious or whimsical, he generally gets it. We all want to help the farmer, but his demands must be kept within the limits of reason. This repeal now comes here without due notice, without an opportunity to be heard, and with the hope of jamming it through the House. I hope this rule will not be passed. If we start with rules at this time, then we might as well pack up and go home and let the Rules Committee do whatever they please.

I do not believe that is the intention of our party. I do not believe that we are going to start in in that manner, and I sincerely hope that we may have a chance to decide this question upon its merits and we will accept the result, whatever it may be, without a murmur.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. I would like to know a little more about the legislation that was passed in New York State, to which the gentleman refers. Let us cut out this agrarian business and talk about the necessity for whatever State legislation there is.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not know what the necessity for it was, but I do know that the State legislature passed a law similar to this, so as to fix the time in like manner.

Mr. GARRETT. I can not understand why any legislation by the State of New York was necessary. This law has been observed in all of the other States without any State legislation.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I agree with the gentleman, but I believe our State statute fixed "standard time" in many of our laws, and no doubt it was necessary to enact State legislation to meet the Federal act.

Mr. GARRETT. Does it affect your labor activities? Is it interwoven with the labor situation in any way?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It must have been. I was not in the country at the time, as the gentleman knows, and am not familiar with the new statute. I shall get in touch with the attorney general in Albany as soon as I leave the floor.

Mr. GARRETT. Let me say that the humor about the time of the farmer rising and all that is not of very much importance, but if there is a real serious legal situation existing in connection with this matter I will be very glad to know what it is before this thing comes to a vote.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I can assure the gentleman that such a condition exists, and I received my information a few moments ago from an ex-attorney general of the State of New York and will immediately communicate by long distance with our State attorney general.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] said that he did not think any substantial results would be achieved in the matter of a reduction of the cost of living because of the tremendous inflation in the currency. While I think inflation is a very substantial factor in the increased cost of living, yet facts which I will make known and which have been called to the attention of the American people innumerable times give another side to the question. For 14 years prior to the late war the average wheat yield per acre in France was 36 per cent in excess of ours, in Germany 107 per cent, and in England 124 per cent. During 1917 had the wheat yield per acre been on a parity with those countries we could have sent to our Allies an amount of wheat equal to our entire yield for that year and have had more than enough for home consumption. I was mayor of Boston for six years, and during that time I endeavored to have an interest taken in the farm life of New England.

I introduced bills in the legislature calling for the foundation of an agricultural school in the city of Boston. If anyone from that city wanted to learn farming, he was compelled to go to the agricultural school, which is situated away in the western part of the State, I believe in the district of the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. TREADWAY, or that of the Speaker, Mr. GILLETT. I found there was very little encouragement in that great big city for boys to learn this most essential industry, because with lack of opportunities to study agriculture the stage ridiculed the farmer, and the picture of the farmer's life was made as hideous as possible. In that city at that time—and I think the situation existing there was true in all the larger cities of the country—80 per cent of the boys who entered the

elementary schools work out their existence eventually with their hands, yet the education was largely cultural. But 1 boy out of 10 who entered the elementary school graduated from college, and yet the curricula of the high schools of that city and in the big cities of the country were cultural and preparatory for college, and that is an essential reason, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, why the cost of living is so great—too many boys for ornamental positions and too few to till the soil.

We want more farmers and more farmers and more farmers. When countries like France, Germany, and England have 36, 107, and 124 per cent more yield of wheat per acre than we, it shows that the fundamentals in this country of ours are wrong and that farming as an institution and as a means of living has been neglected. [Applause.] Now, another reason for the high cost of living not connected with currency inflation is this: The other day I called upon the representative of the United Fruit Co., which largely controls the banana industry in the United States. I wanted to know why bananas were so high. We are all fond of bananas, fond of them when we were children, and we are fond of them as grown-ups, and particularly if we are married men with large families. Because of the scarcity of fruits generally apples are $8 to $10 a barrel, an unheard-of price. I do not know that history records as high a price as exists for apples at the present time; with oranges scarce and high, with pineapples and grapefruit dear and scarce, the only plentiful fruit to-day is the banana, and reports from Jamaica, the West Indies, and South America show that there is a tremendous abundance of them.

So, as I said, I waited upon the representative of this company and I called his attention to the great abundance of bananas and their high price. I said, "There is a prohibitive price upon all fruits because of their scarcity, and the banana, in which you specialize, is the one fruit which I understand is abundant. Why do you charge $5.75 to $6 a hundred, as against $2 to $2.50 a hundredweight a few years ago, thereby forcing banana dealers to sell them at retail at from 50 to 60 cents a dozen as against 15 to 20 cents a dozen a short time ago?" "Well," he said, "Mr. FITZGERALD, you know how wharf labor has increased." I said, "Yes." He said, "And you know how the wages of the men employed on those boats have increased." I said, "Yes." He said, "You know the increase in the price of coal." I said, "Yes; I know all those things, but, my dear sir, the records of your company, just published for three months, show that you are making $40 a share, or 40 per cent on your capital, an unconscionable profit, when you consider that the general public get 5 per cent or less on their savings."

He as much as said "We are going to get all the traffic will stand, and what are you going to do about it?"

The time has arrived, Mr. Chairman, when the Congress of the United States must do something about these matters, else some day you will find an army of intelligent and determined citizens march upon this Capitol to find the reason why.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. May I have a moment more?

Mr. LEVER. I yield the gentleman two minutes additional.

Mr. FITZGERALD. These people will not be Bolshevists in the sense that the term is used in Europe, but indignant men and women, who will ask us why all the blood and treasure just spilled in Europe, if might as spelled in money power and monopoly is to overpower the people of this country.

Mr. Chairman, while those conditions exist and companies dealing in food products are permitted to get $40 a share on every $100 of capital when conditions exist such as I told the House the other day, when the people of Massachusetts were charged 200 and 300 per cent profit on food products dealt in on property owned by the State, owned by the people themselves, when these profiteers brought in from the ocean fish that cost little more than a cent a pound and charged 6 and 8 cents a pound, when they were able to take property which cost a few hundred thousand dollars and overnight turn it into millions of stock, and put the stock in the bank as collateral, as long as those conditions prevail prices are bound to soar. [Applause.] There must be further regulation of these companies which control the food supply of the country; we must further encourage our school boys and girls to a knowledge of the splendid livelihood to be earned in farming and to the wonderful aid to humanity that a career like this opens up to the youth of the country; and finally we must get rid of the remaining so-called experts, who, under the pretense of helping the Government solve the food problems, are really playing the game of the food profiteer. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention, in behalf of some very prominent constituents of mine, to a quarantine regulation, known as No. 37, I believe, which goes into effect on a very large variety of plants on June 1.

I have in my district an organization known as the Lenox Horticultural Society, composed of superintendents of large estates and places. They are as prominent men in their line of occupation as probably are to be found anywhere in the country. Their work is most scientific in its plan and scope. They are thoroughly competent, educated men. This organization sent to me at the time the agricultural bill was up last spring a set of resolutions, an extract from which I wish to read at this time, as follows:

Resolved, That the Lenox Horticultural Society protest against the order of the Federal Horticultural Board which prohibits the importation of nearly all plants and bulbs after June 1, 1919, as being contrary to the best interests of all branches of horticulture throughout the country, as well as being grossly unfair to the growers of the allied countries. Further, we consider it quite impossible to achieve the purpose aimed at, viz, to prevent the importation of all plant and soil diseases. And be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the Hon. ALLEN T. TREADWAY, our Representative in Congress, with an urgent request that he do all in his power to get the said order rescinded.

Now, the question comes up whether or not under the law establishing the Horticultural Bureau authority is vested in that bureau to establish any such stringent regulations as are provided in these quarantine regulations known as No. 37.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] this morning made most happy reference to the increase of expenditures in order to have some very expert or supposedly efficient employees on the pay roll, and it seeems to me that in the creation of this board to which reference is made, to consist of five men, giving them the authority to so interfere with business, so interfere with carrying out horticultural pursuits as to absolutely prohibit securing the plants themselves, is an exact illustration of that to which the gentleman refers, namely, that we are making appropriations for good, fat salaries, but not in the interest of the organizations or of the people directly affected.

This same subject came up last year and some explanation was offered by the committee, and I wish that explanation might be more explicit. I think that we, representing the great agricultural interests of the country, ought to know whether such power as this quarantine regulation No. 37 gives to five employees of the Agricultural Department should become a law of the land. They have issued a good deal of literature in the Department of Agriculture in support of their rulings, of which I have several copies here before me. Reference is made commenting on the objections. They say the objections come from one firm, which wants to import these bulbs and shrubs. That is absolutely unfair in view of the fact that such an organization as the Lenox Horticultural Society and similar organizations throughout the country have appeared here before this bureau in protest against the promulgation of such regulations. Consequently I ask that a thorough explanation of this matter be given in the course of this debate. I asked for time under general debate in order that when we reached the paragraph in the bill itself we might go into the full detail of this matter and know whether or not such an authority should be vested in five employees of the Agricultural Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] has expired, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to use that.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired, and the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

Salaries, office of the Secretary of Agriculture: Secretary of Agriculture, $12,000; 2 Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture, at $5,000 each; solicitor, $5,000; chief clerk, $3,000, and $500 additional as custodian of buildings; private secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture, $3,000; executive clerk, $2,250; executive clerk, $2,100; stenographer and executive clerk to the Secretary of Agriculture, $2,250; private secretary to the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, $2,250; 1 appointment clerk, $2,000; 1 assistant in charge of information, $3,000; 1 officer in charge of supplies, $2,000; 1 assistant, $2,000; 1 inspector, $3,000; 1 inspector, $2,250; 1 attorney, $3,500; 2 attorneys, at $3,250 each: *Provided*, That hereafter the position of attorney in the Department of Agriculture shall be and remain in the competitive classified civil service, anything in the law or in the civil-service rules and regulations to the contrary notwithstanding, and the law clerks now in said department who may be appointed or promoted to said positions of attorney shall retain all the rights of competitive employees, and the Secretary of Agriculture may detail said attorneys for service in or out of the District of Columbia; 2 law clerks, at $3,000 each; 2 law clerks, at $2,750 each; 4 law clerks, at $2,500 each; 8 law clerks, at $2,250 each; 1 law clerk, $2,200; 5 law clerks, at $2,000 each; 3 law clerks, at $1,800 each; 2 law clerks, at $1,600 each; one assistant editor, $2,000; 4 assistant editors, at $1,800 each; 1 assistant editor, $1,600; 1 expert on exhibits, $3,000; 1 assistant in exhibits, $2,000; 1 telegraph and telephone operator, $1,600; 1 assistant chief clerk and captain of the watch, $1,800; 5 clerks, class 4; 14 clerks, class 3; 21 clerks, class 2; 27 clerks, class 1; 1 auditor,

$2,000; 1 accountant and bookkeeper, $2,000; 1 clerk, $1,440; 2 clerks, at $1,100 each; 1 clerk, $1,020; 7 clerks, at $1,000 each; 18 clerks, at $900 each; 2 clerks, at $840 each; 14 messengers or laborers, at $840 each; 12 messengers or laborers, at $720 each; 1 messenger or laborer, $660; 1 mechanical superintendent, $2,500; 1 mechanical assistant, $1,800; 1 mechanical assistant, $1,400; 1 mechanical assistant, $1,380; 1 engineer, $1,400; 1 electrical engineer and draftsman, $1,200; 2 assistant engineers, at $1,200 each; 2 assistant engineers, at $1,000 each; 1 fireman, $840; 8 firemen, at $720 each; 1 chief elevator conductor, $840; 16 elevator conductors, at $720 each; 3 elevator conductors, at $600 each; 1 superintendent of shops, $1,400; 1 cabinet-shop foreman, $1,200; 5 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at $1,200 each; 3 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at $1,100 each; 9 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at $1,020 each; 3 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at $900 each; 1 instrument maker, $1,200; 1 electrician, $1,100; 2 electrical wiremen, at $1,100 each; 1 electrician or wireman, $1,000; 1 electrical wireman, $900; 1 electrician's helper, $840; 3 electrician's helpers, at $720 each; 1 painter, $1,020; 1 painter, $1,000; 5 painters, at $900 each; 5 plumbers or steamfitters, at $1,020 each; 2 plumber's helpers, at $840 each; 2 plumber's helpers, at $720 each; 1 blacksmith, $900; 1 elevator machinist, $900; 1 tinner or sheet-metal worker, $1,100; 1 tinner's helper, $720; 1 lieutenant of the watch, $1,000; 2 lieutenants of the watch, at $960 each; 73 watchmen, at $720 each; 4 mechanics, at $1,200 each; 1 mechanic, $1,000; 1 skilled laborer, $1,000; 2 skilled laborers, at $960 each; 1 skilled laborer, $900; 2 skilled laborers, at $840 each; 2 skilled laborers, at $720 each; 1 janitor, $900; 14 messengers or laborers, at $600 each; 1 carriage driver, $600; 8 messenger boys, at $600 each; 24 messenger boys, at $480 each; 1 messenger boy, $360; 1 charwoman, $540; 3 charwomen, at $480 each; 1 charwoman, $360; 15 charwomen, at $240 each; for extra labor and emergency employments, $20,000; in all, $501,020.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

I make the point of order on line 9, page 2, on the increase of the salary of the private secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture. I know of no authority of law existing for increasing the salary of this position from $2,500 to $3,000. I think in the act providing for a private secretary the salary was fixed at $2,500.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. I also make a point of order against——

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand there is any increase in that item at all. The gentleman from Massachusetts is entirely mistaken. In the old bill, I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, we did provide an increase in that item, but the committee reporting this bill restored it to the original sum.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman to raise the point of order against line 9. The salary is fixed in line 8.

Mr. WALSH. I have some other points of order on the paragraph.

Mr. HAUGEN. And I am instructed by the committee to reduce the amount to $2,500.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. WALSH. With the understanding that the point of order is reserved against other sections.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, certainly. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAUGEN: Page 2, line 8, strike out "$3,000" and insert "$2,500."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. According to the bill—and the Chair desires to call the attention of the gentleman from Iowa to the fact—there is no line "8" in the bill. There are two "9's."

Mr. HAUGEN. I ask unanimous consent that it be corrected. It is a typographical error.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct the numbering of the lines, and, unless there is objection, it will be so ordered. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The amendment will read line 8. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized on his reservation of the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. On the proviso on page 2, for the purpose of asking the reason for incorporating this into permanent law.

Mr. HAUGEN. It is simply for the purpose of placing the attorneys in the department under the classified service. If the gentleman insists upon his point of order, I will concede it, and not take up any time in discussing it. It was suggested by the department that the change be made. It changes the title from "law clerk" to "attorney" and covers them under the classified service.

Mr. WALSH. The attorneys who are now holding the office are covered into the classified service—the competitive classified service?

Mr. HAUGEN. Exactly.

Mr. WALSH. I will withdraw the reservation on that and reserve a point of order on line 9, page 3, increasing the number of clerks in class 1 from 26 to 27.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the exact language to which the gentleman reserves a point of order?

Mr. WALSH. The words "twenty-seven" in line 9 on page 3. What authority is there for increasing the number of clerks of class 1?

Mr. HAUGEN. The general authority to increase the number of clerks required to successfully carry on the activities of the department. I do not understand that the proposition to increase the number is subject to a point of order, but an amendment to increase the salary of any employee is subject to a point of order. If it is found necessary to increase the number of employees, it is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. WALSH. And it is necessary in this instance?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is so represented by the department, and in the judgment of the committee the increase should be made.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation and submit a reservation of a point of order in line 11, on "two clerks at $1,100 each." I make a point of order on that item.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state the ground for his point of order on this item? Will the gentleman from Massachusetts state the reason for his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. These are two new positions, and apparently from the language of the bill they have created two new positions in this office, two clerks, at $1,100 each. Now, there is no authority for the creation of new positions. They may, as the chairman of the committee has intimated—although I am not entirely in agreement with his statement—increase the number of clerks, perhaps, but when they jump in two new positions at a specified salary, I submit it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HAUGEN. I do not concede the point of order. I contend that the committee has the authority to provide for the necessary number of employees required to successfully carry on the activities authorized under the law. This is simply adding two new places which are believed to be absolutely necessary.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. If that is so, why does not the committee appropriate a lump sum of $501,020 and let the Secretary make up his roll of clerks and assistants to suit himself?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is required that the employees shall be transferred from the lump sum to the statutory roll, and in many instances where the increases appear it is simply a transfer from the lump-sum fund to the statutory roll, or from one bureau to another, and the committee is carrying out that requirement. The act provides that "Congress may from time to time provide and employ other persons for such time as their service may be needed," including chemists, skilled laborers, and so forth.

Mr. WALSH. Certainly; they may from time to time, but it can not be done on an annual appropriation bill. They have got to get authority, the same as they do for additional Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture. They got specific authority to appoint them when the bill passed the House. Now here are two new classes of clerks at $1,100 who have never heretofore been employed.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Certainly.

Mr. LEVER. The Chair has uniformly held that there is a distinction between Assistant Secretaries, referred to by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and ordinary clerks. The uniform rulings of the Chair have been in the past eight years, to my certain knowledge, that the authority exists to make these appropriations for the necessary clerks under the department, and I have repeatedly myself cited the statute from which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] has just read; and the Chair has always sustained that position.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is inclined to believe that if there is any time when increases of positions shall be made under the statute read by the gentleman from Iowa, that time is when an appropriation bill is under consideration, and the Chair overrules the point of order. The Clerk will read.

Mr. WALSH. I have some other points of order, Mr. Chairman. I desire to reserve a point of order on lines 17 and 18, on "one mechanical assistant, $1,380," and also on line 3, page 4, on "one instrument maker, $1,200." These are apparently new positions created, for which no authority of law exists; and notwithstanding the ruling of the Chair in the former instance, which, with all due respect to his knowledge and learning and long career in the House, I disagree with, I submit

that if there is any time when we ought to prevent, by points of order or otherwise, the creating of new positions, it is when a general appropriation bill for a department is being considered; that if there is no limit to which the committee must conform they can come in here with new positions galore and load up these paragraphs under that general law. The general law states that from time to time they shall provide these things, but it does not abrogate the rule of the House that you can not put legislation upon an appropriation bill. When you create a new position and put it in an appropriation bill you are putting legislation upon that appropriation bill. The statute providing that these positions shall, from time to time, be authorized means that they shall be authorized in an orderly, regular way.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts allow the Chair to ask him a question?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the statute mean where it says, "The Congress may from time to time provide and employ other persons for such time as their services may be needed"? Does that give authority to appropriate, or does the gentleman conclude that it requires new legislation?

Mr. WALSH. Why, Mr. Chairman, I submit that it means that the House must specifically authorize the employment of specified classes of assistants or laborers, the same as it does in any other instance. If that were not so, permit me to direct the Chair's attention to the fact that all that will be necessary will be to phrase the paragraph in language appropriating $500,000 for the employment of all of these assistants and classes of help, without specifying the number, but simply saying, "There is hereby appropriated $501,000 for the employment of clerks, telephone and telegraph operators, messengers, laborers, Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture, custodians, firemen, and elevator conductors," without specifying the number and without specifying their salaries.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman allow the Chair to ask him another question?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman agree that the fundamental law establishing the Department of Agriculture and authorizing the employment of persons from time to time as the development of the department goes on must be modified by new legislation every time a new employee is needed?

Mr. WALSH. No, sir; I do not make such a contention. I am not seeking to contend that this is a modification, but that is a general fact, which states the purpose of the department and what authority it shall have and whom it may employ; but when you have a certain number of employees down there, and you have provided for them by legislation, and then come in on an appropriation bill and provide for an additional class and number of employees you are legislating supplementary to the fundamental law which the chairman has read, and that is what the committee has attempted to do in this instance.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that these are not new places. This is simply a transfer from one roll to another. These appropriations were made and the employment of these employees was authorized in previous Congresses; hence they are not new places.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman point out in the current law where this instrument maker, at $1,200, and the mechanical assistant, at $1,380, are carried in the current law?

Mr. HAUGEN. They are paid out of the lump-sum fund.

Mr. WALSH. Why is it necessary to specify them amongst the assistants of the Secretary's office?

Mr. HAUGEN. That is suggested by the department in line with the long-established practice of transferring from one roll to another.

Mr. TREADWAY. In connection with the establishment of the new positions to which the gentleman has referred, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee just what the reference may be in this connection, on page 6 of the committee's report, wherein it speaks of "new places," one Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, $5,000, and two attorneys, one at $3,500 and one at $3,250. What is meant by "new places"?

Mr. HAUGEN. In reference to the two attorneys, it is simply a change of title from law clerks.

Mr. TREADWAY. And raising their salaries?

Mr. HAUGEN. Their salaries are increased.

Mr. TREADWAY. In other words, they are worth more under their new title than they were under their old title?

Mr. HAUGEN. According to the statement of the department, they are entitled to a promotion.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield, it will be found that the department claims credit for two places dropped; that is, it is economizing with reference to two law clerks who were paid $1,600 each, or $3,200 in all; but the department continues to retrench in a peculiar way when it increases those two law clerks, that it claims credit for having dropped, to the position of attorneys, one at $3,500 and the other at $3,250.

Mr. TREADWAY. Probably the same individuals, with so much better titles that their salaries ought to be doubled.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In other words, this extraordinary discretion given to the Secretary of Agriculture, which no other Secretary seems to have, of utilizing the lump-sum fund and transferring people at will, means that by transferring two law clerks, who got $1,600 each, he can provide that they become attorneys at a total of $6,750. So while he appears to reduce expenditures by dropping two law clerks at $1,600 each he appoints two attorneys, one at $3,500 and the other at $3,250. I am glad the gentleman brought this up, because the new Members of the House who come from the farming districts ought to know how the Department of Agriculture is providing farm labor for the country by creating attorneys in Washington.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is very apparent, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The question before the committee is the point of order.

Mr. TREADWAY. I should like some further information, if the point of order has not been disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. It has not been disposed of.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, just a word, if I may. I have not been able during this discussion to put my hands upon the ruling that has been made, but the gentleman from South Carolina stated it correctly, and I think I can state from memory the reason upon which the chairman predicated his decision. I do not undertake to quote his language, of course, but I do undertake to state the reasoning. It was this: The language contained in the organic act was in substance "may from time to time create additional places," and that language must mean something, or else it would not have been placed in an act creating a great department of the Government.

Now, unless it be held that it does mean that they can be created in an appropriation bill it is meaningless, for the reason, of course, that if the organic act did not contain that language Congress could at any time it saw fit create new places. Further, the Committee on Agriculture is both a legislative and an appropriating committee, and that is the reasoning upon which the chairman has based his decision, of which I have memory.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman is referring now, I assume, only to the organic act creating the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. GARRETT. That is the law which has been read here.

Mr. WALSH. That is the only law the gentleman refers to?

Mr. GARRETT. That is the law that has always been quoted in support of these provisions in the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to be heard further upon this?

Mr. WALSH. No; I have nothing further to say.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair believes that the law organizing the Agricultural Department is sufficiently comprehensive to authorize the employment of additional persons by the department from time to time, as the department develops. Therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I make the motion in order to secure further information about the items on page 6 of the report about the new places. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has elucidated very clearly the transfer of two men from law clerks to attorneys and more than doubling their salaries; but my particular inquiry is directed to the new place designated as "one Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, $5,000." I should like very much to know what the new place is, whether or not that place has previously been authorized by statutory provision, or whether it becomes a new place when this appropriation is effective. I think the description is wrong if it is not a new place and if we are simply appropriating the money to pay the salaries.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Why does not the gentleman insist that the chairman of the committee explain that?

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit, the last bill that was passed by this House carried provision for two Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture. The point of order was made on the additional place, and the Chair sustained the point of order. The bill before the House is the identical bill that was reported by the Committee on Agriculture when the House last considered this measure. The reason the committee allowed this one additional place is because during the last few years the Department of Agriculture has grown immensely, as the gentleman knows. The appropriations for that department have increased in my

own time in this House from four or five million to $31,000,000. We have placed burdens upon the Department of Agriculture within the last few years in the way of the cotton-futures act, the Federal warehouse act, the quarantine matter that the gentleman speaks of, and various and sundry new activities have been given to the department. The Secretary himself says that he believes it to be really in the interest of good administration and economy that some of the burdens of the Secretary's office be divided. That is the statement he made a year ago.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield the floor.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The provision which the gentleman from South Carolina has so kindly explained to the gentleman from Massachusetts ought to be explained a little further. A provision is attached to the bill on page 2 which says:

Provided, That hereafter the position of attorney in the Department of Agriculture shall be and remain in the competitive classified civil service, anything in the law or in the civil-service rules and regulations to the contrary notwithstanding, and the law clerks now in said department who may be appointed or promoted to said positions of attorney shall retain all the rights of competitive employees, and the Secretary of Agriculture may detail said attorneys for service in or out of the District of Columbia.

Does that mean to make their positions perpetual?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is the same as anybody else under the classified service.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It puts attorneys at law in this department under the classified service?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It gives them a life tenure of the job.

Mr. HAUGEN. It provides for them the same as any other person in the classified service.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the passage I have read.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I submit that the point of order comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order was made, discussed, and withdrawn, and discussion has been had on the paragraph since that time, and it is a question whether the point of order is not too late.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The paragraph is still under discussion, and all points of order were reserved.

Mr. HAUGEN. But the gentleman from Massachusetts withdrew the point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Massachusetts withdrew his point of order, but the general reservation still stands.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will have to overrule the point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the provision on page 3, lines 17 and 18, "one mechanical assistant, $1,380."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out, on page 3, lines 17 and 18, the words "one mechanical assistant, $1,380."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And also, on page 2, lines 4 and 5, the words "two Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture, at $5,000 each."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Page 3, lines 17 and 18, strike out "one mechanical assistant, $1,380," and, on page 2, lines 4 and 5, strike out "two Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture, at $5,000 each."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will modify the amendment so as to strike out the word "two" and insert the word "one," and strike out the word "each" after "$5,000," so that it will provide for one Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, at $5,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, lines 4 and 5, strike out the word "two" and insert the word "one," and also strike out the word "each" following "$5,000."

Mr. TILSON. And you ought also to change the plural of Secretaries to singular.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will modify the amendment to that extent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Lines 4 and 5, strike out the words "two Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture, at $5,000 each," and insert in lieu thereof "one Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, at $5,000."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the House and the country that we have presiding over this committee so amiable and able a Representative of the United States as the gentleman from Illinois. [Applause.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Did the gentleman from Pennsylvania make any such statement when the bill from the Indian Affairs Committee was being considered? [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rose to make an observation of the same tenor when the House was in Committee of the Whole on the Indian bill, but the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] was in the chair, and owing to his native modesty he failed to recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania for that purpose. [Laughter.]

Having thus won, I hope, the sympathy of the Chair for the three or four minutes I shall occupy the floor, I wish to address myself to the new Members of Congress—to those on the other side of the House and upon this side of the House, and especially to that very energetic body of Representatives who come from what we call the farming districts.

Gentlemen, much has been said about the farmer in this House, and always worthily said, except at times the farmer back on the farm has not thoroughly understood the drift of legislation. The farmer is under the impression that the appropriations we make for the Department of Agriculture are directly for his benefit. In the few remarks I made from the floor a little while ago I endeavored to show that the Department of Agriculture, by creating bureaus and employing lawyers and experts, and taking under its wing those who do not labor on the farm but who lecture to the farmer, has succeeded in bringing within its folds more than 18,000 employees. I do not know whether the average farmer knows what a splendid lot of machinery is built up around and about himself, which is sustained from the products of the farm. The Secretary of Agriculture is naturally interested in developing the power, and one year after another comes for an increase, in which solicitors, experts, attorneys, and a variety of employees participate. I have stood here sometimes endeavoring to bring these expensive problems to the attention of the farmer to prove that he himself is paying this enormous bill.

This bill carries now over $3,400,000 more than it carried the previous year. It is an increase, not a decrease, of expenditures. The estimable gentleman from Illinois who occupies the chair has ruled on the points of order made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], holding that we could not take out from this bill as it has been written and thrust upon us these extra clerks and attorneys who were appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture under some prior law. We have the power, and you as new Members of Congress have the power, if you care to do it, to vote these appropriations out. That is where you can represent the people and the farmers. If you think these attorneys are not necessary, if you think these extra Secretaries of Agriculture are not necessary, if you think they are a burden instead of a help to the farmer, then support my motion to strike out this extra secretary and this extra mechanical engineer, and if that is done let us follow along as we go through this bill and take down a few of these extra millions of dollars that have been thrust in here with which to employ experts, bugologists, and others, and prove that we mean to retrench. I contend that what the farmer is getting in this bill is an increase in the army of employees in the city of Washington, which he must support. One gentleman told me to-day that he had two barberry bushes in his yard out in some town in Iowa, and that three Government inspectors came to him and told him that those barberry bushes must be removed. I have discussed the barberry bush on this floor time and time again, but I contend that it is not necessary for the Secretary of Agriculture to have three experts from some college to look after two barberry bushes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is generally recognized that if we are to increase the production of wheat it is necessary to remove the barberry bush. It is just a question whether we will have the barberry bush and a small yield or a heavy yield without the barberry bush. The statement of the gentleman that 18,000 people are employed in the department would indicate that there is some necessity for an additional Secretary of Agriculture. We now have three. The committee recommended two. The gentleman has suggested that the number be cut down to one, the number prior to the war. In the best judgment of the committee it was thought that the compromise on two Assistant Secretaries would be the proper thing to recommend. It is true that the Assistant Secretary in the past has been looked upon more as an ornament, but I believe recently additional responsibilities have been added to that office, and it is necessary that two should be provided for.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to take the new Members into my confidence for a moment. They have witnessed the annual performance of the gentleman from Penn-

sylvania [Mr. MOORE]—able, alert, brilliant, smooth, almost oily. This is his annual attempt to mosquito the farmers of this country and this appropriation bill, which provides for the machinery of the Department of Agriculture. Do not let him mislead you. It is an old story with him. It must be an old story, he tells it so well. Do not get it into your minds that he will keep this performance up on any other appropriation bill. We never see him here attacking any appropriation bill except the Agricultural appropriation bill, and I have reminded him time and time again that except for the work of the farmers in Iowa and South Carolina and Texas his folks would perish in 24 hours. Yet he wants to tear down this machinery. [Applause.]

Mr. BAER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. BAER. Does the gentleman from South Carolina believe that anybody would perish in Pennsylvania if we removed some of these parasites in the Agriculture Department?

Mr. LEVER. They are not parasites, and the gentleman does not think so himself.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to strike out two Secretaries of Agriculture and provide for one.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the amendment is coupled up with another.

The CHAIRMAN. That is on another page. The vote will first be taken on the amendment to strike out two and provide for one.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAUGEN) there were—ayes 41, noes 60.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to strike out the language on lines 17 and 18, providing for a mechanical assistant at $1,380 a year.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, this is only a transfer from the lump sum to the statutory roll, as required by law.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, is this debatable?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that debate is exhausted. There has been debate on both sides of the question for five minutes on a side. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I now move to amend, on page 2, by striking out the following language:

Provided, That hereafter the position of attorney in the Department of Agriculture shall be and remain in the competitive classified civil service, anything in the law or in the civil-service rules and regulations to the contrary notwithstanding, and the law clerks now in said department who may be appointed or promoted to said positions of attorney shall retain all the rights of competitive employees, and the Secretary of Agriculture may detail said attorneys for service in or out of the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Page 2, line 15, strike out the proviso, beginning with the word "*Provided*," in line 15, and ending with the word "Columbia," in line 24.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that those words ought to go out. I do not know whether the gentlemen intended to be covered by this language are Republicans or whether they are Democrats or whether they are Prohibitionists, but it seems to me it is intended to cover somebody. For that reason I think the legislative body ought to be better informed. Sometimes the party that is in power, having appointed some of its favorites to high places, fearing they may be removed if incompetent or for some other reason by the party coming into power, resorts to the medium of the civil service to place the mantle of perpetuity upon the office. That much I wanted to say about this language which I think ought to come out. As to the delightful statement of my friend from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], who is not as well known to the new Members of the House as he is to me, I wish to say that if he would rise now I would be glad to have them look upon him as a specimen in physique and type of the best that is produced in the splendid State of South Carolina. I have no quarrel with him for his politics. I am glad to know that his name is emblazoned upon the pages of American history and will go thundering down the corridors of time as the author of the various Lever bills which were passed by an administration that I hope will soon be no more—bills which, while they were presented in a manner that appealed to the farmers of the country, have succeeded in drawing out of the Treasury of the United States enormous sums, yea, way up into the millions and millions of dollars. My distinguished friend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER]—whose name I am not permitted to mention under the rules of the House, I will say to the new Members of the House [laughter]—is not only one of the handsomest men here but at the same time is one of the most persistent in preserving the integrity of the Department of Agriculture, which he has helped to build up. I think if we were to remove the Secretary of Agriculture and place in his stead the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina we would have a man quite in touch with every one of the 18,000 employees that have been put there, some of them even under the guise of war. Why, he would know almost every one of them by name, and if after he had become Secretary of Agriculture this splendid army of lecturers and experts could go into every State of the Union, fraternizing with every farmer, teaching the mothers how to make cottage cheese and kissing the babies, he would be a promising candidate for President of the United States. You start me out—he said I am clever; I hope I am not—but you start me out with 18,000 employees under my direction, every one of whose salaries I could raise, every one of whom I could transfer to higher station, and I think I could out-McAdoo McAdoo. Mr. Chairman, that is all. [Applause.]

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word simply to direct the attention of the committee to the somewhat substantial increase in the requirements of the office of the Secretary of Agriculture. Now, this bill was sent over to the Senate of the United States on February 3, 1919, at a time when perhaps the full effect of the cessation of hostilities across the water had not made itself apparent here. I regret that the present Committee on Agriculture has not seen fit to consider more carefully the item in this bill with a view perhaps of reducing some positions and expenses of the office of the Secretary. Now, this identical item in the current law calls for an expenditure of $462,000. In this law it calls for an expenditure of $501,020, and they have increased the Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture by one, they have increased the number of clerks and mechanical assistants by three or four, they have increased the number of clerks of class 1 and of class 3, and also incorporated two additional clerks at $1,200, a skilled laborer at $900; they have increased the number of messengers and laborers at $600 from 14 to 21; they have put in eight new messenger boys at $600, and apparently have increased the number of charwomen, and those increases I submit could well have been eliminated by the committee in view of the fact that this appropriation is only to become available for the year following July 1, 1920, and as we get further and further away from the war emergency it would seem to me that this department, important as it is and valuable as is the work it does, ought to be able to get back to a more economical basis.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I know that the gentleman from Massachusetts wants to be fair. I want to call his attention to the fact that there is an actual increase of the statutory roll of only $18,700. The increase of the statutory roll is not real but apparent. For instance, here is one clerk transferred from the statutory roll, Bureau of Chemistry, at $1,600. Then we have two clerks of class 2 transferred from Marketing and Distributing, Farm Products, grain-standard act, Bureau of Markets, at $2,800. There is one from the statutory rolls of the Division of Publications at $1,200; two clerks at $1,100, meat inspection, Bureau of Animal Industry, which illustrates what I wanted to call to the attention of the gentleman—that the increase here is an increase by way of transfer from the lump-sum roll to the statutory roll in accordance with the act of Congress and that there is not a real increase there.

Mr. WALSH. Of course that is an old story on the part of the members of the committee that when attention is called to an increase in various paragraphs the explanation is always forthcoming that the increases are not real, that they are only apparent. It is strange that always in the total of the bill when it is finally passed it is millions more than the bill formerly enacted into law. Why, I do not suppose this is an apparent increase, for extra labor and for emergency, $20,000, an increase of $8,000 over the year before, an item apparently based upon some tremendous emergency down in the office of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, most of the Members with whom I have had the honor to serve in the past months know my attitude upon the vast waste to the Government in publications. I am one of those who recognize——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent for two minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WALSH. I am one of those who recognize the value of the bulletins known as farmers' bulletins, which were published by this department, but I believe that this department has expended more money in publishing other documents and bulletins, news sheets and reports, than almost any other department of the Government, and by doing so they have wasted enormous sums of money. And if permitted a little later on, I shall hope to direct the attention of the committee to some of the employees that are apparently engaged in this work. But I do want to direct to the attention of the committee, notwithstanding the very clear statement of a former chairman of this committee, that this is an apparent increase rather than a real one; that the total carried in this bill for the Secretary's office here in Washington now is over a half million dollars, as compared with $462,000 in the current law. And if the gentlemen of the farming sections of the cotton belt think they are getting any benefit commensurate with that tremendous expense, well and good, but I think that they prefer to have increases made along other lines and for other positions and officials rather than for the office of the Secretary here in Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of asking a question of the gentleman in charge of this bill.

I observe on page 5 of the report, among those items of revenue to the department in the fiscal year 1918, an item aggregating something more than $3,500,000 for the sale of nitrate of soda to farmers. Can the gentleman advise as to the period in which those sales were made?

Mr. HAUGEN. What time?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I would like to know the period in which the Agricultural Department was selling nitrate of soda.

Mr. HAUGEN. In the spring and summer.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then sales were made after the war began, were they? Was the Agricultural Department selling nitrates for fertilizer purposes while the war was on?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that Congress appropriated $10,000,000 to purchase nitrate of soda to be sold to farmers at cost, the proceeds to be returned to the Treasury. That act has been in effect two years, I think, or since the war began, and they are at this moment actually selling nitrate of soda to farmers in the sections that use nitrate of soda.

Mr. HAUGEN. Operating as a distributing agent or as an agent?

Mr. LEVER. Really acting as a distributing agent.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Were they selling it during the war?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Buying and selling.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And that in spite of the fact that the War Department said they needed every possible ounce of nitrate for explosive purposes?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman will recognize the fact that they are an indispensable necessity for certain kinds of production, and Congress recognized that fact by unanimous action here, both in the Senate and the House, in setting aside the sum of $10,000,000 with which to make the purchase.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Another question. Can the gentleman inform me the price at which it was sold?

Mr. LEVER. From $86 to $87 a ton—along about $85 a ton.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Eighty-five dollars a ton?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. My colleague, however, informs me that it is $85 now.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I desired that information for the purpose of making a comparison between the amount the Government is now selling it for and the cost of producing it artificially and in Government plants.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], namely, to strike out the language after the word "*Provided*," in line 15, page 2, down to and including the word "*Provided*," in line 24.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 55, noes 45.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LEVER] will take their places as tellers.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] act as teller instead of myself.

Mr. HAUGEN. No. Let the gentleman act as teller.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania and Mr. LEVER took their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and there were—ayes 67, noes 53.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAUGEN: Page 3, line 18, after the first semicolon, strike out "one engineer, at $1,400" and insert "one chief engineer, $1,800."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a new position created. We drop out "one engineer at $1,400" and insert "one chief engineer at $1,800," thereby creating a new position.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is the very point. It is the creation of a new position.

Mr. HAUGEN. To be frank about it, it is an increase of $400, from $1,400 to $1,800, and the giving of a new title.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question if I may. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] a few minutes ago made the statement that this bill carries some $3,000,000 more than was carried by the bill that was passed just before the close of the last session.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The report states it is $3,816,209 over the regular appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919.

Mr. HAUGEN. The bill under consideration carries an apparent increase of $3,816,209, but an actual increase of only $1,708,329. The $3,816,209 includes $2,107,880 transferred from the food-production act to this bill; or, in other words, $2,107,880 of the $11,031,863 in that bill has been transferred.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does this bill carry a larger appropriation than the bill that was passed just before the close of the last session, but which died over in the other body?

Mr. HAUGEN. The bill under consideration now is identical with the bill introduced at the last session of Congress. A few items went out on points of order and a few were added. The total was changed by $18,540.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Office of Farm Management: One chief of office, $4,000; 1 assistant to the chief, $2,520; 1 executive assistant, $2,250; 2 clerks, class 4; 2 clerks, class 3; 3 clerks, class 2; 10 clerks, class 1; 3 clerks, at $1,100 each; 4 clerks, at $1,080 each; 1 clerk or draftsman, $1,020; 10 clerks, at $1,000 each; 18 clerks, at $900 each; 6 clerks or map tracers, at $840 each; 1 messenger or laborer, $720; 1 messenger boy, $660; 3 messenger boys, at $480 each; 1 charwoman, $480; 5 charwomen, at $240 each; 1 library assistant, $1,440; 1 library assistant, $900; 1 photographer, $1,400; 1 cartographer, $1,500; 1 draftsman, $1,440; 1 draftsman, $1,200; 1 draftsman, $1,100; 2 draftsmen, at $900 each; in all, $86,930.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WALSH. There is an increase in this item over that in the current law of some $3,500. Will the chairman of the committee state if that is one of these apparent increases, rather than a real increase, due to the shifting of positions, wiping out the lump-sum and providing for specific appropriations?

Mr. HAUGEN. The item on line 4 includes an increase; that is, by transfer from the general fund of two clerks of class 1 and one draftsman at $1,100. They are apparent increases, not real. They are simply transferred from one fund to another, and they amount to the same.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman from Massachusetts is on his feet, I would like to take this opportunity to call his attention to the fact that in this transfer the lump-sum fund is decreased by $3,500 and the statutory roll is increased by $3,500.

Mr. WALSH. You mean it is shown in the report?

Mr. LEVER. It is shown in the bill itself.

Mr. WALSH. There is nothing in this item to show it.

Mr. LEVER. It is shown in the amount of the lump-sum fund.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAUGEN: Page 5, line 1, after the colon, strike out "one chief of office, $4,000" and insert "one chief of office, $5,000."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: On line 4, page 5, before the word "clerks" toward the end of the line, strike out "ten" and insert "eight."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, these are simply transfers. There is an apparent increase, but there is a corresponding decrease in the other fund.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, so long as the chairman of the committee has made that statement, I want to ask him whether it is a fact that we are increasing the number of clerks of class 1 in the Office of Farm Management from 8 to 10? My point is that two new clerks are created by this item.

Mr. HAUGEN. The two law clerks are simply transferred.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The total carried by this item is $86,930. Last year the appropriation bill carried $83,430 for this item, so that there is an increase in this appropriation for three new clerks, or two clerks and one draftsman, aggregating more than $3,500. I ask if these are new clerks?

Mr. HAUGEN. They are not new clerks. They are simply transferred from one roll to another.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Where does this $3,500 come from to pay these clerks?

Mr. HAUGEN. They are paid out of another fund, and that fund is reduced by a corresponding amount.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This year you want to receive from the Treasury $86,930.

Mr. HAUGEN. For this particular item. The other item is decreased by that much.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then the Government is paying more than it did last year?

Mr. HAUGEN. No. It is simply a transfer.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The fact remains that the Treasury will be more than $3,500 poorer after this bill is passed than when the last bill was passed?

Mr. HAUGEN. Not at all.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Where is there any saving?

Mr. HAUGEN. There is none. It is simply a transfer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It will be reduced in this bill?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to find out how this thing is done. It is a matter that seems nebulous to some of the Members of the House. I may be obtuse, but the appropriation for 1919 carried for this particular item $83,430. This bill, which is supposed to be an economy bill, carries $86,930. Where do we get that extra money?

Mr. HAUGEN. I call the attention of the gentleman to line 22, page 5. The amount carried last year for this purpose was $221,660, and the amount carried in this bill is only $218,160. This accounts for $3,500.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That helps to elucidate. That means that the Secretary, having been given a lump sum of $221,660 last year to investigate and encourage the adoption of improved methods of farm management and farm practice, created three new clerks and paid for them out of that lump sum. That is practically it.

Mr. HAUGEN. Exactly. They were estimated for and paid out of the lump sum.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. So that instead of the farmers getting that $221,660 that we gave to the Secretary in a lump, with no check upon it, we find he is now parceling it out for the employment of clerks and attorneys. That is true, is it not?

Mr. HAUGEN. It has not been the practice of Congress to distribute money among farmers. The practice has been to engage employees in the department to conduct its activities.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The money has not been for farmers. The money has been for the employment of clerks and attorneys in Washington.

Mr. HAUGEN. Exactly. That is what we have been doing all the time since we established the Department of Agriculture, just as we have been doing in other departments.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In the brief time remaining I want to call attention to the very remarkable statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture that for years we have been making lump-sum appropriations, $200,000 or $300,000, for the Secretary of Agriculture to make certain investigations, and that out of these lump-sum appropriations to him he has been creating places here in Washington and elsewhere, all in the name of the farmers of the United States, who thought they were getting something out of it.

Mr. HAUGEN. It is true that Congress has been making lump-sum appropriations. I fully agree with the gentleman. I do not believe it is a business way of transacting business. I believe that Congress should specify amounts and that salaries should be placed upon the statutory roll.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is a good idea.

Mr. HAUGEN. But we have only about 30 working days from now until the 1st of July, and if we should go into that proposition it would not be possible to pass this bill before the beginning of the next fiscal year. Now, my contention has been that instead of making lump-sum appropriations we should specify, and the employees should be placed on the statutory roll. This seems to me to be the business way of doing it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Do I understand the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN]—for whom I have great respect, and who has been a very faithful member of this committee—to say that it is his intention as chairman of this committee, now that he has come to be chairman, to see that we shall stop making these lump-sum appropriations and put some check upon the Secretary of Agriculture in their expenditure?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is my purpose to scrutinize every item and to put it on a business basis, and to specify so that Congress may know exactly the amount to be paid to each employee. We have not attempted to do that at this time, because of the short time between now and the beginning of the fiscal year. We have simply taken the bill of the last session.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman will perform a great service to his country and a great service to the farmer if he will do that very thing.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking for a little more information in regard to these real or apparent increases. I read from the present bill, at the bottom of page 5:

Total for office of the Secretary of Agriculture, $806,110.

I read from the corresponding item in the current law:

Total for office of the Secretary of Agriculture, $767,090.

Making a difference of $39,020 between the expenses of the office of the Secretary of Agriculture in the current year and in the year for which we are appropriating. Is this difference of $39,020 apparent or real?

Mr. HAUGEN. Much of it is apparent. As has been explained, we add to one item and reduce another the corresponding amount.

Mr. TILSON. Yes; the gentleman has just explained an instance where both of the items are in the total; so taking it from one and adding it to another does not change the total. The gentleman's explanation was correct as applied to the preceding item of $3,500 which was taken from the general expense item and added to the salary item.

Mr. HAUGEN. The actual increase of this item is $18,700, and these transfers are enumerated on page 6 of the report.

Mr. TILSON. You take the clerk who has been paid from the lump sum and transfer him to the Secretary's office?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. You are building up the organization in the Secretary's office here in Washington by taking it from the rest of the country?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; not from the rest of the country, but from the rest of the bureau.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the gentleman from Pennsylvania again complains about the lump sums carried in the appropriation bill. I have served on the Agricultural Committee for 16 years. When I first came on this committee there was absolutely no segregation of the items at all. The sums were tremendously big. They mounted up into the millions frequently, and Congress instructed the committee to segregate the items as much as possible. We have attempted to do that. The gentleman from Pennsylvania would give the idea that these lump sums are being used up in salaries. That is true in a large measure. But does the gentleman from Pennsylvania think we appropriate the money for feeding hogs or feeding cattle or feeding sheep? These lump-sum appropriations have been made for the purpose of employing the best scientific thought on the subjects in the Agricultural Department. It is done so as to bring together the best information in the country and the world on agricultural problems in the production, marketing, and finance, and the like of that, with a view of getting that information to the farmer. But the gentleman from Penn-

sylvania would have you believe and have the country believe that these appropriations have been made primarily to buy sirup, coffee, sugar, and salt so that it may be distributed to the farmers of the country. No one in the House understands that proposition in that light except the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I have a sneaking notion that he does not understand it in that way himself.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In what way is this scientific information conveyed to the farmers?

Mr. LEVER. By various agencies. First, we have the Farmers' Bulletin, and then we have special experts and farm-demonstration agents or, as you call them, county agents. There are various and sundry sources through which the department gets the information to the farmers, for whom it is collected. The gentleman from Pennsylvania gives a wrong impression as to these lump-sum appropriations, the idea that you are making room for some one's salary. Of course, you are paying salaries, for that is the purpose of the appropriation. It is not appropriated to eat, but to give information. It is going to be of value to the country, I hope and believe.

Now, I stand here to say that you may criticize the department as much as you please; the gentleman from Pennsylvania can poke fun as much as he pleases, but I stand here to say to you that there is no organization which approaches it on the face of this earth. [Applause.] It has not been built up alone under Democratic administration. I have said frequently on the floor of this House that the farmers of America, the business men of America, every citizen of the country owe to the late James Wilson a debt of gratitude that they can never pay for his services in building up the Department of Agriculture. [Applause.] And I can say the same thing about the present Secretary. It is not right and it is not fair, and I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania, when he prays over this subject tonight, will stop this business of sticking his finger here and sticking his finger there and filling the RECORD full and running over with statements that will not bear analysis, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows it.

Mr. VARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I will.

Mr. VARE. I want to ask the gentleman from South Carolina whether, under the item of $218,260, on page 22, the employees are appointed by the civil service?

Mr. LEVER. A large majority under the civil service.

Mr. VARE. Have these three men passed the civil-service examination?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; they are clerks in class 1, and they are selected like all other civil-service clerks.

Mr. VARE. And have those whose salaries you increase and who are transferred from one roll to the other passed the civil-service examination?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words to take the floor for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there is an amendment pending.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then I move to strike out the last word of that amendment merely to acquire some information, because there seems to be considerable confusion here. I would like to know just how much more this bill carries than the bill did as it passed the House in the last Congress?

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, if all of the amendments suggested by the committee are agreed to——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask the gentleman whether this is not a little more accurate? There is a provision here for taking care of tuberculosis in cattle and also for taking care of the corn borer, the total of which two, I think, is $950,000.

Mr. HAUGEN. Does the gentleman refer to the bill when it passed the House or the one reported to the House by the committee?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I wanted first to know about the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. HAUGEN. If the amendments recommended by the committee are adopted, which include an amendment of $500,000 additional for the eradication of tuberculosis among cattle, it will carry $961,780 more than the bill reported by the committee of the last Congress.

Mr. LONGWORTH. In the first place, if the gentleman will pardon me, I am asking about this bill as it is before us, and I am not including the amendments that are proposed to be offered, but just the bill as it stands.

Mr. HAUGEN. It is identical with the one that was reported out at the last Congress.

Mr. LONGWORTH. As reported or as passed?

Mr. HAUGEN. A few amendments were added to the bill when it passed. It carries $18,500 more than it did as it passed the House February 1 of this year.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then, if I understand the gentleman correctly, this bill carries only $18,000 more than it did when it passed the House in the last session of Congress.

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes. Last Congress the committee reported a bill carrying $31,691,562. This is the identical bill as reported last Congress and carries the same amount. The House passed the bill on February 1. One item was increased $20,000. Points of order were made against certain increases amounting to $38,500. The bill reported, carrying $31,691,562, was reduced to $31,673,062—in all, $18,500—which represents the amount of increase of this bill as reported to the House over the bill as it passed last session; that is, $18,500.

I might add that the Senate committee considered the bill as passed by the House last session and reported it to the Senate carrying $37,355,352, an increase of $5,682,290.

The chairman of the committee has been authorized to offer amendments which, if adopted, will increase the amount of the bill $961,780, bringing the total amount from $31,691,562, as reported, to $32,653,342.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes to make a brief statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORDNEY. I want to state to the House that at the conclusion of this bill the Committee on Ways and Means has authorized me to report to the House a repeal of section 904 of the new revenue bill, and I shall endeavor at that time to take it up and pass it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. That is the luxury tax?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the answer which the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] attempted to make to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] said with reference to lump-sum appropriations is simply no answer at all. There is no justice; there is no common sense, no fairness, in lump-sum appropriations. The gentleman from South Carolina said that he supposed that the gentleman from Pennsylvania thought some of this money was going to be expended for hog feed or something of that kind. The gentleman knows that under these lump-sum appropriations here, in the one that is on this page, the money can be expended for almost anything; it does not make any difference what it is, and nobody knows what it is going to be expended for.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman does not expect that they can hold minute hearings in the committee in the time allotted them in which to report this bill out.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am coming to that in a moment. I might say right now, since the gentleman has called it up, that I think my friend and colleague from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN], for whom I have the highest respect and for whose judgment I have great regard, is no doubt justified at this particular time in concluding that they have not the time to go over these matters and segregate them. The President is away in France, and it is going to take nobody knows how long to get this bill to him for signature. They have to get this bill through very quickly or important interests will suffer, but the Agriculture Committee might just as well understand, and, I have no doubt, in that they will have the support of my colleague from Iowa, that these lump-sum appropriations will not be tolerated in the future.

I do not believe this Congress is going to stand for them any longer. Here is an appropriation of two or three hundred thousand in one place, or perhaps a half million dollars in another, and if the Secretary of Agriculture wants to he could expend $200,000 on one salary; he could expend $200,000 on holding a meeting somewhere.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. For a question. Do not lump-sum appropriations furnish excellent opportunities for persons in the department to exercise preferences as to salaries and individuals indiscriminately to any amount?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman has it exactly right. All sorts of partiality, all sorts of indefensible practices, can go on, and there is nothing that can be done about it as long as we continue lump-sum appropriations. It simply puts a premium on graft, because it becomes impossible to detect it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know any other department of the Government where lump-sum appropria-

tions are made where Congress does not put a limitation upon salaries?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Not as to a department, but I know a number of cases where lump-sum appropriations were made during the war, and we passed them over with the understanding that when the war was over we were not going to tolerate it any longer.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. BAER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BAER. The point I want to make is in reference to a pernicious practice by some of the departments in Washington in reference to these lump-sum appropriations and that is that they are hiring publicists, some of the most expensive men in this country, who can get $25,000 to $50,000 for working on a magazine, and they get them not to come down here to help the farmer or help the soldier but they get a man who will advertise what the particular department is doing. It is an advertising campaign.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I could go on here all day and cite abuses which have grown up under this practice——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I ask that I may have two minutes more in order to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I want to offer this suggestion——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. The gentleman struck the point just here that I think we ought to emphasize for the work of the future, if not on this bill. Some years ago many of the departments had lump-sum appropriations. We might recite by the hour the battles which have been waged against these lump-sum appropriations and for the fixing of statutory salaries and appropriations to cover the necessary expenses under sworn statements of expense accounts. Future bills should correct such practices.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The final conclusion is this, that Members do not know what they are spending this money for and we do not know what it is going to be used for and we would not approve if we knew how it is to be used, and yet we go on. Now, we are compelled to accept these estimates. I think the chairman has rightly stated that we can not do anything else at this time with this bill if we are going to get through at this session. Therefore I think the action of my friend is justified, but it can not go on any longer.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate is exhausted on this amendment. The question is on the amendment to strike out "10," page 5, line 4, and substitute "8."

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the Chair was in doubt.

On a division (demanded by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania) there were—ayes 55, noes 45.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: Page 5, line 13, after the figures "$1,200" strike out the words "one draftsman, $1,100."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 13, after the figures "$1,200" strike out "one draftsman, $1,100."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To investigate and encourage the adoption of improved methods of farm management and farm practice, $218,160: *Provided*, That of this amount $23,873 may be used in ascertaining the cost of production of the principal staple agricultural products.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I move this pro forma amendment for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee, if he is at leisure, for information concerning this amount of $23,873 to be spent in the determination of the cost of production of staple farm products. I want to say I would move to strike out this entire paragraph if I could not get some assurance that when a man went to this department he could get some figures. I have been down there many times trying to get figures of the cost of production of products gambled in by speculators of this country who are now charging the people 200 per cent more than the cost of production, and I have not been able to get any figures from the department. And you know the later controversy with Dr. Spillman, who has been removed from the department, because he had the audacity to give out some of these figures that we were paying $23,000 for, and the Secretary of Agriculture refused to give them out. I want to know what assurance you have that this money is going to be spent so that we can get any benefit out of it?

Mr. HAUGEN. Much has been said about economy, and the committee has been criticized for reporting increases. But here is an illustration. The department is asking for $512,350, and the committee has reported $23,873.

Mr. BAER. But the result of the last appropriation has never been ascertained from the department by anyone.

Mr. HAUGEN. We thought it ought to be $23,873 when $512,000 was asked for.

Mr. BAER. The $512,000 was an absolute waste to the farmers, so far as this item was concerned.

Mr. HAUGEN. It may be good policy to cut out all of it. If we cut out as we have started to do, probably the better way would be to strike out everything after the enacting clause. If that is what the farmers deserve, that is what we had better do. If we start to cut out $1,100 and $1,200 and a clerk here and there, it might be better to strike out a number of these items. If the activities of that department are not deserving of consideration, it might be good policy to do so. I doubt it.

Mr. BAER. I am asking you if you have any assurance from the men who are going to take charge of this department that they are going to give us any figures on the cost of production?

Mr. HAUGEN. We have assurances all the time. We do not always get all that is looked for. I take it that this money will be spent probably to as good advantage as any other appropriation carried.

Mr. BAER. That is the point of which I complained. It has never been expended to advantage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, may I have a moment?

The Secretary has suggested that the appropriation be made. An urgent request was made for an appropriation of about $512,000. A number of other estimates were made. The committee gave careful consideration to it in the hearing. Those hearings extended over a period of three weeks, and were published. Careful consideration was given to the supplementary estimates. We report here an increase of about $855,000. Every item has been carefully scrutinized. The pruning knife has been applied; we are now submitting our best judgment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Page 5, line 22, after the word "practice," strike out the figures "$218,160" and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this is the first instance in which the bill provides a lump-sum appropriation to be used at the discretion of the Secretary. I am offering this amendment as a test of the sentiment of the Committee of the Whole. Enough has been said of the iniquity of the lump-sum appropriation for all those present to understand. Here is a provision with reference to the Office of Farm Management in the Department of Agriculture. Provision has already been made for the salaries of those employed in that bureau. We have there the chief of office, $4,000; the assistant to the chief, an executive assistant, clerks of one kind or another, draftsmen, messengers—all here in Washington—charwomen, library assistants, a photographer, a cartographer, and other employees. These are all in the bureau of the Office of Farm Management, and they have been provided for, as we have passed the paragraph, to the extent of $83,430. That is behind us. That money we have agreed to appropriate. Those employees we have agreed to keep. Now, we are coming to the item which is before us and concerning which I have offered the amendment, namely:

To investigate and encourage the adoption of improved methods of farm management and farm practice—

for which $218,160 is asked. My amendment proposes to cut down that $218,160 to $150,000. Why? Because it is unwise from a legislative point of view to turn over $218,000 in a lump sum in times of peace to a Secretary to allot as he sees fit after you have provided specifically for the salaries that are to be paid to those who are to work in the bureau.

What is this $218,160 for? I do not know. It may be explained in extenso in the hearings.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In a moment. But so far as the bill states it is not only a lump sum but an omnibus direction to the Secretary of Agriculture. He is to investigate and en-

courage improved methods of farm management and practice. The gentleman from South Carolina says that "the gentleman from Pennsylvania" intimates that money might be spent in Alaska. It might be spent for feed; for sirup. It might be, for all I know and all the gentleman from South Carolina knows. All that I know from reading this bill is that we are dumping into the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture $218,000, which he may use for any purpose on earth, provided he gets it somewhere, within the range of "investigation and encouragement of adoption of improved methods of farm management and farm practice." He can expend that in any way he sees fit.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would, but I promised to yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TIMBERLAKE].

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I would like to ask the gentleman who has offered this amendment to reduce this lump-sum appropriation from $218,000 to $150,000 why he does not, being opposed as he is to a lump-sum appropriation—and I agree with him—move to cut out the whole appropriation?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am frank to say that I do not know enough about the operation of this office and its utility——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, may I have one minute in which to answer the gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for one additional minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not know enough about this Bureau or Office of Farm Management to say whether we ought to cut it out altogether or not. We seem to have authorized it by the employment of a number of clerks who are appointed by the Secretary and whose salaries we are providing for. Whether we ought to give them this sum in addition to the salaries authorized to be expended here upon these very thoughtful and intelligent men, these writers, whom the gentleman from North Dakota indicates may be able to get $25,000 a year writing for magazines, I do not know. I do not know whether it is wise for us to give $218,000 additional for omnibus purposes, or to reduce it to $150,000 and permit some of these men who are to be paid from the $218,000 remain on the magazines, while we put some real farmers into the Farm Management Service in their stead.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If I have time to yield to the gentleman, I will.

Mr. HAUGEN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. The gentleman from Iowa, the chairman of the committee, desires to speak.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. HAUGEN. I will yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment to cut down the item from $218,000 to $150,000, and he says he does not know anything about it. Yet he offers an amendment to cut it down. The question is, Are we going to hamstring the department? Here is an item calling for improved methods in agriculture. It is clearly in the interest of the farmers, in the interest of greater yield and production in this country. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thought maybe the gentleman was going to tell us what this money was to be used for.

Mr. KNUTSON. I suspect the gentleman is not a friend of the farmer, and——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is mistaken. I know he is.

Mr. KNUTSON. He has spoken and voted against these items all day. The Committee on Agriculture has held hearings to determine whether these items are necessary or not, and I for one am willing to follow the lead of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN], because I have unbounded confidence in his honesty and good judgment. I hope the House will vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, we all appreciate the deep interest which our good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has in the farmers. He has demonstrated on many occasions his friendship and loyalty to the farmers, although I have not always found it expedient to follow him. At this time economy has been suggested. The amount carried for the current year in the bill for this item is $221,660. The committee has reported $218,160. As I stated a moment ago, a supplemental estimate of $512,000 was received, but the committee rejected the supplemental estimate and reported a modest sum of $218,160, which is a decrease over the amount carried in the law for the current year.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. HAUGEN. Certainly.

Mr. UPSHAW. Is it not admitted that this sum that has been suggested is intended for a campaign of education, a general agricultural propaganda?

Mr. HAUGEN. Oh, pretty much all the appropriations carried in this bill are for propaganda for education.

Mr. UPSHAW. Certainly.

Mr. HAUGEN. That is one of the functions of the department, and one of its most useful services to the country.

Mr. UPSHAW. Then will the gentleman state, as I intended to ask of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], have you ever known any campaign for general education and investigation to be able to give an itemized account before the investigation is made? As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] has just said, do we not have to give some faith to a great department like this, which has proved its splendid efficiency, and let them have some latitude in making investigations for the good of the farmers of this country?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman from Iowa will yield to me to answer the gentleman, I will be glad.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] illustrates the situation mighty well. He has been against lump-sum appropriations all day long. He has been criticizing them for the last two years, to my certain knowledge. Now, the only amendment that he offers is a lump-sum amendment, and he confesses himself that he does not know whether it is big enough or little enough. [Applause.]

Now, I do not believe the membership of this House is going to follow the lead of the gentleman from Pennsylvania on this bill. Let me submit what has happened. The Committee on Agriculture is a nonpolitical committee. We know neither Democrats nor Republicans on that committee. Long hearings were had on this bill, and on this very item during this year. The Committee on Agriculture under our own administration unanimously agreed to this item. We reported that bill to the House. The membership of the House had at its disposal the printed hearings which the committee took—the testimony on this item. The House itself, by a unanimous vote, passed this bill, and after thorough consideration, and even the gentleman from Pennsylvania did not vote against it.

Now, in the whirligig of politics, we are in the minority on this committee, but the committee has again considered this item. The committee, controlled by nearly two-thirds of the opposite side, a committee of the party to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania belongs, considered this item, and that committee unanimously passed its judgment upon it, and has brought it in here to you, and asked you to take it as the best judgment of the committee available at this time.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I will yield for a question.

Mr. UPSHAW. If it is unwise to appropriate the lump sum of $218,000 without specifications, would it not likewise be unwise to appropriate $150,000?

Mr. LEVER. Absolutely. It is an utterly illogical proposition, and utterly indefensible, from the standpoint even of the gentleman from Pennsylvania himself.

Now, what does this item carry? The gentleman says he does not know what is carried in it. Take the chairman's copy of the Book of Estimates, and in it he will show you every single, solitary expenditure which has been made under this $218,000. There it is printed. It has to be printed under the law. The gentleman from Pennsylvania knows that. The newer Members may not know it, but it is a fact. Borrow the chairman's Book of Estimates, and you will find where every cent of this money is proposed to be spent.

Mr. BAER. Do they have to itemize their expenditures?

The CHAIRMAN. All debate on this amendment is closed.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I move to strike out the last two words. While I have been known as a consistent opponent of lump-sum appropriations and have opposed them in previous sessions and am not in favor of them now, I want to say, with reference to these appropriations that have been brought in

by the Committee on Agriculture at this time, that I do not know what else they could do at this late day. As the chairman of the committee has stated, only 30 days remain before the new fiscal year. The bill has got to go over to Paris to be signed. If this bill is to be put into execution at all, the only thing to do is to take these estimates as they are after the committee has gone over them. The proper thing to do, if we should reach this at all, would be to strike it out entirely, because we do not know how much it ought to be reduced. We can not tell how much it ought to be reduced, and that is one reason why I am opposed to lump-sum appropriations; but I would not be in favor of striking this out entirely after it has been gone over by the committee and has their affirmative sanction.

Mr. BAER. If you knew absolutely that a certain sum had been appropriated for a certain purpose and then you went down to the department to get the figures that they were supposed to obtain and could not do it, would you vote for an appropriation of that kind?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is a matter between the gentleman and the department which I have not time to discuss. I only want to say this: We can not tell how much this ought to be reduced. There is only one thing to do, either to strike it out entirely or else leave it as it is, as representing the best judgment of the committee, without itemizing the figures. I think the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania ought to be voted down for that reason.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] to strike out the figures "$218,160" and substitute "$150,000."

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I make this motion in deference to the opinion of a number of gentlemen who are inclined to think an error was made in moving to reduce the amount. They thought it was illogical and inconsistent to suggest that the item be reduced, because if the item was vicious in the larger amount it would still be vicious in the smaller amount. Hence, accepting the suggestion of the eloquent gentleman from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW] and the former chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], I have offered this motion.

But I want to say—and that is one reason why I make the motion—that I have listened intently to the repeated assaults made on my sincerity by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], and I gently, kindly, but firmly resent them. I do not say that offensively. I say it so delicately and so modestly that I am sure he will not take offense. I am a very sincere and devoted friend of the farmer, and I do not care how often that statement is repeated in this House. I am not so sincerely devoted to the fellow who says he represents the farmer, but who sometimes proves to be an attorney for the farmer or a propagandist, to whom we are devoting large sums of money in this bill.

I want to say to my distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW], a newcomer in this House, who succeeded one of our brilliant Members who has gone back to the home territory, with respect to the suggestion from him about not investigating these lump-sum appropriations, that there are those in the House now who propose to make a very respectful but a very earnest and thorough investigation of a great many lump-sum appropriations that were made in the last Congress. Some of these investigations will be made as to large lump-sum appropriations, running into billions of dollars, that the people of this country will have to pay in taxes. For instance, in the matter of aviation, where we appropriated $640,000,000 to one bureau, which spent every dollar of it without producing a single combat plane for the use of our soldiers in France.

We ought to investigate these things, and I think we will. Millions, hundreds of millions of dollars, were appropriated in lump-sum appropriations at the instance of the Commander in Chief, who is now sojourning abroad, and some of the results produced have not been satisfactory to the people of the United States. I will not mention nitrates. I will leave that to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], who has something on his mind, something that I hope will eventually come out in regard to the expenditure of $100,000,000 to provide nitrates for the farmer. The farmer is left without the nitrates, and he has to make up the $100,000,000 due to the expert scientists at $25,000 a year, or maybe a dollar a year, who rushed to the administration's support in the name of patriotism.

We will investigate other things. One hundred million dollars was appropriated by Congress at the last session at the request of the President of the United States for purposes that Congress was not fully informed about. Some gentlemen who talked about a filibuster the other day did not go into this phase of the question. They did not say that a little bit of the filibuster was due to the fact that although the President had spent most of the $100,000,000 without much detailed accounting, he still wanted $5,000,000 more to spend over on the other side. We will investigate the lump sum in due course of time. I am against it now when we are returning to civil life.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, in relation to the lump sums to be expended according to the line of estimates, there is an opportunity for fair differences of opinion. In the major part, however, the argument is not valid. The head of the department in many instances will group these items together according to his own notion, and it will be utterly impossible for an accounting officer to separate the items and hold him to the line of the estimates. And right there is one of the dangers involved in appropriating by lump sums based solely on the estimates as submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I entirely agree with the gentleman's argument against lump sums in general, but I do not think the gentleman would say that we ought not to expend any money for this purpose.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Oh, no; I do not mean that. I agree fully with the statement made by the gentleman from Iowa a few minutes ago. Under the shortage of time, it is necessary to pass this appropriation as the committee has recommended it, but here we ought to lay the ground and settle the determination that when we have the time to make investigations this sort of business will stop.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. LEVER) there were 16 ayes and 60 noes.

So the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the maintenance of a printing office in the city of Washington for the printing of weather maps, bulletins, circulars, forms, and other publications, including the pay of additional employees when necessary, $12,800: *Provided*, That no printing shall be done by the Weather Bureau that, in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture, can be done at the Government Printing Office without impairing the service of said bureau;

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 10, change the semicolon to a colon, and insert the following proviso:

"*And provided further*, That the proviso contained in section 11 of the act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not prohibit the printing in the printing office of the Weather Bureau in the city of Washington of the maps, bulletins, circulars, forms, and other publications herein authorized."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct the totals wherever necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman how long he intends to ask the committee to sit?

Mr. HAUGEN. Until about 6 o'clock.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY.

Salaries, Bureau of Animal Industry: One chief of bureau, $5,000; 1 chief clerk, $2,500; 1 editor and compiler, $2,250; 1 executive assistant, $2,500; 3 executive clerks, at $2,000 each; 7 clerks, class 4; 1 clerk, $1,680; 14 clerks, class 3; 3 clerks, at $1,500 each; 34 clerks, class 2; 2 clerks, at $1,380 each; 3 clerks, at $1,320 each; 1 clerk, $1,300; 2 clerks, at $1,260 each; 122 clerks, class 1; 4 clerks, at $1,100 each; 6 clerks, at $1,080 each; 11 clerks, at $1,020 each; 65 clerks, at $1,000 each; 14 clerks, at $960 each; 53 clerks, at $900 each; one architect, $2,000; 1 illustrator, $1,400; 1 laboratory aid, $1,200; 1 laboratory helper, $1,200; 2 laboratory helpers, at $1,020 each; 1 laboratory helper, $1,000; 1 laboratory helper, $960; 2 laboratory helpers, at $840 each; 1 laboratory helper, $720; 2 laboratory helpers, at $600 each; 1 laboratory mechanician, $1,440; 1 carpenter, $1,140; 2 carpenters, at $1,000 each; 2 messengers and custodians, at $1,200 each; 1 quarantine assistant, $900; 2 skilled laborers, at $1,000 each; 10 skilled laborers, at $900 each; 1 painter, $900; 2 laborers, at $900 each; 9 messengers or laborers, at $840 each; 3 laborers, at $780 each; 29 messengers or laborers, at $720 each; 4 laborers, at $660 each; 24 laborers, at $600 each; 32 laborers, at $540 each; 30 laborers, at $480 each; 1 messenger boy, $660; 3 messenger boys, at $600 each; 16 messenger boys, at $480 each; 8 messenger boys, at $360 each; 1 charwoman, $600; 2 charwomen, at $540 each; 16 charwomen, at $480 each; 5 charwomen, at $360 each; 2 charwomen, at $300 each; 7 charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $553,150.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee

for an explanation of the increase in this item for the Bureau of Animal Industry from $479,710 to $553,150.

Mr. HAUGEN. The amount carried in the current appropriation bill is $571,041. The statutory roll of the Bureau of Animal Industry carries an apparent increase of $73,440, but an actual decrease of $5,500 for the item, of which $3,900 is transferred to other rolls, and one place at $1,600 dropped.

Mr. WALSH. These apparent increases are transfers to the statutory roll?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. And there is a reduction in the other items under this bureau of the department?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. But yet the total of the bureau is nearly $1,000,000 larger than it was last year.

Mr. HAUGEN. Has the gentleman reference to the total for the bureau?

Mr. WALSH. Yes. I was asking with reference to these positions in the office of the chief.

Mr. HAUGEN. The committee added a large amount for the increase of the employees in the meat-inspection service of the department, I think between 2,900 and 3,000 at $120 a year each, and 11 at $240 a year each.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of making an inquiry, and I do not know whether this is the place to make that inquiry or not. There are a number of agents in this department who are traveling about inspecting these animals. It has been called to my attention that a number are traveling over the same territory, one, for instance, looking after the diseases of sheep and others looking after the diseases of cattle, and so forth. If this is correct, is it not possible to consolidate these departments under one head and have one man cover the territory for all?

Mr. HAUGEN. There may be duplications of work, as the gentleman has suggested, but that is a matter that will have to be taken up with the department. It would be absolutely impossible to segregate every item in this bill.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it not true that there is a duplication, and is it not true that a large number of these agents are traveling over the same territory?

Mr. HAUGEN. I can not answer that question. That is a question that I have propounded to the representatives of the department I presume several hundred times, and I have never been able to get a statement from the department that there are any duplications. The department's statement is that there is not any, and, accepting its word for it, we have to assume that there is not.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it not possible for the committee to have this information definitely, and is it not possible for the committee to stop this duplication?

Mr. HAUGEN. The committee has tried in every way possible to get at the facts and correct the evil, if it exists.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the disease of tuberculosis of animals, for its control and eradication, for the tuberculin testing of animals, and for researches concerning the cause of the disease, its modes of spread, and methods of treatment and prevention, including demonstrations, the formation of organizations, and such other means as may be necessary, either independently or in cooperation with farmers, associations, State or county authorities, $993,520: *Provided, however*, That in carrying out the purpose of this appropriation if, in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, it shall be necessary to destroy tuberculous animals and to compensate owners for loss thereof, he may, in his discretion, expend in the city of Washington or elsewhere out of the moneys of this appropriation, such sums as he shall determine to be necessary for the reimbursement of owners of animals so destroyed, in cooperation with such States, counties, or municipalities, as shall by law or by suitable action in keeping with its authority in the matter, and by rules and regulations adopted and enforced in pursuance thereof, provide inspection of tuberculous animals and for compensation to owners of animals so destroyed, but no part of the money hereby appropriated shall be used in compensating owners of such animals except in cooperation with and supplementary to payments to be made by State, county, or municipality where destruction of such animals shall take place; nor shall any payment be made hereunder as compensation for or on account of any such animal destroyed if at the time of inspection or test of such animal or at the time of condemnation thereof, it shall belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or corporation, to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered for the purpose of being slaughtered: *Provided further*, That out of the money hereby appropriated, no payment as compensation for any tuberculous animal destroyed shall exceed one-third of the difference between the appraised value of such animal and the value of the salvage thereof; that no payment hereunder shall exceed the amount paid or to be paid by the State, county, or municipality where the animal shall be condemned; and that in no case shall any payment hereunder be more than $25 for any grade animal or more than $50 for any pure-bred animal, and no payment shall be made unless the owner has complied with all lawful quarantine regulations: *And provided further*, That the act approved May 29, 1884 (23 Stats. L., p. 31), be, and the same is hereby, amended to permit cattle which have reacted to the tuberculin test to be shipped, transported, or moved from one State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, to any other State, Territory, or the District of Columbia for immediate slaughter, in accordance with such rules and regulations as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, permit cattle which have been shipped for breeding or feeding purposes from one State, Territory, or the District of Columbia to another State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, and which have reacted to the tuberculin test subsequent to such shipment, to be reshipped in interstate commerce to the original owner.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAUGEN: Page 13, line 20, strike out "$993,520" and insert "$1,500,000, of which $500,000 shall be set aside for administrative and operating expenses and $1,000,000 for the payment of indemnities."

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I might state that the department's estimate is $1,000,000. The committee has allowed $500,000 and has set aside $1,000,000 of the $1,500,000 for the payment of indemnities, as provided under the law.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that is a very brief statement for an increase in an appropriation from $993,000 to $1,500,000, particularly in view of the fact that the current law carries only, I think, $1,000,000; and the mere fact that the department has estimated this and has asked for it, I submit is rather a vague reason.

Can the gentleman state whether there is a great increase in tuberculosis in cattle or a great increase in the number of employees who have been put upon these rolls to make this appropriation necessary?

Mr. HAUGEN. Since the passage of the act authorizing the payment of indemnities, great interest has been manifested throughout the States and 32 States have passed legislation and have appropriated upward of $2,000,000, of which $1,310,500 is available for payment of indemnities. The department estimates $1,650,000 necessary to meet the requirements. The committee thought it could possibly get along with $1,500,000. It took up the matter with the chief of the bureau, and, after giving the matter consideration, it thought we might be able to get along with that amount.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. If we are going to match the States in paying indemnities, it will require at the very lowest estimate $843,000.

Mr. WALSH. Then when the committee reported $993,520——

Mr. HAUGEN. It should be $1,000,000, instead of $993,000, as $6,480 has been transferred to the statutory roll.

Mr. WALSH. Now, can the gentleman advise us whether tuberculosis in cattle is on the increase and that is the reason these States have become active and it is necessary for the Government to match the payments of the States?

Mr. HAUGEN. I think it has been on the increase for a number of years, and possibly is on the increase now. I think it is most generally recognized now that an effort should be made to stamp it out. This policy was adopted about a year ago, starting with an appropriation of $500,000, and the House last session increased the amount to $1,000,000, and now we propose to make it a million and a half. For a number of years $50,000 was appropriated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the Chair was in doubt.

The question was again taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAUGEN. I have another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 20, after the word "State," insert "Territory."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the word "Territory" is in there. I direct attention of the gentleman to the fact that the word "Territory" is in line 20, page 15. Does not the gentleman mean to insert the words "District of Columbia"?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is suggested that, after the word "State," in line 13, the word "Territory" should be added so as to read:

State, Territory, or county authorities.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAUGEN. I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 24, after the word "discretion," insert "and in accordance with such rules and regulations as he may prescribe."

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, as the paragraph now stands the department does not have specific authority to prescribe regulations, and that language is suggested.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.
The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.
The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 2, after the word "necessary," insert "within the limitations above provided."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.
Mr. HAUGEN. I offer another amendment.
The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.
The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 3, after the word "States," insert "Territories."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.
Mr. HAUGEN. I offer another amendment.
The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.
The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 11, after the word "State," insert "Territory."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.
Mr. HAUGEN. I offer another amendment.
The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.
The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 12, strike out the word "destruction" and insert "condemnation."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.
Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.
The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.
The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAUGEN: "Page 14, line 25, after the word 'State,' insert the word 'Territory.'"

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.
The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.
The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Bureau of Animal Industry, $5,127,033.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The total for the Bureau of Animal Industry is $5,127,033. Last year it was $4,079,588. Now, we have increased an item by half a million dollars more, which was for the tuberculosis prevention. What are the other increases?
Mr. HAUGEN. In the present bill?
Mr. WALSH. Yes.
Mr. HAUGEN. As I stated a minute ago, the committee recommended a number of increases. There are a number of $1,100 and $1,200 clerks with a bonus of $240 each, which is a considerable amount.
Mr. WALSH. Two hundred and forty dollars a year?
Mr. HAUGEN. Two hundred and forty dollars a year. The salary of some of these is over $2,500, and they do not get the bonus of $240.
Mr. WALSH. Is there any increase in this meat inspection? Does that come under what the gentleman is speaking about?
Mr. HAUGEN. It comes under meat inspection.
Mr. WALSH. There is a $400,000 increase in that item?
Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.
Mr. WALSH. On account of these employees not getting the bonus under the legislative bill?
Mr. HAUGEN. Not exactly that. The committee has contended for some time that their salaries should be increased, and the matter has been gone over very carefully for a number of years. A number of suggestions have been made and a number of bills have been introduced, and this is the result of the controversy. It was finally determined to grant them an increase of $120, which would seem to be satisfactory, and of course does not apply to those who receive a salary of $2,500. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.
The motion was agreed to.
Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MADDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. LARSEN, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence indefinitely on account of sickness of himself and wife.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the House do now adjourn.
The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until Wednesday, May 28, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,
Mr. FORDNEY, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2021) to repeal section 904 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 10), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:
A bill (H. R. 261) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service; Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce discharged, and referred to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.
A bill (H. R. 1235) to fix the compensation of certain employees of the United States; Committee on Reform in the Civil Service discharged, and referred to the Committee on Labor.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:
By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 3274) in the promotion of the general welfare to provide capital for the development by land colonization of the agricultural resources of the Nation, providing certain privileges to soldier settlers, and creating a national colonization board; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.
By Mr. PAIGE: A bill (H. R. 3275) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Gardner, in the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
Also, a bill (H. R. 3276) to increase the limit of cost of public building at Leominster, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
Also, a bill (H. R. 3277) to increase the limit of cost of public building at Southbridge, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
Also, a bill (H. R. 3278) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Clinton, in the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 3279) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Menasha, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
Also, a bill (H. R. 3280) to provide for the erection of an addition to the Federal building in the city of Oshkosh, county of Winnebago and State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
Also, a bill (H. R. 3281) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Two Rivers, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 3282) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Richmond, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
Also, a bill (H. R. 3283) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Sheffield, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 3284) providing for the reimbursement of the diplomatic and consular officers and agents of the United States of America in the countries recently at war, or in the war area, for the loss of personal belongings or other losses incurred consequent to war conditions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
Also, a bill (H. R. 3285) providing for the erection and completion of a public building in the Borough of The Bronx, New York City, in the State of New York; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
Also, a bill (H. R. 3286) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Borough of The Bronx, New York City, two German cannons or fieldpieces of artillery, to be used for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 3287) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Portland, Tenn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3288) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Gallatin, Tenn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3289) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Jamestown, Tenn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3290) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hartsville, Tenn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3291) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Carthage, Tenn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REBER: A bill (H. R. 3292) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Pottsville, Pa., and for the sale of the present post-office site and building thereon; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3293) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Shenandoah, State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3294) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Gordon, Schuylkill County, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3295) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Ringtown, Schuylkill County, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3296) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hegins, Schuylkill County, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3297) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Coaldale, Schuylkill County, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3298) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of McAdoo, Schuylkill County, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 3299) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Forest City, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3300) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Pocahontas, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3301) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Emmetsburg, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3302) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Estherville, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3303) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Garner, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3304) authorizing the secretary of War to donate to the town of Rockwell City, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3305) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Boone, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3306) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Webster City, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3307) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Algona, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3308) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fort Dodge, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3309) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Humboldt, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3310) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Jefferson, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3311) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Denison, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3312) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Manning, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3313) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lake Mills, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3314) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Carroll, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JEFFERIS: A bill (H. R. 3315) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Elkhorn, Douglas County, Nebr., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3316) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Bennington, Douglas County, Nebr., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3317) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Springfield, Sarpy County, Nebr., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3318) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Valley, Nebr., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3319) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Arlington, Washington County, Nebr., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3320) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Papillion, Sarpy County, Nebr., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3321) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Blair, Washington County, Nebr., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3322) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Omaha, Douglas County, Nebr., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3323) to repeal the law known as the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3324) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Bellevue, Sarpy County, Nebr., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3325) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Millard, Douglas County, Nebr., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3326) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Waterloo, Douglas County, Nebr., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3327) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Gretna, Sarpy County, Nebr., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3328) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Herman, Washington County, Nebr., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 3329) to extend the time of the Hudson River Connecting Railroad Corporation for the completion of its bridge across the Hudson River, in the State of New York; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 3330) to grant rank to the Army Nurse Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 3331) to reimburse surviving Civil War prisoners; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 3332) to amend an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 3333) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Savannah, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 3334) donating a captured cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Valparaiso, Porter County, Ind.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 3335) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Conway, Ark., two captured German cannons or fieldpieces, with carriages, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OGDEN: A bill (H. R. 3336) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish to the city of Louisville, Ky., three German cannons, with carriages and shells.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 3337) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Pleasantville, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 3338) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate a cannon or some other fieldpiece to the El Paso High School, El Paso, State of Texas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 3339) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Antwerp, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3340) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Latty, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3341) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Grover Hill, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3342) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Florida, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3343) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Malinta, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3344) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of New Bavaria, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3345) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of West Hope, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3346) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of McClure, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3347) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Liberty Center, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3348) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Deshler, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3349) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Hamler, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3350) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Holgate, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3351) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Elgin, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3352) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Venedocia, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3353) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Ohio City, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3354) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Cavett, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3355) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Scott, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3356) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Rimer, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3357) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Ney, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3358) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Middle Point, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3359) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Convoy, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3360) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Willshire, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3361) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Ottoville, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3362) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Columbus Grove, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3363) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Kalida, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3364) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Continental, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3365) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Gilboa, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3366) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Glandorf, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3367) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Alvordton, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3368) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Edon, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3369) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Blakeslee, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3370) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of West Unity, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3371) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Stryker, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3372) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Pioneer, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3373) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Edgerton, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3374) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Montpelier, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3375) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Broughton, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3376) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Oakwood, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3377) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Melrose, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3378) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Haviland, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3379) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Cecil, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3380) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Payne, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3381) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Rushmore, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3382) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Evansport, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3383) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Sherwood, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3384) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Hicksville, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3385) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Swanton, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3386) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Metamora, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3387) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Lyons, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3388) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Delta, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3389) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Archbold, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3390) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Belmore, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3391) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Dupont, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3392) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Miller City, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3393) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of West Leipsic, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3394) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Cloverdale, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3395) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Pandora, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3396) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Leipsic, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3397) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Delphos, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 3398) for the erection of a public building at Russellville, Logan County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3399) for the erection of a public building at Franklin, Simpson County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITHWICK: A bill (H. R. 3400) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Quincy, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3401) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Marianna, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 3402) to regulate appointments and promotions in the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 3403) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Amherst, N. H., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 3404) to provide for the salaries of a minister and consuls to the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 3405) to establish and maintain military training colleges in the several States of the Union, in Alaska, and in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 3406) providing for a site and public building for post office and other Federal purposes at Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3407) to provide for the enlargement, extension, and remodeling of the Federal building at Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 3408) to provide for the construction of an additional House Office Building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 3409) for an extension to the post-office building at Terre Haute, in the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 3410) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Salamanca, N. Y., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3411) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Olean, N. Y., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3412) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Dunkirk, N. Y., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3413) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Jamestown, N. Y., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3414) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Belmont, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3415) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Franklinville, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3416) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Wellsville, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3417) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Cattaraugus, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3418) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Cuba, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3419) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Randolph, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3420) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Stockton, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3421) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Brocton, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3422) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Sheridan, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3423) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Cherry Creek, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3424) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Forestville, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3425) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Silver Creek, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3426) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Falconer, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3427) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Sherman, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3428) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Ripley, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3429) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Westfield, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 3430) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Board of Commissioners of Audubon Park, New Orleans, La., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3431) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hahnville, La., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3432) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lutcher, La., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3433) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Gretna, La., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3434) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Convent, La., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 3435) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cameron, Clinton County, Mo., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3436) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3437) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Richmond, Ray County, Mo., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3438) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Maysville, Dekalb County, Mo., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3439) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Liberty, Clay County, Mo., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3440) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Plattsburg, Clinton County, Mo., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3441) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Albany, Gentry County, Mo., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3442) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Princeton, Mercer County, Mo., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3443) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Gallatin, Daviess County, Mo., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3444) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Grant City, Worth County, Mo., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3445) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Kingston, Caldwell County, Mo., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3446) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Stanberry, Gentry County, Mo., two German cannons of fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 3447) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Carrollton, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3448) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Mount Sterling, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3449) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Winchester, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3450) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Roodhouse, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3451) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of White Hall, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3452) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Franklin, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3453) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Barry, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3454) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Jerseyville, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3455) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Pittsfield, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3456) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hardin, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3457) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Murrayville, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 3458) to prohibit intoxicating beverages and to regulate the production and use of other alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 3459) to amend an act approved November 21, 1918, entitled "An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the purpose of the act entitled 'An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products, and for other purposes,'" and also an act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel," approved August 10, 1917; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 3460) to amend an act approved November 21, 1918, entitled "An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the purposes of the act entitled 'An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products, and for other purposes,'" and also an act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel," approved August 10, 1917; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 3461) to prohibit the liquor traffic and to provide for the enforcement of such prohibition and the war prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 3462) to repeal sections 35 to 49, inclusive, of the act of June 13, 1898, concerning mixed flour, as amended by the act of March 2, 1901, and as further amended by the act of April 12, 1902, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3463) to provide for a site for a public building at White Hall, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3464) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Carrollton, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3465) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Havana, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 3466) making appropriation for the construction and equipment of a light vessel for the Passes at the entrances of the Mississippi River, La.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3467) making an appropriation for the construction and equipment of a lighthouse depot for the eighth lighthouse district at New Orleans, La., or vicinity; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 3468) to establish a branch soldiers' home at or near St. Cloud, Osceola County, Fla.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 3469) to authorize the commitment of convicted persons to State penal farm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TINCHER: A bill (H. R. 3470) for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 3471) for erecting a suitable memorial to Nathan Hale; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 3472) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at the city of Richmond, in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3473) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at the city of Cameron, in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 3474) to repeal the literacy test; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 3475) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to cause survey to be made of the Colorado River, with a view to controlling the flood waters of said stream, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 3476) to incorporate the American Field of Honor Association; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 3477) to provide employment and rural homes for those who have served with the military and naval forces through the reclamation of lands to be known as the national soldier settlement act; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 3479) to regulate dealing in leaf tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 3480) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Forrest, State of Mississippi, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3481) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Harrison, State of Mississippi, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3482) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Covington, State of Mississippi, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3483) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Greene, State of Mississippi, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3484) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Perry, State of Mississippi, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3485) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Jones, State of Mississippi, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3486) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Wayne, State of Mississippi, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 3487) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mariposa, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3488) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Quincy, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3489) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Placerville, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3490) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Grass Valley, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3491) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Nevada City, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3492) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Yreka, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3493) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Auburn, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3494) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sonora, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3495) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of San Andreas, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3496) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Jackson, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3497) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Susanville, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3498) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Red Bluff, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3499) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Redding, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3500) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Westwood, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3501) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Alturas, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3502) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cottonwood, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINCHER: Resolution (H. Res. 60) making in order the consideration of an amendment to H. R. 3157, relating to proposed amendment to Agricultural appropriation bill, to repeal daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALTERS: Resolution (H. Res. 61) to allow the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor a clerk at a salary of $1,500 per annum; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SIEGEL: Resolution (H. Res. 62) in reference to massacres in Poland, Roumania, and Galicia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORDNEY: Resolution (H. Res. 63) to authorize the Committee on Ways and Means to sit during the sessions and recesses of the present Congress; to employ expert, clerical, and stenographic services; and to gather information through Government agents or otherwise for the preparation of bills for the revision of the present tariff law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. MOTT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 71) authorizing the President of the United States to cause to be struck bronze medals and buttons commemorating the winning of the World War, and to distribute and present such buttons and medals to civilian employees and volunteer assistants of the Government and of the Liberty-loan committee during the war; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 72) to give a medal of honor to Capt. Horatio P. Kile; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Hawaii, urging the passage of a bill to establish a fund for public works in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Hawaii, urging the passage of a bill changing the organic act of the Territory of Hawaii relative to the preference right of citizens to enter public land; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Hawaii, urging a change of the organic act of the Territory of Hawaii with reference to the time required to secure preference right to public land; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Hawaii, urging the passage of a bill to allow the Territory of Hawaii to issue bonds or incur indebtedness up to 10 per cent of the assessed valuation of property in said Territory; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, favoring the amending of the act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii, approved April 30, 1900; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, relative to the public lands in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, in regard to passenger traffic between the Territory of Hawaii and the United States; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal farm loan act so as to include the Territory of Hawaii in one of the 12 districts; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relative to the conservation of fish and clams in the Mississippi River and its branches in the States of Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring the refund of insurance premiums paid by soldiers, sailors, and marines under the soldiers' and sailors' insurance act during the war and to permit such soldiers, sailors, and marines to continue such insurance after discharge; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of Wisconsin, urging Congress to continue appropriations for the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, urging the reduction of freight rates on material so as to encourage public works; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring the withdrawal of the American forces from Russia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress to prohibit the purchase of Liberty bonds by scalpers and providing a penalty therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relating to the cheese, butter, and feed industry, and to the supply of and price for cheese, butter, and feed at the present time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relating to the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, requesting the peace conference to grant the right of self-determination to Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relating to relinquishment of Federal control of the telephone systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relating to a deep waterway from Oshkosh to Green Bay; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 3503) granting an increase of pension to William H. Brane; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 3504) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hyland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 3505) granting a pension to Rhoda Button; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 3506) granting a pension to Fred F. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3507) granting a pension to Archibald T. Lea; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 3508) granting a pension to Baxter Hogan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 3509) granting a pension to Abbie M. J. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRIE of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 3510) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3511) granting a pension to Linda Whetsel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 3512) granting an increase of pension to Soren V. Kalsen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 3513) granting an increase of pension to Walter W. Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 3514) granting a pension to Gustave Stellar; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3515) granting a pension to Wesley Cox Adkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 3516) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William B. Standford; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 3517) granting a pension to Mary Fisk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 3518) for the relief of John Sachs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3519) for the relief of David C. McGee; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 3520) granting an increase of pension to Lora Milliken; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 3521) for the relief of Catherine Grace; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 3522) for the relief of Lemuel Stokes; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 3523) granting a pension to Elizabeth Weeks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3524) granting a pension to Jane McMahon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3525) granting a pension to Jennie Tann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3526) granting a pension to Jane Cory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3527) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Brayton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITHWICK: A bill (H. R. 3528) for the relief of the Southern States Lumber Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 3529) granting a pension to Edna G. Costlow; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3530) granting a pension to Mary Ann Baldridge; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3531) granting a pension to Nancy White; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3532) granting a pension to Mary F. Church; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3533) granting a pension to Peter Dell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3534) granting a pension to Mary C. Halloway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3535) granting a pension to Sarah J. McKim; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3536) granting a pension to Nancy C. Saylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3537) granting a pension to Nancy Herrald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3538) granting a pension to Nancy A. Littleton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3539) granting an increase of pension to John N. Dansdill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3540) granting an increase of pension to Michael Dial; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3541) granting an increase of pension to Ezekiel Bogard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3542) granting an increase of pension to William Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3543) granting an increase of pension to Mary Chadwick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3544) granting an increase of pension to Steward M. Castner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3545) granting an increase of pension to George Barrows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3546) granting an increase of pension to Byron Battin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3547) granting an increase of pension to Ezra Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3548) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Culbertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3549) granting an increase of pension to James K. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3550) granting an increase of pension to George D. Lottridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3551) granting an increase of pension to James Orr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3552) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Palmatier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3553) granting an increase of pension to James E. Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3554) granting an increase of pension to Rudolph Hiller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3555) to correct the military record of William H. Minnick; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 3556) granting a pension to Lewis H. Palmer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3557) granting a pension to Sarah Amerine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3558) granting a pension to Oliver Orn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3559) granting a pension to Mary E. Little; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3560) granting a pension to Mary J. Bowen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 3561) to correct the military record of Thornton Jackson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3562) for the relief of James McD. Hays; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3563) for the relief of John W. Baker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3564) for the relief of George W. Woodall; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3565) granting an increase of pension to James E. Cline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3566) granting an increase of pension to Eli E. Hann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3567) granting an increase of pension to Ambrose S. Uselman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3568) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Woodrum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3569) granting an increase of pension to Zalman Ruddell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3570) granting an increase of pension to Henry Lang; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3571) granting an increase of pension to John Trimble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3572) granting an increase of pension to James R. Beaty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3573) granting an increase of pension to William H. Brock; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3574) granting an increase of pension to George W. Thorneburgh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3575) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson C. Garrigus; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3576) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Kurtz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3577) granting an increase of pension to Noah Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also a bill (H. R. 3578) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Kester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3579) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3580) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3581) granting an increase of pension to James F. Dickey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3582) granting a pension to Clem S. Kirkham; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3583) granting a pension to Zora Hockman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3584) granting a pension to Melissa J. Winburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3585) granting a pension to Elizabeth Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3586) granting a pension to Martin L. Stokesberry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3587) granting a pension to Patrick Lehan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3588) granting a pension to Joseph W. Camp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3589) granting a pension to Jennie Ridgley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3590) granting a pension to Lydia A. Keller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3591) granting a pension to Mary Saint Clair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3592) granting a pension to David Phillips, alias Charles Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3593) granting a pension to Lizzie Wilkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3594) for the relief of John H. Kidd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 3595) for the relief of Edward S. Farrow; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 3596) for the relief of David J. Alley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3597) granting a pension to William O. Peck; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3598) granting a pension to Henry L. Fitzhugh; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3599) granting a pension to Pleasant D. Cooper; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3600) granting a pension to Howard M. Blankenship; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3601) granting a pension to Jesse Courtney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3602) granting a pension to Hiram P. Sloan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H R. 3603) granting an increase of pension to Clarence A. Yancey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3604) granting a pension to H. H. Broce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3605) granting an increase of pension to William McQueen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 3606) granting a pension to James Shortell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 3607) granting an increase of pension to Frank M. Cottrell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 3608) granting a pension to Nathan L. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALTERS: A bill (H. R. 3609) granting an increase of pension to Amos Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 3610) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Frank Cooper; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3611) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Michael Gillespie, alias Michael Harrington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Senate of Porto Rico, urgently requesting to be included in any legislation seeking the eradication of illiteracy; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petitions of Methodist Episcopal Church, of Englewood, and Methodist Episcopal Tabernacle, of Butler, both in the State of New Jersey, protesting against repeal of war time-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution adopted at Hoboken, Hudson County, N. J., relating to the defense of Jews in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Liberal League of Hamilton County, Ohio; Methodist Episcopal Preachers' Meeting, Greater Boston; Blueridge Methodist Church, Shelbyville, Ind.; Arkadelphia Sunday School, Methodist Episcopal Church, Jonestown, Miss.; 1,000 people assembled in South St. Joseph Tabernacle, Mo.; and Forty-sixth Street Methodist Church, Bayonne, N. J., protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of American citizens of Ukrainean descent in Carnegie, Pa., relating to Ukrainean affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, protesting against daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Midvale, N. J., protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, cablegrams from Chaoming Wang, Chaochu Wu, Taichi Quo, and Eugene Chen, at peace conference, Paris, relating to the transfers to Japan of all Germany's rights in Shantung; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: Petition of congregation of First Methodist Episcopal Church of Portsmouth, N. H., Rev. Elmer F. Newell, pastor, protesting against changing the law now in force relative to war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, telegram from Mr. F. B. Hayes, superintendent of Bethany Sunday School, Rochester, N. H., protesting against President Wilson's recommendation to lift the ban on beer and wine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 35 residents of Ossipee, N. H., and vicinity, advocating the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 53 residents of Laconia, N. H., Belmont, N. H., and vicinity, advocating the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 80 residents of Portsmouth, N. H., and Rye, N. H., advocating the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 10 residents of Canterbury and vicinity, State of New Hampshire, advocating the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 25 residents of Chester, N. H., advocating the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Louden Center Grange, No. 273, by Mrs. Jennie M. Hilliard, secretary, advocating the repeal of the daylight-saving plan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAREW: Resolution of a mass meeting of jewelers of the United States, asking for the repeal of the tax on jewelry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions passed at the biennial convention of the Association of Collegiate Alumnæ, favoring the continuation of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DARROW: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade for legislation relative to delivery of unstamped first-class mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolutions by the International Union of Gospel Missions (Inc.), protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: Petition of sundry citizens of Iowa, against repeal of prohibition law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of corn growers of Iowa, protesting against admitting Argentine corn free of duty; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOOLING: Resolution of the National Garment Retailers' Association, asking for the repeal of the present luxury tax on clothing; also resolution presented by Bergdorf-Goodman Co., to repeal luxury tax on clothing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of Briscoe Motor Sales Co., Southwest Nash Motor Co., and E. A. Hatfield, all of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Missouri Bankers' Association, indorsing the One-Cent Letter Postage Association, of Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolutions of Missouri Bankers' Association, relating to railroad and water transportation and opposing Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of cigarmakers' joint unions of St. Louis, Mo., urging repeal of war-prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Deluxe Auto Co., Tate Gillham Motor Car Co., Hudson Frompton Motor Car Co., Supreme Motor Co., Frye Motor Car Co., Kardell Motor Car Co., Barnett Sales Co., Rottersman Auto Co., Wilson Motor Car Co., Cadillac Automobile Co., Moore Automobile Co., Velie Motor Car Co., Packard Motor

Car Co., Neskov Mumperow Motor Car Co., W. G. Wallace, secretary and treasurer Overland Automobile Co., all of St. Louis, Mo., protesting the tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of St. Louis Motor Car Co., asking for removal of sale tax on industries, including automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Newell Motor Car Co., urging support of President Wilson's request to Congress to remove manufacturers' sale tax on industries, including automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Lumaghi Coal Co., St. Louis, Mo., relating to the adoption of an electric mail as part of the post office service, based on the Delany system of telegraphy; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, letter relating to the Electric Mail System as offered by the Telepost Automatic Rapid Telegraphy System; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Letters from J. S. T. Waters and Maurice Gregg, both of Baltimore, Md., relating to prohibition; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Mano Schwartz, furrier; Warner & Co.; the Minch & Eisenbray Co.; L. Slesinger & Son; Joel Gutman & Co.; McDowell & Co. (Inc.); all of Baltimore, Md., protesting against revenue tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Frederick Pastet Co. (Inc.), New York City, asking that all articles purchased and used by the churches and included under section 902 of the revenue act should be exempt from tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: Petition of 759 farmers of Cass County, Ill., against the free admission of Argentine corn; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Howard County (Ill.) Farm Bureau, favoring repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions by citizens of Jacksonville, Ill., favoring league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of citizens of Edgewood and Sisson, Calif., against lifting the ban on wines and beer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Methodist Church of Fort Jones, Calif., against the lifting of the ban on beer and wine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, protest against the tax on jewelry in the revenue law of 1918 by Harry C. Larter, 23 Maiden Lane, New York City; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: Petition of United Brethren Congregation, of Otterbein; First Methodist Church, Long Beach; First Presbyterian Church, Arcadia; Epworth League, San Gabriel; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Burbank; Congregational Church, Garvanza; San Gabriel Methodist Church and San Gabriel Methodist Sunday School, Pasadena; the Neighborhood Bible School, Pasadena; First Methodist Church, 1,700 members, and Sunday School, 1,100 members, of Pasadena; Emanuel Methodist Church, Sunday School, and Epworth League, Pasadena; Hartzell Memorial Methodist Church, La Manda Park; Methodist Church, Epworth League, and Sunday School of Huntington Park; First Methodist Church of South Pasadena; 2,500 people assembled in Bible Institute Auditorium, Los Angeles; First Church of Nazarenes, numbering 1,000 members, Los Angeles; Long Beach Federation of Women's Christian Temperance Union; Marengo Avenue Methodist Church, Alhambra, all of California, against repeal of war-prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Euclid Heights Methodist Church, Los Angeles, Calif., unanimously favoring the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition of the First District (New York) Liquor Dealers' Association, against prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of Darien Grange, No. 1063, of Darien Center, N. Y., urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of the Twenty-seventh Infantry Auxiliary, making an appeal for the return of United States soldiers in Russia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Summit Lodge of Elks, favoring the deportation of aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WASON: Petition of Bert E. Wetherbee and 41 other residents of Lisbon, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Harriet A. Rogers and 20 other residents of Meriden, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of J. O. Reed and 19 other residents of Mason, N. H., and vicinity, urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Lee D. Young and 84 other residents of Milan, N. H., and vicinity, urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of A. F. Kimball and 60 other residents of Haverhill, N. H., and vicinity, urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Watatic Grange, No. 36, of New Ipswich, N. H., requesting the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Frank E. B. Mason and 35 other residents of Keene, N. H., and vicinity, urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Charlestown Grange, No. 204, of Charlestown, N. H., requesting the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of F. I. Twichell and 42 other residents of Crystal, N. H., and vicinity, urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Olive Branch Grange, of Hebron, N. H., requesting the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Granite Grange, Milford, N. H., asking for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Meriden Grange, No. 151, of Meriden, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of H. E. Reed and 30 other residents of Colebrook, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Methodist Sunday School of East Haverhill, N. H., by Mrs. A. L. Buckley, missionary superintendent, urging the retention of war-time prohibition on beer and light wines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. E. Hardy and 55 other residents of Hollis, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *May 28, 1919.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou dost hold the nations of the earth in the hollow of Thy hand. Thou hast a right to rule. We can not take from Thee the divine authority. We seek to know Thy will, that we may understand the relations that exist between men and nations. We pray that Thy rule, which is a rule of truth and righteousness and love, may take possession of our hearts, and that we may do all things according to Thy will. Guide us and direct us in the work of this hour. May it be done to the glory of Thy name. For Christ's sake. Amen.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE.

The Vice President being absent, Mr. CUMMINS, at the Vice President's chair, said:

Senators, I take advantage of this the first opportunity that has been presented to express my deep sensibility of the honor which an election to the office of President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States bestows. I am correspondingly grateful to all of you.

I do not pretend to have mastered that intricate and elusive science commonly called parliamentary law, and I shall constantly demand your kind and patient indulgence for my shortcomings in that regard. Neither have I any great skill in the interpretation of that mysterious code known as the Rules of the Senate, but I am comforted in the reflection that they are exceedingly elastic and my mistakes can be easily and quickly corrected.

Upon the occasions, and I sincerely hope they will be infrequent, when I shall be called upon to fill the office to which you have elected me, I will do my very best to be fair and impartial and assist the Senate in every way I can to transact the business for which it has assembled.

Mr. CUMMINS thereupon took the chair and directed the Secretary to read the Journal of the proceedings of Monday last.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Monday last, when, on request of Mr. ASHURST and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2480) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution appropriating $800 for preparing, compiling, and indexing an edition of the Congressional Directory for the First Session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, etc., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I offer the following order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts asks for the adoption of the following order.

The Secretary read as follows:

Ordered, That the Senate proceed to choose the majority chairmen and majority members of the standing and select committees of the Senate, and that the chairmen and members of the committees be the following Senators——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the list be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Nebraska wait until the Secretary has read the list attached to the order submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

The Secretary read as follows:

On Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress: Messrs. Penrose, Sutherland, and Keyes.

On Agriculture and Forestry: Messrs. Gronna (chairman), Page, Norris, Kenyon, Wadsworth, France, McNary, Capper, and Keyes.

On Appropriations: Messrs. Warren (chairman), Smoot, Jones of Washington, Curtis, Kenyon, Sherman, Gronna, Hale, Spencer, Phipps, and Newberry.

To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate: Messrs. Calder (chairman), Smoot, and France.

On Banking and Currency: Messrs. McLean (chairman), Page, Gronna, Norris, Frelinghuysen, Penrose, Calder, Newberry, and Keyes.

On Canadian Relations: Messrs. Hale (chairman), Sherman, Wadsworth, Spencer, and Newberry.

On the Census: Messrs. Sutherland (chairman), La Follette, McLean, Townsend, New, Calder, and Moses.

On Civil Service and Retrenchment: Messrs. Sterling (chairman), Cummings, La Follette, Smoot, Colt, Ball, and Capper.

On Claims: Messrs. Spencer (chairman), Gronna, Wadsworth, Fernald, Frelinghuysen, New, Keyes, and Capper.

On Coast and Insular Survey: Messrs. Edge (chairman), Townsend, Sterling, Hale, and Borah.

On Coast Defenses: Messrs. Frelinghuysen (chairman), Fernald, Nelson, Calder, Lenroot, and Ball.

On Commerce: Messrs. Jones of Washington (chairman), Nelson, Sherman, Harding, Fernald, Calder, Lenroot, Colt, McNary, Ball, and Edge.

On Conservation of National Resources: Messrs. Colt, Gronna, Calder, Hale, France, La Follette, Kellogg, and McCormick.

On Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia: Messrs. La Follette, Sherman, and Brandegee.

On Cuban Relations: Messrs. Johnson of California (chairman), Knox, and McCormick.

On Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments: Messrs. France, Warren, and McCumber.

On the District of Columbia: Messrs. Sherman (chairman), Dillingham, Jones of Washington, Calder, New, Ball, Capper, and Elkins.

On Education and Labor: Messrs. Kenyon (chairman), Borah, Page, McLean, Sterling, and Phipps.

On Engrossed Bills: Messrs. Warren and Elkins.

On Enrolled Bills: Messrs. Ball (chairman) and Curtis.

To Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service: Messrs. Brandegee, Nelson, Jones of Washington, and Elkins.

On Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture: Messrs. Capper (chairman), Wadsworth, and Keyes.

On Expenditures in the Department of Commerce: Messrs. Elkins (chairman), Fall, and McNary.

On Expenditures in the Interior Department: Messrs. Smoot, Poindexter, and La Follette.

On Expenditures in the Department of Justice: Messrs. Borah, Spencer, and France.

On Expenditures in the Department of Labor: Messrs. McCormick (chairman), Kellogg, and Kenyon.

On Expenditures in the Navy Department: Messrs. Dillingham, Lodge, and Newberry.

On Expenditures in the Post Office Department: Messrs. Keyes (chairman), Watson, and Edge.

On Expenditures in the Department of State: Messrs. Phipps (chairman), Penrose, and Hale.

On Expenditures in the Treasury Department: Messrs. Harding, Cummins, and Ball.

On Expenditures in the War Department: Messrs. Townsend, Norris, and Page.

On Finance: Messrs. Penrose (chairman), McCumber, Smoot, La Follette, Dillingham, McLean, Curtis, Watson, Calder, and Sutherland.

On Fisheries: Messrs. Newberry (chairman), Jones of Washington, Fernald, Moses, and McNary.

On the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians: Messrs. Norris, Colt, and Wadsworth.

On Foreign Relations: Messrs. Lodge (chairman), McCumber, Borah, Brandegee, Fall, Knox, Harding, Johnson of California, New, and Moses.

On Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game: Messrs. McLean, Sherman, New, Warren, and Edge.

On the Geological Survey: Messrs. Norris, Sutherland, Penrose, and Dillingham.

On Immigration: Messrs. Colt (chairman), Dillingham, Penrose, Sterling, Johnson of California, Keyes, and Edge.

On Indian Affairs: Messrs. Curtis (chairman), La Follette, Gronna, Fall, Fernald, McNary, Spencer, Nelson, and McCormick.

On Indian Depredations: Messrs. Poindexter, McCumber, Watson, Frelinghuysen, Warren, and Curtis.

On Industrial Expositions: Messrs. Gronna, Norris, Sutherland, Kellogg, Lodge, Kenyon, and Newberry.

On Interoceanic Canals: Messrs. Borah (chairman), Page, Cummins, Colt, Calder, Knox, Johnson of California, and Edge.

On Interstate Commerce: Messrs. Cummins (chairman), Townsend, La Follette, Poindexter, McLean, Watson, Kellogg, Fernald, Frelinghuysen, and Elkins.

To Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands: Messrs. Jones of Washington, Sutherland, and Townsend.

On Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands: Messrs. McNary (chairman), Jones of Washington, Borah, Johnson of California, Gronna, Fall, and Phipps.

On the Judiciary: Messrs. Nelson (chairman), Dillingham, Brandegee, Borah, Cummins, Colt, Sterling, Fall, Norris, and Kellogg.

On the Library: Messrs. Brandegee (chairman), Wadsworth, Moses, Johnson of California, and Knox.

On Manufactures: Messrs. La Follette (chairman), Lodge, Kenyon, Fernald, McNary, and Gronna.

On Military Affairs: Messrs. Wadsworth (chairman), Warren, Sutherland, New, Frelinghuysen, Johnson of California, Knox, Lenroot, Spencer, and Capper.

On Mines and Mining: Messrs. Poindexter (chairman), Sterling, Sutherland, McCormick, Phipps, and Newberry.

On the Mississippi River and its Tributaries: Messrs. Cummins, Wadsworth, Nelson, and Spencer.

On National Banks: Messrs. Kellogg (chairman), Lenroot, and Elkins.

On Naval Affairs: Messrs. Page (chairman), Penrose, Lodge, Poindexter, Hale, Ball, McCormick, Newberry, and Keyes.

On Pacific Islands and Porto Rico: Messrs. Fall (chairman), Poindexter, Fernald, Harding, Watson, Kenyon, and McCormick.

On Pacific Railroads: Messrs. Brandegee, McCumber, Townsend, Watson, Lenroot, and Capper.

On Patents: Messrs. Norris (chairman), Brandegee, Knox, and Kellogg.

On Pensions: Messrs. McCumber (chairman), Smoot, Poindexter, Sherman, New, Elkins, and Ball.

On the Philippines: Messrs. Harding (chairman), Kenyon, Knox, Johnson of California, McNary, Curtis, Frelinghuysen, and Hale.

On Post Offices and Post Roads: Messrs. Townsend (chairman), Sterling, France, Poindexter, Moses, McCormick, Edge, Elkins, and Phipps.

On Printing: Messrs. Moses (chairman), Smoot, Page, New, and Capper.

On Private Land Claims: Messrs. Nelson, Townsend, Moses, and Edge.

On Privileges and Elections: Messrs. Dillingham (chairman), Kenyon, Sherman, Fall, Knox, Spencer, Wadsworth, Watson, and Edge.

On Public Buildings and Grounds: Messrs. Fernald (chairman), Warren, Curtis, Sutherland, Frelinghuysen, France, Lenroot, Spencer, and Keyes.

On Public Health and National Quarantine: Messrs. France (chairman), Townsend, Frelinghuysen, Penrose, Harding, and Ball.

On Public Lands: Messrs. Smoot (chairman), Fall, Norris, Sterling, Kellogg, McNary, McCumber, Poindexter, and Lenroot.

On Railroads: Messrs. Lenroot (chairman), Lodge, Warren, Dillingham, Phipps, and Newberry.

On Revolutionary Claims: Messrs. Lodge, Kellogg, and Lenroot.

On Rules: Messrs. Knox (chairman), Nelson, Cummins, Curtis, Hale, Moses, and McCormick.

On Standards, Weights, and Measures: Messrs. Harding, Borah, and Kellogg.

On Territories: Messrs. New (chairman), McLean, Jones of Washington, Harding, Hale, Borah, and Smoot.

On Transportation Routes to the Seaboard: Messrs. McCumber, Lodge, Sherman, Phipps, and Capper.

On Transportation and Sale of Meat Products: Messrs. Page, McLean, and France.

On the University of the United States: Messrs. Dillingham, Brandegee, McCumber, Colt, Sterling, and Elkins.

On Woman Suffrage: Messrs. Watson (chairman), Jones of Washington, Nelson, Cummins, and Johnson of California.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I make the parliamentary inquiry whether it is the view of the Chair that this is a matter of high privilege and subject to debate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is, in the opinion of the Chair, a matter of high privilege. I have not considered the question as to whether it is debatable.

Mr. LODGE rose.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to have the view of the Senator from Massachusetts on that subject.

Mr. LODGE. I think there is no question that it is a matter of the highest privilege. It has been held universally, and it has been held in the Senate. There is no need of a ruling on it; it is universal.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And it is open to debate?

Mr. LODGE. I should so consider it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is all I wished to ascertain first.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As far as the Chair is concerned, the Chair will announce that he will rule upon that question when it arises. I am not prepared to rule upon it now.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is a matter of the highest importance. I think the concession of the Senator from Massachusetts settles it that it is a debatable question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concession of the Senator from Massachusetts will have great influence here.

Mr. LODGE. Of course I make no point of order that it is not open to debate.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then I make a point of order against the motion as made, that the election of the chairmen can not be combined with the election of the body of the members of the committees, for the reason that the chairmen must be elected by a majority of the whole number of votes given, whereas a plurality of votes are sufficient to elect the members of the committees. Therefore my point of order is that the members of the committees must be separated from the chairmen in the motion before the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in regard to that point of order—which I do not think is good—the rule says that it shall be done in a certain way "unless otherwise ordered." Now, "otherwise ordered" means in any way the Senate chooses to determine. I read the procedure in reference to the appointment of standing and select committees:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from ——— presents a privileged resolution, which will be read.
(The Secretary reads:)
Resolved, That the Senate now proceed to the appointment of the standing and other committees of the Senate for the present session.

It covers them all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution is agreed to.
A SENATOR. I move that the committees be constituted as stated in the paper which I send to the Chair.

It covers them all. We can make any order that we please about the method. That is clear when the rule says "otherwise ordered."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think not, Mr. President. The rule is very clear that the election of the members of a committee is different from the election of the chairman of the committee. The election may be by ballot or it may be by resolution or it may be by unanimous consent; but when a division is demanded the majority has the right to depend upon the rule, which reads as follows:

A majority of the whole number of votes given shall be necessary to the choice of a chairman of a standing committee, but a plurality of votes shall elect the other members thereof.

That is the rule which applies, no matter what method is adopted. The Senate may adopt the ballot method or it may adopt the roll-call method or it may adopt some other method; but, in any event, there is a difference between the chairman of a committee and the membership of a committee. I therefore insist on my point of order that there must be a division, and that we are entitled to have a division between the election of the chairmen and the election of the bodies of committees.

Mr. LODGE. I am utterly unable to see any force in that point. The words "otherwise ordered" cover the entire rule, and we can order it in any way we please. Of course it is open to debate and it is open to amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, there was no order adopted by the Senate this morning changing the rule, and this is not an order changing the rule.

Mr. LODGE. That is precisely what this order does; it changes the rule.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I disagree with the Senator; and I wish to show why it does not. It undertakes to elect at once without changing the rule at all. Now, let me read the order:

Ordered, That the Senate proceed to choose majority chairmen and majority members of the standing committees of the Senate—

All right; that does not change the rule. Under the rule we can proceed to select. The order continues:

and that said chairmen and members of the committees be the following Senators.

There is no change of the rule. You proceed to elect without changing the rule; you proceed to designate. The practice heretofore has been to pass an order deciding upon a different plan for selection. That order having been passed, then the committees have been submitted. This, however, is simply an order to execute a selection.

Mr. LODGE. Not at all. It provides the manner, which is by electing the membership of committees as they always have been elected.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It provides no manner at all.

Mr. LODGE. It does.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It names them.

Mr. LODGE. It provides the manner of electing them by resolution, because it is itself an order.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But no order has been passed changing the rule. This is an order naming certain Senators without changing the rule at all. Now, let us see what the rule provides——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I desire to state to the Senator from Georgia that it is not necessary to change the rule, and nobody claims that we are changing the rule. The rule itself provides that the Senate may otherwise order than by ballot, and the resolution offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is in accordance with the rule by otherwise ordering.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, let us see what the rule provides in the appointment of the standing committees of the Senate. It reads:

1. In the appointment of the standing committees the Senate, unless otherwise ordered, shall proceed by ballot to appoint severally the chairman of each committee, and then, by one ballot, the other members necessary to complete the same. A majority of the whole number of votes given shall be necessary to the choice of a chairman of a standing committee, but a plurality of votes shall elect the other members thereof.

The rule fixes the way, unless the Senate orders a different plan for election. No order has been adopted by the Senate nor has one been offered to fix a different plan. This is simply a resolution naming certain Senators as chairmen of committees and members of committees from the majority side. We are entitled to an order fixing the mode of electing all members—not simply the Republican members. You have done nothing of the kind. You have not offered a resolution declaring that the members of the standing committees for the coming Congress shall be selected in a certain way. That can be done; the rule allows the Senate to order any way it sees fit to make the selections. You have not done anything of the kind; you have made no provision for the minority selections; you have not said how they shall be made. You have merely undertaken in your resolution to name your own chairmen and your own membership of committees, and then stopped.

Mr. LODGE. Precisely; but that is open to amendment, and you can offer your membership.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But I am raising the point——

Mr. LODGE. I have no authority to offer your members.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not ask you to do that. I ask you to offer a resolution fixing the way in which they shall be selected; and I am pointing out that you have not done it.

Mr. LODGE. I think we have.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am urging that you have not; and, with the greatest respect for the views of the Senator from Massachusetts, I am undertaking to make it clear that you have not done it; and I think I do so. Your order or your resolution can name a way for the selection of the chairmen and the membership of the committees. When you offer a resolution of that kind, it will apply to all. That is not what has been done. This resolution is simply a designation of the Republican part of the committees. Now, I ask—and I am not captious, for I am anxious that we should get right at this and dispose of it speedily—I ask for a resolution designating the way in which the chairmen and the members of the committees shall be selected, applying to Democratic as well as to Republican members of committees. If your resolution provides that they shall be selected by a mere resolution, then we would ask to amend it, and submit that the chairmen be selected by a roll call. Frankly, we desire to go on record with reference to who shall be the chairmen of committees.

Mr. LODGE. There is nothing to prevent that amendment being offered.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But this is not a resolution fixing the mode of selecting committees.

Mr. LODGE. You can add it to the order just as well as you can to any other Senate resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But the order does not say how they shall be elected. You have not changed the rule. You are simply undertaking to elect your own members alone without a modification of the rule.

Mr. LODGE. I propose to change the rule by defining the manner in which members of the committees shall be selected; the way in which it has always been done.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. You only elect your own members.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly. There is nothing in the rule that obliges you to elect them all. You can fill one committee or you can fill fifty.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But the rule says you must designate the way in which they shall be selected.

Mr. LODGE. We have designated the way.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. You have designated your own members.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly, I have.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. You have not designated the way in which the committees shall be selected, nor have you designated the way in which the chairmen shall be named.

Mr. LODGE. I do not have to do so.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. You have made no designation with reference to it. You have simply undertaken to elect your members by resolution, and without providing a plan for the election of the chairmen and members of the committees.

Mr. LODGE. I have prepared a plan; and the plan is the list offered, as it has always been done.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is, where it was done by unanimous consent?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The very action which the Senator called attention to was a resolution providing for the election in a certain way of all members of committees——

Mr. LODGE. Those proceedings were by unanimous consent.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And not simply the election of a particular man.

Mr. LODGE. I only read a definition of privileged questions.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. What we ask of you is this: We think it is fair that at the same time that you provide the method for the selection of your chairmen you should provide for the selection of the other members, and that you ought not to segregate simply your members and proceed in that way alone.

Mr. LODGE. I would not have segregated ours if I had had an opportunity to offer a list of all the committees together, as has been hitherto universally done.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator would offer a general resolution providing for a way in which all should be elected, we could amend it or we could yield to the method which is proposed, and when you presented your members we could present ours also.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, if the Senator will furnish the names of the members of the minority, I shall be only too glad to include them.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, that is not the question. We realize we have the opportunity to amend, but we are depending as a minority on our rights under the rules of the Senate, which require that the chairman of a committee must be elected by a majority vote, no matter how that vote is taken, whereas the other members of the committees may be elected by a plurality vote, no matter how the vote is taken. We think we have the right to depend upon that rule. We realize that the vote may be by ballot, and we realize it may be by roll call.

Mr. LODGE. In both cases "unless otherwise ordered."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No.

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is a point upon which I desire to speak.

Mr. LODGE. And I offer another method, which is the usual method of electing them, namely, by list.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is very evident from a perusal of this rule that the rule intends that it shall lay down the practice that committees shall be elected by ballot, unless otherwise ordered, but it also provides that a chairman must in any case have a majority vote, whereas the members of the committee may be elected by a plurality vote. I wish to read the rule in view of that statement:

> In the appointment of the standing committees, the Senate, unless otherwise ordered, shall proceed by ballot to appoint severally the chairman of each committee, and then, by one ballot, the other members necessary to complete the same.

That ends that. Here is a new sentence:

> A majority of the whole number of votes given shall be necessary to the—

It does not say whether it is by ballot or how—

> shall be necessary to the choice of a chairman.

You can not select a chairman, you can not make a choice of a chairman without a majority where there is any contest.

Mr. LODGE. "Unless otherwise ordered."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; if you could otherwise order, you could elect the chairman by a plurality vote, and then the provision of the rule would be a dead letter.

Mr. LODGE. You can if you order otherwise, and that can be done by a majority.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; the Senator must realize that my contention is right; that this is a rule for the protection of the minority.

Mr. LODGE. Let me ask the Senator, if I may check the flow of his eloquence in regard to ballots, which have not been used, I think, for 60 years, will he tell me what "otherwise ordered" means.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. "Otherwise ordered" means that a majority can change from a ballot to a resolution, but, whether the method is by ballot or resolution, a majority is necessary to select a chairman, while a plurality may select other members of the committee, because at the close of the rule it is said:

> But a plurality of votes shall elect the other members thereof. All other committees shall be appointed by ballot, unless otherwise ordered, and a plurality of votes shall appoint.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. What I want to ask the Senator from Massachusetts is this: If a majority in the Senate are opposed to this method of proceeding, how are we to express our opposition on a vote on this motion?

Mr. LODGE. You can amend it or defeat it.

Mr. PITTMAN. I understand that; but how are we to express the majority view of the Senate, in the event the majority view is such, in opposition to this method by voting on this motion?

Mr. LODGE. Under the words "otherwise ordered" we have abolished the ballot, as has been done for the last 50 or 60 years.

Mr. PITTMAN. If I vote "no" on this matter, I am not voting against the changing of the order of business, but I am voting against certain candidates. If I vote "yes," I may not be voting for the order of business but for certain candidates. I want the privilege of voting for candidates, but I do not desire to vote for the candidates under the method that will be forced on us, unless we can determine the order in which they shall be voted on. There is no method of determining the order by voting on anything before the Senate now.

Mr. LODGE. The resolution can be amended at any point and in any way; it is open to amendment, of course.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me for a suggestion?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] that it would be competent to offer a substitute for the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts, providing that the Senate proceed to the election of the chairmen of the various committees under the rules.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The objection to that is this: Such a motion might be carried by a party vote, and it would destroy the right of the minority to insist upon a separate vote for chairmen and for members, which is evidently made clear by the rule. It is made clear no matter what the method of the election is. It is in the choice of the chairmen, not in the method of the choice, that a majority is required, whereas only a plurality is required in the case of other members of the committees. We do not care what method you adopt; the minority does not care whether you vote by ballot or by resolution; but we do think we have a right to insist upon the terms of the rule, which require that chairmen must be elected by a majority.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me merely to make a suggestion?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator from Nebraska is not making the point that this matter can not be determined otherwise than by ballot; he concedes that the members of the committees and the chairmen can be selected otherwise than by ballot. It is proposed to do it by resolution, and that feature is not objected to; but all the Senator from Nebraska is insisting on is that you shall divide the question, because a different vote is required as to the chairmen of the committees than the vote that is required as to the other members of the committees. Am I not correct?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. FLETCHER. It seems to me clearly under the rule we are entitled to a division of that question. That is the whole question. It is not contended that you can not order otherwise than by ballot at this election; we are not contending that you can not do it by resolution, and not opposing your plan, for that matter; but we are insisting that, under the further provision of the rule, we are entitled to a division of the question as to the election of chairmen and the election of other members of the committees. That is the whole point of order.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make an inquiry at that point?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I understand that the Senator from Florida makes the point that the election of chairmen of committees requires a majority vote, whereas in the case of an ordinary member of a committee it only takes a plurality. Now, the Senator admits that the Senate can otherwise order the election of these officers than by ballot; the Senator admits, of course, that the Senate can pass an order by a majority vote of the Senate, does he not?

Mr. FLETCHER. I presume that is true.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Well, that is the only way the Senate can act—by a majority.

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Now, if this order naming these chairmen and the members of the committees secures a majority vote of the Senate, it certainly has a plurality, and it does not lie in the mouth of the Senator from Florida to find a grievance as to the ordinary members of the committees getting a majority instead of a plurality. A right to a division of the question is not within the rule at all.

Mr. FLETCHER. But I do insist that where the Senate is required to vote en bloc upon all these members the vote might be one way, whereas if the question were separated the vote might possibly be otherwise. That is the whole question of whether you are entitled to a division of any question or not. That is what is involved here.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I have no doubt that if the Senator were drawing an order of his own he could so arrange it as to put up different questions and paragraphs, some of which would secure a larger majority than others; but the difficulty is, this order is drawn by the Senator from Massachusetts, and it clearly is within the rule and in accordance with the rule that the Senate may order otherwise than by ballot; and that is exactly what the Senator from Massachusetts has proposed. The fact that his order embraces chairmen, as well as other members of the committees, does not at all detract from its efficiency as an order of the Senate if a majority vote for it. The grievance of the Senators is that they have not a majority and we have; and if a majority passes this order they have no grievance to complain.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] stood up here the other day and insisted upon the right of the majority to do business, and that is the reason why he voted for the rule against filibustering at the last session. Now we have a majority. Let us organize the Senate. The fact that we do not lay down a general rule for the appointment of all the committees at the same time, as suggested by the Senator from Georgia, presents no question of order. The Senate has a right under the rule to order otherwise than by ballot the appointment of these committees in any respect that it has a mind to.

It can order that the majority members of the committee be appointed in this way, and that the minority members be appointed by ballot, or by unanimous consent, if that order gets a majority vote of the Senate, and that is all there is to it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is quite ready to rule upon the point of order. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. I was going to make this suggestion to the Senator: The only portion of this method of electing these chairmen and members that can be modified by a majority vote or changed from ballot to otherwise is the portion as to whether you shall elect by ballot or in some other way. That the rule provides for. A majority can change the ballot to some other method. I admit that. There is no question but that that can be done; but a majority can not change the rule. If you are going to change this rule, you will have to do it by the regular method under which you can change a rule; and the rule provides that the chairmen must be selected by a majority vote, not otherwise.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I agree to every word the Senator has said, which reinforces the argument that I make, Mr. President. We are not trying to change the rule. If we tried to change this rule, we would have to get a two-thirds vote, and probably give a day's notice. We are pursuing the rule exactly. We are going along in accordance with the very provisions of the rule itself; and we are attempting to pass an order here which, if the Senators on the other side will let us come to a vote on it, will disclose a majority vote of the Senate ordering that these committees be appointed otherwise than by ballot. It is just as clear as crystal.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia rose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia desire to continue the debate?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not know that I do, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the opinion of the Chair that the question argued by the Senator from Nebraska is not raised by his point of order. The rule very clearly provides that—

> In the appointment of the standing committees the Senate, unless otherwise ordered, shall proceed by ballot to appoint severally the chairman of each committee, and then by one ballot the other members necessary to complete the same.

The Chair is of the opinion that the motion offered by the Senator from Massachusetts merely changes the form in which the selection is to take place, and the question whether it must be adopted by a majority or by a plurality—the latter is impossible, of course—does not arise at this time. The Chair is inclined to believe that the chairmen of these committees must be selected by a majority, unless it is otherwise ordered by the Senate in the proper way, but that question is not before the Senate at this time, and is not presented by the point of order.

The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I move as a substitute for the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts that the Senate proceed to choose by roll call the chairmen of the committees of the Senate. I will say, in making that motion, that it is not my purpose to require that that go down through the whole list. We are willing to confine it to the major committees and abandon the roll call and allow the remainder to go by unanimous consent, but we take this method of bringing before the Senate the election of the chairmen of committees in the regular way.

Mr. LODGE. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the order offered by the Senator from Massachusetts the following is proposed:

> *Ordered*, That the Senate proceed to select the chairmen of the standing committees of the Senate by call of the roll.

Mr. LODGE. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. HITCHCOCK, Mr. THOMAS, and other Senators called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I desire to announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] has a pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER].

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I announced at the convening of this session of Congress that during the last session I had a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island. I had no understanding with him that the pair was to extend to this Congress. I notified his office two weeks ago to-day that I was not prepared to continue it into this Congress. I have had no communication with him since. I respected it for the first day, at the suggestion of certain Democratic Senators, in order that he might have ample time to return from Europe. I do not feel in the slightest degree obligated to respect a pair which, as I understood, was for the last Congress only.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. GRONNA. I call for the regular order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I ask, on behalf of the Senator from Rhode Island, to be permitted to state that when he left here he expected to be back at the beginning of this session, and stated that if not he would be protected by his pair with the Senator from New York, and that the Senator from New York recognized that pair on one of the first votes taken in the Senate after the matter had been called to his attention. The Senator from Rhode Island, at the time the notice was given to his office, was in France somewhere near the front, and is there now.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the matter of pairs is one with which the Senate has nothing whatever to do, and can not settle any controversy of that character.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I think I am entitled to state that on the convening of Congress I stated that I would recognize the pair for that day only.

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 48, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—48.

Ball	Edge	Johnson, Calif.	McCumber
Borah	Elkins	Jones, Wash.	McLean
Brandegee	Fall	Kellogg	McNary
Calder	Fernald	Kenyon	Moses
Capper	France	Keyes	Nelson
Colt	Frelinghuysen	Knox	New
Cummins	Gronna	Lenroot	Newberry
Curtis	Hale	Lodge	Norris
Dillingham	Harding	McCormick	Page

Penrose	Sherman	Sterling	Wadsworth
Phipps	Smoot	Sutherland	Warren
Poindexter	Spencer	Townsend	Watson

NAYS—45.

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Pittman	Stanley
Bankhead	Jones, N. Mex.	Pomerene	Swanson
Beckham	Kendrick	Ransdell	Thomas
Chamberlain	King	Reed	Trammell
Culberson	Kirby	Robinson	Underwood
Dial	La Follette	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	McKellar	Shields	Walsh, Mont.
Gay	Martin	Simmons	Williams
Gore	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Harris	Nugent	Smith, Ga.	
Harrison	Overman	Smith, Md.	
Henderson	Owen	Smith, S. C.	

NOT VOTING—3.

Gerry	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan

So Mr. HITCHCOCK's amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, on page 19 of the list furnished by the Senator from Massachusetts, after the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], I move to strike out the word "chairman."

Mr. LODGE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Let us have the yeas and nays.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I call for the yeas and nays on that request, Mr. President.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ASHURST. Let the question be read again, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to lay upon the table the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. The motion of the Senator from Nebraska is to strike out, after the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], the word "chairman" in the list of the Committee on Finance. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I wish to inquire whether the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] has voted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] has not voted.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator from Mississippi is at liberty to vote, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was a very delicate question, and without the Senator giving the liberty I felt bound to withhold my vote.

Mr. PENROSE. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator, but I understand no pairs are recognized on this vote on organization.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I then vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 48, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—48.

Ball	Fernald	La Follette	Page
Borah	France	Lenroot	Phipps
Brandegee	Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Poindexter
Calder	Gronna	McCormick	Sherman
Capper	Hale	McCumber	Smoot
Colt	Harding	McLean	Spencer
Cummins	Johnson, Calif.	McNary	Sterling
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Moses	Sutherland
Dillingham	Kellogg	Nelson	Townsend
Edge	Kenyon	New	Wadsworth
Elkins	Keyes	Newberry	Warren
Fall	Knox	Norris	Watson

NAYS—43.

Ashurst	Henderson	Owen	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Hitchcock	Pittman	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Jones, N. Mex.	Pomerene	Stanley
Chamberlain	Kendrick	Ransdell	Swanson
Culberson	King	Reed	Trammell
Dial	Kirby	Robinson	Underwood
Fletcher	McKellar	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Gay	Martin	Shields	Walsh, Mont.
Gore	Myers	Simmons	Williams
Harris	Nugent	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Harrison	Overman	Smith, Ga.	

NOT VOTING—5.

Gerry	Penrose	Phelan	Thomas
Johnson, S. Dak.			

So Mr. HITCHCOCK's motion was laid on the table.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I withheld my vote on the last roll call. I did so because I felt that it was hardly just to discriminate among the chairmen of the committees as proposed by the resolution, although I appreciate the purpose which inspired the amendment, and I would have voted in the negative had my vote been controlling. Politically none of these chairmanships are acceptable to me. Personally I am just as content with the nomination of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] as chairman of the Finance Committee as I am with the other chairmanships which have been designated by the so-called stand-pat wing of the Republican Party. The adjective may from this time on, I think, be eliminated, because that is the only wing that is left.

We have had a good deal of agitation, if I may use the term, or at least we have been favored with much speculation and agitation regarding objections to two Senators of the majority who have been named by a majority of the majority for the chairmanships of two of the major committees. I have been unable to discriminate, my subtlety of mind is unequal to the ability of discriminating, between those who from a political standpoint may be assumed to be equally and impartially obnoxious. I do not understand that mental process which strains at the Penrose gnat and swallows the Lodge camel, which shies at the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] and embraces the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]. All these gentlemen look alike to me—politically, I mean, of course.

Inasmuch as this opposition or rebellion has dwindled from its inception until it assumes microscopic dimensions, and inasmuch as the lion has lain down with the lamb in the usual way, I have been somewhat surprised that Senators should resort to parliamentary tactics in order to escape going on record upon the main proposition.

The country now knows, Mr. President, because of the votes which have been taken, that all is harmony on the Republican side; that the assertion of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] that the Republican Party is in the majority in the Senate is absolutely true—a slender majority, a dangerous majority, if you please, but a majority nevertheless—with the old guard once more in the saddle and the old Republican policies in all probability to be resumed and made effective if possible.

Mr. President, since I have the floor, and since I have some criticisms to make, which I have on previous occasions made, regarding the procedure of the Senate, I want to make one more appeal to this new majority in behalf of such a modification of our methods of procedure as may enable us to do business and get somewhere with the work that is now confronting the Senate.

The Sixty-third, Sixty-fourth, and Sixty-fifth Congresses have passed into history. They were numerically and nominally Democratic. In the House the majority was actual; in the Senate it was potential, when it was not powerless, and it was always powerless when a minority willed to have it so.

The closing days of each of these Congresses were given over to continued and successful filibuster. The first was provoked by the so-called shipping bill of 1915, which aroused the opposition of many Republicans and a handful of Democrats. It delayed our shipbuilding program for more than two years of infinitely precious time. Not till the great war was upon us and our entry into it officially proclaimed could it be reformulated and secure a place upon the calendar.

In March, 1917, the armed ship defense bill, urged by the Executive and demanded by every instinct of national security, became the Senate order of business. It was instantly assailed and swamped by a nonpartisan filibuster, conducted to the last second of the session, and leaving the Government to its unaided resources in meeting the emergency thrust upon it by the German renewal of indiscriminate submarine warfare.

In March, 1919, the session was filibustered to an ignominious and humiliating finish by three Senators for reasons doubtless satisfactory to themselves, but by no means so to the country. More than a dozen supply bills of the first and most pressing importance were talked and gesticulated to death. Because of this a great part of the governmental machinery must be relieved by July 1 or cease to operate. One of them, perhaps the most immediately important of all, was essential to the performance by the Government of its agreement with the transportation companies, made with the sanction and by the direct command of the Congress. But for this filibuster the special session just begun, with its many discomforts, annoyances, and inevitable controversies, could have been avoided.

The filibuster of 1915 aroused the public to a sharp disapproval; that of 1917 provoked its bitter indignation. The last one has inspired disgust and resentment, which may or may not eventuate in changing our rules and thus preventing a recurrence of the calamity. The Republican Party, now in control of the Senate, and always charging its adversary with lack of administrative capacity, and therefore of power to accomplish reforms, either of government or procedure, may be wise enough to seize the opportunity of its brief hour of supremacy and discard for all time the minority's ancient and reprehensible facilities for obstruction. Democracy had its opportunity to do this and failed. Its so-called cloture rule is a misnomer. It was the response to a public demand for limiting senatorial debate. The public clamored for radical and substantial change. We pre-

sented it with a new rule which aggravated, if that were possible, the intolerable condition it pretended to improve. We emphasized the evil by authorizing two-thirds of the Senate, after a three days' debate, to bring the subject of it to a vote not longer than 96 legislative hours thereafter. But inasmuch as filibusters seldom or never occur until the session draws to its close, the rule is palpably ineffectual. It was literally the offer of a stone in response to a demand for bread. I do not say that this miscarriage was premeditated, for that would reflect most unjustly upon the authors of the amendment; but it is true that no more liberal concession could be extorted from the conservatism of a majority of those then composing the membership of the United States Senate. So far it has never been actually invoked. The creaking of its ponderous and ill-adjusted mechanism may perchance sometime assail the nerves of the Senate and attract the curious to its galleries, but I apprehend that will occur only when some political organization shall command the allegiance of two-thirds of its Members. Long before that phenomenon occurs it should be sent to the limbo of legislative antiques.

When this amendment was laid before the Democratic caucus, I registered a feeble protest against it, which was neither loud nor long enough to distract attention. It was accepted with practical unanimity because its sponsors lauded its sufficiency and asserted that it embodied the extreme of Republican cooperation, which in plain English meant "take that or nothing." The difference between that and nothing has never been perceptible and, in my judgment, it never will be. When it was submitted to the Senate on March 7, 1917, I submitted very briefly some of the reasons for my dissent from the general approbation with which it was greeted. I shall disentomb but a single extract from its buried and forgotten wisdom:

> Now we have presented to us, because of the developments in the last few days, which may never recur, and the aroused public opinion upon the subject, a rare opportunity to amend the rules and establish cloture by majority. If we are to let it pass by the enactment of this rule, which will bring no real measure of relief, we shall regret it very soon. This rule, requiring a two-thirds vote for its recognition, can not be obtained in most instances, perhaps in very few. When obtained, it fixes no time when a vote can be taken, but leaves full opportunity to the minority to postpone a vote to the consideration of endless motions to adjourn and to calls for quorums and to appeals from the rulings of the Chair, which may prove quite as efficacious to obstruction as the longest addresses can be. We are therefore giving a promise to the ear of the country which will be broken to the hope. We have agreed to, and are about to enact at this crisis, something that we call cloture, which, in its practical operation, will prove a delusion and a snare; in other words, this golden opportunity is to be lost, and we are about to enact a proposed limitation upon debate to relieve this body from the burden of future filibustering which leaves many opportunities for its continuation. The fact is that a majority do not want cloture. They will not surrender the power which its absence gives to the individual. My impression is that unless the rules be amended by providing cloture by majority the practical operation of this measure will prove a deep disappointment to the hopes of those who are sponsors for it. I trust I may be mistaken. I have the most abundant confidence in the wisdom and judgment of the Senators who disagree with me upon this subject. I earnestly trust that theirs may in time prove to be the correct estimate of what this measure will accomplish, but I doubt it. I therefore vote for it under protest.

After this experience the cloture storm of 1917 subsided. The Senate went on in its old way, and the public accepted the assurance of leaders on both sides of the Chamber that cloture had been established; that the Senate had mended its ways and the age of the filibuster had passed. Then three men suddenly demonstrated their ability to talk continuously and say nothing, and thus paralyze the public business, suspend the calendar, keep the Senate in continuous session for days and nights and bring the machinery of the legislative department to a standstill. They have gone far to establish the labor demagogue's theory that the longer the hours of toil the smaller the output. They have varied somewhat the former and staider methods of innovations which are suggestive and which may ripen into attractions for the curious and the unemployed.

Mere talk, however melodious and edifying, becomes dull when unduly prolonged. But when punctuated by vigorous action its monotony may sometimes be lessened if not altogether relieved. This was demonstrated by one of the filibustering triumvirate, whose exhibition of vocal and physical gymnastics upon this floor will long be remembered by the few Senators unfortunate enough to be present upon that memorable occasion. He did not favor us with a double somersault, but he certainly established an enviable record as a pedestrian. He traveled up and down, across and along the Chamber. He circled its outer limits, explored all its nooks and crannies, tested the quality of every desk with the sledge-hammer blows of his powerful fists, while his voice sonorously proclaimed his unappeasable anguish. His mileage was prodigious and his vocabulary was wholly unfettered. Whether he talked because he was walking or walked because he was talking, no man to this hour can say, for the race between his tongue and his legs ended in a draw. When he finally yielded the floor to one of his allies and retired to be groomed, fed, and blanketed for the next heat he was easily the favorite performer to the galleries. The others were powerful engines, but they were stationary. He was the locomotive, and always on the move. Stenography surrenders at discretion to this new style of filibuster. Only the moving picture and the phonograph can adequately present him to a continental constituency.

Frankly, Mr. President, if our rules are to remain unchanged and filibustering is to continue, I favor this new method of conducting it. It is a Russian innovation. Since the overthrow of the Czar every Russian mingles motion with malediction. Success comes to the loudest and the longest. I hope the new precedent will be initiated and expanded. Let us have singing, clog dancing, and ground and lofty tumbling. A duet by the Senators from Wisconsin and Illinois, leapfrog over the desks and chairs by the Senator from Maryland, and "We won't go home till morning" by the trio would serve to keep the rest of us awake, give the members of the press gallery some inducement to remain in the Chamber, and be just as effectual in obstructing the due and ordered course of legislation. Moreover, it would be less exhausting to the performers and quite as relevant to the subject ostensibly under discussion.

The dignity of the Senate has become traditional. Dignity can not flourish when self-respect is lost, and self-respect can not long be maintained in a body, however distinguished, which not only permits but sanctions and perpetuates a method of obstruction that would not be tolerated in a ward caucus. The usefulness of the Senate can be challenged by the fact that it functions only by unanimous consent, and may, as it frequently does, arrest or threaten governmental operations by the force of legislative inertia. It was incorporated into the governmental scheme for no such purpose. It would have been rejected by the fathers of the Republic had they conceived the possibility of its degeneracy into a final asylum for the filibuster. If it is subject to that reproach—and I affirm that it is—it should reform itself or be eliminated, for it has no place in the mechanism of twentieth century democracy, and public opinion will sooner or later focalize upon that subject and demand a radical revision of article 1 of the Federal Constitution.

The easy manipulation of State legislatures by millionaires and big combinations interested in the selection of Senators compelled the adoption in 1913 of organic changes whereby the people of the respective States were clothed with the duty of choosing their Senators by popular vote, and of legislative enactments whereby expenditures for seeking nominations and elections were limited under severe penalties to a maximum presumably within the reach of all aspirants. This maximum was deemed amply sufficient for all legitimate needs, yet so small as to prevent resort to undue and corruptive processes of campaigning. This change was hailed as an epoch in governmental reform as the knell of the old era, as the dawn of moral and intellectual regeneration of the Senate. The people would thereafter choose of their best; merit would supplant money in political contests, both primary and ultimate; and the public would find expression through the enactment of wise, just, and needed legislation. But, alas for the imperfections of human foresight. After six years' experience under the new régime we perceive that in politics, as in the world of matter, mere changes of form seldom work changes of substance. The hand is hardly that of Esau, while the voice is yet the voice of Jacob.

The corrupt-practices act has proven to be more unsubstantial than a soldier's dream. The 42-centimeter guns of the millionaire aspirant for senatorial honors demolish its barriers as easily as those of Von Kluck battered the fortifications of Namur. Corruption money flows through its meager network of obstruction like water through a sieve. It has served only to increase ignorance and destroy the synonym between consent and acquiescence. A candidate for the Senate by merely swearing that no money beyond the statutory limit has been expended in his behalf with his knowledge or by his consent may become the complacent beneficiary of corruption funds mounting into the hundreds of thousands collected and distributed in his behalf. Ignorance has become a sine qua non to a nomination, and the withholding of audible consent a sure defense and bulwark to the unhindered and unblushing prostitution of the public franchise. As between elections of Senators by legislatures and by popular vote, economy and decency will decide in favor of the former, whose processes are cheaper and less flamboyant.

It is therefore unhappily apparent that improvements in legislation must come, if they come at all, through reforms in parliamentary procedure rather than through methods of senatorial selection.

Primaries and popular campaigns may be substituted for legislative intrigue, but they have not changed human legislation. A constituency which will return a faithless or venal Repre-

sentative must be endowed with similar vices, and these may be reached at the source as we now soberly realize. If we, the flower and fruit of the new régime, are of more rugged fiber than those whom we have displaced, we must prove it; and we can not do so by accepting their methods and imitating their example, both of which up to this time we have faithfully done.

I deny that the right of unlimited obstruction is an essential to the public welfare. There may be rare occasions when resort to such an agency becomes the only means for the general protection. The Force bill of 1891 is constantly cited as an illustration of the need for this remedy, and the possibility of its reappearance is the specter always confronting the novitiate from the South who may be prone to question the wisdom of its survival. While it is true that the Force bill was a monstrous conception, incapable of justification, whose enactment would have wrought infinite wrong to the South had its provisions been enforced, it is nevertheless true that public opinion would have prevented its operation and consigned the party responsible for its appearance to certain disaster. No measure of legislation that is opposed to the prevailing sentiment of a free people can be made effective or long disfigure the statute books. And the average Senator, be he Democrat or Republican, always has one and tries to keep both ears to the ground that he may catch the first notes of the popular view of current subjects. No seismograph more surely records the remotest vibrations of the earth nor more swiftly defines their meaning. True, the public is sometimes dumb and frequently discordant, but its general direction is easily observant to the anxious listener, who may be sure to find sooner or later the clue he seeks. I therefore question whether the Force bill would have become a law even had it reached a vote, and I know it would have wrecked the Republican Party had it ever dared to make the law effective. That was demonstrated by the election of 1892, wherein the effort to force its passage became an important factor of the campaign.

The silver filibuster of 1893 accomplished no purpose other than to make the cause of free coinage the more obnoxious to the country. That of 1901 against the rivers and harbors bill only postponed its enactment to the succeeding Congress, when its appropriations were swelled away beyond those of its ill-fated predecessor.

But were the facts otherwise, the legislative abuses which the system not only permits but encourages far outweigh its importance. I affirm that appropriations which upon their merits could not command a tithe of the votes of this body, and that vicious or undesirable legislation which could not be taken from the calendar for serious consideration, are enacted at every session wholly because of it. I have witnessed the securing of appropriations for local purposes by Senators who had only to intimate a purpose to filibuster in order to secure them. I have known riders to be placed, not once but frequently, upon bills for general legislation, because otherwise they could never reach a vote. It is needless to cite instances. Every Senator on this floor, save those recently coming into office, knows that I speak the truth. Rules of procedure which permit such things are not only indefensible but damnable.

Ours is a Government of majorities. This must be so, for we are a Republic. The majority should govern. The majority is held responsible, and properly so, for the efficient conduct of public affairs, and especially for all mistakes or errors of legislation and of policy. Hence it must have power to function. It has this power everywhere save in the Senate. The Democratic Party had numerical control of the last Congress, but it could cast no vote in the Senate save by grace of the minority. That Congress expired with a Senate calendar congested with business of tremendous importance. It failed to transact this business because a very small minority vetoed its purpose. Yet the public do not censure the minority which would not, but the majority, which could not submit its measures to final consideration. The majority of this Congress is Republican. Responsibility has shifted, but power has not shifted. This is with any handful of us on either side of the aisle which may wish to deadlock the due course of procedure.

Some of your leaders have announced their commendable purpose to establish a budget system at an early day, thus making economy of administration possible. God speed you in your good work. But if I mistake not quite a respectable number of Congressmen in both Houses are not enamored of your purpose. They prefer to perpetuate the old methods, under whose influence they can secure fat slices of pork for local larders always lean and hungry for more. Still others shudder at innovations, especially if they smack of a British flavor. Where will your budget be on March 4, 1921, if gentlemen see fit to lay an embargo upon your demand for a roll call? True you can invoke the agency of the amendment of 1917, provided you begin in time, but even then you may be compelled to reinvoke it upon your conference report, for do not forget that one very important bill was last session strangled to death upon the consideration of the conference report. And you may have other equally valuable legislation in prospect, which may not appeal to many of our brethren whose progressive tendencies are more vocal than actual.

This reminds me that a vehement Republican sentiment asserts that you are not only more efficient but more progressive than we Democrats are. Many of you admit this to be so. I hope it is, and I fervently trust that once you begin the work of revision procedure you do not stop with cloture. Strike a blow as well at seniority. The system has been the source of a recent unhappy family disturbance, for which many thanks, not from any political viewpoint, but because it indicates that the leaven of a healthy change is working in your midst. Why should a man enjoy the chief honors of senatorial committee assignments merely because he has been here longer than his associates? The fact should be given due heed, but why should it be controlling? Are merit, industry, fidelity in attendance, intelligence, and knowledge of public affairs to forever yield here to seniority of service? Where else does such a standard prevail? We have recently done our part in overthrowing the Hun. Could we have done it by following senatorial precedents? What business enterprise in the country following our illustrious example could survive for a twelvemonth?

The senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] is the most industrious man I ever knew. His politics is pernicious, but his capacity for labor is prodigious. He is a member of the Finance, Appropriations, Public Lands, Printing, Pensions, and Auditing Committees. All of them are important. He manages to attend them all and to keep himself in touch with their manifold activities and at the same time attend to his duties in the Senate. He is nearly always in his seat while the Senate is in session. He is familiar with the bills on the calendar, whether reported from his committees or from the others. Yet he is the senior member of but two committees, and these by no means the most important.

The junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is a legislator of long and ripe experience. His career until four years ago was in the House, but he brought to this body a wealth of information in matters legislative and a familiarity with public affairs acquired through long years of arduous service. No man is better fitted to preside over the deliberations of a great committee or to represent the Senate in committees of conference. But, forsooth, because he comes here later than some one else he must, under the seniority rule, stand in the outer circle, hat in hand, and await the tedious ticking away of the days and the years until the death or defeat of his elders brings him the necessary qualifications for the best service that is in him. No one can successfully defend such a system. Instances have occurred where Senators appointed because of their seniority on conference committees have never attended their sessions. Seniority, on the other hand, is of course entirely compatible with capacity for the highest service, but do not longer make it the condition of that service. This is the day of change, and great is the need thereof. The Republican lion and the Progressive bull moose are again yoked together. The team looks peculiar and their gait awkward and incongruous—the moose has shrunk to microscopic dimensions—but they are pulling the wagon. Before they shall again rush to a head-on collision let them revise and improve the Senate rules by placing effective limitations on debate and depriving seniority of its high prerogative. That will be an achievement for which many Democrats and a vast majority of their countrymen will give them due and merited praise.

Republican speeches and campaign books during the past six years have been clamorous with denunciations of the South, because of its prominence in legislative affairs. It was in the saddle and riding the national steed to its destruction. The North had been in the saddle for an unbroken period first of 24 and then of 16 years. But that, in the classic language of Mr. Perlmutter, was "something else again yet." The first from the Republican standpoint was scandalous and destructive; the latter normal and necessary. I shall not pause to analyze the logic of this paradoxical attitude nor even to question the justice of its denunciation. I merely wish to remind my Republican brethren that the predominance of southern chairmanships upon committees and southern control of their memberships are the necessary outcome of the rule of seniority, and that whenever the Democratic Party controls the Congress that will be the framework of its committee organization, for which you are quite as much to blame as we are.

The Republican Party now controls the House. It is evident that you will organize the committees of this Senate. The

result is that the North is in the saddle and the South has the same right to rail against it as a calamity that you have had to so denounce their past supremacy. The sectional discrimination is even more complete in this body, for every chairman of every active committee hails from north of Mason and Dixon's line. I am not complaining, for I do not regard the situation with that doleful horror which obsesses the Republican conscience when the shoe is on the other foot. I think we shall get along very well. But I am convinced that since one must judge a tree by its fruits this product condemns it. Therefore cut it down and cast it aside.

Mr. President, as well as I am able to determine, for the future my public life, should I be spared so long, and that of the Sixty-sixth Congress will end together. Contingencies which I can not imagine, and which I trust may never arise, may possibly alter this determination. Before that day arrives I want to be consoled with the reflection that the American Senate, of which I am a small and unimportant integer, possesses, like other legislative bodies, the power to vote as the majority may determine, and to utilize its best material without regard to length of service. The constantly expanding activities of the National Government and the consequent extension of its responsibilities tax its time to the utmost; it can not respond to the demand for increasing efficiency unless it bursts the fetters that have bound it for a hundred years and molds its procedure to conform with its twentieth-century environment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the resolution of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, under Rule XVIII I ask that the proposition before the Senate be divided, so that we may come to a vote upon the chairmen and the other members of the committees separately.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hale	Moses	Smith, Ariz.
Ball	Harding	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Harris	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Harrison	New	Smith, S. C.
Calder	Henderson	Newberry	Smoot
Capper	Hitchcock	Norris	Spencer
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	Nugent	Sterling
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Sutherland
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Owen	Swanson
Curtis	Kellogg	Page	Thomas
Dial	Kendrick	Penrose	Townsend
Dillingham	Kenyon	Phelan	Trammell
Edge	Keyes	Phipps	Underwood
Elkins	King	Pittman	Wadsworth
Fall	La Follette	Poindexter	Walsh, Mass.
Fernald	Lenroot	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Lodge	Ransdell	Warren
France	McCormick	Reed	Watson
Frelinghuysen	McCumber	Robinson	Williams
Gay	McKellar	Sheppard	Wolcott
Gore	McNary	Sherman	
Gronna	Martin	Simmons	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators have answered the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I renew my request that under Rule XVIII this question be divided, so that the Senate may proceed to vote upon the chairmen and the membership of committees separately.

Mr. FALL. I object, Mr. President.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is not a question of whether the Senator objects. It is a question of whether we will follow the rules of the Senate.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, we will proceed to argue that question when we get to it. What is the rule of the Senate?

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the rule is this, if the Senator will yield to me. It says that—

> If the question in debate contains several propositions, any Senator may have the same divided.

This question contains several propositions; it contains a great many propositions for the chairmanship and membership of committees. On each separate proposition it is the clear right of every Senator to have a separate vote.

Mr. FALL. We can not all argue the question at once, and I think the proponent has the burden in proffering his request. This is a question of the highest privilege, of senatorial privilege, and not a question of individual right. This is not a proposition involving a division of a question under debate. This is a proposition involving the organization of the Senate itself, and it is a question of joint senatorial privilege as to whether it shall organize this body for business as it pleases. It is not a question of any individual right to demand a division of a question.

Further, upon that proposition I am prepared to sustain my views, I think, by competent authority. At this time, as I take it, it simply being a request as the Senator has made it, an individual request for a division, it can not be accorded over objection. For that reason I simply interposed an objection.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I had not supposed it would be necessary to make any argument in support of the privilege that is always extended of having a separate vote under Rule XVIII. It has been done constantly and, so far as I know, it has never been refused. The Chair has always ruled that a single Member demanding it was entitled to it as a matter of right.

Evidently there are two propositions here—first, to elect the chairmen of the committees; second, to choose the membership of the committees. Rule XXIV distinguishes between chairmen and members, and the Chair has already recognized that distinction. All we ask is that the question be divided, so that we will come first to a vote upon the chairmen and later to a vote upon the membership of the committees.

It is not a question that I care to argue. I think it is a self-evident proposition.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, there is another reason which I wish to give for urging this right at this particular time. It is the only way, I think, in which these selections can be made. Rule XXIV, as was argued to you a little while ago, does authorize the Senate to provide a way of selection other than by ballot. That is distinctly stated:

> In the appointment of the standing committees the Senate, unless otherwise ordered, shall proceed by ballot to appoint severally the chairman of each committee, and then, by one ballot, the other members necessary to complete the same.

Now, that balloting can be otherwise ordered. It is to be by ballot unless otherwise ordered. There we end the proposition; but there are other propositions with regard to the selection of chairmen that are fixed by this rule. Let us see what they are:

> A majority of the whole number of votes given shall be necessary to the choice of a chairman of a standing committee, but a plurality of votes shall elect the other members thereof.

There is no authority in the Senate to deviate from the fixed proposition that the chairman of a committee must be selected by a majority of the votes cast. The Senate can abandon the plan of balloting. The Senate can go, as we will now go, to a roll call, where each Senator shows to the public how he votes—a much better plan than a secret ballot. I greatly prefer it. But there is nothing in this rule that justifies a modification of the provision that a majority of those voting shall be necessary to elect a chairman. Now, a plurality is sufficient for the election of the membership of the committees. So that in asking for a separation of this question, in asking that we have an opportunity to vote for the chairmen separately, we not only exercise a right under Rule XVIII to divide the question that is before the Senate but we exercise a right that is essential to carry out the provisions of the rule providing for committee elections, because under the rule a majority is required for the chairmen, and a plurality elects the ordinary members. The rule itself discriminates between the vote required for each.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia this question: If the Senate decides to select the chairmen of committees by resolution instead of by ballot, and a majority is necessary to the passage of that resolution, then, in the opinion of the Senator, has not the majority of the Senate voted for the chairmen of the committees?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I could not catch the last part of the Senator's remark.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. There is so much conversation going on that I do not wonder that the Senator did not catch it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I followed the Senator to his last clause and then the noise prevented me from hearing it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore rapped for order.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I say, if the Senate decides to select the chairmen of committees by resolution instead of by ballot, and a majority of the Senators vote for the resolution appointing the chairmen, has not that complied with the provisions of the rule requiring a majority?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Oh, I think so; but a plurality is sufficient for the members other than the chairmen.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I know it; but if there is not only a plurality but a majority for the other members of the committee, where is the Senator's grievance?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There would be no grievance. I do not insist that there would be a grievance. What I insist is

that there are two distinct propositions, the election of chairmen and the election of the membership, a recognized distinction being made by the rule between chairmen and members. Therefore it is clearly a case where under Rule XVIII there are two propositions, and we have as a matter of right the privilege of separating them; and what we are asking is, as a matter of right, to vote separately upon the chairmen and the membership.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That is a different point. I was not discussing Rule XVIII at all. I was discussing the Senator's contention that you might not get a plurality even if you got a majority. Of course, the greater includes the less.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; I did not take that position. The Senator misunderstood me. I began with Rule XVIII, insisting that we had a right to divide questions. Then I turned to Rule XXIV to show that that rule itself recognized a different vote as required, the one from the other, and that emphasized our right to have it divided, because we might want to demand for the minority, for the membership, election by a plurality and not by a majority.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not see that Rule XXIV strengthens the Senator's position under Rule XVIII at all.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think it does, because it magnifies the importance of our right to separate the two propositions, because the two propositions are treated differently in the ballot. That was my view of the matter.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Georgia permit a suggestion from the Chair?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. With regard to the requirement of the rule that the chairmen shall be elected by a majority vote there can be no reasonable doubt. The right of the Chair, however, is challenged by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] to pass upon the question of divisibility; and what the Chair would like to hear discussion upon, so long as the discussion is had, is, Who shall decide the question of divisibility? Shall it be the Chair or shall it be the Senate?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the rule is that the Chair decides a question unless otherwise provided. It is a general rule of parliamentary practice that a question of order raised is passed upon by the Chair unless otherwise directed. There are certain things which under our rules are expressly designated as matters which may be referred by the Presiding Officer to the Senate.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator to suggest that Rule XVIII does not require unanimous consent to demand a division? There is nothing of that sort required in the rule.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Oh, not at all.

Mr. FLETCHER. Then one objection can not prevent it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Oh, that is not the position of the Chair.

Mr. FLETCHER. The rule says "any Senator may have the same divided."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator from Florida has not caught the question of the Chair. The question of the Chair was whether he should rule upon our request or whether it should be submitted to the Senate. Now, I understand generally the practice is that whenever a Presiding Officer desires to submit something to the Senate to be decided, he can do so; but I think in this case the Presiding Officer has the right to decide it himself, or, if he should prefer to submit it to the Senate, he would have the right to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That was the thought in the mind of the Chair; but the present occupant of the chair has seen so frequently a question upon which the Chair may be in doubt submitted to the Senate, and therefore he propounded the question to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I suggested the distinction—which is perfectly apparent to me, and, I think, upon thought, it will be to any other Member of the Senate—between the division of a question under debate, a question of legislation in the proceedings of the Senate, and a question of the organization of the Senate itself. One is governed by rules of law, the other by rules that may be adopted and changed from time to time and from day to day.

I challenge the assertion of the Senator from Georgia that the ordinary rule of parliamentary law or parliamentary practice or parliamentary procedure is that in any question even of ordinary legislation the individual Senator has an individual right to have a question divided. I understand that that is his position.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was interrupted, and did not catch the latter part of the Senator's observation.

Mr. FALL. I will repeat it. I understand that the position of the Senator is that under Rule XVIII, on a question under debate in the Senate, it is a matter of right for an individual Senator to have a division of the question.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. FALL. And that the Senator asserts, aside from the rule itself, that that is the rule of ordinary parliamentary law.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; I did not say that. The Senator misunderstood me. What I said was this: The Chair asked whether he should decide the question or whether he should submit it to the Senate. I said that Rule XVIII did not declare whether the decision should be by the Chair or by the Senate; that under ordinary rules of parliamentary practice the Presiding Officer would always pass upon a point of order. I did not say that Rule XVIII was a general rule of parliamentary practice, because I do not think it is. I think it is a special rule of the Senate.

Mr. FALL. Yes; construed by the rules as contained in Jefferson's Manual, which are made a portion of the rules of this body. If the Senator will refer to Rules XXXV and XXXVI in Jefferson's Manual, referred to in the note to Rule XVIII, he will discover that it is there distinctly set forth that the question of division, even the ordinary legislative proposition, is not a question of individual right, but is a question of order of the Senate to be raised by any Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is why I desired the Senator to understand that he misunderstood the proposition that I declared was a question of general parliamentary practice.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

Mr. FALL. I hope that the Presiding Officer who will rule upon this proposition will understand it clearly, so that we may all vote intelligently and that he may rule intelligently upon the point at issue. As I understand it, there is no point whatsoever at issue. The Senate, of course, recognizes that the Chair is now being changed and that the present Presiding Officer has heard nothing thus far of this argument.

Mr. President, if the President of the Senate will yield to me for a moment I will endeavor to state the point at issue as briefly as possible. The Chair of course has before him the resolution offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] has now requested—and I think he carefully worded his request—a division of the question at issue to the end that the chairmen at least on certain committees should be voted upon separately. As I understand it, that is his proposition. The Senator made the request. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] objected to the granting of that request. By unanimous consent, of course, the Chair would have granted the request.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

Mr. FALL. I think I have properly stated the question thus far. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska for a question only.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator intimates that I asked for unanimous consent. I did not.

Mr. FALL. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I asked under Rule XVIII that the two questions before the Senate, the election of chairmen and the selection of members of the committees, be divided, so that we could vote upon chairmen and membership separately, as provided in Rule XXIV.

Mr. FALL. I thank the Senator for stating his position. I beg to assure the Senator, with all seriousness and earnestness, that the Senator from New Mexico has no desire nor intention of drawing any other conclusion than that which the Senator himself has just stated exactly, and has no desire to make the impression upon the present Presiding Officer that the Senator had for one moment suggested that he did not have an absolute individual right to have his request granted without referring it to the Senate. In fact I understood that was his position. I now understand that his able coadjutor and colleague, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], agrees with the Senator from New Mexico that it is not an individual right——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No.

Mr. FALL. But that the Presiding Officer presents it to the body.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. FALL. Then I am unfortunate.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator is unfortunate or I am unfortunate in not expressing myself clearly. I claim that under Rule XVIII any Senator may, as a matter of right, ask the Presiding Officer and obtain from the Presiding Officer a direction that a resolution involving two or more propositions be separated. I fully agree with the Senator from Nebraska that the resolution, involving as it does an effort to elect the chairmen of all the committees and the separate members of

the committees, is a divisible question and that he had as a matter of right the privilege of obtaining a division of the questions. What I said further was that the Chair was not bound to decide, if he preferred to submit it to the Senate.

Mr. FALL. To the request of the Senator from Nebraska the Senator from New Mexico offered an objection, upon the theory that under the rules and under parliamentary procedure generally the question of a division, even of a legislative question under debate, is not a matter of individual right, but upon objection must be refused or granted by the body to which it is presented. This argument, then, is proceeding upon the request of the Senator from Nebraska and upon the objection of myself, the Senator from New Mexico.

During the absence of the present Presiding Officer I stated two propositions: First, that the pending question was not such as was contemplated or intended to be covered by Rule XVIII. The pending question, Mr. President, is a question of the highest senatorial privilege and not of the privilege of an individual Senator. It is a question of the organization of a body, not a question of legislation by that body after it is organized.

The greater portion of the rules of the Senate are adopted for the proper conduct of legislative proceedings. This body is not yet organized. It is proceeding to organize and create the instrumentalities through which it does its business, and those are the committees of the Senate.

First, my position is that Rule XVIII was never intended to apply to a question of this kind. In the second place, I dispute any ruling which may have been made in the past or any individual opinions which may have been held by any Senator to the effect that Rule XVIII vests in any Senator individually a right to have a division of a question. It vests in him a right to demand it, but it leaves in any other Senator the privilege of objecting to the exercise of such a right by the Chair.

In the event, then, of an objection being made to the request for a division, it becomes clearly the duty of the Chair to submit the question as to whether the Senate will so order, as is declared in Jefferson's Manual, referred to in Rule XVIII, where the Senate itself must order a division or not, as it pleases. It is clearly the duty of the Chair in the premises to submit to the Senate of the United States as to whether the request of the Senator from Nebraska will be granted.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

Mr. FALL. I have concluded that portion of my discussion, but I still hold the floor. Does the Senator desire to ask me a question?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President——

Mr. FALL. I yield to the Senator from Montana first.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should like to ask a question. I understand the Senator from New Mexico to take the position that Rule XVIII of the Senate does not have any application to the procedure of the Senate in connection with this matter of organization. If that is so, I should like to inquire of the Senator from New Mexico if any other rule has any application or whether we are proceeding now under general parliamentary rules?

Mr. FALL. My impression is, to be perfectly frank with the Senator, that with all the rules you may write the Senate proceeds with its organization exactly as it pleases whenever it convenes; that it makes rules, and the Senator knows it can do exactly the same thing throughout the course of its legislation whenever the majority see fit.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I learn with a great deal of gratification that the Senator and myself are in entire unanimity upon that question. I addressed the Senate upon that subject two years ago, and insisted that the rule is as the Senator now declares it to be; but, rather unfortunately for me, the Presiding Officer has taken quite a contrary view of the matter and maintains that the rules which existed at the last session are still in full force and vigor.

Mr. FALL. I think they are, subject to change at any time by any order just such as we propose. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Assuming that we are acting under the rules, as I understand the position of the Senator it is that the language "any Senator may have the same divided" is simply equivalent to saying that any Senator may request a division.

Mr. FALL. Certainly, and that any other Senator may object to a division.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I can not construe the language in that way.

Mr. FALL. I know it has not been so construed, but I think——

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

Mr. FALL. Will the Senator from Florida allow me to answer the Senator from Washington? If the Senator from Washington will refer to Jefferson's Manual, he will find the very rule explained. It is in Jefferson's Manual, Rule XXXV and Rule XXXVI.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Does the rule need the explanation of Jefferson's Manual? It seems to me there is not very much room for explanation.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator from Washington is entirely right about that. Of course, if the Senator from New Mexico proposes to disregard all rules, then we are at the end of discussion and there is no use to invoke this rule. But I contend that the rules are binding and that under the rules the majority may have all the power he insists it has and all the rights he insists it has, but the minority and any Member of the minority has a right to invoke the permanent standing rules of the Senate and to have a procedure in accordance with those rules. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico this question: Does he concede that the question under debate contains several propositions?

Mr. FALL. No, the Senator does not.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator concedes that it contains first the membership of all the Senate committees?

Mr. FALL. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. It contains second the chairmen of these committees?

Mr. FALL. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. Are not those two separate propositions?

Mr. FALL. No.

Mr. FLETCHER. They are not the same proposition. The chairman of a committee, the Senator will concede, may be a member, but determining the membership of a committee does not determine the chairmanship.

Mr. FALL. Certainly.

Mr. FLETCHER. And determining the chairmanship of a committee does not determine its membership. Consequently there must be more than one proposition involved.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

Mr. FALL. I should like to answer one question at a time, and then I will yield to the Senator from Ohio. A Senator can offer an amendment to strike out the name of any proposed committeeman and insert another. Under these rules, the rights of the minority are absolutely protected. This is the question of the organization of the committees of the Senate. If the question were simply that we should now proceed to vote yea or nay upon the proposition to organize the Senate, and then if we should proceed to vote yea or nay upon the adoption of the list of committees proposed by the majority, while I do not think there is any individual right to have those questions separated, I am perfectly frank to say as far as I am concerned there would be no earthly objection to having them separated.

The rights of the minority in the matter of suggesting substitutes for chairmen and other members of committees, as Senators all know, are absolutely protected.

Now, Mr. President, what is it all about? I am in the habit of speaking very plainly when it becomes necessary for me to speak at all. What is this all about? The people of the United States of America at the last election declared their confidence in the Republican Party in so far as vesting in them a majority of the membership of the United States Senate was concerned. It has come to the knowledge of certain gentlemen belonging to the other party, through newspaper reports, that there has been a divergence of opinion between certain majority members upon this side as to certain chairmanships of certain committees. Certain propositions have been made by Members of the other side to this side as to how the majority Members could be left in the lurch if we would trade with certain Members on the other side with reference to the organization of the Senate. This is real patriotism!

I want to say to my friends upon the other side that the reports which they have read in the papers as to a division on this side have been very much exaggerated, as they are now aware.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

Mr. FALL. I yield for a question, and only for a question.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I would like to know how the Senator came to that conclusion?

Mr. FALL. What conclusion?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That the reports were exaggerated.

Mr. FALL. I have been of that conclusion since the very beginning. Undoubtedly I have never placed in the reports the confidence which the Senator himself has placed in them.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does the Senator know the opinion held by the leading members of his party, by the leader of the party and the chairman of the committee on committees?

Mr. FALL. I have no immediate means of translating for the Senator the minds of those Senators to whom he has referred nor can I say to him that I have had any confidential communication or communication of any kind or character with either of those gentlemen upon the subject which he has called up.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. When the Senator expressed the view that certain of his colleagues have no intention of taking an independent position, did he speak as a result of personal conferences with them?

Mr. FALL. That portion of the statement which I made was based upon the report to me of the endeavor of certain Senators upon the other side to make a trade, to be perfectly frank, with the majority Members upon this side; and in that way I have heard the question discussed.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Where did the Senator get the impression that certain Senators upon his side of the Chamber, who have been spoken of in the papers as averse to voting for certain candidates for committees, did not intend to carry out their proposed program?

Mr. FALL. I may say the newspaper reports as to their sentiments and their position upon this side were very much exaggerated. I obtained the information, I may say the knowledge, from conferences with those Senators myself individually.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It was like the report of the death of Mark Twain. He denounced it as exaggerated.

Mr. FALL. The Senator is not only partisan but facetious.

Mr. President, the country will understand what this play is to-day. It is the effort upon the part of the minority, I think for the first time in the history of this body, to interpose objection to the organization and the orderly conduct of business by the duly elected majority. I think it is the first time. The Senator would undoubtedly have discovered them if there had existed precedents for the remarkable efforts which he has been making here this morning.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the Senator one other question?

Mr. FALL. I yield only for a question.

Mr. FLETCHER. In referring to precedents, did the Senator ever know of either side of the Chamber before with a majority of two proposing to put upon each of four standing committees of the Senate a majority of three?

Mr. FALL. That is the point at issue. I have never known Senators to go to the other side and say in respect to two or three votes that you might need, "We will help you out, provided you give us more members for the minority than we gave you last session." Does the Senator know anything about that proposition?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. FALL. I will yield to the Senator from Nevada for a question.

Mr. PITTMAN. As a Member of this side, I do not like to allow the Senator to be so indirect in his reference to Members on this side. I know of no such proposition having been made. I challenge the Senator to disclose the proposition.

Mr. FALL. I am glad to have the individual statement of the Senator. Let it go upon record for what it is worth.

Mr. President, I have not been exceedingly partisan during my membership in this body. I had no intention of engaging in any partisan controversy of any character at all upon entering the body at this session.

For myself, I was not here during the Republican conference, called prior to the meeting of this body. I was not present at the conference called to pass upon the committees, but I was sent for after the committee list had been adopted. Believing then, as I know now and as I knew then, that some of the Members upon the other side, and I have carefully made that distinction in every statement which I have made, were mistaken as to the seriousness and the gravity of the disputes upon this side, and that the newspapers had very much exaggerated them, and not having been at the conferences, not having voted for the list of committees, I consulted with the Senators myself. I joined them in insistence upon an open conference with the Republicans to pass upon the organization of the Senate. That was held. It may be that the Senator from Nebraska, who is making these motions, knows something of some hidden motives or conviction or intention of some of the Senators who were represented at that meeting of which I have no knowledge. I do not believe he has.

Mr. President, it is a most remarkable thing that this early in the game, to use an ordinary colloquialism, partisanship should be injected into the proceedings of this body, and yet it has been sedulously and insidiously so injected from the first words uttered in the Chamber. It is the evident belief and I presume sincere belief of some of the Senators who are following the President of the United States in the very important negotiations of the matters now pending in Europe, I presume it is the sincere conviction of some of those Senators, because I think they have been hypnotized for several years past, either by some great hypnotist versed in the science or by the operation of self-hypnotism, into the belief, until they entertain it sincerely, that any man upon this side or out of this Chamber who does not swallow the proposed league of nations is not sincere in his opposition, but that he is merely partisan in his desire to injure it in some way or to destroy, if not impair, the influence of the President of the United States; and at the same time they have been so hypnotized, and by the operation of their own mental faculties so continue to hypnotize themselves, that they agreed first that the first draft was absolutely correct and should be adopted, and second, of course, when it is suggested naturally, because I understand one of the things about hypnotism is suggestion and autosuggestion, that an amendment should be made, they at once insist that it is now perfected, and that they, and they alone, are the patriots.

Is it not a remarkable exhibition that when we proceed to discuss a resolution presented before this body for additional information, and incidental to such discussion that we proceed to discuss shortly a most important proposition presented to the people of the world to-day, that because we may be divided into two camps, one line of thought opposing it, the other approving it, those approving it are patriots and those opposing it are either traitors or else solely partisans, desirous of impairing the influence of the President of the United States, for political purposes, as charged by the Senator from Nebraska, who has been leading the great Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, as I understood his remarks in this body?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the Senator intimated a few moments ago that we were obstructing the operations of the Senate in organizing. The instructions of the committee by which I appear here to-day are not to object, not to delay, and we are ready to come to a vote. I simply asked the Presiding Officer to rule whether we have a right to a separate vote. If we have, we are ready to take it without five minutes' delay.

Mr. FALL. I doubt not, Mr. President, the Senator does not like the few remarks I am making, and there may be others made during the procedure here that he may not approve any more.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President——

Mr. FALL. I yield for a question.

Mr. ROBINSON. I do not ask the Senator to yield. I desire to make a point of order. The point of order is that the point of order submitted to the Chair is not subject to debate.

Mr. FALL. Having been debated upon the other side of the proposition at some length——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not know anything about it, except what has been stated during the last 10 minutes. The rule is that when a point of order is made the Chair should pass upon it without debate, and if an appeal is made to the Senate from the decision of the Chair you can talk about it all day.

The Senator from New Mexico says that Rule XVIII, which reads, "If the question in debate contains several propositions, any Senator may have the same divided," means that he can have it divided if the Senate is willing to have it divided. I do not think so. I think any Senator has the right to have a question divided. More than that, by Rule XXIV it is provided that—

> In the appointment of the standing committees, the Senate, unless otherwise ordered, shall proceed by ballot to appoint severally the chairman of each committee—

Not the chairmen of all committees, but "the chairman of each committee"—

> and then, by one ballot, the other members necessary to complete the same.

The Chair rules that the question is divisible and any Senator has a right to have a vote on the chairman of any committee submitted by this report. From that I suppose there will be an appeal.

Mr. FALL. Oh, no, indeed. I withdraw the objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I withdraw the order I offered and now offer the following order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

> *Ordered*, That the Senate proceed to the appointment of the majority chairmen and members of the standing committees of the Senate, and that the chairmen and members thereof proposed in any motion or resolution be voted upon by roll call without division of the question.

Mr. FLETCHER. That means an amendment to the rules by a majority vote.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; it is not an amendment to the rules at all. It is under Rule XXIV.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I object to it because it destroys our right under Rule XVIII to have a separate vote on the different questions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unfortunately, Rule XXIV provides that the Senate may otherwise order how the committees shall be selected. The Chair will have to overrule the point of order.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I understand the Chair declines to give a division?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair holds, and so announced a moment ago, that the procedure for the election of committeemen is provided for in Rule XXIV, providing for the appointment of committees of the Senate, read by the Chair heretofore. It reads:

In the appointment of the standing committees, the Senate, unless otherwise ordered, shall proceed by ballot to appoint severally the chairman of each committee, and then, by one ballot, the other members necessary to complete the same.

In ruling upon the former point of order, the Chair ruled that, without any motion to divide, it was the duty of the Senate, unless otherwise ordered, to elect each chairman separately. The rule provides that it can be otherwise ordered.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then, if this motion should be carried, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would present his list of committee membership and chairmen, and it would be open to amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly; open to amendment by striking out and inserting. There is no doubt about that. The rule clearly provides on the face of it that if there is a contest about it the chairman of each committee must be separately elected by a majority vote, but that the Senate can otherwise order about the election.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will offer what I send to the desk as a substitute for the resolution which has been offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LODGE. Is it a motion to strike out and insert?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Senator will listen, he will ascertain in a moment. It is a substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The Secretary read as follows:

That it is the sense of the Senate that the apparent Republican majority in the Senate being only two, it is neither just nor necessary that the Republicans should receive more than two majority on any committee: And it is therefore further

Resolved, That in all cases where a larger majority is proposed the necessary reduction shall be made by the authority making such proposal.

Mr. LODGE. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask for a roll call on that motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and, being taken, resulted—yeas 49, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—49.

Ball	France	Lodge	Poindexter
Borah	Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Sherman
Brandegee	Gronna	McCumber	Smoot
Calder	Hale	McLean	Spencer
Capper	Harding	McNary	Sterling
Colt	Johnson, Cal.	Moses	Sutherland
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Townsend
Curtis	Kellogg	New	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Kenyon	Newberry	Warren
Edge	Keyes	Norris	Watson
Elkins	Knox	Page	
Fall	La Follette	Penrose	
Fernald	Lenroot	Phipps	

NAYS—45.

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Pittman	Stanley
Bankhead	Jones, N. Mex.	Pomerene	Swanson
Beckham	Kendrick	Ransdell	Thomas
Chamberlain	King	Reed	Trammell
Culberson	Kirby	Robinson	Underwood
Dial	McKellar	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Martin	Shields	Walsh, Mont.
Gay	Myers	Simmons	Williams
Gore	Nugent	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Harris	Overman	Smith, Ga.	
Harrison	Owen	Smith, Md.	
Henderson	Phelan	Smith, S. C.	

So the motion to lay Mr. HITCHCOCK's amendment on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. On the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, just a moment before the vote is taken. I only wish to call attention to the effect of the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. Its object is apparent. Under the rule, unless otherwise directed, we should vote for the chairman of each committee separately. A yea-and-nay vote might be asked for on each selection. Now, proceeding under the order first offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, we asked for a division of the question, so as to have a vote on the individual chairmen of committees separately. The Senator from Massachusetts withdrew his first resolution when a separate vote on each chairman was practically assured and offered a new resolution, the one now before the Senate. It provides:

That the Senate proceed to the appointment of the majority chairmen and members of the standing committees of the Senate, and that the chairmen and members thereof proposed in any motion or resolution be voted upon by roll call without division of the question.

That is simply intended, as I gather it, to prevent a division of the question and to prevent a separate vote on individual chairmen of committees. Under the ruling of the Chair such a motion is in order. Of course it is not for me to express any disapproval of the policy of the Senator from Massachusetts, but I take it for granted that every Senator does understand exactly what this means. I, however, wish to call attention to it and the connection in which it is offered in order that there may be no doubt about it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia is entirely correct as to the purpose of the resolution, which I hope and trust is apparent. For the first time in my service in the Senate, I believe probably for the first time in the history of the Senate, an attempt has been made by one party to dictate the choice of chairmen or of other members of committees by another party. I have never before seen that done. The attempt here is to dictate or to interfere with the selection of Republican members of the committees. We could do the same thing if we chose to as to committees of the other party. We could leave them off if we were disposed to do so; we have the majority, but we feel that the make-up of your committees is your business and your responsibility, and that the make-up of our committees is our business and our responsibility. That is the ordinary rule of courtesy and good manners which I have never before seen violated in the Senate.

Mr. President, I hope we may have a vote on the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The yeas and nays were taken, and resulted—yeas 49, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—49.

Ball	France	Lodge	Poindexter
Borah	Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Sherman
Brandegee	Gronna	McCumber	Smoot
Calder	Hale	McLean	Spencer
Capper	Harding	McNary	Sterling
Colt	Johnson, Calif.	Moses	Sutherland
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Townsend
Curtis	Kellogg	New	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Kenyon	Newberry	Warren
Edge	Keyes	Norris	Watson
Elkins	Knox	Page	
Fall	La Follette	Penrose	
Fernald	Lenroot	Phipps	

NAYS—45.

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Pittman	Stanley
Bankhead	Jones, N. Mex.	Pomerene	Swanson
Beckham	Kendrick	Ransdell	Thomas
Chamberlain	King	Reed	Trammell
Culberson	Kirby	Robinson	Underwood
Dial	McKellar	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Martin	Shields	Walsh, Mont.
Gay	Myers	Simmons	Williams
Gore	Nugent	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Harris	Overman	Smith, Ga.	
Harrison	Owen	Smith, Md.	
Henderson	Phelan	Smith, S. C.	

NOT VOTING—2.

Gerry	Johnson, S. Dak.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS and Mr. LODGE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts indulged in a remark before the vote was taken which I do not believe——

Mr. LODGE. May I not make my motion, in order to get something before the Senate?

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will pardon me a moment, I have the floor.

Mr. LODGE. I thought I had.

Mr. THOMAS. I was about to say that the Senator, before the vote just taken, indulged in a display of temper and made a remark reflecting upon the minority, which I am not disposed to permit to pass unchallenged.

The Republican majority in the Senate is a very slender one. If we are to judge from reports of proceedings, that majority has not been made a certainty until very recently. The Democratic minority have felt, and they still feel—and they are perfectly honest about it—that no committee of the Senate need have a greater majority than the majority upon the floor. Hence the motion of the Senator from Nebraska. It was offered in good faith; we have voted upon it in good faith. Some of us

have felt that, owing to the very attenuated majority upon the other side, which I am disposed to think is still uncertain, we might be justified in offering somewhat greater obstruction to the organization of the Senate than has thus far been offered. I certainly trust that the Senator will not indulge in such reflections upon the minority in the future.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I offer the order which I send to the desk.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Massachusetts whether this is the same list which was presented under his former resolution?

Mr. LODGE. It is precisely the same as the one read this morning.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I presume it might be possible to avoid the rereading of this list.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; I should be very glad to have it avoided. I ask that the reading may be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to omitting the reading of the names? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The order is as follows:

Ordered, That the chairmen and majority members of the standing committees of the Senate be the following Senators:

On Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress: Messrs. Penrose, Sutherland, and Keyes.

On Agriculture and Forestry: Messrs. Gronna (chairman), Page, Norris, Kenyon, Wadsworth, jr., France, McNary, Capper, and Keyes.

On Appropriations: Messrs. Warren (chairman), Smoot, Jones of Washington, Curtis, Kenyon, Sherman, Gronna, Hale, Spencer, Phipps, and Newberry.

To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate: Messrs. Calder (chairman), Smoot, and France.

On Banking and Currency: Messrs. McLean (chairman), Page, Gronna, Norris, Frelinghuysen, Penrose, Calder, Newberry, and Keyes.

On Canadian Relations: Messrs. Hale (chairman), Sherman, Wadsworth, Spencer, and Newberry.

On the Census: Messrs. Sutherland (chairman), La Follette, McLean, Townsend, New, Calder, and Moses.

On Civil Service and Retrenchment: Messrs. Sterling (chairman), Cummins, La Follette, Smoot, Colt, Ball, and Capper.

On Claims: Messrs. Spencer (chairman), Gronna, Wadsworth, Fernald, Frelinghuysen, New, Keyes, and Capper.

On Coast and Insular Survey: Messrs. Edge (chairman), Townsend, Sterling, Hale, and Borah.

On Coast Defenses: Messrs. Frelinghuysen (chairman), Fernald, Nelson, Calder, Lenroot, and Ball.

On Commerce: Messrs. Jones of Washington (chairman), Nelson, Sherman, Harding, Fernald, Calder, Lenroot, Colt, McNary, Ball, and Edge.

On Conservation of National Resources: Messrs. Colt, Gronna, Calder, Hale, France, La Follette, Kellogg, and McCormick.

On Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia: Messrs. La Follette, Sherman, and Brandegee.

On Cuban Relations: Messrs. Johnson of California (chairman), Knox, and McCormick.

On Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments: Messrs. France, Warren, McCumber.

On the District of Columbia: Messrs. Sherman (chairman), Dillingham, Jones of Washington, Calder, New, Ball, Capper, and Elkins.

On Education and Labor: Messrs. Kenyon (chairman), Borah, Page, McLean, Sterling, and Phipps.

On Engrossed Bills: Messrs. Warren and Elkins.

On Enrolled Bills: Messrs. Ball (chairman) and Curtis.

To Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service: Messrs. Brandegee, Nelson, Jones of Washington, and Elkins.

On Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture: Messrs. Capper (chairman), Wadsworth, and Keyes.

On Expenditures in the Department of Commerce: Messrs. Elkins (chairman), Fall, and McNary.

On Expenditures in the Interior Department: Messrs. Smoot, Poindexter, and La Follette.

On Expenditures in the Department of Justice: Messrs. Borah, Spencer, and France.

On Expenditures in the Department of Labor: Messrs. McCormick (chairman), Kellogg, and Kenyon.

On Expenditures in the Navy Department: Messrs. Dillingham, Lodge, and Newberry.

On Expenditures in the Post Office Department: Messrs. Keyes (chairman), Watson, and Edge.

On Expenditures in the Department of State: Messrs. Phipps (chairman), Penrose, and Hale.

On Expenditures in the Treasury Department: Messrs. Harding, Cummins, and Ball.

On Expenditures in the War Department: Messrs. Townsend, Norris, and Page.

On Finance: Messrs. Penrose (chairman), McCumber, Smoot, La Follette, Dillingham, McLean, Curtis, Watson, Calder, and Sutherland.

On Fisheries: Messrs. Newberry (chairman), Jones of Washington, Fernald, Moses, and McNary.

On the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians: Messrs. Norris, Colt, and Wadsworth.

On Foreign Relations: Messrs. Lodge (chairman), McCumber, Borah, Brandegee, Fall, Knox, Harding, Johnson of California, New, and Moses.

On Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game: Messrs. McLean, Sherman, New, Warren, and Edge.

On the Geological Survey: Messrs. Norris, Sutherland, Penrose, and Dillingham.

On Immigration: Messrs. Colt (chairman), Dillingham, Penrose, Sterling, Johnson of California, Keyes, and Edge.

On Indian Affairs: Messrs. Curtis (chairman), La Follette, Gronna, Fall, Fernald, McNary, Spencer, Nelson, and McCormick.

On Indian Depredations: Messrs. Poindexter, McCumber, Watson, Frelinghuysen, Warren, and Curtis.

On Industrial Expositions: Messrs. Gronna, Norris, Sutherland, Kellogg, Lodge, Kenyon, and Newberry.

On Interoceanic Canals: Messrs. Borah (chairman), Page, Cummins, Colt, Calder, Knox, Johnson of California, and Edge.

On Interstate Commerce: Messrs. Cummins (chairman), Townsend, La Follette, Poindexter, McLean, Watson, Kellogg, Fernald, Frelinghuysen, and Elkins.

To Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands: Messrs. Jones of Washington, Sutherland, and Townsend.

On Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands: Messrs. McNary (chairman), Jones of Washington, Borah, Johnson of California, Gronna, Fall, and Phipps.

On the Judiciary: Messrs. Nelson (chairman), Dillingham, Brandegee, Borah, Cummins, Colt, Sterling, Fall, Norris, and Kellogg.

On the Library: Messrs. Brandegee (chairman), Wadsworth, Moses, Johnson of California, and Knox.

On Manufactures: Messrs. La Follette (chairman), Lodge, Kenyon, Fernald, McNary, and Gronna.

On Military Affairs: Messrs. Wadsworth (chairman), Warren, Sutherland, New, Frelinghuysen, Johnson of California, Knox, Lenroot, Spencer, and Capper.

On Mines and Mining: Messrs. Poindexter (chairman), Sterling, Sutherland, McCormick, Phipps, and Newberry.

On the Mississippi River and its Tributaries: Messrs. Cummins, Wadsworth, Nelson, and Spencer.

On National Banks: Messrs. Kellogg (chairman), Lenroot, and Elkins.

On Naval Affairs: Messrs. Page (chairman), Penrose, Lodge, Poindexter, Hale, Ball, McCormick, Newberry, and Keyes.

On Pacific Islands and Porto Rico: Messrs. Fall (chairman), Poindexter, Fernald, Harding, Watson, Kenyon, and McCormick.

On Pacific Railroads: Messrs. Brandegee, McCumber, Townsend, Watson, Lenroot, and Capper.

On Patents: Messrs. Norris (chairman), Brandegee, Knox, and Kellogg.

On Pensions: Messrs. McCumber (chairman), Smoot, Poindexter, Sherman, New, Elkins, and Ball.

On the Philippines: Messrs. Harding (chairman), Kenyon, Knox, Johnson of California, McNary, Curtis, Frelinghuysen, and Hale.

On Post Offices and Post Roads: Messrs. Townsend (chairman), Sterling, France, Poindexter, Moses, McCormick, Edge, Elkins, and Phipps.

On Printing: Messrs. Moses (chairman), Smoot, Page, New, and Capper.

On Private Land Claims: Messrs. Nelson, Townsend, Moses, and Edge.

On Privileges and Elections: Messrs. Dillingham (chairman), Kenyon, Sherman, Fall, Knox, Spencer, Wadsworth, Watson, and Edge.

On Public Buildings and Grounds: Messrs. Fernald (chairman), Warren, Curtis, Sutherland, Frelinghuysen, France, Lenroot, Spencer, and Keyes.

On Public Health and National Quarantine: Messrs. France (chairman), Townsend, Frelinghuysen, Penrose, Harding, and Ball.

On Public Lands: Messrs. Smoot (chairman), Fall, Norris, Sterling, Kellogg, McNary, McCumber, Poindexter, and Lenroot.

On Railroads: Messrs. Lenroot (chairman), Lodge, Warren, Dillingham, Phipps, and Newberry.

On Revolutionary Claims: Messrs. Lodge, Kellogg, and Lenroot.

On Rules: Messrs. Knox (chairman), Nelson, Cummins, Curtis, Hale, Moses, and McCormick.

On Standards, Weights, and Measures: Messrs. Harding, Borah, and Kellogg.

On Territories: Messrs. New (chairman), McLean, Jones of Washington, Harding, Hale, Borah, and Smoot.

On Transportation Routes to the Seaboard: Messrs. McCumber, Lodge, Sherman, Phipps, and Capper.

On Transportation and Sale of Meat Products: Messrs. Page, McLean, and France.

On the University of the United States: Messrs. Dillingham, Brandegee, McCumber, Colt, Sterling, and Elkins.

On Woman Suffrage: Messrs. Watson (chairman), Jones of Washington, Nelson, Cummins, and Johnson of California.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution provides that it shall be voted on by a roll call without a division of the question.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, on this question we are simply going to ask for a record vote. I will state to the Senator from Massachusetts that we felt it proper that we should develop on the other side the fact that the chairmen of the committees proposed by the majority represent the unanimous wish of all elements on the Republican side of the Chamber. Having demonstrated that fact by the votes heretofore taken, we simply wish a record vote upon this proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts.

I will say furthermore that there is another reason, a reason of courtesy, for avoiding unnecessary discussion here, and that is that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] has been prevented from delivering an address which was by notice scheduled for to-day. I trust that there may be no further delay in taking this vote, so that the Senator from Arkansas may take the floor. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution calls for the yeas and nays. The Secretary will call the roll.

The yeas and nays were taken and resulted—yeas 49, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—49.

Ball	France	Lodge	Poindexter
Borah	Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Sherman
Brandegee	Gronna	McCumber	Smoot
Calder	Hale	McLean	Spencer
Capper	Harding	McNary	Sterling
Colt	Johnson, Calif.	Moses	Sutherland
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Townsend
Curtis	Kellogg	New	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Kenyon	Newberry	Warren
Edge	Keyes	Norris	Watson
Elkins	Knox	Page	
Fall	La Follette	Penrose	
Fernald	Lenroot	Phipps	

NAYS—42.

Ashurst	Henderson	Phelan	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Hitchcock	Pittman	Stanley
Beckham	Jones, N. Mex.	Pomerene	Swanson
Chamberlain	Kendrick	Ransdell	Thomas
Culberson	King	Reed	Trammell
Dial	Kirby	Robinson	Underwood
Fletcher	McKellar	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Gay	Myers	Shields	Walsh, Mont.
Gore	Nugent	Simmons	Wolcott
Harris	Overman	Smith, Ariz.	
Harrison	Owen	Smith, Ga.	

NOT VOTING—5.

Gerry	Martin	Smith, Md.	Williams
Johnson, S. Dak.			

So the resolution of Mr. LODGE was agreed to.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I offer the resolution which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Ordered, That the minority membership of the Senate standing committees be composed of the following Senators.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to this list, which is official and has been printed, and I will state that we are perfectly willing to give unanimous consent for its adoption without having it read.

Mr. LODGE. I think, as this matter has never been read into the RECORD, that the names of the minority Senators had better be read in and then agreed to unanimously.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Very well.

The Secretary read as follows:

On Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress: Messrs. Simmons (chairman) and Stanley.

On Agriculture and Forestry: Messrs. Gore, Smith of South Carolina, Smith of Georgia, Ransdell, Johnson of South Dakota, Kendrick, and Harrison.

On Appropriations: Messrs. Martin, Overman, Owen, Smith of Maryland, Culberson, Underwood, Smith of Arizona, Gay, and Harris.

To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate: Messrs. Jones of New Mexico and McKellar.

On Banking and Currency: Messrs. Owen, Hitchcock, Pomerene, Fletcher, Kendrick, Henderson, and Walsh of Massachusetts.

On Canadian Relations: Messrs. Kendrick, Myers, Walsh of Massachusetts, and Harris.

On the Census: Messrs. Sheppard, Ashurst, King, McKellar, and Walsh of Massachusetts.

On Civil Service and Retrenchment: Messrs. McKellar, Ransdell, Bankhead, Kirby, and Wolcott.

On Claims: Messrs. Robinson, Johnson of South Dakota, Beckham, Trammell, Wolcott, and Henderson.

On Coast and Insular Survey: Messrs. Gay, Culberson, Bankhead, and Harrison.

On Coast Defenses: Messrs. Smith of Maryland, Gerry, Wolcott, Chamberlain, and Swanson.

On Commerce: Messrs. Fletcher, Chamberlain, Ransdell, Sheppard, Martin, Bankhead, Simmons, Reed, and Kirby.

On Conservation of National Resources: Messrs. Smith of South Carolina (chairman), Bankhead, Smith of Arizona, Johnson of South Dakota, King, Kendrick, and Henderson.

On Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia: Messrs. Pomerene (chairman) and Ashurst.

On Cuban Relations: Messrs. Underwood and Dial.

On Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments: Messrs. Walsh of Montana (chairman) and Martin.

On the District of Columbia: Messrs. Smith of Maryland, Pomerene, Phelan, King, Sheppard, and Dial.

On Education and Labor: Messrs. Smith of Georgia, Jones of New Mexico, McKellar, Wolcott, and Walsh of Massachusetts.

On Engrossed Bills: Mr. Overman (chairman).

On Enrolled Bills: Mr. Dial.

To Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service: Messrs. Smith of Maryland (chairman), Culberson, and Robinson.

On Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture: Messrs. Simmons and Underwood.

On Expenditures in the Department of Commerce: Messrs. Wolcott and Stanley.

On Expenditures in the Interior Department: Messrs. Bankhead (chairman) and Martin.

On Expenditures in the Department of Justice: Messrs. Gore (chairman) and Robinson.

On Expenditures in the Department of Labor: Messrs. Beckham and Shields.

On Expenditures in the Navy Department: Messrs. Swanson (chairman) and Gay.

On Expenditures in the Post Office Department: Messrs. King and Culberson.

On Expenditures in the Department of State: Messrs. Myers and Dial.

On Expenditures in the Treasury Department: Messrs. Smith of Georgia (chairman) and Trammell.

On Expenditures in the War Department: Messrs. Chamberlain (chairman) and Harrison.

On Finance: Messrs. Simmons, Williams, Thomas, Gore, Jones of New Mexico, Gerry, and Nugent.

On Fisheries: Messrs. Fletcher, Martin, Wolcott, and Gay.

On the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians: Messrs. Owen (chairman) and Myers.

On Foreign Relations: Messrs. Hitchcock, Williams, Swanson, Pomerene, Smith of Arizona, Pittman, and Shields.

On Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game: Messrs. Hitchcock (chairman), Overman, Myers, and Thomas.

On the Geological Survey: Messrs. Smith of Arizona (chairman), Smith of South Carolina, and Trammell.

On Immigration: Messrs. Gore, Gerry, Nugent, King, Harris, and Harrison.

On Indian Affairs: Messrs. Ashurst, Owen, Johnson of South Dakota, Walsh of Montana, Kendrick, Jones of New Mexico, and Nugent.

On Indian Depredations: Messrs. Myers (chairman), Swanson, Pomerene, Kendrick, and Stanley.

On Industrial Expositions: Messrs. Pittman (chairman), Overman, Henderson, Gore, Harris, and Stanley.

On Interoceanic Canals: Messrs. Walsh of Montana, Simmons, Phelan, Kirby, Trammell, and Ransdell.

On Interstate Commerce: Messrs. Smith of South Carolina, Pomerene, Myers, Robinson, Underwood, Wolcott, and Stanley.

To Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands: Messrs. Ashurst (chairman) and Nugent.

On Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands: Messrs. Phelan, Sheppard, Walsh of Montana, Smith of Arizona, Henderson, and Kendrick.

On the Judiciary: Messrs. Culberson, Overman, Reed, Ashurst, Shields, Walsh of Montana, Smith of Georgia, and King.

On the Library: Messrs. Williams, Beckham, and McKellar.

On Manufactures: Messrs. Smith of South Carolina, Pomerene, Jones of New Mexico, Reed, and Walsh of Massachusetts.

On Military Affairs: Messrs. Chamberlain, Hitchcock, Fletcher, Myers, Thomas, Sheppard, Beckham, Kirby, and McKellar.

On Mines and Mining: Messrs. Henderson, Walsh of Montana, Ashurst, and Phelan.

On the Mississippi River and its Tributaries: Messrs. Ransdell (chairman), Shields, and Kirby.

On National Banks: Messrs. Gerry and Dial.

On Naval Affairs: Messrs. Swanson, Smith of Maryland, Phelan, Pittman, Walsh of Montana, Gerry, Trammell, and King.

On Pacific Islands and Porto Rico: Messrs. Sheppard, Trammell, Nugent, Harrison, and Gore.

On Pacific Railroads: Messrs. Thomas (chairman), Johnson of South Dakota, Kendrick, Dial, and Stanley.

On Patents: Messrs. Kirby, Smith of South Carolina, and Gore.

On Pensions: Messrs. Walsh of Montana, Johnson of South Dakota, Phelan, King, Gay, and Walsh of Massachusetts.

On the Philippines: Messrs. Fletcher, Beckham, Phelan, Hitchcock, Robinson, Chamberlain, and Shields.

On Post Offices and Post Roads: Messrs. Bankhead, Beckham, McKellar, Henderson, Gay, Walsh of Massachusetts, and Dial.

On Printing: Messrs. Smith of Arizona, Fletcher, and Ransdell.

On Private Land Claims: Messrs. Culberson (chairman), Thomas, and Hitchcock.

On Privileges and Elections: Messrs. Pomerene, Reed, Walsh of Montana, King, Wolcott, and Ashurst.

On Public Buildings and Grounds: Messrs. Reed, Ashurst, Culberson, Beckham, Trammell, Swanson, and Gay.

On Public Health and National Quarantine: Messrs. Ransdell, Fletcher, Owen, Underwood, and Harris.

On Public Lands: Messrs. Myers, Smith of Arizona, Pittman, Chamberlain, Phelan, Jones of New Mexico, Kendrick, and Johnson of South Dakota.

On Railroads: Messrs. Gerry, Reed, Smith of Arizona, Williams, and Smith of South Carolina.

On Revolutionary Claims: Messrs. Sheppard (chairman) and Harrison.

On Rules: Messrs. Overman, Smith of Georgia, Owen, Underwood, and Harrison.

On Standards, Weights, and Measures: Messrs. Reed (chairman) and Smith of Maryland.

On Territories: Messrs. Pittman, Owen, Phelan, Nugent, and Chamberlain.

On Transportation Routes to the Seaboard: Messrs. Fletcher (chairman), Sheppard, Bankhead, and Harris.

On Transportation and Sale of Meat Products: Messrs. Shields (chairman) and Walsh of Massachusetts.

On the University of the United States: Messrs. Williams (chairman), Shields, Overman, McKellar, and Dial.

On Woman Suffrage: Messrs. Jones of New Mexico, Owen, Ransdell, and Johnson of South Dakota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolution offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The resolution was agreed to.

TREATY OF PEACE.

Mr. ROBINSON obtained the floor.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Chair if there is not an unfinished business of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business was not laid before the Senate at the regular time on account of the question of privilege which was before the Senate.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not proper to lay the unfinished business before the Senate at this time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not know.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON. I object, Mr. President. The morning hour has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. It comes up after the morning hour. It follows the morning hour.

Mr. ROBINSON. I decline to yield to the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator can speak to that. We do not ask——

Mr. ROBINSON. I decline to yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. CURTIS. There is nothing before the Senate, Mr. President; and I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I ask that the resolution of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the following resolution, which will be read.

The Secretary read Senate resolution 12, submitted by Mr. JOHNSON of California on the 20th instant, as follows:

Whereas the peace treaty has been completed and has been delivered to the representatives of Germany; and
Whereas a synopsis only of the treaty has been given publicity in the United States, and our people are entitled to know its full contents, and to what, if any, engagements they have been committed; and
Whereas it is reported in the press that the entire treaty has been cabled to the State Department and is now in the possession of the State Department: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested forthwith to transmit to the Senate the full text of the treaty of peace completed at the Paris conference and delivered to the representatives of Germany.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I presume that every one here realizes that I could have taken the floor at an earlier time in the debate and proceeded, but it was exceedingly desirable that the very important matter of the organization of the Senate be completed.

The resolution of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], requiring the Secretary of State to lay before the Senate a complete copy of the proposed treaty of peace, can not with propriety be adopted at this time, for the reason that the negotiations are still in progress. The press of the country has given notice of some changes that have been made since the resolution was first under consideration in this body, and it is quite possible that other changes may be made.

The proposed terms of peace as submitted by the Allies, if adopted, will render Germany powerless again to break the peace of the world. Reduced to harmlessness in military and naval forces, deprived of approximately 40,000 square miles of territory, stripped of cables, colonies, and shipping, restricted in fiscal policy, and compelled to submit to the neutralization of the territory east of the Rhine as an evidence of her good faith, Germany will be compelled throughout the future to regard her treaties and to observe international law.

The proposed league of nations is a part of the treaty of peace. It has been discussed for several weeks by the members of the Senate. I desire to say in the outset, in reply to the statement made by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] a few moments ago that there is a disposition upon the part of those who want the league of nations to denounce and censure severely those who oppose it, that there is no such thought in my mind. It is a question that calls for candid and courageous consideration by every member of the Senate.

It is exceedingly regrettable that there should have been, during the course of this debate, a shameful display of partisanship touching this important treaty. During the course of the debate in the Senate on last Friday it was pointed out that the leader of the majority and the whip of the majority, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], had, prior to the reconvening of Congress in extraordinary session, sent to every member on the other side of the chamber a telegram urging Republican members of the Senate to remain silent on the subject of the revised draft of the league of nations treaty until a party conference could be held, and the attitude of the party concerning the matter, in so far as that could be ascertained, determined. The Senator from Massachusetts stated last Friday that was strictly a nonpartisan telegram; that while it was sent only to Republican members of the Senate it was an impartial and nonpartisan request.

Mr. President, the only way in which any measure has been or can be made a party issue in the United States Senate is through the action of the conference or caucus of the party desiring to make it a party measure; and I respectfully submit that the remark of the Senator from Massachusetts that this request to Republicans was a nonpartisan act does not reflect credit upon his candor.

I do not want to see this subject made a partisan issue. The Senator from Washington stated on last Friday that it was his desire that the issue shall be made partisan. My reason for desiring that it be considered in a nonpartisan spirit is not through fear that it will result in discrediting or defeating the political party with which I am allied, but is due to the fact that if it be made a partisan issue it will result in defeating the treaty of peace, in postponing or defeating the league of nations, in compelling the United States in all probability to part company with her Allies with whom she has been so closely connected in the prosecution of the war, and to go her own way and make a separate peace with the Imperial German Government. It is desirable to avoid that from every standpoint.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS INSEPARABLE FROM PEACE TERMS.

Mr. President, I have already stated that the league of nations is a part of the treaty of peace as proposed. Its agencies are made the principal factor in effectuating many of the important and complicated details of the proposed peace treaty proper. While other instrumentalities might be created to perform the functions contemplated for the league of nations, the latter becomes an almost indispensable portion of the treaty of peace. The machinery of the league of nations is a logical and practicable agency for carrying out the details of the treaty. It would be impracticable to enforce the treaty provisions respecting plebiscites, the neutralization of German territory east of the Rhine, and the government of former German colonies without some agency corresponding in authority to the so-called league.

When the first draft of the proposed league of nations covenant was published, its provisions monopolized attention. They immediately became the subject of discussion in the press and before assemblies throughout the Nation and, indeed, well-nigh throughout the world. Many Senate leaders impetuously declared the document at variance with reliable American political traditions and subversive of our best institutions. On the whole the debates have been marked by ability and patriotism scarcely equaled since the time our Constitution was adopted. Yet in notable instances discussion of this subject has been characterized by unaccountable misconception of the purposes and effects of the instrument. Some of the arguments directed against the treaty in principle are little different from those urged by cave men in opposition to any social order, while others, in favor of it, seem to rest upon the theory that all that is necessary to consummate a reform is to earnestly desire it.

It is a common mistake to assume that great and difficult problems may be solved in such patent way as to meet with universal approval and acceptance. Experience shows that no important public question is ever determined with that direct simplicity which academicians are in the habit of proposing. Great issues work themselves out after agitation and discussion. The solution is usually a compromise not wholly satisfactory to either the advocates or opponents of reform.

It was not expected that the first draft of the proposed league of nations treaty should escape criticism and meet with universal approval. Indeed, its authors expected changes to be made. They so declared at the time it was first presented. Leon Bourgeois, the French member of the committee, said:

I do not present it as something final, but only as the result of an honest effort to be discussed and examined not only by this conference but by the public opinion of the world.

Lord Robert Cecil, the British member of the committee, made the declaration:

We are not seeking to produce for the world a building finished and complete in all respects. To have attempted such a thing would have been an arrogant piece of folly. All we have tried to do—all we have hoped to do—is to lay soundly and truly the foundations upon which our successors may build.

Premier Orlando, the Italian member of the committee, expressed this thought. He said:

As the present debate has for its object to bring the whole scheme before the public opinion of the world, I wish to bring to that debate my personal contribution.

After the President's return to Paris the committee resumed consideration of the subject, having the benefit of the criticisms offered in debates in the Senate and elsewhere and of much discussion in the public press, and as a result have incorporated a modified draft in the treaty of peace. It is regrettable that partisan politics should enter into this subject.

SHAMEFUL DISPLAY OF PARTISANSHIP.

The negotiation of a proper treaty of peace, a treaty that will safeguard the world against aggressions by Germany and repair in so far as possible the wrongs which she has done to unoffending nations, is too important to be made a partisan issue. The preparation of a treaty which will promote good will where rivalry and jealousy have heretofore threatened the security and prosperity of nations; the incorporation in the treaty of terms which will make possible the lightening of the tax burdens on our own people, is of supreme moment to Democrats and Republicans alike. The work of our representatives at the peace conference is so important, so complicated, and difficult that it should combine the sympathies and efforts of all loyal Americans. It is regrettable that a spirit of partisanship, exemplified in notable instances by Members of this body and displayed in editorials in many newspapers and periodicals, should have hampered and embarrassed the President and his associates in their labors at Paris. Surely no other subject which has arisen or can arise so vitally affects this Government and so earnestly invites nonpartisan consideration and action.

Since the beginning of the war we have heard much and read much concerning our obligation to support the President as the leader of the Nation. Assuming that the President acts in good faith and with full recognition of his responsibilities, it is just as much the duty of Senators and newspapers to support him in his

labors at the peace conference as it was to aid him as Chief Executive and as Commander in Chief during actual hostilities.

UNFAIR ATTACKS UPON THE PRESIDENT.

Notwithstanding the considerations which require unity among our people the President has been the object of repeated unfair and bitter attacks from many sources at home, attacks which can only be justified upon the theory that he has either willingly betrayed or ignorantly sacrificed the cause he represents.

When the first draft of the treaty was published, the President requested Senators to refrain from discussing it until after he had conferred with members of the committees in the Senate and House intrusted with subjects affecting foreign relations. The request was misconstrued by some and misrepresented by others. The manifest purpose of the request was to give the President and Senators the advantage of a mutual interchange of viewpoints, so that whatever modifications might be necessary should be harmoniously made, and the united support, if possible, of all factors in the treaty-making power brought to the league treaty as finally written.

The request, however, was unfairly characterized as an effort to stifle debate and to suppress public knowledge of the terms of the instrument. The President was assailed here as a dictator and as an usurper.

Deliberate misrepresentations were published upon the alleged authority of Senators attending the conference with the President. Misrepresentations to the effect that the President appeared ignorant of the terms of the covenant and intolerant of opposition to them, when, as a matter of fact, exactly the reverse was true. He disclosed astonishing and thorough familiarity with both the language and the legal construction of the treaty, and submitted himself to cross-examination by every Senator and Representative attending the conference. He declared that certain clauses in the instrument needed clarification. These alleged interviews could only have one effect. They necessarily discredited the President, not only in this country but also before the people of the world, and materially impaired his influence at the peace conference. Notwithstanding the libelous character of these reports attributed to certain Senators, those Senators have never denied the authenticity of the falsehoods. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], in a speech before this body, characterized appropriately these false and damaging statements, but his speech was not expressly corroborated by the Senators alleged to have stated that the President displayed ignorance and an intolerant spirit during the consultation with Senators at the White House. Neither candor nor justice would have been violated if the Senators had chosen to repudiate the interviews which everyone now knows were fabricated.

REPUBLICAN LEADERS URGE SILENCE.

This phase of the negotiations has recently assumed a humorous aspect. The leader of the majority in the Senate, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Republican whip [Mr. CURTIS], who thought it amounted to usurpation in the President to request Senators to refrain from discussing the original draft until he could confer with them, with ridiculous inconsistency, have appealed to all Republican Senators to withhold opinions concerning the revised draft. The Senator from Idaho, who has fretted because of secrecy in the proceedings at the peace conference, at once held a secret conference with the Senator from Massachusetts and, after the conference, gave to the world the astonishing, lucid, and frank information that "the conference had been very satisfactory."

The press article respecting this partisan request is as follows:

SILENCE ASKED OF G. O. P. SENATORS—LODGE URGES THEM NOT TO DISCUSS LEAGUE OF NATIONS UNTIL AFTER A CONFERENCE.

WASHINGTON, *April 29.*

Telegrams were sent to all Republican Senators to-day by Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, floor leader, and Senator CURTIS, of Kansas, asking that public expressions of opinion upon the league of nations covenant be withheld until a Republican conference could decide upon what attitude should be adopted. Senator LODGE and other Republican leaders, it was said, have no intention of summoning Republican Senators to Washington immediately. The Republicans will be urged to give the revised draft of the covenant careful study preparatory to a conference before the Senate meets. It was considered probable that Senators now here would hold informal conferences meanwhile with Senator LODGE.

Senator LODGE and Senator BORAH, of Idaho, conferred to-day, and Senator BORAH said that the conference had been very satisfactory. This announcement attracted attention in view of Senator BORAH'S opposition to the league of nations.

Senator MCNARY, of Oregon, Republican, announced that he would support the league covenant as adopted in Paris.

Unwilling to acquiesce in the request of the President for silence until after a conference, all but six Republican Senators promptly obeyed the instructions of Senators LODGE and CURTIS. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], and the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] with commendable firmness refused to be muzzled.

The Senator from Washington is quoted as saying that he "did not see how the league of nations could be made into a party question at this time."

The press notice of the agreement to remain silent is as follows:

REPUBLICANS AGREE TO REMAIN SILENT—ALL BUT SIX SENATORS PROMISE NOT TO DISCUSS LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

WASHINGTON, *May 2.*

Senator CURTIS, of Kansas, Republican whip, who, with Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, leader, recently telegraphed all Republican Senators asking them not to discuss the revised league of nations covenant until a party conference could be held, said to-day replies had come from all but about six Senators, who could not be located, and that all agreed silence would be the best policy for the present.

Senator KENYON, of Iowa, joined to-day with other Republicans of the progressive group in opposing the making of the league of nations questions a party matter.

"It will not be a party question," he said. "The question will be determined in the Senate not on any theory of helping or injuring any political party but solely on its merits as a distinct problem."

Senator POINDEXTER, of Washington, who returned to-day from a month's speaking trip in opposition to the league, said he did not see how the league of nations could be made into a party question at this time.

NOT A PARTY ISSUE.

The impropriety of making the league of nations a party issue is emphasized by the courageous refusal of a number of so-called Progressive Senators to be controlled.

NOT A PARTY ISSUE, PROGRESSIVES SAY—OPPOSED TO HAVING LEAGUE OF NATIONS CONSIDERED AT CONFERENCE.

WASHINGTON, *May 1.*

Several Republican Senators of the group known as Progressives to-day said that they opposed having the league of nations covenant considered at a Republican conference, with a view to determining the attitude of party toward the document.

Senators JOHNSON, of California; JONES, of Washington; MCNARY, of Oregon; and BORAH, of Idaho, made statements declaring the league could not be made a party question.

They were commenting on the action of Senator LODGE, leader, and Senator CURTIS, whip, in telegraphing, asking Republican Senators to withhold statements concerning the league until a party conference could be held. Senator NORRIS, of Nebraska, said he did not oppose the conference, but would refuse to be bound by any action it might take.

"I don't care what Mr. LODGE, Mr. Root, or anyone else says or determines. It won't influence me in this matter," said Senator JOHNSON. "This matter transcends all other questions in importance too much to be made a party question. If any man can't determine his own attitude upon the league, he is not fit to hold his seat in the Senate."

Senator JONES said he thought it was a mistake to inject politics into the consideration of the league of nations.

Senator MCNARY, who recently announced that he would support the covenant as finally revised in Paris, criticized the sending of the LODGE-CURTIS telegram, and declared that every Senator should determine his attitude upon the league.

"This is a matter no political party can bind me on unless it agrees with my views," said Senator BORAH.

Senator LODGE to-day denied reports that he had conferred with Elihu Root and other party leaders in New York regarding the league.

The Senator from Massachusetts stated Friday last in the debate on the resolution of the Senator from California that he regards the sending of the telegram by himself and the Senator from Kansas as a nonpartisan act. Mr. President, that is the only way in which any measure is made a partisan issue—by bringing it before a party conference for consideration and action.

ITALY'S CLAIMS.

Demands of Italy for the annexation of Fiume, denial of which led to the withdrawal from the peace conference of the Italian representatives, were supported by the Senator from Massachusetts in an open telegram to the Italian societies of Boston. The press announcement shows that the Senator impliedly assailed the President's attitude in opposing the Italians' claims as lacking in a proper appreciation of the necessities of Italy and of her rights growing out of sacrifices in the war. The uncontradicted press report of the Senator's action is as follows:

LODGE SUPPORTS ITALY'S CLAIMS—SAYS NATION'S DEMANDS REST ON GROUND OF SAFETY AND PROTECTION.

WASHINGTON, *April 29.*

Demands of Italy for the port of Fiume, denial of which led to the withdrawal of the Italian plenipotentiaries from the peace conference, were upheld to-night by Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, Republican floor leader, in a telegram sent to Italian societies of Boston.

Senator LODGE declared that Italy's demands rested on the ground of her national safety and protection, whereas reasons which had been advanced for turning the port over to the Jugo-Slavs were "purely commercial and economic."

He said that since Italy had sacrificed a half million of her people and burdened herself with heavy debts in aiding France, England, and the United States to repulse the German onset, he could not see how her request could properly be refused.

The Senator said he could not understand why arrangements had not been made for satisfying Italy's desire for military and naval control over the Adriatic and at the same time providing the Jugo-Slavs with a port through which they would have access to the sea.

"In the discussions of the terms of peace," said Senator LODGE, "I have always declared that the region known as 'Italia Irredenta' and all adjoining regions where Italian culture and Italian population are dominant should be returned to Italy, and that Italy should have military and naval control of the Adriatic not only for her own protection but as an essential barrier against any future attempt of Germany to attack the rest of the world as she did in the recent war. I have also

said repeatedly that the Jugo-Slavs ought to have access to the Adriatic, which I regard as economically essential to their independence.

"From information given me by an Italian deputation whom I saw last spring in Washington, I was assured that Italy was entirely willing to give portions of the Dalmatian coast containing good ports to the Slav population."

The President's reasons for opposing the annexation of Fiume were based principally on the contention that under the secret treaty between Italy, France, and England by which Italy was induced to support them in the war against Germany, Italy did not acquire any claim to Fiume; that the disintegration of Austria as the result of the war freed Italy from any danger of a renewal of attack and that Fiume is the logical seaport for Czechoslovakia. The President's explanation of the matter is clear and convincing, and I publish it as another illustration of the prejudices at work to break him down before the peace conference.

PRESIDENT WILSON EXPLAINS ATTITUDE—MAKES PUBLIC MEMORANDUM SENT TO ITALIAN DELEGATES ON APRIL 14—DESIRES TO DO JUSTICE—BUT SAYS HE CAN NOT SUGGEST ONE BASIS FOR PEACE WITH GERMANY AND ANOTHER FOR AUSTRIA.

PARIS, *April 29*.

A statement was issued to-night dealing with the memorandum sent by President Wilson to the Italian delegation on April 14 with permission to make it public in Italy and which was given out to-day in Rome.

A complete copy of the President's statement under the heading "Memorandum concerning the question of Italian claims on the Adriatic" follows:

"There is no question to which I have given more careful or anxious thought than I have given to this, because, in common with all my colleagues, it is my earnest desire to see the utmost justice done to Italy.

"Throughout my consideration of it, however, I have felt that there was one matter in which I had no choice and could wish to have none. I felt bound to square every conclusion that I should reach as accurately as possible with the 14 principles of peace which I set forth in my address to the Congress of the United States on the 8th of January, 1918, and in subsequent addresses.

"These 14 points and the principles laid down in the subsequent addresses were formally adopted with only a single reservation by the powers associated against Germany and will constitute the basis of peace with Germany. I do not feel at liberty to suggest one basis for peace with Germany and another for peace with Austria.

PEOPLE MUST DECIDE.

"It will be remembered that in reply to a communication from the Austrian Government offering to enter into negotiations for an armistice and peace on the basis of the 14 points to which I have alluded, I said there was one matter to which those points no longer applied. They had determined autonomy for the several States which had constituted parts of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and I pointed out that it must now be left to the choice of the people of these several countries what their destinies and political relations should be.

"They have chosen with the sympathy of the whole world to be set up as independent States. Their complete separation from Austria and the complete dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire has given a new aspect and significance to settlements which may be effected with regard at any rate of the eastern boundaries of Italy.

PACT NO LONGER APPLIES.

"Personally I am quite willing that Italy should be accorded along the whole front of her northern frontier and wherever she comes into contact with Austrian territory all that was accorded her in the so-called pact of London, but I am of the clear opinion that the pact of London can no longer apply to the settlement of her eastern boundaries.

"The line drawn in the pact of London conceived for the purpose of establishing an absolutely adequate frontier of safety for Italy against any possible hostility or aggression on the part of Austria. But Austria-Hungary no longer exists.

"These eastern frontiers will touch countries stripped of the military and naval power of Austria, settled in interdependence of Austria, and organized for the purpose of satisfying legitimate national aspirations, and created States not hostile to the new European order, but arising out of it, interested in its maintenance, dependent upon the cultivation of friendships, and bound to a common policy of peace and accommodation by the covenant of the league of nations.

"It is with these facts in mind that I have approached the Adriatic question. It is commonly agreed, and I very heartily adhere to the agreement, that the ports of Trieste and Pola, and with them the greater part of the Istrian Peninsula, should be ceded to Italy, her eastern frontier running along the natural strategic line established by the physical conformation of the country—a line which it has been attempted to draw with some degree of accuracy on the attached map.

"Within this line on the Italian side will lie considerable bodies of non-Italian populations, but their fortunes are so naturally linked by the nature of the country itself with the rest of the Italian people that I think their inclusion is fully justified.

FIUME CAN NOT BE INCLUDED.

"There would be no justification, in my judgment, in including Fiume or any part of the coast line to the south of Fiume within the boundaries of the Italian kingdom. Fiume is by situation and by all the circumstances of its development not an Italian but an international port, serving the countries to the east and north of the Gulf of Fiume.

"Just because it is an international port and can not, with justice, be subordinated to any one society, it is my clear judgment that it should enjoy a very considerable degree of genuine autonomy, and while it should be included, no doubt, within the customs systems of the new Jugo-Slavic State, it should, nevertheless, be left free in its own interest and in the interest of the States lying about it, to devote itself to the service of the commerce which naturally and inevitably seeks an outlet or inlet at its port.

"The States which it serves will be new States. They will have complete confidence in their access to an outlet on the sea. The friendship and connections of the future will largely depend upon such an arrangement as I have suggested, and friendship, cooperation, and freedom of action must underlie every arrangement of peace if peace is to be lasting.

"I believe there will be common agreement that the island of Lissa should be ceded to Italy, and that she should retain the port of Volna. I believe that it will be generally agreed that the fortifications which the Austrian Government established upon the islands near the eastern end of the Adriatic should be permanently dispensed with under international guaranty, and that the disarmament which is to be arranged under the league of nations should limit the States on the eastern coast of the Adriatic to only such minor naval forces as are necessary for policing the waters of the island and the coast.

"These are conclusions which I am forced to by compulsion of the understandings which underlie the whole initiation of the present peace.

NO OTHER CONCLUSIONS ACCEPTABLE.

"No other conclusions seem to be acceptable to being rendered concise with these understandings. They were understandings accepted by the whole world, and bear with peculiar compulsion upon the United States, because the privilege was accorded her of taking the initiative of bringing about the negotiations for peace, and her plans underlie the whole difficult business.

"And certainly Italy obtains under such a settlement the great historic object which her people have so long had in mind. The historical wrongs inflicted upon her by Austria-Hungary and by a long series of unjust transactions, which, I hope, will before long sink out of the memory of man, are completely redressed. Nothing is denied here which will complete her national unity.

"Here and there upon the islands of the Adriatic and upon the eastern coast of that sea there are settlements containing large Italian elements of population, but the pledge under which the new States enter the family of nations will abundantly safeguard the liberty, the development, and all the just right of national and racial minorities, and back of these safeguards will always lie the watchful authority of the league of nations. And at the very outset we shall avoid the fatal error of making Italy's nearest neighbors on her east her enemies and nursing just such a sense of injustice as has disturbed the peace of Europe for generations together and played no small part in bringing on the terrible conflict through which we have just passed."

The President has had and still bears the greatest responsibility ever assumed by a human being. He may have made mistakes. It would be remarkable if he should have avoided all errors. Let us hope he will escape companionship with that contemptible class of egotists who classify themselves as omniscient. The only renowned individual of our time claiming the attributes of divinity, the Kaiser, has become a pitiable outcast. Let other egotists beware.

Senators may succeed in forcing a compromise favorable to Italy, still they can not successfully answer the argument of the President. The New York Times, in an able editorial, shows the fallacy of the Senator's position:

LODGE'S ASSERTION PROVES BOOMERANG—STATEMENT REGARDING FIUME GIVES ARGUMENT TO SUPPORT WILSON, EDITOR SAYS.

WASHINGTON, *May 4*.

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, floor leader of the Republican majority in the next Senate and chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, apparently has stepped into a trap of his own making. An evident desire to hamper and criticize the President in the effort to prevent the port of Fiume from being appropriated by the Italians has caused Senator LODGE to make and publish statements bitterly criticizing the President. But immediately he has drawn upon himself the severe criticism of the editor of one of the largest Republican papers in the East, and a review of the statement later by the New York Times shows the editor is correct and that LODGE merely has offered a good argument to support the President, just the reverse of what he intended to do.

Senator LODGE said the Fiume situation was similar to the New Orleans situation in our early history. Just as the United States would regard the holding of New Orleans by a foreign power as a menace to this country, the Italians must regard the holding of Fiume by any other power than Italy as a menace to Italy, he contended. Fiume must be had by Italy to protect that country from German aggression, he insisted.

The Republican editor, one of the ablest students of history, insists the conditions are just the reverse. He says that just as New Orleans drains that great economic area to the north, so Fiume is the outlet for the economic area other than held by Italy. It is necessary for other countries than Italy to have this outlet, he says, just as the United States would demand that New Orleans be had by this country.

"BLOW TO ITALIANS."

The New York Times, an independent paper, says:

"The Massachusetts Senator forgot himself when he declared that 'Italy regards Fiume as the founders of our Republic regarded the mouth of the Mississippi River when it was said that any other nation holding the mouth of the Mississippi was of necessity an enemy of the United States.' Jefferson's observation about the mouth of the Mississippi is perfectly appropriate as an argument for the retention of Fiume by the Jugo-Slavs, since if that port passed into the hands of any other nation, that nation will in a large measure control their trade, a relation which they might come to regard as hostile. By the use of that illustration Mr. LODGE dealt his Italian friends a blow under which they must have winced."

In so far as the point of self-determination is to be considered, the Times points out that Italy is to be given territory to her north, where, if a vote was taken, the German population would control. This territory is necessary to the future of Italy, it is conceded, and the President has assisted in having Italy obtain it.

OPPOSE UNITED STATES AIDING FRANCE.

France has insisted upon a specific agreement on behalf of the United States and Great Britain to support her if attacked again by Germany. I do not regard such an agreement as necessary and believe that the provision in the league of nations treaty is adequate for all cases of possible aggression. The Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Kansas have hastily declared their opposition to such a stipulation, while the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] prefers it to the league of nations covenant.

OPPOSE UNITED STATES AIDING FRANCE IF ATTACKED—OTHER SENATORS OBJECT TO THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS IN PEACE TREATY.

WASHINGTON, *May 9.*

As they completed their study of the official summary of the treaty of Versailles last night, Senators began to give expression of their views on the momentous document which is now in the hands of the German plenipotentiaries. A few Senators, however, still withheld comment, preferring to examine the complete text before reaching a definite conclusion. These included Senators LODGE, of Massachusetts, SMOOT, of Utah, and other Republican leaders.

Sharp opposition to the proposal that the United States, in consort with Great Britain, commit herself to go to France's aid in the event that country were attacked was voiced by Senators BORAH, of Idaho, and CURTIS, of Kansas, while Senators SHERMAN, of Illinois, and MOSES, of New Hampshire, criticized the league of nations covenant in the treaty.

Senator HITCHCOCK, of Nebraska, retiring chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, approved the treaty as a whole, and said that, in his judgment, the "crowning glory of this great document is the fact that there is embedded in it the great constitution of the league of nations." The Senator declared the treaty was a "monumental work", and measured up "to the highest moral standards of the world," with justice as the basis of reorganization.

APPROVE MILITARY TERMS.

General approval of the military and naval terms imposed on Germany was given not only by both Republican and Democratic Senators, but by officials and diplomats generally. They concurred in the view of Army and Navy officers that with the carrying out of the terms Germany would be stripped of every vestige of power necessary for it to disturb again the peace of the world.

Senator BORAH made no comment on the peace treaty itself, confining his statement solely to the proposal for a triple alliance between the three leading associated powers. He declared that whether the United States should take part in any future European war was "a matter which should be determined upon the facts when and as they arise and by the particular generation which must bear the brunt of the war and by the intelligence and the conscience and judgment of the American people as they see the situation when face to face with it."

Senator SHERMAN said the "manner in which the treaty has been presented is a resort to gag rule." He declared it was "a confession of weakness that the league of nations has to be dragged through as an annex to the treaty of peace," and said he would vote to separate the league covenant from the treaty and take a separate vote on each.

Senator MOSES did not regard the separation of the league covenant from the treaty as impossible, and said he preferred the triple alliance between the United States, Great Britain, and France to the league plan as drawn.

France has suffered and is anxious. Let us not refuse her plea discourteously or offensively decline to hear her cause. Are we justified in foreclosing the case against her before hearing it?

As another illustration of the partisanship displayed by Republican Senators in discussing the league of nations covenant, the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] is quoted as attacking the President for combining with Bolshevists to destroy the independence of the United States. The press report of the Senator's speech before a Republican club at Cambridge, Mass., quotes him as charging that the independence of the United States is being attacked by anarchistic organizations and by the President and his administration acting in conjunction with the I. W. W. and kindred organizations.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. What I referred to in the address that the Senator just mentioned were matters about which I presume there will be no dispute—certain matters of fact. The Senator from Arkansas undoubtedly has read the speech of the President delivered to Congress on January 8, 1918, in which the President referred to the Bolshevist government of Russia as represented at the Brest-Litovsk peace conference as "challenging the admiration of every friend of mankind," the language which was used by the President. The Senator undoubtedly is also familiar with the fact that the so-called Bolshevists or communists in the United States have taken that expression from the President's speech to Congress and printed it on the first page of the pamphlets which they have circulated throughout the world; and, I assume, as I said in Massachusetts, that eulogy of the Bolshevists by the President used in that way is of great benefit to the communist movement.

Mr. ROBINSON. I can not tell what was in the mind of the Senator from Washington when he made the speech to which I am referring further than the press notices advise me, and I am going to read the press report on that subject. I have not seen the statement which the Senator from Washington attributes to the President, but I will say that if the press report of the Senator's speech from Cambridge, Mass., delivered before a Republican club there is accurate, that it does not sustain his statement here. That report is as follows:

POINDEXTER DEFENDER OF UNITED STATES INDEPENDENCE—SENATOR TURNS HIS GUNS ON ALLEGED ASSAILANTS OF AMERICAN FREEDOM.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *May 9.*

Senator POINDEXTER, of Washington, speaking before the Republican Club of Cambridge last night, declared a dual attack was being made against the independence of the United States and charged President Wilson with aiding the movement.

"The independence of the United States is being attacked from two directions," said the Washington Senator, "one the internationale of the proletariat represented by the I. W. W., the radical Socialists, the Bolshevists, and anarchists, and the other movement of certain elements of international business and international pacifists. Strangely, each of these movements receives support from the other.

"In every country in Europe President Wilson has appealed to the socialistic element, and they, in return, have from every country in Europe supported his purpose. The Socialist labor parties of England, France, and Italy have supported every move he has made for an international government, of which he is to be the head.

"Likewise, the President and his administration," the Senator continued, "have reciprocally aided and encouraged the communists.

"Like certain international business men, the communists care nothing for the principle of nationality. Unlike them, however, they also care nothing for the principle of property. Such a doctrine is the worst foe of the workingman and is destructive of American institutions. Encouragement it has received from the administration intensifies its menace.

"The supreme issue and the supreme duty of Americans is to revive in its full vigor the spirit of American nationality as we received it from the inspired fathers and leaders of the Republic and to defend against violence from below or intrigue from above individual security and national independence."

I will ask the Senator from Washington if that is a correct report of the speech made at Cambridge, Mass., before the Republican Club?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, as nearly as I have been able to follow the reading of the Senator from Arkansas, it is. If the Senator will permit me just a moment——

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator ought to try to justify that. I am perfectly willing he should make any explanation he desires of that matter, however.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I was going, as a matter of proof, to state the facts. The statement which I made at Cambridge, Mass., was a very deliberate one, which I would not have made if it were not based upon facts which I do not think can be denied. I think they are facts that will be admitted by everyone.

Mr. ROBINSON. That such a charge should have come from such a source is deeply regrettable, and it illustrates and emphasizes the correctness of the conclusion that this ought not to be made a party issue. It is unfair; it is unjust; it seems to me that it is unpatriotic that a United States Senator should make that kind of attack upon the President of the United States, even though the Senator belongs to and is a leader of an adverse political party.

When that speech was made the President of the United States was the representative of this Government at the Paris peace conference, where were being considered the mightiest issues that were ever presented to the world. The President, as the representative of this Government, was entitled to immunity from attack from behind. We have heard much said about supporting the President during the war. Assuming that the President acts honestly, assuming that he acts in good faith and with a fair knowledge of his duties and responsibilities, I say, Mr. President, that it was an act of injustice not only to him but to the American people to strike him from behind. This I believe to have been the act of the Senator from Washington when he made that speech before the Republican Club at Cambridge, Mass.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, may I ask a question of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Do I understand the attitude of the Senator from Arkansas to be that the action of the President at the Paris peace conference is not subject to criticism?

Mr. ROBINSON. Certainly not.

Mr. POINDEXTER. By citizens of the United States?

Mr. ROBINSON. No.

Mr. POINDEXTER. And that if we do not agree with the position he has taken, we are not at liberty to state our disagreement?

Mr. ROBINSON. Oh, Mr. President, if I have left any such impression upon anyone else who has heard me, I must apologize for my inability to express any thought that is in my mind. Nor has the President taken any such position. It is perfectly fair if the Senator from Washington wants to criticize the acts of the President that he should do so, but it is unfair to charge the President with treason while he is carrying the weightiest burdens the American people have ever put upon any man and trying to serve the Nation.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, if the Senator——

Mr. ROBINSON. Just a moment. To charge the President was conspiring to destroy the independence of the United States is as grave a charge as can be made against any citizen or officer, and the Senator from Washington ought to justify it or withdraw it. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. My justification, so far as the action of the President in attacking the independence of the United States is concerned, and the proof of my statement is to point to the proposed constitution for the government of the world

which has been published under the authority of the President and which submits to a body of delegates, from the polyglot peoples of Europe, Asia, and Latin America, every international dispute which may arise between the United States and other nations, and which provides——

Mr. ROBINSON. I understand what the treaty provides, if the Senator will pardon me.

Mr. POINDEXTER. And which provides in so many words that when the Army and Navy of the United States have been fixed under the proceedings provided by the league of nations they can not be increased without the permission of the league of nations. When that agreement is ratified by the United States, if it ever shall be ratified, the independence and sovereignty of the Nation will have disappeared.

Mr. ROBINSON. Now, Mr. President——

Mr. POINDEXTER. Just one more suggestion I want to make.

Mr. ROBINSON. I will yield to the Senator from Washington. I will ask him, however, to consider the lateness of the hour and to be as brief as he can.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I just want to call the attention of the Senator from Arkansas to the last words that were spoken by the President of the United States before he left this country and set up the White House in Paris. I use that term "White House in Paris" because it has come to be a common term I notice used in the dispatches in sort of an official way. The term is used, I believe, by employees of our peace delegation, referring to the residence of the President in Paris as the "White House," emphasizing the fact that the seat of the Government of the United States so far as——

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing, if the Senator from Washington urges that as a justification of his charge that the President was conspiring with the Bolshevists to undermine the independence of the United States, to yield to him, otherwise I shall proceed with my remarks. I shall ask him to let me proceed.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I had not finished the sentence.

Mr. ROBINSON. All right.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Before the President started to take up his residence or to pursue his duties in Paris, he made a speech at New York in which he used these words:

The time has come for us—

Referring to the people of the United States—

to make the supreme sacrifice and to join our fortunes with the fortunes of men everywhere.

And when he said that we should make the supreme sacrifice and join our fortunes with the fortunes of men everywhere, those fortunes which heretofore have been sovereign and independent, he attacked the independence of the United States.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Washington made the explanation which he has made. All of you who heard him know that he has justified the charge to which I have referred solely on the ground that the President is advocating the league of nations.

He regards the action of the President substantially as an act of treason because the President is putting forward and urging the league of nations. I submit, Mr. President, it was not candid in the Senator from Washington, occupying the position that he does, to have made such a speech in such a place. His explanation of it simply means that anyone who advocates the league of nations is a traitor to the United States and is trying to undermine its independence.

I regard that speech as an emphatic and conclusive proof of an effort by the Senator from Washington to raise prejudice upon issue throughout the United States.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] read into the RECORD some weeks ago a statement signed by 37 Republican Members of this body announcing their opposition to the league of nations covenant as originally proposed. Since the revised draft has been published—meeting, I believe, the material objections urged in this statement—the Senator has appealed to his fellow Republican Senators to remain silent concerning the subject until a partisan conference may be held. In pursuing this course admirers of the Senator from Massachusetts inquire whether he has faced about and marched backward since May, 1916, when he addressed the annual convention in this city on the league to enforce peace. In that address he urged the obligation to create an organization among nations which would put force behind international peace, and anticipated many of the objections which his associates now urge to the league. Let me quote from that address:

The limit of voluntary arbitration has, I think, been reached. * * * I think the next step is that which this league proposes, and that is to put force behind international peace. We may not solve it in that way, but if we can not solve it in that way it can be solved in no other.

On the same occasion he further said:

I know how quickly we shall be met with the statement that this is a dangerous question which you are putting into your agreement, that no nation can submit to the judgment of other nations, and we must be careful at the beginning not to attempt too much. I know the difficulties which arise when we speak of anything which seems to involve an alliance. But I do not believe that when Washington warned us against entangling alliances he meant for one moment that we should not join with other civilized nations of the world if a method could be found to diminish war and encourage peace.

It was a year ago that in delivering the chancellor's address at Union College I made an argument on this theory—that if we were to promote international peace at the close of the present terrible war, if we were to restore international law as it must be restored, we must find some way in which the united forces of the nations must be put behind the cause of peace and law. I said then that my hearers might think that I was picturing a Utopia, but it is in the search for Utopias that great discoveries have been made. "Not failures, but low aim is crime."

This league certainly has the highest of all aims for the benefit of humanity, and because the pathway is sown with difficulties is no reason that we should turn from it. It is the vision of a perhaps impossible perfection that has led humanity across the centuries. If our aspirations are for that which is great and beautiful and good and beneficent to humanity, even when we do not achieve our end, even if the results are little, we can at least remember Arnold's lines:

Charge, then, and be dumb;
Let the victors, when they come,
When the forts of folly fall,
Find your body at the wall.

How do these brave words compare with the Senator's conduct in demanding a conference with his party colleagues to tell him how to vote?

It is poor consolation, Mr. President, to remember Arnold's lines. The only suggestion the Senator from Massachusetts makes if failure came to the great project for which he then stood is to remember some lines of a poet. Statesmanship supreme!

The Senator from Massachusetts recently demonstrated his title to party leadership. He led the stand-pat forces to a signal victory which tends to submerge for all time the leader of the so-called Progressive forces. The leader of the Progressive forces—the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]—made a gallant fight indeed! He marched his army up the hill and then marched down again!

What clearer or more forceful argument can be made in advocacy of the general principles of a league of nations than is furnished by this speech of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Seldom in American political history has any statesman demonstrated more versatile talents than the Senator from Massachusetts has disclosed in discussing both sides of this subject. His speech in the recent debate with Mr. Lowell, in which he opposed the league treaty, is one of the most powerful addresses in opposition, while the address which I have just quoted ranks with the best in support of the league. Many believe, after carefully weighing the arguments of the Senator from Massachusetts on both sides of the proposition, that he was right three years ago when he supported the league, and that he is wrong now when he opposes it or hesitates and asks his associates not to declare themselves.

We who admire him, but differ from him politically, think that he missed an opportunity to retrieve the greatest mistake of his leadership when he failed to urge acceptance of the revised draft, and express the hope that he may yet accord the treaty his support.

So far as I know, the Senator from Massachusetts has kept his injunction to his colleagues to remain silent on the revised draft of the league of nations treaty. He spoke at great length and with much force against the original draft. He has remained silent as to the provisions of the revised draft. I hope he will conclude to support it and use the same magic he applied to control the Progressives in connection with the organization of the Senate.

The effort to gain partisan advantage reflected in the interviews mentioned has met with only partial success.

Many renowned men affiliated with the Republican Party are strongly supporting the President in his labors at the peace conference, and have treated with contempt the effort by their associates to harass the Nation's Chief Executive in his efforts to promote international peace and security.

TAFT A HERO IN DEBATE.

Former President William H. Taft has toured the United States in support of the President's attitude and in defense of the league of nations treaty. He has been ridiculed without mercy by those who possess too narrow a vision of world affairs to grasp the significance of his attitude. With sublime indifference to censure he has answered the serious criticisms urged against the league, and has reestablished himself in the confidence of the American people.

MR. WICKERSHAM'S VIEWPOINT.

Former Attorney General Wickersham, a staunch Republican and a lawyer of international renown, has announced his con-

version to the support of the league as a result of personal familiarity with conditions in Europe obtained during his recent visit to war-stricken lands.

MR. ELIHU ROOT'S VIEWPOINT.

Mr. Elihu Root, who is universally known as a great Republican and as a great statesman, has said that if the press reports of the treaty as revised are found correct he will give it cordial indorsement.

SOLDIERS ALMOST UNANIMOUSLY SUPPORT LEAGUE.

American soldiers almost unanimously support the league of nations. They are entitled to be consulted; entitled to be heard. Their sacrifices have impressed them with the meaning of war and its absurdity as a factor in Christian civilization. The viewpoint of the American soldier is well set out in a letter to the Senator from Idaho, published in the Saturday Evening Post in the issue of April 19. It is a polite but stern rebuke of the spirit of partisanship which unhappily has characterized the debate on the league of nations treaty, and is as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Philadelphia, Apr. 19, 1919.]

SOLDIERS AND SENATORS.

This letter speaks for itself and, we believe, for a majority of the men who fought the war:

MARCH 13, 1919.

HON. WILLIAM EDGAR BORAH,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I attended the meeting at Boston which you recently addressed in opposition to the league of nations. The full case was not presented at that meeting. Sailors and soldiers who attempted to speak were denied the opportunity.

A mere soldier, one among four millions, could not challenge a United States Senator; but, as one so fortunate as to have been on the firing line when it was a question of the life or death of our Nation, I ask permission to present at your meetings the case for the men who were willing to make and who did make the supreme sacrifice for a better world.

The American soldier fought with no selfish or sordid aim. He believed that something mightily worth while would follow his sacrifice. He believed an organization would follow which would make peace more secure. He knew little of the details of a league of nations, but from his everyday life he could see the necessity of organization. He now believes that it is the business of a constructive statesman to say what that organization should be and not merely to oppose the one suggested.

We have been too busy on the other side to know what has been going on politically at home. Possibly an appeal for party support was made where it should not have been made. Possibly the Senate was not given full consideration. We do not know. But we do know that American soldiers have been dying for certain principles, and that these principles are too great to be discredited for the purpose of discrediting the man who happens to uphold them; too great to be discredited for the purpose of discrediting any party.

Of course this letter is public.

Respectfully, yours.

(Signed) THOMAS G. CHAMBERLAIN,
Captain, United States Army.

Address: Hotel McAlpin, New York City.

Mr. President, in the conduct of the war which has recently closed through the signing of an armistice the United States presented a spectacle which astonished the world. This Government, with fixedness of purpose and loyalty to the institutions of civilization, speedily accomplished wonders which amazed mankind. Our armies were increased in one and one-half years from a little more than 200,000 officers and men to 4,000,000 officers and men. Our Navy was advanced from a personnel of approximately 40,000 to 500,000. While this was being accomplished appropriate quartermaster and ordnance organizations were effected, cantonments and training camps were built. We organized a great aerial service. The hum and drone of American battle planes were sounding above German fields and German homes when the armistice was signed.

But great as was the accomplishment of the Government of the United States in preparing for the war and in carrying on the war, it was not equal to the exemplification of loyalty made by the people of the United States as a whole. With a willingness to make any sacrifice which the circumstances required, they devoted themselves to war industries with all the energy they possessed. Women who never before knew toil quit their frivolities and went to work for the comfort of the men in our Army. This spirit of loyalty and unity among the people of the United States enabled us to mass our resources and apply every force of the Nation to the winning of the war. It enabled us to win a year ahead of schedule time.

Inspiring as was the spectacle of the Government of the United States preparing for war and in conducting this war, glorious as was the sacrifice made by the men and women who could not go to the front, these did not equal or compare with the achievements of our soldiers. Never since time began has any army acquitted itself more gloriously. The German Government said that it would be impossible for the United States to get into the war until she had whipped the Allies, and yet within a few months we had seized, borrowed, and purchased enough ships to be carrying more than 100,000 soldiers a month to the battle front and had thrown into the war at its crisis the best fighting force the wars of earth have ever known. When the armistice was signed 60,000 men who wore the uniform of this Republic were sleeping among the ruins of France.

And now as the lilies and poppies begin to bloom about their graves we are bringing back home the survivors and are restoring them to civil life. Two hundred thousand have been seriously wounded, many of them are blind, others have lost limbs, all have suffered and sacrificed. Our soldiers are united in the desire for something that will prevent a recurrence of the war into which they were called to make so great a sacrifice.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has failed totally to take the broad view and grasp the real situation. While he was devoting his great energies, the greatest in debate perhaps of any Senator in this Chamber, while the Senator from Idaho was exhausting his resources in preventing the creation of any organization to preserve the peace of the world, our soldiers who had experience at the front, with one accord, were asking the Senator from Idaho, "Why, instead of wasting your time opposing what is proposed, do you not devise a plan that will help to protect humanity from the evils of warfare throughout the future?"

If a comparison of the modified with the original draft be regarded desirable it may be said that the principal modifications are intended to clarify the language of the first draft.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE ORIGINAL AND THE MODIFIED DRAFT.

(1) In the revised draft the Monroe doctrine is specifically preserved.

(2) The revised draft provides that a unanimous vote shall be required in both the assembly of States and in the executive council in any decision on a matter of international interest or involving the peace of the world.

(3) In the modified draft it is made clear that the acceptance by the States is required of recommendations by the executive council as to the armed forces to be supplied by them in executing the covenants of the league.

(4) A similar change is found in the articles relating to disarmament. It is specifically set forth that the recommendations of the council for reductions of armaments shall be adopted only with the consent of the States affected.

(5) There can be no doubt that the acceptance of the responsibilities of a mandate is entirely optional. The language of the treaty as now written removes any shadow of doubt upon that point. One of the chief objections urged in the Senate before revision was that under the language any member of the league might be compelled against its will to act as a mandatory; that the United States might thus be made to govern remote colonies and territories under systems in conflict with our form of government.

(6) In clearly expressing the right of any State to withdraw from the league on two years' notice when that State has kept its obligations to date another objection gravely urged against the treaty has been met. Advocates of the treaty never admitted that a State could be forced to remain in the league against its will, but it was pointed out that even if the right to abrogate the treaty were reserved to the States, to pursue such a course might be regarded by other members of the league as an unfriendly act and result in serious differences, certainly in grave embarrassments to the abrogating State.

The limitation of the right of a nation to withdraw from the league, that it must give two years' notice and must have kept its obligation, is fair and reasonable. No nation ought to be permitted to suddenly sever its relations under such a treaty, and it ought not to be permitted to escape liability for breaches already made by withdrawing, and thus giving its action an ex-post facto effect.

(7) The seventh change to be noted in a comparison of the first and the revised drafts relates to amendment. Under the original provision the unanimous approval of all the States represented in the executive council and a three-fourths majority of those represented in the body of delegates was required to effectuate an amendment. Under the changed provision the unanimous approval of the States represented in the council is required, while a simple majority in the assembly is sufficient.

(8) A new provision is found to the effect that the number of powers of each class represented on the executive council may be increased by the unanimous consent of the council and a majority of the assembly.

(9) Jurisdiction of domestic questions is expressly denied the league. The language of the tentative draft, in the opinion of many lawyers, did not authorize the executive council to render opinions concerning domestic questions. Such subjects were reserved impliedly to the States. Out of respect to the fears of some that such questions as those relating to immigration might

be regarded by the league as within its jurisdiction, the document has been modified so as to remove any doubt. It is expressly stated that the council shall have no power to render an opinion on any dispute involving subject matter within a nation's domestic jurisdiction. Immigration falls within this class. It could only become a subject of dispute by reason of treaty stipulations, and in such cases the same necessity for arbitration or inquiry would arise as in disputes over other subjects.

(10) Other new provisions embrace the acceptance of certain responsibilities by member States with regard to labor conditions, slavery, the white-slave traffic, the opium traffic, commerce in arms with semicivilized and civilized countries, transit and trade conditions, public health, and Red Cross organizations. The league is recognized as a coordinating agent in general international affairs.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSES AND EFFECTS OF THE DOCUMENT.

The preamble declares a twofold purpose, namely: (1) To promote international cooperation; (2) to secure international peace. These laudable purposes meet with universal approval. Modern conditions make imperative cooperation among enlightened nations, not only to prevent warfare, but also to advance the common interests of peoples avowing their devotion to the principles of liberty and progress. No one disputes the desirability of securing peace throughout the world. Differences arise in connection with the methods to be adopted in obtaining this end. The preamble declares the purpose to promote international cooperation and to secure international peace and safety by (1) the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war; (2) by the prescription of open, just, and honorable relations between nations; (3) by defining international law and making it the actual rule of conduct among nations; (4) by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations.

This general description of the methods proposed, like that of the purposes desired, affords little ground for debate. It is only the details that provoke disagreement and controversy. When the effort is made to form a definite plan, some oppose it for fear of granting too much power, while others are panic stricken at the thought of a supergovernment dominating and oppressing the world. No one who favors a league of nations can reasonably oppose the covenant in its present form as granting too much power to the agencies of the league, for it may be shown to represent the minimum of authority required to accomplish the purposes announced.

MACHINERY OF THE LEAGUE.

The machinery suggested consists of (1) an assembly representing the States members, (2) an executive council, and (3) a secretariat; two commissions are contemplated, one to aid in carrying out the provisions relating to disarmament, the second to assist in executing the provisions as to mandates; (4) a bureau of labor is to be established with advisory powers; (5) a permanent court of international justice is contemplated, with authority to hear and determine controversies which the parties thereto recognize as suitable for submission to it for arbitration; (6) other boards of arbitration may be constituted by agreement of the nations who become parties to a dispute.

It is apparent, considering the present total absence of machinery for the adjustment of international disputes, that the proposed organization, namely, the assembly, the executive council, the secretariat, the armament commission, the mandatory commission, the labor bureau, and the courts of arbitration, is neither unnecessarily numerous nor complicated. On the contrary, this organization is simple. It would be difficult to provide simpler machinery for executing the purposes of the league in the methods outlined in the preamble.

SOMETHING MUST BE DONE TO MAKE WAR IMPROBABLE.

There appears a strong and growing conviction throughout the civilized world that the absence of facilities to promote cooperation among the nations is productive of controversies, while the total lack of tribunals to adjust these controversies promotes war. Therefore, in spite of denunciation and hysterical misrepresentation, the conclusion is becoming general that it is the inescapable obligation of the statesmen of this period to supply the necessary facilities and tribunals to promote international cooperation and to adjust international controversies. The condemnation of history will descend with overwhelming force upon present-day statesmen if the world is permitted to lapse into the chaotic condition respecting international relationship which existed prior to the war. Only cowardice, overcaution, or inefficiency can leave well-intentioned peoples desirous of establishing and maintaining harmonious relations with one another dependent solely upon the partiality and prejudice of their own separate and multitudinous political agencies—agencies totally wanting in any means or methods of coordination. If nothing is done to prevent future wars, what will have been won for coming generations through victory to the Allies? Nothing but debt, infirmity, and sorrow. Shall no other monument be raised to commemorate the valor of the millions who fell in the cause we boast to have meant the preservation of civilization? To know that the blood and treasure poured out in this war have put behind the peace of nations the combined political and moral power of them all; to know that with peace shall come an understanding which will make future wars improbable; to believe and hope that rulers and statesmen have learned a little while others have suffered so much—all this will be some compensation for the sacrifices which the war has brought. How disappointing it will be if the nations which won this war shall part company at its end and each pursue its separate way in selfish disregard of the interests of its former Allies and in ignorance of their true necessities and motives. Then will the souls of all who mourn know profoundest sorrow. Then will they who have suffered and struggled realize that their efforts and their sacrifices have come to naught.

Surely Senators who oppose this agreement will feel constrained by the prayers and tears of the living and by the blood and ashes of the fallen to devise some other better plan to save humanity from the woes of war.

A LEAGUE OF NATIONS THE LOGICAL PRODUCT OF THE WAR AND OF THE PEACE WHICH SHALL FOLLOW IT.

Assuming that some serious attempt must be made to promote international cooperation and to establish international peace and security, it is easily demonstrable that a league of nations in some form analogous to that proposed is necessary, if not indispensable.

It is, of course, the duty of the victors in this war to make effective the substantial features of the treaty of peace. Surely no one here will assert that the war being over the United States may retire to a condition of isolation and leave her late Allies to bear the sole responsibility of carrying out the treaty. Our obligation to cooperate in the discharge of the responsibilities resulting from victory is as undenable as our privilege to enjoy the fruits of triumph. It would be cowardly, unthinkable, for example, to leave Poland, Serbia, Ukraine, and Jugo-Slavia to the mercy of the Central Empires should they be rehabilitated, or to abandon to anarchy the colonies and territories separated by the war from the Central Empires. We organized a league of nations for the purpose of conducting the war and victory did not appear in sight until this was done. We must maintain a league with our Allies, for a period at least, or suffer the danger of reactions in Europe which might lose to the world the fruits of our victory. To preserve for coming generations the benefits of our expenditures and sacrifices in the war, and to escape the military burdens otherwise unavoidable, it is now proposed to broaden the existing international organization by means of which the war was won so as to embrace other nations willing to cooperate in preserving peace and in promoting the happiness and progress of mankind. That this course may require some sacrifices may be admitted without embarrassment, if it is clear that these sacrifices are more than offset by benefits likely to be obtained.

Before discussing some of the material objections urged to the proposed treaty, and making some comment upon the remarks made in this Chamber day before yesterday by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], it seems proper in advocating it to mention in detail some of its probable beneficial effects not specifically outlined in the preamble.

The war has given an impetus to democratic ideas and institutions, and the result of the peace conference will determine whether these or a state of anarchy shall prevail.

BOLSHEVISM THE SUPREME MENACE.

The supreme menace to civilization is Bolshevism—discontent masking under many forms and massing under many flags. Not Russia alone, but what formerly constituted the central empires, and even France and England, are threatened with submersion by a high tide of malcontent.

It would be difficult to undertake in this connection an analysis of the causes which have given rise to the spirit of anarchy now so threatening throughout the civilized world, a spirit which recognizes neither the sanctity of religion nor the value of law, but which, with violence and disorder, assails alike all established governmental and social institutions. Whether it be the half-savage protest of the oppressed blindly seeking relief or the mere aggression of anarchy, or both combined, its advance is rapid and its discordant clamors sound throughout the world. Many of the foremost Americans anticipate with anxiety the spread of Bolshevism in America. The premiers of France, England, and Italy contemplate with dread the day of judg-

ment which may come to their Governments if the United States refuses to give even moral support to their efforts to maintain life and property rights through recognition of the principles which underlie our Government—the principles of individual liberty and of vested rights.

The league of nations as proposed will give encouragement to the growth of democratic ideas and at the same time repel the threatened assaults of the hideous foe to all governments advancing in the name of Bolshevism to the overthrow of liberty and to the confiscation of private property by the abrogation of all constitutions and laws which preserve them.

It is senseless to imagine that we have reached the end of international disputes even among those who now comprise our Allies. It is equally senseless to rely upon the old haphazard prewar method of settling these disputes. We must devise some way of insuring the equitable adjustment of controversies without resort to force between all classes of well-disposed nations, and the medium of treaty agreements, analogous to that comprised in the league of nations, is the sole effective method of accomplishing this end.

That the proposed league of nations would make wars improbable seems to me conclusive. It would end secret diplomacy and all secret alliances, because it contemplates the abrogation of all such treaties now existing and the assumption by the various powers of undertakings not to make them in the future. The agreement not to resort to war until every other means of settlement has been exhausted is calculated to substitute law for force. By the elimination of secrecy in treaties and the extension of popular control to international diplomacy, comity and good will will supersede suspicion and intrigue.

Disarmament is now desired by all nations. How can it be secured except by means of treaties, and what other form of treaty can accomplish it than that proposed in the league of nations? Disarmament must be carried on by the nations simultaneously. No nation can be expected to abandon the means of its own preservation while others retain the armaments necessary for aggression.

The guaranty contained in the treaty against sudden aggressive warfare removes in part the motive for competition among the nations in armament and makes possible great reductions in existing military systems, which will be strengthened and expanded rather than contracted unless some arrangement for disarmament be made.

Comity and good will among the nations will be promoted through the agency of the league. Certainly this is an end to be desired. The free interchange of products and ideas essential under present conditions can only occur among nations whose peoples mutually understand one another and are willing to cooperate in good faith.

The league will bring the pressure of organized public opinion for the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

Through its instrumentality international law will be codified and given a more uniform interpretation and application.

The present uncertainty respecting what constitutes international law and the degree of its binding force emphasizes the importance of securing a uniform understanding of international law and of making it the rule of conduct among nations. Arrangements for permanent peace essential to the progress and happiness of mankind can only be secured through some agency which will give representation and recognition to the interests and rights of all the nations concerned. Any other plan involves a surrender of sovereignty by some and the exercise of mastery by other nations. This is exactly what a league of nations is designed to prevent. Other spheres of influence suggest themselves in which the league may be made useful to civilization.

It may be made an instrument to stabilize international finance and foreign exchange and to insure equal and uniform transportation charges on international rivers and railways for the citizens of the States members of the league. It would furnish opportunity for the guaranty of trade routes across the various independent States, thus nullifying the necessity for ocean ports for countries now shut out from the seas. It would diminish international trade rivalry and promote agreements as to tariffs, shipping rates, insurance, and harbor facilities.

This statement does not fully set forth the benefits fairly to be anticipated from the establishment of a league of nations. It is, however, believed to be sufficient to shift the burden of proof to the opposition. Unless it can be shown that serious detriment will probably result from the establishment of the league, unless it appears that the liberty of men and the independence of States participating in the league will be unduly restricted, unless those who oppose the proposition establish the probability that the organization will fail to accomplish these ends and that it will be subversive of the real interests of humanity, the treaty should be promptly ratified.

Even casual consideration of the important provisions of the instrument creating a league of nations convinces me that it will prove of incalculable value. Its adoption necessarily involves mutual concessions on the part of the nations agreeing to it, but the things they yield are unimportant when compared with the benefits derived.

MILITARY CONQUEST ENDED.

Article 10 contemplates an agreement by members of the league "to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all States members of the league." The spirit of conquest has prompted more than half of the wars of history. It has compelled the creation of large armaments and fostered unfair prejudices and antagonisms. If it be claimed that conquest has often been the instrument of civilization, it may be answered that it has also been the more frequent means of oppression and enslavement. The world has by common consent reached the conviction that conquest must be outlawed. This can only be effectuated through the agreement of civilized nations not to wage wars of conquest themselves nor to permit other nations to do so. This provision, notwithstanding the criticisms that have been hurled against it, if honestly observed, will in effect write into the law of nations a new chapter which will obviate the necessity and repeal any justification for the maintenance of large armies and navies. It will at once abolish competition among nations in armament, since either aggression or defense against it constitutes the principal motive for maintaining large military forces.

The league covenant as now written expressly preserves intact the Monroe doctrine and thus effectively reserves from intervention by nations in other parts of the world the whole of the Western Hemisphere. The incorporation of this provision has removed one of the chief objections urged against the league of nations. By article 10 the principle of the Monroe doctrine is made universal. Under the conditions of present-day civilization little or no necessity exists or can arise for the intervention by military force of one nation in the affairs of any other nation. It is said that had such a provision been in force France would have been prevented from giving us aid in the Revolution, and our Government would have been estopped from going to the rescue of Cuba. It may be replied that France and England long had been at enmity and were really in a state of war when France sent money and men to support the cause of the Colonies, and, in a sense, she was merely fighting her own battles.

With respect to other illustrations used as to past aggressive wars, it may be said that we act now for the present and the future, and that no condition exists or is likely to arise which would justify any government engaging in war merely to work internal reforms in other nations or to wrest territory from them.

THE IRISH QUESTION.

Much has been said about Ireland in connection with this article. Yet no one here, however much he may sympathize with Ireland, advocates war by the United States against Great Britain on account of the Irish question. The Government of the United States has never proposed intervention to free Ireland. Article 10 does not obligate the United States to aid Britain in case of an Irish revolution. No one claims it does that. It is petty politics to attempt to defeat this wholesome league on the theory that it may become the duty of this Government to attack Great Britain because of her alleged misgovernment of Ireland. The Irish question is not fairly involved in the consideration of the league of nations. The latter has nothing to do with Ireland. Exceptional cases have arisen in the past which have justified, in the judgment of mankind, the use of external forces in the settlement of internal difficulties. But the peace of the world, the stability of governments, and the maintenance of law and order are paramount considerations which justify this article, even if it be believed to involve a restraint on the occasionally justifiable use of external force in isolated cases.

The declaration often made that article 10 authorizes the executive council to involve the world in war in its execution is absurd. The language of the article is: "In case of any such aggression, or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the executive council shall advise upon the means by which the obligation shall be fulfilled." It is perfectly clear that the executive council can compel no action under this article. The use of the word "advise" defeats such a construction. Moreover, the language used is both necessary and appropriate. There ought to be some means of coordinating the policies of the nations which have thus bound themselves to prevent conquest. The executive council, representing the controlling factors in the league, is the appropriate agency to bring about this coordination.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GAY in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield.

Mr. OWEN. Before the Senator leaves article 10, which he has just read, pledging the territorial integrity and existing political independence of members of the league, I want to call his attention to the manner in which that meets nearly all of the objections which have been urged against the league, due to the vote of the so-called delegates or members of the executive council.

Mr. ROBINSON. I shall discuss that in detail before I conclude.

Mr. OWEN. Very well.

DISARMAMENT.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, article 8, relating to disarmament, has been the subject of much misunderstanding. It is an admirable statement of the consensus of enlightened opinion touching the necessity for the reduction of armament and a fair plan for bringing this about. It proposes a contract between the various powers to fix a program of disarmament. This is the only conceivable method by which the end can be accomplished. That it presents practical difficulties is undeniable. The fear is perhaps warranted that it may not prove effective. It is certainly not objectionable as depriving any Government of the right or means of self-defense, for whatever is done in the way of disarmament must be accomplished solely through the consent of the Governments concerned. No attempt is made to impose a limitation of armament against the will of any Government. The proposition is that the executive council shall propose what equipment and armament is fair and reasonable, and when the proposal is submitted the various Governments may either accept or reject the same. Acceptance, of course, will be based upon the condition that other members of the league shall likewise accept proposals for reductions in their armament. If any program is worked out it can only be done in this way. It is not to be expected that the United States or any other nation will disarm while other nations retain their existing forces or increase them. It is provided that when a limitation is adopted by a nation, that nation binds itself not to exceed the limit without permission of the executive council, and that limitations on armament shall be revised every 10 years to meet changed conditions. It would be futile to work out a scale of armament for the various nations and have that scale agreed to, only to be disarranged by a renewal of the competitive spirit in the maintenance of armament, which might result if nations left themselves free to enlarge their forces without the agreement of other parties to the treaty. It was the thought of the draftsmen that the executive council should act as the agent of the various nations in the league in determining whether a proposed increase in armament by a nation having agreed to a limitation is necessary and justifiable.

Coupled with the provision for disarmament is a plan to supervise and restrict the manufacture of munitions by private persons. Without this or some similar agreement, any limitation of armament would be abortive. Krupp and similar manufacturers would continue to stimulate the spirit of war in order to provide a market for their products, and would indirectly enlarge the military strength of their Governments by doing exactly what the Governments had agreed should not be done.

To give effect to the proposal that the manufacture of munitions by private agencies shall be properly supervised and restricted, the members of the league agree to a frank interchange of information as to their military and naval programs and the condition of such of their industries as may be adapted to warlike purposes.

Article 18 makes the league the agent of the various members for the supervision of the trade in arms and munitions "with countries in which the control of this traffic is necessary in the common interest."

This will provide, among other things, against dangers arising from the accumulation in half-civilized or uncivilized countries of large quantities of munitions which might threaten peace. This language, general and somewhat ambiguous, may nevertheless prove useful in preventing States which decline to enter the league from engaging in war by rendering them unable to secure the means with which to conduct the same. Certainly the provision can do no harm.

The disarmament provisions are not objectionable because they grant too much power to the executive council. My fear is that rivalry and jealousy among the nations may make disarmament difficult or delay it and in that way continue the burdens of militarism.

THE LEAGUE PLAN FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES AMONG NATIONS.

Under the proposed plan for settling international disputes the members of the league agree that if disputes arise between them which can not be adjusted through diplomacy they will in no case resort to war without first submitting the questions involved either to arbitration or to the executive council, and until three months after award or recommendation, and that they will not even then resort to war against any member of the league which complies with the award of the arbitrators or the recommendation of the executive council.

Two classes of controversies are recognized—justiciable and nonjusticiable. The agreement further provides in article 13 that in cases of disputes recognized by the parties as arbitrable, and which can not be settled by diplomacy, they will submit the whole matter to arbitration.

Where disputes arise which are not regarded as justiciable and which are not submitted to arbitration, the parties agree to refer the matter in dispute to the executive council.

If the efforts of the executive council fail to result in a settlement of the dispute, a report by the council is to be published explaining the controversy and the recommendations of the council for settlement. If this report is unanimously agreed to, the agreement further provides that the members will not go to war against any party complying with the recommendations of the executive council. If the report is not unanimous, the majority and the minority may issue statements of explanation and recommendation.

Any dispute referred to the executive council may be by that body referred to the assembly. Either party to a dispute may have the controversy referred to the assembly by the executive council by request made within 14 days after the submission of the dispute to the executive council.

In cases referred by the executive council to the assembly, either upon the motion of the executive council or of one of the parties to the dispute, the assembly is authorized to take the same procedure and action as the executive council had the cause been retained by it.

In case any nation breaks its contract to submit its complaint to arbitration or to inquiry by the executive council it thereby commits an act of war against all the other members of the league, who are obligated under the treaty to subject the offending nation to a severance of all trade or financial relations and the prohibition of its commerce both with members of the league and with other nations.

The often repeated statement that the executive council is empowered to declare war is unfounded. The nations in the league do not even bind themselves to declare war against parties who breach the agreement. It is true that breaches of the agreement relating to arbitration or inquiry by the executive council constitute acts of war, but every lawyer knows the distinction between an act of war and a declaration of war. There is no power whatever conferred upon the executive council to declare war. It is empowered to make recommendations to the various nations as to the military and naval forces they shall contribute under the agreement to protect the covenants of the league. It has no power whatever to compel any nation either to go to war or to supply military or naval forces.

It is undoubtedly true that the moral obligation under the treaty on the part of every member of the league would arise to do its share in protecting the covenants of the league, but every nation under the agreement is left at liberty to accept or reject the recommendations of the executive council.

Article 17 provides that in case of disputes between a State member of the league and another State not a member of the league, or between States not members of the league, that the States not members of the league shall be invited to join the organization for the purpose of the dispute, upon conditions to be prescribed by the executive council.

When such invitation has been issued the executive council, it is agreed, shall immediately institute an inquiry into the merits of the controversy and shall make recommendations for a settlement.

If any power invited to join the league for the purposes of settling a dispute refuses to do so, it shall be subjected to the same economic boycott as is contemplated against members breaching the obligations respecting arbitration and inquiry by the executive council.

Where both parties refuse to accept the obligations of membership in the league for the purpose of the dispute, the executive council is authorized to pursue such course and to make such recommendations as in its opinion will result in the settlement of the dispute.

It is noticeable that this plan does not, as that urged by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], outlaw war in all

cases, nor does it contemplate compulsory arbitration of nonjusticiable controversies, as urged by Mr. Elihu Root.

It undoubtedly recognizes the right of any nation to refuse to submit a controversy which it regards as nonjusticiable to arbitration, but it also imposes upon that nation the obligation to submit the matter to investigation by the executive council, and in case of a unanimous agreement by that body it pledges the nation not to resort to war against the adverse party if the latter complies with the recommendation of the executive council.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] in a speech before this body March 1 last, forcibly assailed the proposed constitution for a league of nations and submitted a plan of his own.

He objected to the pending proposition, claiming that it recognizes the legality of war in some instances and makes war obligatory in others.

When analyzed the same is exactly true of his own plan.

On page 37 of the pamphlet containing the speech before referred to he said:

Among the first articles of the constitution which shall create this league should be one which shall provide that war is thereby declared to be an international crime, and that any nation engaging in war, except in self-defense when actually attacked, shall be punished by the world as an international criminal.

Thus he would not only legalize war in self-defense, which, of course, is unavoidable, but he would also require the remainder of the world to attack the nation beginning war.

Nor is that the only case in which he would legalize war. Reflecting upon his criticism of the pending plan it is astonishing to note that he would require every nation entering the league to go to war for the enforcement of the decree of an international court, which court he would empower to settle every dispute arising between nations.

On page 38 of the same pamphlet the Senator from Pennsylvania declared:

This constitution should also provide that all disputes relating to international matters as defined by an international code should be decided by an international court.

Supergovernment, indeed! There is nothing in the league plan proposed by the Paris conference to compare with this provision suggested by the Senator from Pennsylvania. He would compel every nation to submit every dispute of an international character to a league tribunal and in that way deprive the respective nations of all sovereignty and control over their foreign relations. The proposition is far-reaching, but it is not fully comprehended until considered in connection with declarations on page 39 of the printed speech, in which the Senator asserted:

The international court should be authorized by the league constitution to call upon the powers signatory to enforce its decrees and awards as against unwilling States by force, economic pressure, or otherwise.

He further said:

It (his league plan) would make the waging of war otherwise than in self-defense when attacked a public crime, punishable by the combined forces of the world.

It therefore appears that the Senator from Pennsylvania has a league plan of his own, and that his plan would compel war by all nations members of the league in every case where one nation attacked another, and in every case where a nation declined to carry out the judgment or decree of the international court which he would empower to determine every dispute.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. What the Senator has said with reference to one plan submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania applies likewise to the other two plans to which he refers. There is not one of them that would not lead to war in the event that there should not be a compliance with the terms of the settlement or of the award.

Mr. ROBINSON. I agree with the Senator from Ohio.

MANDATES.

When the peace conference convened no more difficult problem presented itself than that relating to colonies and territories which as a result of the war had ceased to be under the sovereignty of the Central Empires. Article 19 recognizes three classes of such colonies and territories and provides varying degrees of control by the States members of the league according to the status of the colonies and territories to be governed.

First. Portions of the former Turkish Empire are to receive administrative advice and assistance for a limited time and in the end are to become independent nations. It is expressly provided that these communities will be consulted in the selection of the mandatory power.

Second. Other territories, especially those of Central Africa, are to be administered by mandatory powers subject to conditions which will guarantee freedom of religion and sustain public order and morals, while at the same time prohibiting abuses, including slavery, the traffic in arms, the opium traffic, and the prevention of the establishment of fortifications or military or naval bases.

Third. Another class is recognized as having such a status as will require their complete administration under the laws of the mandatory power, and as parts thereof subject to guaranties of freedom of religion, public order, and the prohibition of abuses.

A mandatory commission is contemplated to receive and examine the annual reports of the mandatory powers and to assist the league in insuring the observance of the terms of all mandates.

Since it is now perfectly clear that no nation can be required to act as a mandate without its own approval, there should be no objection to the mandatory provisions.

As early as 1846 the United States guaranteed the sovereignty of New Granada over the Isthmus of Panama. By a treaty ratified in 1903 we guaranteed and agreed to maintain the independence of the Republic of Panama. By the treaty of 1916 the United States guaranteed the independence of Haiti and agreed to assist in the administration of its affairs.

While these guaranties all affect territory in the Western Hemisphere only, and to some extent may be regarded as the necessary consequence of the Monroe doctrine, which in one aspect constitutes the United States the protector of the western world, it can not be denied that our obligation as one of the victors in the war now closing is to assist in preserving independence and in maintaining order among the peoples who have been separated from their former sovereignties by our acts.

Participation in the war necessarily involved the United States in European complications, and the league of nations appears to be an appropriate means of securing relief from the "complications" consequent to the disintegration of the Central Empires and the establishment of new governments upon their ruins.

ARTICLE 25.

Article 25 has been the subject of but little comment, probably because it is merely the clear expression of a necessary implication arising from the compact as a whole. Nevertheless, it is a valuable provision. By its terms the nations composing the league agree to abrogate all inconsistent treaties, and also contract not to make other treaties violative of its principles. Like every other contractual provision, it depends upon the good faith of the nations making it. If honestly executed, it will prevent offensive and defensive alliances and thus avert the danger to peace which such combinations in their nature constitute. It will prevent the creation of factional groups within the league. It will not, however, prohibit necessary and justifiable undertakings among the members of the league. The only limitation which it imposes on treaty making, and this would exist if it were not expressly stated, is the moral obligation which it recognizes to refrain from making treaties in conflict with the principles of the league. Every nation will be the judge of whether a proposed treaty with another member is consistent with the league treaty. It can, therefore, operate only as a moral restraint. No power is vested in any agency of the league to declare void a treaty between two of its members for inconsistency with the league covenant. It is, of course, conceivable that the penalties for violations of the league treaty might be incurred by a member nation by reason of acts under treaties in conflict with the covenant. Otherwise the league treaty would be valueless. The whole structure would fall if member nations exercised the power to make treaties violative of their undertakings in this treaty with no possibility of incurring any penalty whatever.

Mr. President, a great variety of arguments have been made against this proposed feature of the treaty of peace. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] has addressed the Senate on a number of occasions touching this important subject.

In the first address he opposed the league with great vigor, because he said it would be dominated by Great Britain, and referred to the fact that under the proposed constitution the so-called self-governing colonies of Great Britain would have representation in the league. Mr. President, there is a fundamental fallacy underlying the argument of the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] upon that point, namely, that by reason of giving the self-governing colonies of Britain representation in the league we give Great Britain control of the league. In the first place, the method of determining decisions before the assembly is not upon majority vote. It is upon a unanimous vote; and one vote is just as effective to prevent a decision as any number less than the

whole. So that in so far as the decisions of the league are concerned, it is immaterial whether Great Britain's colonies are represented in the assembly or not. The purpose of giving these self-governing colonies representation in the league was not to enable Great Britain to dominate the league, but it was to give to those respective peoples—the peoples of Canada and of India and of the other self-governing colonies of Great Britain—representation in a body whose action might affect their interests differently from the way in which it would affect the interests of the mother country.

Everyone who is familiar with the history of the British Empire during the last century or two knows that frequently controversies have arisen affecting the interests of Canada differently from the way in which those controversies affected the interests of the mother country, and the same is true of every one of these self-governing colonies. No harm can come to any nation in the world by giving these colonies representation in the assembly, for it does not matter if they should vote with the mother country in every instance, their decision would not be effective unless it was also supported by the unanimous decision of the other nations. It is not conceivable that this could occur in any questionable case.

The next position taken by the Senator from Missouri was that it would be dominated by kings and monarchs.

Mr. President, I think the Senator has abandoned that contention. The hand of history has already practically written kings out of existence. The only remaining kings of importance that I can recall are Albert of Belgium, the King of Italy, the Emperor, or Mikado, of Japan, and perhaps one or two others. So that three or four so-called kings represent all of royalty that remains as a result of this war. It is not now seriously contended that there is any danger of imperialistic influences controlling the league. That position has been abandoned practically by everyone.

The latest and most amazing position assumed by the Senator from Missouri is that taken on day before yesterday, when he declared that the league will be dominated by negroes.

The Senator from Missouri in that address went into the field of ethnology. He reclassified the human race. He divided it into two classes, white and dark, and under the dark classification he put every other race except the white race.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. OWEN. As a Cherokee Indian, I object.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Oklahoma rightfully objects.

The position of the Senator from Missouri in attempting to make this classification is, in my opinion, absurd. He attempted to show that as a result of this classification there would be a greater population represented in the league among colored races than among the white race, and therefore it would inevitably lead to the overcoming of the white race by the dark races.

Mr. President, there has been much said from time to time concerning the conclusion of the Paris conference to give each State which is a member of the league one vote in the assembly. I presume that the Senator from Missouri knows that under international law all States are equal, without regard to enlightenment, military power, or economic importance. If you do not recognize this fundamental principle of international law, which has applied for many centuries, let me ask you what basis of representation you would accept? Let me ask the Senator from Missouri whether he would like to change the plan adopted at the Paris peace conference to give each State a representative in the league, and instead base representation upon population. Such a plan, if adopted, would be objectionable for many reasons. It would be a repudiation of the long-recognized and well-established principle of the equality of all sovereignties before the law. This objection is totally unimportant, in my opinion, when viewed in connection with the fact that the method of deciding controversies in the league is by a unanimous vote and not by a majority vote. If the decisions were based on majority findings, the representation of small States upon an equality with the United States or with similar great powers might be objectionable; but since all decisions must be effected by unanimous vote, it is immaterial, except to their own interests, that small States are given representation.

There is a reason for giving small States representation in the league which even the Senator from Missouri, in the prejudice which I fear may have blinded him to some of the merits of this proposition, might be made to see. One of the purposes of this league is to produce cooperation among the nations of the world, to bring about a state of good will, if possible, between them; and in order to do that it is absolutely necessary that every nation have some representation in the league. To exclude a nation because it is small or backward would be to counteract the very influences which the league itself is intended to promote. It is very desirable, if the league accomplishes the purpose for which it is being created, that all nations should be represented in it; and no harm can come to this Government or to any nation by reason of the recognition of the small countries to which the Senator from Missouri refers.

There is one feature of the address of the Senator from Missouri which I think does discredit to his fairness. In a speech of some hours he assailed various nations which now occupy friendly attitudes toward the United States and our people. In bitter denunciation and withering sarcasm he recalled the history of many of the countries in the Western Hemisphere which have experienced revolutions, discussed the instability of their governments, their inability, as he alleged, to control their own affairs, and then ridiculed the thought of giving them representation in the league of nations. Why, if you please, Senators, one of the very purposes in giving them representation is to provide stability for their governments, is to give them stronger and better institutions, and to give them the benefit of the counsel and assistance and cooperation of the great nations of the world.

The Senator, for instance, might very well have spared himself the bitter criticism and denunciation of the Republic of Panama. It is not my intention to put into the RECORD again the language that he used in denouncing Panama and other countries which bear friendly relations to the United States, but I point it out as an illustration of the spirit displayed by the Senator from Missouri in his attempt to bring race prejudice into this question.

The Senator from Missouri made another allusion to which I desire to call the attention of the Senate. He said, on page 244 of the RECORD of May 26:

> If a Republican President had brought the league here; if Roosevelt had brought it here, there is not a Democrat who would not have been standing by my side fighting to the last ditch to rescue the country from the threatened danger—

And so forth.

I wonder if the Senator from Missouri comprehended the implication of that remark. I wonder if he realized that he was substantially declaring that in order to support President Wilson, Democrats are deliberately seeking the undoing of the country. If I were disposed to do so, I might ask the Senator from Missouri if any other President than President Wilson had brought this league here, if President Roosevelt or some other President had brought it here, whether he would not be found supporting it instead of opposing it. The implication of his statement is an unfair reflection upon the membership of this body who are supporting the league of nations.

Mr. President, I respect the President of the United States. I am not ashamed to say that I sympathize with him during this period when he is bearing such great responsibilities, and at the same time is the victim of suspicion and denunciation from sources that ought to support him. But this question must be determined upon its merits. This question involves issues of too far-reaching importance to be determined either by friendship for or antagonism toward any man; and I submit to the Senator from Missouri himself, in view of his record before this body, that it does not lie in his mouth to declare that men in this Senate are supporting this treaty because a Democratic President brought it here, and that we would oppose it if a Republican President submitted it. His attitude toward the President of the United States, his attitude toward the issues presented in this body by his party, does not justify him in a wholesale denunciation of his colleagues on this side of the Chamber.

The climax of absurdity was reached when the Senator from Missouri sought to intimidate Senators from the South by injecting the race question into this controversy. Among the things which he said upon that subject was the following:

> How will Senators from the South, who represent States which have contended that the white race alone is fit to control the destiny of the States of America, who have, therefore, contended that the black man of the South should not be permitted to cast his individual ballot to be counted against the ballot of the white man—how can they contend that Liberia, Haiti, and other negro or seminegro nations should be permitted to sit at the council table of the world and each cast a vote equal to that of the United States?

In another part of his remarks he made this declaration:

> Yet you men of the South, you lily-whites, you gentlemen who say that white men alone should control in your own States, are willing to allow this meagre population, 90 per cent of whom are negroes and mulattoes, living hundreds of miles from our shores, to have a vote equal to the total vote of the United States in the league of nations!

On page 241, speaking on the same subject, he said:

> Go back to your people and justify yourselves if you can.

Mr. President, there is no race question involved in the question of a league of nations. Would the Senator from Missouri favor the creation of a league composed of white nations alone and thus force the creation of a rival league composed of other nations? If we created an organization or a society among white nations and expressly excluded other races or nationalities from the association, we would thus arouse an antagonism which in itself might produce war. But under the system that is proposed there is no possibility of a race issue becoming a serious menace to the civilization of the world. I think the Senator from Missouri is well enough informed, if he will divest himself of the prejudices that are blinding him now, to see that that is true.

But he made a challenge. He said:

Go back to your people and justify yourselves if you can.

I accept the challenge of the Senator from Missouri. The day he leaves Washington to go to Missouri to justify himself before his constituency for his resistance to every effort to prevent war in the future, resistance to every effort to promote international good will and fellowship, to the creation of any kind of league of nations—the day he leaves to go to Missouri to vindicate himself before his people I leave here to go to Arkansas to vindicate my support of the league of nations, and I make him this challenge now: If I do not get back before he does, I will never return. I make him this challenge: Since he has seen fit unfairly to inject the race question into this debate, and challenges me and other Senators from the South to justify ourselves before our people, I tell him that I will give to the Presiding Officer of this body my resignation to-morrow if he will also give his own, to be held until after the question has been voted on in Missouri and Arkansas as to whether or not the people want a league of nations. If a majority of Missourians say that the Senator is right in the attitude that he has taken here, he will remain in the Senate. If a majority of the people of Arkansas say I am wrong, my resignation shall go into effect. Aye, I will make this challenge to him: If the people of the State of Arkansas do not vote for the league of nations 2 to 1 or more, I will retire from the Senate.

But the Senator will not accept the challenge. He knows that the people of Missouri are against him on this issue. He knows he can not intimidate me from doing what I believe to be my duty as a Member of this body by a threat of arousing race prejudice.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Missouri, with pleasure.

Mr. REED. I do not know what I have said to make my very good friend from Arkansas think that I have made a personal attack on him or issued any personal challenge to him——

Mr. ROBINSON. No; I did not say that.

Mr. REED. Or why he should grow heated.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator has challenged every southern Senator.

Mr. REED. Well——

Mr. ROBINSON. Does the Senator accept my challenge or decline it

Mr. REED. Why, the Senator's challenge reminds me of a good many other challenges I have heard. They are made for effect, with full knowledge that there is not any way to put them into execution. I simply rose to say to the Senator that if he had any feeling that I have personally attacked him, I want him to get it out of his head, because he is almost the last man in the world to whom I would say anything unkind.

So far as the people of Missouri are concerned upon this question, I venture the assertion that if this question is submitted to a vote in any way the league of nations as now proposed will be overwhelmingly defeated. I leave the Senator to judge as to the people of his own State; but I think perhaps I am fully as well informed about the people of Missouri as he is, although he visited my State and we spent many happy days campaigning together a little over a year ago.

Mr. ROBINSON. There is no personal issue between the Senator from Missouri and myself. The Senator understands that. I read, when I began remarks touching this feature of the subject, statements which he made day before yesterday and repeated two or three times, in which he challenged Senators from the South to go back to the South and justify their position before their people. I now repeat the challenge that I made to my friend the Senator from Missouri. The day he is ready to leave Washington and go to Missouri to try it out there and justify himself in the opposition to creating a society of nations to preserve peace among the nations of the world, that day I will also go and justify myself to my people.

Mr. REED. That is a perfectly fair proposition, because both of us will have to do it if we come back to the Senate after election. I say this to the Senator, and I say it in all fairness and all calmness: No man has a right to say I have opposed all efforts toward the preservation of world peace. I am just as much in favor of the preservation of world peace as is the Senator. The difference between the Senator and myself is that a certain particular remedy or alleged remedy is presented. That remedy in my judgment will not preserve the peace or even promote peace, and I have opposed that proposition.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. REED. Certainly; the Senator has the floor.

Mr. ROBINSON. What is the plan of the Senator from Missouri to preserve international peace and promote cooperation among the nations?

Mr. REED. If the Senator will give me a moment, I will try to answer that as well as I can.

Mr. ROBINSON. I shall be glad to do it.

Mr. REED. If the Senator were to propose a cure for tuberculosis, or consumption, and I were to say that I believed that remedy to be worse than the disease, that it would aggravate the disease, he might turn to me then and say, "Well, you have either got to accept my remedy or you have got to show me how you are going to cure consumption." The fact about the matter is that nobody has ever found a cure for consumption. There have been many things proposed that would help. So nobody has ever found up to this time a cure for war, although there are many things that have been done from time immemorial tending to lessen war.

So with the Senator's proposition that I shall tell him a remedy for a thing which can not be remedied, according to the statement of President Wilson, according to the statement of ex-President Taft, according to the statement of Lloyd-George, according to the statement of Clemenceau, according to the statement of every great man of the earth, all saying that war can not be prevented. As long as that is the situation the Senator must not ask me to provide a sovereign remedy for war.

But if the Senator asks me whether I think anything can be done having a tendency to lessen war, then I answer him that I think it can be done. I think, in the first place, that the great nations of the world, through their proper representatives, could meet and that international law could be clarified and codified.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield now? Is it not the express purpose to accomplish that in the plan we are now discussing?

Mr. REED. No.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is not?

Mr. REED. The plan you now discuss absolutely ignores it, in my judgment. International law to-day rests in a number of somewhat contradictory precedents, and has its origin also in some treaties that have been largely accepted and in some customs that have been established. There is not only a twilight zone in international law, but nearly all international law may be said to be in the twilight zone. My opinion is—and I trust I am not interfering too much——

Mr. ROBINSON. No; I am very glad to have the Senator make his statement. It is very interesting.

Mr. REED. My opinion is that a very large number of international disputes would never arise and some in the past would never have arisen if international law had been clarified, extended, and codified so that the respective nations would know their rights. I want to illustrate that by the present situation, and I will be as brief as I can to make myself plain.

It was considered to be international law that a belligerent in declaring a blockade was compelled to limit its blockade to a particular port or ports which it would actively patrol and thus actually maintain a blockade of fact and not a blockade of paper, and that no nation had the right to declare a general blockade of a sea or of an ocean. Yet those precedents were not so clear and so without exception that Great Britain did not assert the right to substantially blockade the North Sea and to sow it with mines and mark out lanes through which the commerce of the world must travel.

Responding to that, or following that, I should say, Germany proceeded then to declare a blockade of the waters about Great Britain. She fixed bounds within which she said she would sink vessels. Subsequently she extended those bounds until she included nearly all the Atlantic Ocean and a lot of the Red Sea. On this assertion of a right of blockade she began to sink American vessels. We protested that she had no right to sink

our vessels under those circumstances; that she had no right to capture them. It was out of that controversy, which primarily, in my opinion, grew out of a misconstruction or out of a doubt of international law, that we were finally dragged into this war.

If international law had been written in the form of a code, if Great Britain had given her assent to it before this war began and Germany had likewise given her assent and sanction to that code, and if that code had specified that seas could not be blockaded, but that a blockade must be limited to ports, it is my opinion that neither Great Britain nor Germany would ever have interfered with the rights of the commerce of the United States upon the high seas, and we would not have been in this war. That is an illustration. It is one of scores that I might give.

So I say to the Senator, who is a great lawyer and a great student of history, he knows as well as we all know that it is the uncertainty in regard to contracts, the uncertainty regarding international law that causes most of the controversies of the earth, and so it has contributed to international controversies. That is one thing I would do.

I say to the Senator again, I will not object to the creation of an international judicial tribunal—and I use the term "judicial" with some emphasis—to which may be referred controversies of nations of a justiciable character. I would not give to it power as of right by force to compel the submission to it of those questions which involve the life or the sovereignty of our country, but many questions could be submitted to it that might be by it so illuminated and elucidated and clarified that controversies would thereby be lessened. I shall not object to the making of treaties between nations having for their purpose and object the settlement of disputes between those nations.

The point of difference between the Senator and myself, and with this I take my seat, thanking him for his very great courtesy, is that I object to setting up a governing body which shall have the power and right to determine a question which involves the very life of the United States, which involves our great international policies, and giving to that body the power of decision, the setting up of a supergoverning body. I may be wrong; that may not be in this league; but as I read the document it is in the league.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, going back to the declaration by my friend the Senator from Missouri that there is no way to obtain an expression of the sentiment of the people of Missouri and Arkansas upon this question, I desire to say to him I think it can be done. I think we could easily arrange for a vote upon the question in the two States, and I believe it would be a valuable thing for us both to do. It would certainly relieve him of the impression, which I think is a very erroneous one, that I am in danger of meeting repudiation from my people on account of my support of this league, and it certainly would ease my mind of what I fear is an impending political calamity to the Senator from Missouri should he continue his obstinate resistance to the league.

Mr. REED. May I say to the Senator I do not think the people of Arkansas would repudiate him if he should agree tomorrow to abolish the Constitution of the United States in toto, but I am quite sure that the people of Missouri do not hold me in such profound affection, particularly the somewhat dangerous Republican half of my State.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Missouri has so completely disarmed me by that statement that I can not continue this feature of the discussion.

As to the more important point relating to the plan for securing relief against the probability of war, if I understand the Senator correctly, he says that it is an impossible thing to prevent war, and the only plan he has to suggest to minimize it is to codify international law and make it clear so that there can be no dispute about what is the law. He also made the statement that this war was the outgrowth of a misunderstanding of the rules of international law.

Mr. REED. Our entrance into the war.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; and that there was no provision in the proposed league of nations covenant looking toward a codification of international law. Let me recall to the Senator from Missouri that in the preamble itself it is declared that to accomplish the two general purposes of the league, namely, "to promote international cooperation and to secure international peace and security," "the firm establishment of the understandings of international law as the actual rule of conduct among governments" is necessary and desirable. If that is not an explicit declaration not only for clarifying international law but for establishing it as the actual rule of conduct among nations, I do not know what would be.

Mr. President, I lay down the proposition that the Senator from Missouri has committed a basic error when he asserts that our entry into this war was the result of a misunderstanding of international law. For a thousand years it has been the law of nations that no government or people can monopolize any part of the open sea except by actual blockade. Germany never believed, and no international lawyer ever believed, that the act of Germany in establishing a war zone embracing the approach to allied ports—embracing a portion of the sea 1,400 miles in length through which passes three-fourths of the commerce of the world—was acting in accordance with international law. Germany knew, and every lawyer in this world knew, that the so-called war-zone decree issued by Germany, by which she sought to preempt or monopolize the sea, was a violation of international law.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. Just a moment. When she declared any vessel entering that zone, whether neutral or belligerent, in commerce with the allies, subject to destruction without visitation or warning, everybody knew she was violating the law of nations; and if the law had been written as plain as it was written in letters of fire to the ancient King of Babylon, if it had been written as plainly as human language could express it, Germany would not have known any better than she in fact knew that in making such decree she was violating international law. This war would have come, with all its misery and its horrors, even though international law had been codified.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. Just a moment. In my judgment the remedy suggested by the Senator from Missouri is a partial remedy and is comprehended in the plan that I support. In my judgment the remedy suggested by the Senator from Missouri, without additional remedies, is inadequate and will prove unavailing. I agree with him that there is necessity for codifying international law. I do not agree with him that it either is or can be regarded by students of the question as an adequate remedy for the whole subject under consideration.

I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. If the Senator will permit an interruption, the Senator has said Germany violated international law when she undertook to blockade the high seas. Does the Senator not apply that same rule to Great Britain when she blockaded the North Sea?

Mr. ROBINSON. Oh, yes; and I am not justifying either Germany or Great Britain in violating the law.

Mr. REED. I am not justifying Germany. The Senator will not put me in that light?

Mr. ROBINSON. Oh, certainly not.

Mr. REED. But the point I am making is that Great Britain by her act, followed by the act of Germany, produced a condition which resulted in interference with our rights upon the sea. I agree with the Senator from Arkansas that both of them violated international law; but I also say that international law, being based upon precedents, was not so clear as it might have been. Does not the Senator remember when there were protests made against Great Britain's act that Great Britain undertook to justify it by precedent?

Mr. ROBINSON. I also remember that Germany attempted to justify her act.

Mr. REED. I am simply putting this to the Senator, not in any spirit of controversy but in a spirit of fair statement, and perhaps if we had more of that we would come nearer to giving the American people a true insight into this situation. If Germany and Great Britain and all the other nations of the earth of any importance had agreed to a code of international law that had been plain and explicit and undoubted, does not the Senator believe that would have decreased the likelihood of either one of these nations undertaking to blockade the seas?

Mr. ROBINSON. I do not believe that Germany would have abandoned or failed to pursue her lawless submarine warfare. She never claimed that it was lawful. She sought to justify it on the ground that Great Britain——

Mr. REED. Had already done it?

Mr. ROBINSON. Had already violated the law. She admitted that she was violating international law. I repeat what I tried to make plain before, that while I should like to see international law codified just as much as the Senator from Missouri, I regard the remedy as totally inadequate; that there was no such uncertainty in the minds of any of the belligerents as to what the rights of neutrals were upon the seas as to justify either Great Britain or Germany in the decrees they issued restricting neutral commerce. It was justified on the ground of necessity by each of them, rather than on the ground of international law. So that if the law had been written so plainly that no one could have doubted what its provisions were the war would have happened anyway.

Mr. REED. Very well. Then, agreements between nations and treaties between nations, no matter how solemn, and though they are agreed to by all the nations of the earth, will not prevent war under some circumstances?

Mr. ROBINSON. I think that is true. They will not prevent war under every possible circumstance.

Mr. REED. Then——

Mr. ROBINSON. Wait a moment. It is certainly true of some governments that they do not regard their treaties. We all recall that Germany openly and deliberately violated the Belgian treaty, that she denounced it as a scrap of paper, and treated it with contempt and indifference. If she would do that, if she would treat with contempt a solemn obligation under which she had bound herself to observe Belgian neutrality, she would of course violate other treaties if left free to do so.

Mr. REED. In other words, we come to this, that treaties, however solemnly made, are disregarded by nations; and laws, however long existing, under some circumstances and some conditions that may arise will be violated.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; we will say in rare instances.

Mr. REED. In rare instances. I think the Senator is right. I think where the law is perfectly clear the instances where they are violated are rare; but there will come a time, in the Senator's opinion, that, no matter how solemn a treaty or sacred a law, it will be defied. Now, what is the remedy for that, except force? Is there any remedy for that but force?

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the economic pressure provided for in the pending league of nations treaty will, in my judgment, make wars so improbable that they will be almost impossible.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. Now, listen; just let me have a little of my own time.

Mr. REED. Certainly. I ought not to ask——

Mr. ROBINSON. I do not object to the Senator propounding a question to me, if he will give me an opportunity to answer it.

There is not a Senator present who does not know that if Germany had known that her commerce would have been shut off, that the other nations of the world would have imposed an economic boycott on her, so that the very lives of her people would have been imperiled—there is not one who does not know that she would have refrained from bringing on this war; and in the future one of the most vital and effective means of preventing wars will be that provision of the league of nations treaty that combines all of the nations of the world against an offending nation that does violate its treaty. It is one of the most effective ways of enforcing treaties. It is better than force, for under that old system, when force alone was applied as the only means of settling disputes, the nations divided; but under this plan they would unite against the nation breaching its treaty.

Mr. REED. By "economic pressure" the Senator means that character of pressure that is referred to in sections 12 and 16 of the league covenant?

Mr. ROBINSON. I refer to the provision of the treaty—I do not remember the number of the section—which obligates all of the contracting nations to sever all commercial and financial relations with a nation that breaches its treaty obligations respecting arbitration and investigation of disputes.

Mr. REED. Exactly. Now, the Senator thinks that is preferable to war?

Mr. ROBINSON. I think it is even more effective than war in many instances.

Mr. REED. The economic pressure to which the Senator refers is starvation, is it not?

Mr. ROBINSON. It may result in that.

Mr. REED. It is proposed to starve the offending nation into subjection. Does the Senator believe that sort of condition could exist even for a day without provoking war? Would it indeed not be war itself, and war of the most horrible character—the starving of the women and children of a country?

Mr. ROBINSON. I will answer the Senator's question. Throughout history belligerent nations have practiced what are known in law as blockades; they have availed themselves of the law of nations authorizing them to cut off commerce from their enemies. I believe that, if this treaty is made, a nation, instead of violating its treaty and giving cause for economic pressure, will keep its treaty, and there will be no war, either economic or military.

Mr. REED. That is only another way of saying that if a nation knows that if it shall violate the conditions of this league all nations of the world will stand against it, either to starve it to death or fight it into subjection, no nation would go to war. But the Senator really does not think that, from the standpoint of humanity, there is much difference between starving people to death and shooting them to death, does he?

Mr. ROBINSON. Oh, I am perfectly willing to grant that the economic pressure contemplated by this treaty is a powerful means of compelling action by the nations; and that is what I want.

Mr. REED. Exactly.

Mr. ROBINSON. I want to prevent a nation from appealing to arms by imposing upon it the penalties of the severance of trade relations and of financial relations with the remainder of the world. The Senator from Missouri can not argue with me, and he surely will not take up my time to discuss the horrors of starvation, which might result from a blockade. We all understand that. We know that the purpose of a blockade is to compel submission by an enemy, and that it is quite effective; sometimes it is more effective than actual conflict between armies.

Mr. REED. And it was that in fact that probably weakened Germany to the point where she had to surrender in this last war. I am not arguing that it is inhuman. I am simply arguing that it is a part of the machinery of war; that it is as destructive as is war itself.

Now, I want to proceed to the next point, if the Senator will pardon me. It depends for its efficacy upon all other nations, or substantially all of them, standing together and refusing to trade or to have any business with the nation that has offended.

Mr. ROBINSON. If the Senator will pardon me, it depends upon the nations keeping their treaty obligations.

Mr. REED. Exactly.

Mr. ROBINSON. And I will say in this connection, if the Senator will pardon me, that practically every provision of this treaty depends upon the good faith of the nations.

Mr. REED. If it is true, as the Senator has said, that no treaty, however carefully drawn, and no law, however clear or sacred, will prevent nations from breaking such treaties and laws and going to war and serving their own selfish purposes, how does he distinguish this particular treaty—for that is all it is—from other treaties? And how can you guarantee that the moment the selfish interests of nations unite in groups you will not have a defiance of the law?

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I have never said, nor has any other advocate of this treaty said, that it is possible to prevent war in all cases. I have said, and I now repeat, that this league-of-nations treaty creates an organization which will make war exceedingly improbable—almost impossible. If nations violate their treaties and refuse to carry out their obligations, as they have the power to do, there might result war in spite of this treaty.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator for his indulgence.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have tried to be as frank with the Senator as possible. I do not know of anyone who claims that the result of this treaty will be the prevention of all war to a certainty, and I can give the Senator no assurance that if Germany should enter this league she would not violate her treaty again and go to war if she thought it safe to do so, if she thought she had a chance of overrunning the world.

Mr. REED. The Senator would not want to write a guaranty for any other country except our own on that, would he?

Mr. ROBINSON. I assume that our Allies would keep their treaty obligations. I could not guarantee any government in that particular, and the Senator from Missouri knows it.

Mr. REED. The Senator certainly would not want to guarantee Japan.

Mr. ROBINSON. I think that our Government will keep its treaties. I recognize the fact that there is a possibility of any government violating its treaties, but when you consider the obligations which under the league the nations assume, both with respect to their business relations with other nations and their obligations to enforce the covenants of the league, the fact that no decision of the league can be binding except it is unanimous, I am convinced the ratification of this treaty will mean the end of war for centuries.

Let me take note of another statement made by my friend, the Senator from Missouri. In his address of last Monday he said:

> My countrymen, I say to you that if you erect a league of nations you will have taken a long step toward the declaration that America's doors shall be open to the people of all lands; and we shall have Chinese and Japanese knocking at our gates, and along with them all of the races of Asia and of Africa that desire to enter the golden gates of this great country.

Why, Mr. President, China and Japan have been knocking at our gates for many years. Under the provisions of this treaty all domestic questions are exempted from determination by the league, and every lawyer knows that questions relating to immigration are domestic questions. Then, how can the estab-

lishment of a league of nations give to the Chinese or Japanese the right of admission into this country?

Under the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States it is not within the power of the treaty-making authority to deprive Congress of the right to exclude aliens. The Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of Ping *v.* The United States (130 U. S., 581), declared:

> The power of the legislative department of the Government to exclude aliens from the United States is an incident of sovereignty which can not be surrendered by the treaty-making power.

This treaty not only exempts immigration questions from the jurisdiction of the league of nations, but it is also the law that, even if the treaty attempted to give the league jurisdiction of it, its action in that particular would be unavailing to defeat a subsequent act of Congress.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to conclude what I have to say by some observations on the legal aspect of this treaty.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS TREATY—ITS CONSTITUTIONALITY.

From the publication of the original draft the authority of the treaty-making power to enter into such a league of nations as that contemplated has been drawn in question.

GROUNDS OF ALLEGED UNCONSTITUTIONALITY.

It is claimed that the treaty is in conflict with the Constitution of the United States and therefore void. The principal grounds upon which this contention is based are: (1) That the disarmament provision vests in a foreign tribunal the power of Congress to provide and support armies and navies; (2) that the arbitration and investigation provisions are in conflict with that article of the Constitution which vests in Congress the sole power to declare war; (3) that the treaty is also unconstitutional because it authorizes the executive council to prescribe what force each nation shall contribute to protect the covenants of the league, and thus infringes the exclusive power of Congress to raise armies and to declare war; (4) that the mandatory provisions in the proposed treaty are inconsistent with our form of government; (5) that the general provisions of the treaty constitute the league of nations a supergovernment and seek to empower it to exercise sovereignty reposed by the Constitution in the various departments—legislative, executive, and judicial.

TREATY IN PRESENT FORM CERTAINLY NOT UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

In its present form the treaty, in my opinion, is certainly not subject to serious objections on the grounds of unconstitutionality. It would be academic to discuss alleged ambiguities in the original draft, which have been clarified by the instrument as now proposed. Everyone understands that the first draft was published for the purpose of obtaining the expression of public opinion and that in respect for criticisms urged a modified document supersedes the original as a chapter in the proposed treaty of peace.

LIMITATIONS ON THE TREATY-MAKING POWER.

The theory that the treaty-making power of the United States is practically unlimited is, in my opinion, a legal absurdity. The treaty-making power, like every other power of the Government, is limited by the Constitution, notwithstanding the fact that the limitations are implied rather than expressed. Nothing which the Constitution forbids to be done by the Government can be legally consummated through a treaty. Article II, paragraph 2, clause 2, of the Constitution provides:

> He [the President] shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

This provision is nowhere expressly limited by the Constitution, but it must be construed in connection with other provisions of the instrument, and must be so construed as not to nullify other fundamental provisions equally obligatory.

A treaty can not take away any right secured by the Constitution to the citizens of the United States nor enlarge the Federal jurisdiction. (Downs *v.* Bidwell, 182 U. S., 312, 370.)

Not only is it true that all treaties seeking to take away fundamental liberties secured by the Constitution are void, but it is also true that no treaty can bind the United States to do anything which the Constitution forbids it to do. (Tucker, vol. 2, p. 725; Cooley, Principles of Constitutional Law, p. 117; Cherokee Tobacco Case, 11 Wallace, 616; Works of Alexander Hamilton, vol. 6, p. 342; Turner *v.* Williams, 194 U. S., 279; Kansas *v.* Colorado, 206 U. S., 89.)

The United States by treaty can not deprive its citizens of the rights secured by the due process clause, nor can it establish a religion for the people of the United States or restrict them in the enjoyment of any other rights expressly secured by the Constitution. The treaty power can not reestablish slavery in the United States or abridge the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

While no treaty of the United States has ever been held unconstitutional, and while there are some expressions in the decisions of the United States Supreme Court which indicate that the only limitations on the treaty-making power are to the effect that it can not change the form of the government or cede or incorporate territory, the true doctrine applicable seems correctly stated in general terms in Holden *v.* Joy (17 Wallace, 243), wherein the court said with reference to the treaty-making power:

> The framers of the Constitution intended that it should extend to all those objects which in the intercourse of nations had usually been regarded as the proper subjects of negotiation and treaty, if not inconsistent with the nature of our Government and the relation between the States and the United States.

The Federal Government is a government of delegated powers. It has no powers except those which are conferred upon it, either by the express provisions of our Constitution or by necessary implication of its terms. It is, of course, sovereign and supreme within the spheres of its powers and actions.

A treaty is not unconstitutional merely because it contains agreements the execution of which requires the exercise of powers vested by the Constitution exclusively in the executive and legislative branches of the Government. The treaty-making power may enter into agreements which can only be carried out by other departments of the Government. It can make treaties pledging the exercise of every power possessed by the Government, but it can make no treaty requiring the exercise of power denied to the Government as a whole by the terms of the Constitution.

To hold that the treaty-making power is unlimited by the provisions of the Constitution limiting the powers of the Government as a whole would be to nullify the Constitution, override and break down the wholesome bulwarks which it establishes for the safety of our citizens and the preservation of their rights.

To declare that no treaty can be made which requires legislative action to execute it, or which pledges the Government to do something exclusively within the power of the Executive, would nullify a large majority of the treaties heretofore entered into by the United States and render the Government powerless to maintain foreign relations.

Notwithstanding the constitutional provision that treaties made by the United States shall constitute the law of the land, many treaties are mere contracts to be performed or not, as the political departments of the Government may determine. In all such cases the treaty creates a moral obligation upon the political departments, but no power exists to compel them to discharge the obligation.

Under the Constitution the sole power to appropriate moneys is vested in Congress. Nevertheless we have made many treaties obligating the Government to the payment of sums agreed in the treaties to be due foreign nations or their citizens. No power can compel Congress to make the appropriation necessary to carry out such treaties. The treaty is not void because it obligates Congress to legislate. Yet it is a mere executory contract, which may never be performed.

Another illustration: The sole power to levy taxes is vested in Congress. Many treaties have been made obligating the Government to impose certain rates on exports and to collect specified rates on imports. Treaties of reciprocity have been negotiated with foreign nations involving mutual rates to be levied on commerce. Such treaties require legislation by Congress to put them into operation, but they are not unconstitutional for that reason. They are contracts.

Any treaty which is self-executing is a law, and it is subject to the same tests of constitutionality as acts of Congress. If it is a violation of the Constitution, the courts in a proper case may so declare, just as they may hold an act of Congress unconstitutional.

The principle that the treaty power may create obligations which can only be performed by the Executive or the Congress, or by both, is a full legal justification for all the provisions contained in the league of nations treaty respecting disarmament and the settlement of international controversies.

The United States has already entered into many treaties pledging itself not to engage in war against certain foreign nations until the expiration of a definite period, and it has also agreed by treaty to settle many disputes by arbitration. It has likewise contracted with Great Britain, in the treaty of 1817, for a limitation of armament on the Great Lakes and not to fortify the Canadian boundary. Notwithstanding such agreements, Congress still has the power to declare war; it still has the power to place unlimited armament on the Great Lakes and to fortify the Canadian boundary. Congress has the power to disregard such treaty provisions. The United States agreed just a few years ago not to enter upon war with the various nations of the world until the expiration of one year. Are these treaties void?

If the league of nations treaty is entered into, no limitation of armament can be imposed that is objectionable to the United States. When a limitation has been imposed Congress can abrogate the treaty and provide for unlimited armament, but if it does so such action would constitute an act of war by the terms of the league covenant.

The provisions of the treaty contemplating disarmament, and the peaceful settlement of disputes with foreign nations, will require legislation by the Congress. The treaty is not rendered void for that reason. It is a well-established rule of law that Congress can abrogate a treaty by enacting legislation in conflict with it. It is equally true that a treaty may fail to become effective through the refusal of Congress to enact legislation necessary to carry it out. The test of the constitutionality of a treaty is not whether it infringes upon the legislative or executive departments of the Government. The true test is whether it pledges the performance of acts which those departments are prohibited by the Constitution from doing.

The treaty provision relating to arbitration of all justiciable questions, and investigation by the executive council or the assembly of States of all other questions, is embraced within the same principles. It contemplates that Congress shall legislate in some cases and refrain from legislating in others. But it can not deprive Congress of its exclusive jurisdiction to declare war when it chooses for any cause that it pleases. It is, of course, to be presumed that all departments of the Government will keep and regard the obligations created by the treaty-making power. But the treaty power itself can not compel action by the President or by the Congress as to matters within their exclusive jurisdiction. The courts of the United States may in certain cases render judgments the satisfaction of which requires an appropriation by Congress. Every lawyer knows that no court can compel Congress to pass an appropriation act, however clear may be the moral obligation arising from a judgment. The judgment is not void. It simply remains unexecuted if Congress fails to legislate.

The same principle applies to treaties which are not self-executing and which are mere contracts.

MANDATORY PROVISIONS SUSTAINED BY PRECEDENTS.

With respect to the allegation that the mandatory provision is in conflict with the Constitution, it seems only necessary to say that the only question of a constitutional nature arising in connection with this feature of the treaty is whether the United States is forbidden to govern or assist in the government of other countries having the legal status of conquered territory. There is no question under the revised draft of compelling the United States to act as a mandate. The language clearly and expressly makes it optional to perform such duties. And the only inquiry necessary is whether such mandates as are contemplated by the treaty are in conflict with the fundamental principles of our Government.

The decisions of the Supreme Court in connection with the Philippines, Cuba, and Porto Rico are believed to be controlling on this point. As early as 1846 the United States guaranteed the sovereignty of New Granada over the Isthmus of Panama.

By the treaty of 1903 we agreed to maintain the independence of the Republic of Panama.

In 1916 the United States by treaty guaranteed the independence of Santo Domingo and agreed to assist in the administration of its affairs. Of course, if it is constitutional to maintain mandates for Panama and Haiti, it is likewise constitutional to sustain similar relations toward peoples in other parts of the world.

LEAGUE WILL NOT CREATE SUPERGOVERNMENTS.

The objection that the league of nations treaties creates a supergovernment which will dominate the United States is without foundation. It can take no action in any important controversy without the consent of the United States or without the unanimous vote of all other nations. Its powers are advisory. It can compel no action on the part of this Government. By the treaty it becomes the common agent of the signatory powers to promote international cooperation and peace. It is our agent, not our master. As now proposed the league of nations in no important particular appears to be in conflict with the provisions of our Constitution.

To reach this conclusion it is not necessary to expand the treaty-making power or give it any greater authority than the framers of the Constitution intended it should exercise. Its most important provisions contemplate action by Congress in order to effectuate them, just as almost every treaty made by the United States has done. It can not raise armies; Congress alone can do that for the United States. It may suggest limitations upon armament, but these limitations can only become effective when approved by Congress. The league of nations can not declare war. It merely defines the refusal to submit a controversy to arbitration or investigation as an act of war. Congress still has, and alone can exercise, the power to declare war by the people of the United States. In favoring the creation of a society of nations to promote peace we yield in no degree our devotion to the flag which symbolizes our national glory. In the broadest and truest sense we exemplify attachment to liberty and advancement. We disarm and overcome the enemies of government and secure to coming generations the benefits of Christian civilization.

SOME THINGS THAT WILL ENDURE.

The spirit of discontent, the forces of lawlessness are, indeed, making themselves felt throughout the world. The war has materially changed conditions everywhere. It has brought a new viewpoint to humanity. The period of reconstruction upon which we are entering has its peculiar problems, scarcely less difficult and not less important than those which attended actual hostilities. No one can be forgetful of the cruelty, wastefulness, misery, desolation, and ruin which came with the war and swept with irresistible fury over Europe, destroying the best products of five centuries of progress. The problem now is one of salvage and restoration. Not salvage of property alone, not alone the restoration of works of art, of industries and enterprises, but salvage of war-weary, downtrodden, and disheartened peoples; restoration of social, moral, and political institutions. The combat is now against pestilence, poverty, famine, and despair. The task is appalling both in difficulty and importance. Amid all the destruction and ruin of the war there are, thank God, some things that are still secure; that will stand firm against every assault and inspire hope and confidence.

This Nation, the institutions of liberty, equality, and justice still stand, and will stand in spite of discontent and anarchy. Law has not been destroyed. The frequent violation of it but attests its indispensable value to mankind. Justice has been trampled upon and mangled, but it will rise to rule the world, for God is above all and eternal.

Now, while the evils of war, its horrors, and its sacrifices are fresh in our memories, we labor to prevent their recurrence and to make permanent the peace which has come through the tribulation and sorrow of the human race.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. ASHURST obtained the floor.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes; I yield. I wish to say that I am only going to speak 10 minutes; but, of course, I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. I ask unanimous consent to make a report out of order.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. On what subject?

Mr. WATSON. From the Committee on Woman Suffrage, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and I will say that I want to follow that up with another request for unanimous consent to take up the discussion of the subject next Tuesday, and to make it a continuing order until it shall have been finally disposed of.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I shall not interpose any objection. I think that is a perfectly fair proposition.

Mr. WATSON. I ask unanimous consent first to report favorably House joint resolution No. 1, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women. Now, I ask for the unanimous-consent agreement which I send to the desk.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the proposed unanimous-consent agreement which the Senator is sending to the desk is to fix a time for voting——

Mr. WATSON. No; I am not asking that. I could not do that without a quorum.

Mr. REED. I was simply going to call attention to the rule on that subject.

Mr. WATSON. I could not do that without the presence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DIAL in the chair). The Secretary will state the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Indiana offers the following unanimous-consent agreement:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that immediately upon the conclusion of the routine morning business on the calendar day of Tuesday, June 3, 1919, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of House joint resolution 1, joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women, and will continue such consideration to the exclusion of other business until its final disposition.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think I shall object to that. I do not see why we should agree absolutely to tie up the business

of the country for this purpose. Let me say to the Senator from Indiana that I will not object to the joint resolution being made the unfinished business, but as the agreement is presented it is to be carried out to the exclusion of all other business.

Mr. WATSON. After the morning hour.

Mr. REED. Well, I would object to that; but I will not ask——

Mr. WATSON. Then I will give notice to-morrow.

Mr. ROBINSON. May I ask the Senator from Missouri if he objects to fixing a time to vote? I have a very important personal reason for wanting to know when a vote is to be taken.

Mr. REED. I do not object to fixing a time to vote, if the Senators are so situated that they can be here.

Mr. WATSON. I will say that the only objection to fixing by unanimous consent a definite time to vote is that it must be done in the presence of a quorum, and that we have not got.

Mr. REED. Since I made the objection, let me state my position: I have not the slightest disposition to delay a vote on this joint resolution. I think I shall want to take 10 or 15 minutes in a mere statement of my personal position; but I do object to an agreement which puts this matter down for consideration to the exclusion of all other business, that agreement being a unanimous-consent agreement, which we can not escape from when we have once made it. I will not object to this matter being made the unfinished business, and I assure the Senator from Indiana that there will be no dilatory tactics on my part.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who has charge of the resolution that is now the unfinished business, I do not see how we could consent to having this joint resolution made the unfinished business; so I suggest to the Senator that he file his report, and then, either now or upon to-morrow, he can give notice as to when he will call up the joint resolution.

Mr. OWEN. That will be the better plan.

Mr. WATSON. That is all I can do now. Therefore, on to-morrow I will give notice that I will call it up on Monday.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Is it the Senator's expectation to dispose of it next week?

Mr. WATSON. I hope so; but I do not know.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana if we can not rely upon his giving us two or three days' notice before he presses it?

Mr. WATSON. I propose to-morrow to call it up, and give notice that I shall take it up on Monday.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is satisfactory.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the Senator—it is merely personal to me—that I want to vote on the joint resolution, and intend to do so; but it would be a very great inconvenience to me to be here Monday and Tuesday. It is purely a matter of personal inconvenience.

Mr. WATSON. To-morrow many Senators are going away for the purpose of making Memorial Day addresses; and I have had notice from many Senators that they will not be present the latter part of next week. I have no desire to work a hardship on my friend from Arizona; but, after all, I do not believe that any time could be fixed when all the Senators could arrange to be present.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator will allow me to make a suggestion, I believe we could all agree to vote on it the middle of next week if we had two or three days' notice to that effect.

Mr. ROBINSON. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that we can settle that to-morrow.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; I only make that suggestion.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I should like to see the question settled to-morrow if it can be done, because I am leaving the city for two or three days, at least, and I do not want to leave if some adjustment of that kind is made, and I will have to remain here.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That is my attitude exactly.

SHIPMENTS INTO GERMANY.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. I introduce a Senate resolution, to which there will be no objection.

Mr. ASHURST. I am sure it will lead to debate, and I am afraid I shall have to object.

Mr. GORE. Let it be read.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I object to taking it up without an understanding that it shall not displace the unfinished business.

Mr. GORE. What is that?

Mr. CURTIS. The unfinished business is the resolution of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. GORE. Oh, well, I will say to the Senator that it will require unanimous consent to consider it. If there be any objection, of course it will go over under the rule. It is only in case no Senator objects that it can be considered.

The Secretary proceeded to read the resolution.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I could not yield the floor for the introduction of such a resolution. I beg the pardon of my friend the Senator from Oklahoma, but I can not yield the floor even for the introduction of the resolution. I yield now to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I think the Senator did yield for that purpose; but it can go over.

Mr. ASHURST. I wish it known to the country and to the Senate that had I known the character of it, I would not have yielded to the Senator. I mean no discourtesy to him.

Mr. ROBINSON. I think, in view of that statement, that the Senator from Oklahoma should withdraw it and introduce his resolution at another time.

Mr. ASHURST. I mean no discourtesy.

Mr. ROBINSON. I understand, but I make that suggestion to the Senator.

Mr. GORE. I intend to leave the city day after to-morrow, and I should like to have it introduced now, so that it can simply be called up to-morrow. Of course, it will meet its fate then. That is my reason for imposing on the Senate at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, speaking for myself——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield, but I am anxious to hurry along. I want to speak for about 10 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Speaking for myself, I have heard enough of the resolution to know that I object to it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I suppose his objection goes to its consideration and not to its introduction now, because I had, as I understand, consent for that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understood that the Senator got the consent of the Senator from Arizona to permit it to be read for the purpose of finding out whether or not we did object to its introduction. I object to its introduction or its consideration.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will say that the resolution is intended to meet the situation growing out of newspaper reports that cotton and certain other products are to be excluded from shipment into Germany under the peace treaty, which have occasioned some disquietude. This resolution is couched in the ordinary terms—that if compatible or when compatible with the public interests the President is requested to advise the Senate whether or not the peace treaty contains such a provision. It conforms to the rules and precedents in that regard.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that is what the Senator wants and I understand just why I object to it. Within due time, and in a very short time, the Senator will get the information he desires in the shape of the treaty itself, which will have no such provision in it. There is no use "gumming up the cards" or taking up further time with it now.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I would like to add, as the Senator has made reference to that report, that I have seen cables from Europe in the press within the last 24 hours denying that such a provision is in the treaty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If you had watched closely, you would have seen another one asserting it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I said there was one first asserting that there was such a provision, but it has been corrected and definitely stated that there is nothing of that kind in the treaty. The Senator misunderstood me.

Mr. GORE. This confusion illustrates the futility of further discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is out of order at this time.

DISARMAMENT ON THE GREAT LAKES.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, during the able speech of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] he referred to a convention concluded with Great Britain in 1817 providing for disarmament on the Great Lakes. I delivered a speech in the West recently upon the question of the "Reduction of armament by arbitration," and in the course of my address I referred to the fact that we had for over 102 years been living under a treaty with Great Britain under and by the terms of which Great Britain and the United States had reduced—indeed, practically abandoned—armament on the Great Lakes. A distinguished citizen of the United States, whose opinion is entitled to respect, took issue with me and asserted that the treaty had been abrogated long ago. I think in the next 10

or 12 minutes I can demonstrate that the treaty is in full life and vigor.

First I will read the treaty, which appears on page 630, volume 1, of Treaties, Conventions, and so forth, between the United States and other powers. It is very brief. Omitting such formal parts as the salutations and recitations, it reads:

The naval force to be maintained upon the American lakes by His Majesty and the Government of the United States shall henceforth be confined to the following vessels on each side; that is:

On Lake Ontario, to one vessel not exceeding 100 tons burden and armed with one 18-pound cannon.

On the Upper Lakes, to two vessels not exceeding like burden each and armed with like force.

On the waters of Lake Champlain, to one vessel not exceeding like burden and armed with like force.

All other armed vessels on these lakes shall be forthwith dismantled and no other vessels of war shall be there built or armed.

If either party should be hereafter desirous of annulling this stipulation and should give notice to that effect to the other party, it shall cease to be binding after the expiration of six months from the date of such notice.

The naval force so to be limited shall be restricted to such services as will in no respect interfere with the proper duties of the armed vessels of the other party.

The Rush-Bagot convention, agreement, arrangement, or treaty—for each of these terms has been applied to it—was concluded on the 29th of April, 1817, during the Presidency of James Monroe, and in my opinion the Rush-Bagot treaty may in the future prove as vital, important, and as pregnant with possibilities for coming generations as the Monroe doctrine itself.

In his first message to Congress, which was on December 2, 1817, the President, Mr. Monroe, advised Congress of the fact that he had entered into the Rush-Bagot treaty, and on the 6th day of April, 1818, the President sent the treaty to the Senate.

The Senate considered the treaty, and on the 26th day of April, 1818, ratified the same by the unanimous vote of 30 Senators, that number being all the Senators present and voting. The treaty was at once put into operation, as by its own terms it was self-executing and required no appropriation. In accordance with the terms of that treaty our Navy on the Great Lakes was reduced and Great Britain likewise reduced her navy there immediately upon signing the treaty.

It is true that in the summer of 1864 a resolution, to wit, House joint resolution No. 91, was introduced proposing to repeal the treaty, or proposing rather to give the six months' notice of intention to abrogate the treaty. The resolution passed the House in the summer of 1864. Now, enter the energies of the Department of State, and on the 23d day of November, 1864, our minister to Great Britain, Mr. Charles Francis Adams, delivered a notice to the British foreign office advising that the British Government take notice that it was the intention of the United States to abrogate the Rush-Bagot treaty at the end of six months from November 23, 1864.

When Congress assembled in December, 1864, this Chamber was filled with denunciations of President Abraham Lincoln and Secretary of State William H. Seward, alleging that they had proceeded to abrogate and annul a treaty in an unconstitutional manner. I have read the debates that ensued. They are tiresome. They sound very like the debates we hear in these days alleging that Woodrow Wilson is attempting to do something unconstitutional.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They certainly were not that bad?

Mr. ASHURST. No; not quite that bad. The Senate amended the House resolution and passed the same on January 18, 1865, the House concurred in the amendment, and the same was signed by President Lincoln on the 9th day of February, 1865. So here was a joint resolution passed by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President giving notice of the intention to abrogate the Rush-Bagot treaty. An assembly of lawyers will, of course, promptly ask me the question how an act of Congress would thus be set aside through instructions given by Secretary Seward to Minister Adams, even with the approval of Presidents Lincoln and Johnson. I answer that it was actually done, that it was acquiesced in by both countries, that the Governments of both Great Britain and the United States considered, and now consider, this treaty in full force and effect. However extraordinary the story of its birth, life, and vicissitudes may appear to us, as a practical precedent for disarmament by treaty it is a conspicuous instance of international neighborliness and a noble example to all the world. Those who assert that the treaty was finally abrogated fail to remember, however, that on the 8th of March, 1865, or about one month after Congress passed the joint resolution No. 91, the Secretary of State, William H. Seward, instructed Mr. Charles Francis Adams, our minister in London, to say to the British foreign office that notwithstanding the previous notice given in November, 1864, and notwithstanding the joint resolution 91, he—Seward—acting on behalf of the President, who under our Constitution has charge of the foreign relations of our country, gave notice to Great Britain that the Rush-Bagot treaty should remain in full force and vigor, and that the previous notices of intention to abrogate were themselves annulled.

The following is a copy of a part of the letter sent by Secretary Seward to Mr. Adams:

[Seward to Adams, Mar. 8, 1865.]

The notice which has been given by this Government for the termination of the convention of April, 1817, limiting the naval force on the Lakes, was indispensable to enable us technically with honor to protect ourselves from insurgent incursion from Canadian territory. As it is hoped and believed that under existing circumstances no further incursions of that character may be apprehended, you may say to Lord Russell that we are quite willing that the convention should remain practically in force; that this Government has not constructed or commenced building any additional war vessels on the Lakes or added to the armament of the single one which was previously its property, and that no such vessels will in future be built or armed for us in that quarter. It is hoped and expected, however, that Her Majesty's Government on its part, so long as this determination shall be observed in good faith by that of the United States, will neither construct nor arm nor introduce armed vessels in excess of the force stipulated for by the convention referred to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will pardon me, as a matter of historical interest, what immediately led to the agitation for giving notice of abrogation was the St. Albans raid. A lot of escaped Confederate prisoners up in Canada got guns and arms and went down into Vermont and invaded the little town of St. Albans, and among other things took about a quarter of a million dollars out of a bank there and carried it up to Canada to the financial agent of the Confederate government in Canada. So they got an idea that there was a great Confederate army concealed somewhere up in Canada, and they had to take this method of preventing it from operating against the United States.

Mr. ASHURST. Yes; I thank the Senator for this historical reference. While I have not found any record of the action of Mr. Adams upon this instruction from Secretary Seward, Mr. Adams did in fact communicate its purport to Earl Russell, as is seen by an inquiry addressed to Acting Secretary Hunter June 15, 1865, by Sir F. Bruce, who had succeeded Lord Lyons as British minister. Referring to Mr. Adams's communication of the instruction of March 8 to Her Majesty's Government, and reciting its import, Mr. Bruce adds:

It may admit of a doubt whether the notice of the abrogation of the agreement has been rendered inoperative by the communication thus made through the American minister, and as it is essential that no misapprehensions should exist on so important a point, I am instructed to ascertain whether the dispatch to Mr. Adams of the 8th of March was intended as a formal withdrawal of the notice given by the American minister to Earl Russell on November 23, or whether, as the period of six months from the date of that notice has now elapsed, the agreement of 1817 is virtually at an end, and the abstinence of either party from increasing its force on the Lakes, without further notice, rests merely on the good pleasure of each, unfettered by any diplomatic engagement.

Her Majesty's Government considers that in the latter case a very inconvenient state of things would exist; and I am directed to add that it appears to Her Majesty's Government that the best course would be that the notice of November 23 should be formally withdrawn, whereby the agreement of 1817 would remain unimpaired and would continue binding on both parties until six months after fresh notice by either of them of its abrogation.

To this inquiry Mr. Seward replied on the following day, June 16, 1865, that the instruction of March 8 to the United States minister at London, upon which his reported communication to Earl Russell was based, "was intended as a withdrawal of the previous notice within the time allowed, and that it is so held by this Government."

Here the correspondence in regard to the termination of the arrangement of 1817 ceased. Since that time it has been regarded by both Governments as in continuing force and effect.

During the administration of President Harrison the question was agitated as to whether or not that treaty had been annulled, and the Senate called upon the Department of State to make a specific statement as to whether or not the treaty was in force. The Secretary of State, John W. Foster, in his report, dated December 7, 1892, said, inter alia—I can not read it all:

As between the United States and Great Britain, Mr. Seward's withdrawal of the six months' notice of termination within the prescribed period and before the arrangement could in fact have ended is no less authoritative than the notification itself. The British Government, being as incompetent to inquire into the authority of the Secretary of State to withdraw the notification as it would have been to inquire into his authority to give it under the terms of the arrangement, could only accept and respect the withdrawal as a fact. As between the two countries the arrangement is, therefore, to be regarded as still in existence and only terminable in good faith by six months' notice of abrogation on either side.

The first Cleveland administration recognized the treaty to be in full life and vigor; the Harrison administration recognized the treaty to be in full life and vigor; the second Cleveland administration recognized the treaty to be in full life and vigor; the McKinley administration recognized the treaty; and I know of no respectable publicist or lawyer of eminence who

questions the efficacy of this treaty except those who regret to see a treaty on our statute books which stands as an enduring and perpetual memorial of the fact that nations may reduce their armaments by treaties and those alleged constitutional lawyers who assert that it is a violation of our Constitution to reduce our armaments by treaty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Even though the treaty was abrogated, and it was not, as the Senator says——

Mr. ASHURST. It was not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Suppose it had been; still there would remain the historical fact that from 1817 down to 1864 this country had operated under a treaty acknowledged by everybody to be valid and binding which did make the United States agree not to increase its armament in certain territory partially its own. That is stronger than on the high seas. So their contention that it was abrogated is as irrelevant as most of the other nonsense that they offer. Suppose it had been abrogated, it would not affect in the slightest degree the fact that the United States Government had a right to enter into the treaty, had entered into the treaty, had observed the treaty, and had bound Great Britain by it from 1817 to 1864.

Mr. ASHURST. Let me say, in conclusion, that never in the history of nations has an international document, so far-reaching in its effect, been compressed into so small a compass as the Rush-Bagot agreement of 1817. It is a model of brevity and comprehensiveness and in many respects a hundred years ahead of the times. Edward Atkinson, of Boston, said that it was "the greatest step in progress toward the maintenance of peace and without precedent in history." The London Times said in reference to it:

> No wiser act was ever agreed upon between two nations than the limitation of the naval force on the Lakes.

Let me further say that this treaty has saved the people of the United States and the people of Great Britain untold millions of dollars by virtue of their agreement not to keep a strong naval force on the American Lakes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And has saved them from war besides, because if they had had navies there they probably would have gotten into war.

RESTRICTIONS ON EXPORTS.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a very important matter, and I would be glad if the Senators who are present would give me attention for just a few minutes. I shall not detain the Senate over five minutes.

Our present balance of trade in favor of the United States is running about $400,000,000 a month, but that means, of course, a commodity balance. It means the net balance of goods shipped by the United States in excess of goods received by the United States. There have been put upon American goods import licenses by Great Britain. I am not going to take the time of the Senate now to read it, but ask leave to put in the RECORD a statement of the correspondence demonstrating the strong efforts made by the American Chamber of Commerce in London to get these restrictions on imports from the United States into Great Britain modified and their failure to get them modified. I merely offer that record as a preamble to what I am going to say. Without objection, I will insert it in the RECORD in order that Senators may see it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

AMERICANS WANT RESTRICTIONS CUT—WORKING OF BRITISH IMPORTS POLICY IS REVEALED BY CORRESPONDENCE—TRADERS ASK CHANGES—CHARGE MADE THAT BAN IS RESPONSIBLE FOR BUSINESS DEPRESSION.

LONDON, *May 19.*

Quite an amount of light on the working of the British Government's import restriction policy is shown by the publication of the correspondence that has taken place between the Board of Trade and the American Chamber of Commerce in London.

All branches of the chamber are naturally much affected by the restrictions and have submitted numerous proposals and criticisms to the department.

After consideration of the restrictions in detail the chamber submitted five proposals to the British Government, as follows:

1. That restrictions on imports from the United States should end on September 1, the date when the Government's transition period is supposed to end.

2. During the period of restriction imports of restricted articles should be restored to the prewar basis. This, it is believed, would give ample field for expansion to British industries.

3. That a request that a representative of importers should be added to the consultative committee on import restrictions.

4. Requested the removal of restrictions from firms here desiring to buy goods in the United States for delivery in the British colonies by direct shipment.

Five principles were suggested on which rationing and licensing should run—in apportionment of imported tonnage between raw materials and manufactures in the proportion of 1912–1914 trade equality between allied and associated countries; maintenance of existing firms and organizations by allowing them sufficient imports to keep their business going; a standardized form of refusal of license, stating the reason for refusal, whether other firms have licenses, and when application may be renewed, and public hearing of cases in regard to rationing.

The board of trade's reply was received more than a month after the receipt of the chamber's letter, and then only after repeated requests.

The consultative council, the board claims, already contains representatives of general interests, and the board is of the opinion that to add further representatives on another basis would so enlarge the council as seriously to impair its efficiency.

As to the other points raised, the board says the suggested proportionate import of raw materials and manufactured articles is impossible, but they will give "sympathetic consideration to the other proposals in the administration of the interim trade policy." The board refuses the information as to the licenses granted but offer to give the grounds for the refusal of licenses and suggest that later an application may meet with success. The answer to the request for a public hearing is that the consultative council takes evidence from "responsible firms or associations" before making recommendations.

The traders' point of view of the working of the board is one of continual protest and demand for the removal of control. On the one hand, British exporters are claiming that the refusal of licenses is practically killing their foreign connections, and on the other hand the importers claim that the issue of licenses gives some firms advantages over their competitors.

It is claimed that the consultative council is ill balanced and biased, and that the only solution of the present trade depression is either to remove the Government control of both imports and exports entirely or to set up a system of distribution of licenses on an equality basis.

Mr. OWEN. The authorities of Italy have substantially done the same thing. The officials of France have done the same thing. The import license bureaus are denying licenses to merchants of Italy and France and Great Britain to bring goods from the United States to those countries, and the principal reason appears to be that the exchange is running so heavily in favor of the United States and against Great Britain and against France and against Italy. The exchange of Great Britain is much below par. The exchange of France has gone from 5.18 down to 6.60, 6.70, and 6.80. The exchange in Italy has gone from 5.18 down to 8.60, so that the Italian merchants who buy American goods are being compelled to pay 60-odd per cent exchange on the transaction, making it impossible for them advantageously to do business with the exporters of the United States.

There is but one way in which this can be adjusted. The belligerent nations can not pay us to-day in gold. They have not got it to spare. They can not pay us to-day in commodities except in degrees. They are sending all the commodities they can send, but the balance is still heavily in our favor. In order to meet this commodity balance, America in some form will be obliged to extend term credit, credit for three or four or five years, probably, until those industries can be started again. During the war our Government extended credits directly to our allies—Great Britain, France, Italy, Belgium, and so forth—to the extent of over $9,000,000,000; but with the war over it no longer seems the better course to extend direct governmental credits but to extend the credits required by agencies apart from the Government itself if possible and practicable.

I think it entirely practicable to have a foreign finance corporation chartered by Congress to take over European sound credits and sell the American investing public bonds based on such securities and the capital of the corporation itself as an added safeguard to the investor.

Frank Vanderlip, who is president of the National City Bank of New York, gave a full explanation of the need of extending prompt credits, and Mr. Caldwell, who attended the Economic Club dinner, did the same thing. With the permission of the Senate, and for the information of the Senate, I ask to put that in the RECORD, so it may be seen, without taking the time to read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

VANDERLIP WARNS AMERICA OF DUTY—CIVILIZATION OF THE WORLD DEPENDS ON QUICK AND UNSTINTED AID, HE SAYS—BOLSHEVISM THREATENS—PRESIDENT OF NATIONAL CITY BANK GIVES ACCOUNT OF SITUATION IN EUROPE.

Unless the United States promptly and unstintedly extends credit to Europe, all of Europe, the civilization of that continent and perhaps of the whole world will surely go to smash—that is the substance of a warning delivered before the Economic Club at the Hotel Astor last night by Frank A. Vanderlip, president of the National City Bank, who returned recently after studying financial and economic conditions in the countries west of Germany.

Mr. Vanderlip's warning was supported emphatically by Robert J. Caldwell, the other speaker of the evening, who is president of the Mid-European Association and who has just returned also from a survey of conditions in Europe. Mr. Caldwell said flatly that America has failed utterly to comprehend the gravity of industrial conditions in Europe and to understand the peril for this country unless hunger is checked.

It was not a cheerful picture which was presented by Mr. Vanderlip and Mr. Caldwell, each of whom said with the utmost earnestness that unless America helps Europe to get to work very soon, provides the raw materials that will start up shops and factories, and provides vast quantities of food until resumed work brings its natural prosperity and contentment there will be more red revolution and a likelihood of Bolshevism spreading across the Atlantic. Both speeches were heard intently by the 1,200 members of the club who gathered in the Astor's grand ballroom last night.

LARGER ASPECTS OF THE SITUATION.

Henry Morgenthau was to have presided at the dinner, but he is still in Europe, and George W. Wickersham acted as toastmaster. He presented Mr. Vanderlip as one whose advice the country need not hesitate to follow. Mr. Vanderlip said:

"After seeing England and all of Europe west of Germany, I know the views I held regarding the effect of the war were absurdly inadequate. We have not begun to understand the full import of what has happened to Europe. There are forces of destruction which might be let loose as a result of after-war conditions that would be more fearful than the Great War itself. There are starvation, idle industry, crippled transportation, paralyzed markets, injured morale, shattered Government credits.

"We can not gauge present chances of recovery by any experience with former postwar conditions. The difficulties are entirely different from those existing after the Napoleonic War. The whole industrial age has developed since then. The mechanism of society is indefinitely more complex. The population of Europe at the close of the Napoleonic War was 175,000,000. Now it is 440,000,000. Europe was able to feed the increase only because she could manufacture and exchange the products of her factories for food. A state of society so built up makes the continuance of industry on a prewar scale essential to supporting the life of the people. Europe is but a great factory community, dependent in the main upon world trade for much of its food and raw materials.

ENGLAND'S CASE DESPERATE.

"Take the situation of England. There is the most thickly populated country in the world, with 700 people to the square mile. Its agriculture little more than compares with the kitchen gardens about a mill town. Its factories must run if all its people are to live in England. For the last 20 years England has held her predominance in international industry in no small part because of her comparatively low-wage scale. This low-wage scale, in connection with rising living cost, has not been adequate to meet normal and proper living requirements. Labor has not earned enough to keep a roof over its head, and 1,000,000 houses for workmen is made a national debt and will in part be a charge on the national purse. In the future England must have a resumption of European demand for her goods or she can not get the outside credits with which to buy food and materials. So her future is absolutely bound up with the Continent's future. A responsible minister told me that unless the European demand could be speedily reestablished so that English industry could move forward at its old speed, five or six million Englishmen will of necessity have to be got nearer to the source of food supplies.

"France is facing an annual budget of 22,000,000,000 francs. Far more important than her financial difficulties, however, is her industrial position. A great part of her industries were destroyed, but those which had been untouched were, in large measure, idle. It is the idleness of industry on the Continent, the stoppage of production, and the enormous difficulties in the way of restarting production that is the most serious feature of the after-war situation. Unless industry can be started there will be idleness, want, and a disturbance of the social order. The advance in the cost of living has exceeded the advance in wages, great as that has been, and workmen have become suspicious of the efficacy of advances in wages. Everywhere there is a serious minority questioning the fundamental principles of property rights and the present social order.

EUROPE MUST GET TO WORK.

"The difficulty of several of the continental nations in balancing their international trade is insuperable of solution in a moment. There are things from other countries that these nations must have to live. There are only three possible ways in which they can pay for these things. These are by export of goods, by export of gold, or by export of their credit. Italy must have 1,000,000 tons of coal a month, all her cotton, and most of her minerals. France must have vast amounts of cotton, wool, silk and some food if she is to resume her normal life. Belgium must have machinery, raw material, and food. All must have railroad equipment or their manufactories can not operate nor their people be fed. None of these nations can export enough goods at present, and they have no more gold to spare. They must have credit. No outside charity can be of any avail. That only postpones, and does not postpone long. Europe must get to work if it is to be saved, but it must be helped even to start work.

"It is easy to say that this is too excited a view; that it is seen with too imaginative a brain; that nothing is ever so good or so bad in the end as the indications picture. It can be said that the European population is composed of industrious people; that the land, houses, and most of the factories are still there; that there may be suffering and hardship, but to talk about a civilization being destroyed is hysterical and unwarranted; that things will straighten out 'in the long run.'

"I would answer to this contented view that hungry stomachs will not wait for things to straighten out in the long run. In past history there is nothing comparable with the present intricate organization of society. National life is based on international interdependence. Industrial life is highly specialized. There has been a vast growth of population that can only be fed when industry goes on and international trade is continued.

"Former war debts bore hardly a comparable relation to present war debts. There is a chaotic currency situation, which would alone be an enormous problem to untangle. There are insolvent governments, judged by the old rules of finance, but the industrial paralysis is even of vastly more importance than the financial confusion.

"America must be made to see the facts in their true relations and consequences, for America is almost the sole hope. If America will understand the situation and will do her duty, she is amply able to give the necessary help. This aid must be given in a big-spirited scientific way. It is useless to give it in grudging measure or piecemeal to a few countries. We must regard the European situation as a unit; we must be awake to the danger of delay. Hundreds of thousands of people have died of starvation. These figures are not adjectives. They are statistical facts.

"The highest authority believes that the food situation will be worse in the spring of 1920 than it has been this year. The supply of Russia is cut off. Rumania, which has been a large exporter of grain, has lost her work cattle, and because of shortage of work cattle and of seed has planted only enough for her own people. Poland has planted only about one-third of her land. In those countries east of Germany transportation is so broken down that there will be starvation, because the food which might be available can not be moved.

AMERICA'S DUTY AND OPPORTUNITY.

"Hand in hand with America's duty is America's opportunity. Never before in all history has a nation been so fortunate. We are now the world's reservoir of capital. Other nations have been that before, but, in addition, we are the reservoir of raw material. The combination of these two advantages makes our position relatively incomparable. There is need for charity in America, but it is not a charity of giving; it is a charity of mind. We should charitably view the condition of these European people, make every allowance for their chaotic state of mind, their depression, their shaken morale. We should be charitable toward their mistakes, charitable of their apparent grasping shown at the peace conference, where they seem to have clutched in every direction for something to ease their horrible wounds.

"We must be charitable toward their prejudices, toward their chauvinism. Nor will it do for us to feel that we stand apart, and, while sympathizing with these suffering countries, ourselves enjoy uninterrupted prosperity. Wherever want and hunger becomes severe enough there will be blazing revolution. If the blaze should become widespread the Atlantic would not be broad enough to keep us safe from its parks. The great danger is in America not understanding, not comprehending what is its duty. If it does understand it is amply able to supply the needed remedy. The remedy is by no means purely financial. What we should supply is not credits to exhausted national treasuries, but the actual things necessary to restart industry. We should supply food, machinery, raw materials, and railroad equipment, to be paid for in time and the payment guaranteed by the best security the nations can give. It is unsafe to do that for certain countries and leave others unprovided for. There is no safety anywhere in Europe until all Europe has been started back toward a normal life. Wherever there is failure to give that helpful start there will be danger spots that will breed Bolshevik unrest, and this unrest is contagious.

"If Europe is once started back toward her normal life then America's opportunity is beyond all limits. We will be the source of capital for world development. We will supply raw material for much of the world's industry. In giving ourselves and doing our duty we can win the greatest place that any nation ever held and perform an incomparable economic and humanitarian service. I know this situation can be worked out if we cooperate quickly and forcefully to do it."

MR. CALDWELL'S ADDRESS.

Mr. Caldwell said that the dominant question before the world to-day is the economic reconstruction of Europe.

"How much do our people generally comprehend," said he, "that most of the world is getting hungrier rather than less so? How many realize that the world will be hungrier a year from now than it is now? How much is Bolshevism due to hunger and to the dislocation of employment? Who can guarantee that he would not be a Bolshevist if that was the only means of relief for his starving family? Finally, is anyone so dull as to imagine that all this volcanic disorganization and cyclonic disruption can swirl about us and we remain serenely undisturbed? We had better concern ourselves. Before Europe and Asia starve they will fight, and the fight of hunger and starvation is a fight to the death. That way Bolshevism lies.

"There must be quick material relief and financial and industrial relief. There must be much more. We grant no rights to the workingman which he does not prove himself able to wring from an unwilling employer. We consult him not at all about his industrial welfare. We fail to protect his industry. We discharge men wholesale with no thought of the consequences to the unemployed. I say that the world must now apply to industry the principles of democracy which we have enjoyed politically. Industry must be governed with the consent of the governed. The universal signs of unrest in the ranks of labor are healthy signs of national growth. It is inconceivable that progressive America should fail to profit by the experience of Great Britain and Australia in this direction.

"If we wish to avoid in this country the issue of nationalization of industries, we will be wise while there is yet time. We must adopt the cardinal principle of a standard day and the other cardinal principle of a minimum wage. It was represented to us in Great Britain that three forms of relief would be generally acceptable to workers there—unemployment insurance, health insurance, and old-age insurance. In each industry were subjected to a tax equivalent to 5 per cent of the pay roll, this would be a matter of entire unimportance to its cost to the industry.

"Employment is needed for the idle everywhere, for unemployment breeds trouble and hunger. The world industry in general is sick of this palsy, and nothing short of a miracle can check it. The solvent nations surviving the war need to check unemployment and thereby hunger in the prostrate nations. We must either invade these nations with the banner of prosperity or they will invade us with the red flag. Shall we profit by Great Britain's example and prove that we can and will stand shoulder to shoulder with her, resolutely facing the dark menace? I am sure America can afford to do no less.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, in order to accomplish this we must provide a mechanism. There is not a bank in this country strong enough to take this great volume of European credit and pass it on the investing public of the United States. There is needed a mechanism by which these credits from Europe, in the form of bonds of the Governments of Europe, in forms of commercial bills running through a period of years given by commercial syndicates and manufacturing syndicates, may be taken over by some strong financial power, who may issue debentures against it or issue bonds against these securities and sell the bonds at an acceptable rate to the American investing public. Short-time bills can then be handled by the banks on an exchange rate that will permit and encourage our foreign commerce to proceed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. With good security.

Mr. OWEN. Yes; with good security.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This organization, whatever it may be, underwriting the final payment?

Mr. OWEN. Yes. That matter has been discussed more or less. It was proposed by Leopold Frederick a couple of months ago, and various men have suggested it, but some action ought

to be taken and it ought to be taken immediately. I saw a cable on Friday from Italy to one of the great importing houses of this country, stating that the Italian import licenses were being restricted to prevent shipment of our goods to Italy because of this adverse exchange condition. I saw a similar cable from France advising to like effect, that American imports to France are being refused import licenses because of this condition. A large exporting American house told me to-day drafts for 2,000,000 francs on French houses were refused because of the great fall in exchange. The Senator from Georgia has just told me of a like experience with a big cotton shipment to Italy.

I want to call the attention of Congress to this now, because it requires legislative relief and it is the plain duty of Congress to afford the relief and to do it immediately. I favor having the United States permit the War Finance Corporation to take a substantial part of the stock of such a foreign finance corporation and give a proper national charter. With Government backing, the required capital could be quickly raised and American investors would more readily buy the bonds of such a corporation. I earnestly urge immediate action.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. HALE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Skowhegan, Frye, Sherman, and Staceyville, all in the State of Maine, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. McLEAN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Bridgeport, Norwalk, Stratford, Willimantic, Windham, Lakeville, Salisbury, Simsbury, East Granby, Granby, Wallingford, Yalesville, Meriden, Moodus, Hamden, Branford, North Branford, Guilford, New Haven, Milford, Orange, Putnam, Woodstock, Reddick, Canterbury, Plainfield, Central Village, Danielson, Thompson, Norwich, Salem, Griswold, Bozrah, Colchester, Sprague, Lisbon, Preston, Middletown, Portland, East Haddam, East Hampton, Deep River, Sterling, Clinton, Hartford, Bloomfield, Glastonbury, East Hartford, Stafford Springs, Hebron, Andover, Bolton, Rockville, Stamford, New Milford, Bridgewater, Roxbury, Litchfield, Thomaston, Winsted, Torrington, New Hartford, and Norfolk, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which were referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

He also presented a memorial of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Ridgefield, Conn., and a memorial of sundry citizens of West Redding, Conn., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of West Willington, Stafford Springs, Durham, Norfolk, and Winsted, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of sundry citizens of Jackson, Mich., praying for the repeal of the so-called luxury tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the congregation of the Jefferson Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, of Detroit; of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal churches of Ionia, Orleans, and Belding, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Western Michigan Development Bureau, of Traverse City, Mich., favoring the plan proposed by the Secretary of the Interior, granting land and money to discharged soldiers and sailors, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. FERNALD presented a petition of Aroostook and Penobscot Union Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Maine, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Aroostook and Penobscot Union Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Maine, praying for a tariff, embargo, or other provision against the free entry of potatoes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the Labor Council of San Francisco, Calif., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, and favoring the President's stand on the question of the disposition of Fiume, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of San Francisco, Calif., remonstrating against the adoption of the proposed amendment to the railroad appropriation bill depriving the Interstate Commerce Commission of its power to authorize departures from the long-and-short haul clause, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CALDER presented a petition of the Common Council of Syracuse, N. Y., praying for the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SPENCER presented a petition of the National Shakespeare Federation, praying for the construction of a national Shakespeare peace memorial building in the city of Washington, D. C., which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. WATSON, from the Committee on Woman Suffrage, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women, reported it without amendment.

JURISDICTION OF COURT OF CLAIMS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Several days ago I introduced a bill, being the bill (S. 411) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to certify certain findings of fact, and for other purposes, and it was inadvertently referred to the Committee on Claims. It is not a claims bill. At the last Congress a similar bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and was reported favorably from that committee. I move that the Committee on Claims be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

RECLAMATION OF LANDS IN NEVADA.

Mr. PITTMAN. On the 20th instant I introduced a bill, being Senate bill 9, to encourage the reclamation of certain arid lands in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes, and it was inadvertently referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands. The mistake grew out of the title of the bill. It is the same bill that has been considered three times by the Public Lands Committee of the Senate, and I move that the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands be discharged from its consideration, and that it be referred to the Public Lands Committee.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 845) to amend section 6 of the act of October 15, 1914, entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 846) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Harwinton, Conn., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 847) to authorize the erection of a monument at Fort Seybert, W. Va., to commemorate the capture and massacre of Capt. Seybert and a number of men and women at that point and in the South Fork and South Branch Valleys of the Potomac by the noted Indian Chief Kill Buck and his band of Indian warriors in the year 1758; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 848) to reimburse Isaiah Stephens, postmaster of McMechen, Marshall County, W. Va., for money and postage stamps stolen; and

A bill (S. 849) to reimburse S. S. Buzzerd, postmaster at Berkeley Springs, Morgan County, W. Va., for cash stolen; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 850) for the relief of the heirs of Dennis C. Snook;

A bill (S. 851) for the relief of R. A. McCutcheon;

A bill (S. 852) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah L. Nuzum, widow of Joel D. Nuzum, deceased;

A bill (S. 853) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Presbyterian Church, of Keyser, W. Va.;

A bill (S. 854) for the relief of lock masters, lockmen, and other laborers and mechanics employed by the United States Government in the locks and dams of the Kanawha River, in West Virginia;

A bill (S. 855) for the relief of Thomas J. Lloyd;

A bill (S. 856) for the relief of the estate of James Henry;

A bill (S. 857) for the relief of Gideon C. Corley;

A bill (S. 858) for the relief of the estates of Aaron Van Camp and Virginius P. Chapin;

A bill (S. 859) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Mary E. Buckey; and

A bill (S. 860) for the relief of the legal representatives of John T. Adkins, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRANDEGEE:
A bill (S. 861) for the relief of Edward W. Whitaker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
By Mr. LODGE:
A bill (S. 862) to authorize the acquisition and operation by the United States of the Cape Cod Canal; to the Committee on Commerce.
By Mr. SMOOT:
A bill (S. 863) to provide employment and rural homes for those who have served with the military and naval forces through the reclamation of lands to be known as the national soldier settlement act; to the Committee on Public Lands.
By Mr. McKELLAR:
A bill (S. 864) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at McMinnville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
A bill (S. 865) granting an increase of pension to George W. Pinion (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. CALDER:
A bill (S. 866) providing for the issuance to Herman L. Karpeles of a duplicate of an original medal of honor awarded to his father, Leopold Karpeles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 867) for the relief of Frank H. Walker and Frank E. Smith, a part of whose real property was taken and is now occupied by the United States for the foundation of the west wall of the Government Printing Office, in the city of Washington, and the remainder not taken damaged by reason of the construction and operation of said Printing Office; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 868) granting an increase of pension to Harriet S. Mansfield; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. TOWNSEND:
A bill (S. 869) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to muster Dr. John A. Bobb, deceased, a brigade surgeon, with rank of major, from assistant surgeon;
A bill (S. 870) granting promotion to Robert M. Smith;
A bill (S. 871) to correct the military record of Burton Hubbell;
A bill (S. 872) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Wallace O. Glazier; and
A bill (S. 873) to correct the military record of Clark G. Russell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 874) granting a pension to Heinery Poth (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 875) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Miel (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 876) granting a pension to Lorenzo J. McEvoy;
A bill (S. 877) granting an increase of pension to Sanford S. See (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 878) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Rogers;
A bill (S. 879) for the relief of Emma M. Gordon;
A bill (S. 880) granting an increase of pension to David A. Kooker;
A bill (S. 881) granting a pension to Nirenia S. Savage;
A bill (S. 882) granting an increase of pension to Bert E. Gray;
A bill (S. 883) granting an increase of pension to James K. Brooks;
A bill (S. 884) granting a pension to Lucy A. Palmer;
A bill (S. 885) granting a pension to Frank Fessenden;
A bill (S. 886) granting a pension to Sylvester Oatman;
A bill (S. 887) granting a pension to John M. Honeywell;
A bill (S. 888) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin McKimmy;
A bill (S. 889) granting a pension to Henry F. Baldwin;
A bill (S. 890) granting a pension to William Meyers;
A bill (S. 891) granting a pension to Joseph E. Dearborn;
A bill (S. 892) granting a pension to Arthur H. Letts;
A bill (S. 893) granting a pension to William Meyers;
A bill (S. 894) granting a pension to Nathan L. Brass; and
A bill (S. 895) granting a pension to Annie Manchester; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. NELSON:
A bill (S. 896) to prohibit intoxicating beverages and to regulate the production and use of other alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
A bill (S. 897) for the relief of the Red Wing Brewing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 898) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the University of Minnesota, at Minneapolis, Minn., a captured German supergun;
A bill (S. 899) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the municipality of Vining, in the State of Minnesota, a captured German cannon, cannon balls or shells, and a gun carriage, or a condemned United States cannon, cannon balls, or shells, and a gun carriage;
A bill (S. 900) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate captured German cannons or fieldpieces to the municipalities of Mankato, Chisholm, and Wright, in the State of Minnesota;
A bill (S. 901) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Fort Ridgely State Park, Minn., three captured German cannons or fieldpieces;
A bill (S. 902) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Waldorf, Minn., a captured German siege mortar; and
A bill (S. 903) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the municipalities of Alexandria, Crosby, Elbow Lake, Fairfax, Gibbon, Little Falls, and Wheaton, in the State of Minnesota, captured German cannons, cannon balls or shells, and gun carriages, or condemned United States cannons, cannon balls or shells, and gun carriages; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 904) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Fisheries.
A bill (S. 905) to provide for the construction of a public building at Duluth, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
A bill (S. 906) to increase the pensions of those who have lost limbs or have been totally disabled in the same in the military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. SWANSON:
A bill (S. 907) for the relief of John B. H. Waring; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 908) for the relief of the Arundel Sand and Gravel Co.; to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. WATSON:
A bill (S. 909) for the relief of Joseph Heaton; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 910) granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Wolven; and
A bill (S. 911) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Fifer; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. SHIELDS:
A bill (S. 912) to declare Nonconnah Creek, Shelby County, Tenn., navigable; to the Committee on Commerce.
A bill (S. 913) for the relief of Henry Gregg;
A bill (S. 914) for the relief of Charles M. Gourley; and
A bill (S. 915) for the relief of Barneybass Eastridge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 916) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Brewer;
A bill (S. 917) granting a pension to D. J. Owens;
A bill (S. 918) granting an increase of pension to Eugene E. Scherrer;
A bill (S. 919) granting a pension to Israel W. Bennett;
A bill (S. 920) granting an increase of pension to Jesse S. Baldwin;
A bill (S. 921) granting an increase of pension to Alexander B. Tadlock;
A bill (S. 922) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Chambers;
A bill (S. 923) granting an increase of pension to Louis M. Starring;
A bill (S. 924) granting an increase of pension to John T. Phillips;
A bill (S. 925) granting a pension to Margaret Howell Butler;
A bill (S. 926) granting a pension to Alfred C. Williams;
A bill (S. 927) granting a pension to Otto Greenlee;
A bill (S. 928) granting a pension to Minta Jones;
A bill (S. 929) granting a pension to Vian Bennett;
A bill (S. 930) granting a pension to D. J. Owens;
A bill (S. 931) granting an increase of pension to John L. Johnson;
A bill (S. 932) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Flournoy;
A bill (S. 933) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Owen Dennison;
A bill (S. 934) granting a pension to John H. Smith;
A bill (S. 935) granting a pension to John K. Miller;
A bill (S. 936) granting a pension to Zack Amis;
A bill (S. 937) granting an increase of pension to William Harris;
A bill (S. 938) granting a pension to Oscar F. Heath;
A bill (S. 939) granting a pension to G. F. Hudson;

A bill (S. 940) granting an increase of pension to Wade H. Pyle;
A bill (S. 941) granting a pension to Zania Seal Trent;
A bill (S. 942) granting a pension to James M. Gibson;
A bill (S. 943) granting an increase of pension to John B. Haley;
A bill (S. 944) granting a pension to Robert L. Zell;
A bill (S. 945) granting a pension to Fred W. McMeen;
A bill (S. 946) granting an increase of pension to John F. Haynes;
A bill (S. 947) granting a pension to Jane Roberts;
A bill (S. 948) granting an increase of pension to C. F. Boyer;
A bill (S. 949) granting a pension to William D. Davis;
A bill (S. 950) granting a pension to Tide Owens;
A bill (S. 951) granting an increase of pension to Ruth S. Gleaves;
A bill (S. 952) granting a pension to William R. Phillips;
A bill (S. 953) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Wright;
A bill (S. 954) granting an increase of pension to William R. Miller;
A bill (S. 955) granting a pension to Louisa Brown;
A bill (S. 956) granting a pension to Joseph H. Hopper;
A bill (S. 957) granting a pension to Edward B. Earl; and
A bill (S. 958) granting a pension to W. D. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 959) for the relief of Hubert Reynolds; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. ELKINS:

A bill (S. 960) making the 11th day of November in each year a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
A bill (S. 961) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hamlin, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 962) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Moorefield, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 963) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of New Cumberland, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 964) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Ripley, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 965) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Romney, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 966) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lewisburg, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 967) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Petersburg, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 968) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Glenville, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 969) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of West Union, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 970) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Clay, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 971) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Grantsville, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 972) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Sutton, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 973) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Madison, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 974) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Philippi, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 975) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wellsburg, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 976) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Fayetteville, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 977) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Charles Town, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 978) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Weston, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 979) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Point Pleasant, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 980) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Princeton, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 981) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Keyser, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 982) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Williamson, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 983) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Logan, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 984) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Elizabeth, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 985) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Pineville, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 986) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Buckhannon, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 987) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Parsons, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 988) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Beckley, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 989) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Winfield, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 990) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Marlinton, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 991) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of St. Marys, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 992) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Franklin, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 993) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Webster Springs, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 994) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wayne, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 995) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Middlebourne, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 996) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hinton, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 997) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Spencer, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 998) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Harrisville, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 999) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Summersville, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 1000) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Welch, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;
A bill (S. 1001) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Berkeley Springs, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; and
A bill (S. 1002) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Union, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 1003) for the relief of Jesse L. Clay; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A bill (S. 1004) for the relief of the owner of the steam lighter *Cornelia;*
A bill (S. 1005) for the relief of the owner of the steamship *Matoa;* and
A bill (S. 1006) for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Horatio G. Foss;* to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 1007) granting a pension to William Burton;
A bill (S. 1008) granting pensions to the surviving members of Capt. J. L. Humble's company of Indian fighters who took part in the Battle of Big Hole, Mont., in the Nez Perce War of 1877, and to the widows of members;
A bill (S. 1009) granting a pension to Kizziah Morris;
A bill (S. 1010) granting a pension to Augusta Costello;
A bill (S. 1011) granting an increase of pension to Edward Love;
A bill (S. 1012) granting an increase of pension to Hettie Fletcher;
A bill (S. 1013) granting a pension to Sophie Lizotte;
A bill (S. 1014) granting a pension to Charles B. Wemple;
A bill (S. 1015) granting an increase of pension to David W. Herriman; and

A bill (S. 1016) granting an increase of pension to John Fitzgerald; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Georgia:

A bill (S. 1017) to create a department of education, to authorize appropriations for the conduct of said department, to authorize the appropriation of money to encourage the States in the promotion and support of education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROBINSON (for Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

A bill (S. 1018) authorizing the Sioux Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STANLEY:

A bill (S. 1019) providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (S. 1020) to amend the act establishing the eastern district of Kentucky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 32) authorizing the President to extend invitations to other nations to send representatives to the world cotton conference to be held at New Orleans, La., October 13 to 16, 1919, inclusive; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. OWEN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 33) proposing a method of amending the Constitution of the United States by establishing constitutional majority rule; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE OF EDUCATION AND LABOR.

Mr. KENYON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 41), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANT CLERK.

Mr. SPENCER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 42), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Claims of the United States Senate be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk at the rate of $2,500 per annum, to be paid out of the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law.

SEARS, ROEBUCK & CO. V. FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD the decision of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit in the case of Sears, Roebuck & Co. against Federal Trade Commission. This case involves the constitutionality of some features of the Federal Trade Commission act, and I ask that the decision be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[In the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. October term, 1918, April session, 1919. No. 2659. Sears, Roebuck & Co., petitioner, *v.* Federal Trade Commission, respondent. Original petition to review order of Federal Trade Commission.]

Sidney A. Adler for petitioner, John Walsh for respondent.

Before Baker and Alschuler, circuit judges, and Carpenter, district judge.

Baker, circuit judge, delivered the opinion of the court:

This is an original petition to review an order entered by the respondent, the Federal Trade Commission, against the petitioner, Sears, Roebuck & Co., a corporation, commanding the petitioner to desist from certain unfair methods of competition in commerce. Respondent's order was based on its complaint, filed on February 26, 1918, on the petitioner's answer and on a written stipulation of facts. Procedure before the commission and also before this court on review is prescribed in section 5 of the act to create a Federal Trade Commission, approved on September 26, 1914. Respondent's authority over the subject matter of its order is derived from the following provision in the same section: "Unfair methods of competition in commerce are hereby declared unlawful." Section 4 is a dictionary of terms used in the act. "Commerce" means "interstate or foreign commerce," but the general term "unfair methods of competition" is nowhere defined specifically, nor is there a schedule of methods that shall be deemed unfair.

In its complaint respondent averred that petitioner is engaged in interstate and foreign commerce, conducting a "mail-order" business; that petitioner for more than two years last past has practiced unfair methods of competition in commerce by false and misleading advertisements and acts, designed to injure and discredit its competitors and to deceive the general public in the following ways:

1. By advertising that petitioner, because of large purchases of sugar and quick disposal of stock, is able to sell sugar at a price lower than others offering sugar for sale.

2. By advertising that petitioner is selling its sugar at a price much lower than that of its competitors, and thereby imputing to its competitors the purpose of charging more than a fair price for their sugar.

3. By selling certain of its merchandise at less than cost on the condition that the customer simultaneously purchase other merchandise at prices which give petitioner a profit on the transaction without letting the customer know the facts.

4. By advertising that the quality of merchandise sold by its competitors is inferior to that of similar merchandise sold by petitioner, and that petitioner buys certain of its merchandise in markets not accessible to its competitors and is therefore able to give better advantages in quality and price than those offered by its competitors.

Petitioner extensively circulated the following advertisements, among others:

"We can afford to give this guarantee of a 'less than wholesale price' because we are among the largest distributors of sugar wholesale or retail in the world. We sell every year 35,000,000 pounds of sugar. And, buying in such vast quantities and buying directly from the refineries, we naturally get our sugar for less money than other dealers.

"For instance, every grocer carries granulated sugar in stock, but does he tell you which kind? There are two kinds—granulated cane sugar and granulated beet sugar—and they look exactly alike. Some people prefer the one and some the other. But beet sugar usually costs less than cane sugar, so if you are getting beet sugar you should pay less for it. Do you know which kind you are getting and which you are paying for?

"Our teas have a pronounced, yet delicate, tea flavor with an appealing fragrance, because we spare neither time nor expense to get the very best the greatest tea gardens of the world can produce.

"First, because of the difficulty of getting in this country the exact character and flavor of certain teas, we do our own importing and critically test every tea. Our representative goes to the various tea-growing countries and makes the selection in person. Then the greatest care is taken to get only first-crop pickings from upland soil.

"Also, by buying direct from the tea gardens, while the crops are being harvested, we are able to have them always perfectly fresh.

"It would be natural for you to conclude that all this care in buying and selecting would make our teas very high in price, but in reality our prices are unusually low for such high quality. Here is a reason: By buying direct from the tea gardens we cut out the middleman's profit.

"Over land and sea, from the greatest coffee regions in the world, we bring you the choicest of the crop, and make it possible for you to have that fresh, savory, and fragrantly tempting cup of coffee for your breakfast. You see, we buy direct from the best plantations in the world. We get the pick of the crop—upland coffees from rich, healthy soil, and growers of unquestioned experience and skill. We buy enormous quantities and pay cash, thus making it possible to offer our customers the very best coffees at very low prices."

Petitioner's sales of sugar during the second half of 1915 amounted to $780,000, on which it lost $196,000. Petitioner used sugar as a "leader" ("You save 2 to 4 cents on every pound"), offering a limited amount at the losing price in connection with a required purchase of other commodities at prices high enough to afford a petitioner a satisfactory profit on the transaction as a whole, without letting the customer know that the sugar was being sold on any other basis than that of the other commodities. Petitioner obtained its sugar in the open market from refiners and wholesalers. Competitors got their sugar from the same sources, of the same quality and at the same price. Sugar is a staple in the market. Price concessions upon large purchases are unobtainable. From the facts respecting petitioner's methods of advertising and buying and selling sugar respondent found, and properly so, in our judgment, that petitioner intentionally injured and discredited its competitors by falsely leading the public to believe that the competitors were unfair dealers in sugar and the other commodities which petitioner was offering in connection with sugar.

Petitioner purchased 75 per cent of its teas from wholesalers and importers in the United States. The remainder it purchased through its representative Peterson in Japan; but there was no proof that Peterson made or was qualified to make "selections in person" or "first-crop pickings from upland soil." All of petitioner's coffees were purchased from wholesalers and importers in the United States. Respondent found that petitioner's advertisements of teas and coffees were false and designed to deceive the public and injure competitors.

By the order, issued on June 24, 1918, petitioner was commanded to desist from:

"(1) Circulating throughout the States and Territories of the United States and the District of Columbia catalogues containing advertisements offering for sale sugar, wherein it is falsely represented to its customers or prospective customers of said defendant or to customers of competitors, or to the public generally, or leads them to believe, that because of large purchasing power and quick-moving stock, defendant is able to sell sugar at a price lower than its competitors;

"(2) Selling or offering to sell sugar below cost through catalogues circulated throughout the States and Territories of the United States and the District of Columbia among its customers, prospective customers, and customers of its competitors;

"(3) Circulating throughout the various States and Territories of the United States and the District of Columbia, among customers, prospective customers, and customers of its competitors, catalogues containing advertisements representing that defendant's competitors do not deal justly, fairly, and honestly with their customers;

"(4) Circulating throughout the various States and Territories of the United States and the District of Columbia, among customers, prospective customers, or customers of its competitors, catalogues containing advertisements offering for sale its teas, in which said advertisements it falsely stated that the defendant sends a special representative to Japan who personally goes into the tea gardens of said country and personally supervises the picking of such teas;

"(5) Circulating through the various States and Territories of the United States and the District of Columbia, among customers, prospective customers, or customers of its competitors, catalogues containing advertisements offering for sale its coffees, in which it falsely stated that the defendant purchases all of its coffees direct from the best plantations in the world."

I. Petitioner insists that the injunctional order was improvidently issued because, before the complaint was filed and the hearing had, petitioner had discontinued the methods in question, and, as stated in its answer, had no intention of resuming them. For example, no sugar offers of the character assailed were made after August, 1917. But respondent was required to find from all the evidence before it what was the real nature of petitioner's attitude. It was permissible for respondent to take judicial notice of the Government's war-time control of sugar sales and consumption. It was also proper to note that peti-

tioner was contending (and still contends) that the act is void for indefiniteness, that the act is unconstitutional, and that the act, even if valid, under any proper construction has not been infringed by petitioner's practices. In Goshen Mfg. Co. *v.* Myers Mfg. Co. (242 U. S., 202), which was a suit for infringement of a patent, the defendant company averred and introduced evidence to prove that six months before the bill was filed, and with notice to complainant, it had sold its factory, wound up its business, and had no intention of resuming. But throughout the intervening period, and also in the answer to the bill, the defendant company was attacking the validity of the patent and the right of the complainant to compel desistance. This conduct was held to be such a continuing menace as to justify the maintenance of the bill. So, here, no assurance is in sight that petitioner, if it could shake respondent's hand from its shoulder, would not continue its former course.

II. Petitioner urges that the declaration of section 5 must be held void for indefiniteness unless the words "unfair methods of competition" be construed to embrace no more than acts which on September 26, 1914, when Congress spoke, were identifiable as acts of unfair trade then condemned by the common law as expressed in prior cases. But the phrase is no more indefinite than "due process of law." The general idea of that phrase as it appears in constitutions and statutes is quite well known; but we have never encountered what purported to be an all-embracing schedule or found a specific definition that would bar the continuing processes of judicial inclusion and exclusion based upon accumulating experience. If the expression "unfair methods of competition" is too uncertain for use, then under the same condemnation would fall the innumerable statutes which predicate rights and prohibitions upon "unsound mind," "undue influence," "unfaithfulness," "unfair use," "unfit for cultivation," "unreasonable rate," "unjust discrimination," and the like. This statute is remedial, and orders to desist are civil; but even in criminal law convictions are upheld on statutory prohibitions of "rebates or concessions" or of "schemes of defraud," without any schedule of acts or specific definition of forbidden conduct, thus leaving the courts free to condemn new and ingenious ways that were unknown when the statutes were enacted. Why? Because the general ideas of "dishonesty" and "fraud" are so well, widely, and uniformly understood that the general term "rebates or concessions" and "schemes to defraud" are sufficiently accurate measures of conduct.

On the face of this statute the legislative intent is apparent. The commissioners are not required to aver and prove that any competitor has been damaged or that any purchaser has been deceived. The commissioners, representing the Government as parens patriæ, are to exercise their common sense, as informed by their knowledge of the general idea of unfair trade at common law, and stop all those trade practices that have a capacity or a tendency to injure competitors directly or through deception of purchasers, quite irrespective of whether the specific practices in question have yet been denounced in common-law cases. But the restraining order of the commissioners is merely provisional. The trader is entitled to his day in court, and there the same principles and tests that have been applied under the common law or under statutes of the kinds hereinbefore recited are expected by Congress to control. This prima facie reading of legislative intent is confirmed by reference to committee reports and debates in Congress, wherein is disclosed a refusal to limit the commission and the courts to a prescribed list of specific acts. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 63d Cong., 2d sess., pp. 13, 18, 533, 12246.) And this interpretation is not affected by the subsequent adoption of the Clayton Act, October 15, 1914, condemning certain specific acts.

III. But such a construction of section 5, according to petitioner's urge, brings about an unconstitutional delegation of legislative and judicial power to the commission. Grants of similar authority to administrative officers and bodies have not been found repugnant to the Constitution. (Butterfield *v.* Stranahan, 192 U. S., 470; Union Bridge Co. *v.* United States, 204 U. S., 365; Pennsylvania Railroad Co. *v.* International Coal Co., 230 U. S., 184; National Pole Co. *v.* Chicago & North Western Railway Co., 211 Fed., 65.)

With the increasing complexity of human activities many situations arise where governmental control can be secured only by the "board" or "commission" form of legislation. In such instances Congress declares the public policy, fixes the general principles that are to control, and charges an administrative body with the duty of ascertaining within particular fields from time to time the facts which bring into play the principles established by Congress. Though the action of the commission in finding the facts and declaring them to be specific offenses of the character embraced within the general definition by Congress may be deemed to be quasi legislation, it is so only in the sense that it converts the actual legislation from a static into a dynamic condition. But the converter is not the electricity. And though the action of the commission in ordering desistance may be counted quasi judicial on account of its form, with respect to power it is not judicial, because a judicial determination is only that which is embodied in a judgment or decree of a court and enforceable by execution or other writ of the court.

IV. In the second paragraph of the order petitioner is commanded to cease selling sugar below cost. We find in the statute no intent on the part of Congress, even if it has the power, to restrain an owner of property from selling it at any price that is acceptable to him or from giving it away. But, manifestly, in making such a sale or gift the owner may put forward representations and commit acts which have a capacity or a tendency to injure or to discredit competitors and to deceive purchasers as to the real character of the transaction. That paragraph should therefore be modified by adding to it "by means of or in connection with the representations prohibited in the first paragraph of this order, or similar representation."

Sufficient appears in this record and in the presentation of the case to warrant us in expressing the belief that petitioner's business standards were at least as high as those generally prevailing in the commercial world at the times in question, and that the action of the commission is to be taken rather as a general illustration of the better methods required for the future than a specific selection of petitioner of reproof on account of its conduct in the past.

Respondent is directed to modify its order as above stated, and in other respects the petition is denied.

By Alschuler, Cir. J.:

In my judgment the order of the commission should be further modified by striking out the third paragraph, which relates to alleged representation that petitioner's competitors do not deal fairly and honestly with their customers. In so far as the sugar, coffee, and tea advertisements ascribe petitioner's asserted lower prices and superior qualities to quantity purchases and special facilities and advantages for inspection, selection, and purchasing, they would tend to negative any imputation upon competitors of unfair dealing with their patrons. I believe the charge of imputing to competitors unfair dealing with their patrons rests wholly on petitioner's so-called "caveat emptor" advertisement in its catalogue of March and April, 1916, wherein the public is cautioned in regard to white sugar, stating that some is cane and some beet sugar, alike in appearance, but the former usually higher in price; that petitioner plainly designates which of the two it offers, and the query is suggested, where else are goods so plainly described, and whether the customer gets elsewhere what he thinks he is buying. It seems to me that this does not amount to more than a statement or boast that petitioner, without being asked, describes the white sugars it proposes to sell, and the intimation is carried that competitors do not volunteer such description, but it is not suggested that they actually misrepresent the truth.

The facts before the commission appear by stipulation, and those concerning this advertisement, aside from the advertisement itself, are as follows:

"When Mr. A. M. Daly, the attorney in charge of the investigation in these proceedings, was in Chicago in March, 1916, he submitted to Mr. A. V. H. Mory, chief chemist of Sears, Roebuck & Co., and Mr. Joseph Scott, manager of the grocery department, a copy of the advertisement entitled 'Caveat Emptor,' hereinbefore mentioned, and hereto attached, and requested them to state their views as to this particular advertisement and what it meant. They stated that this advertisement was for the purpose of calling attention to the distinction between beet sugar and cane sugar and laying stress upon the point of the facilities that Sears, Roebuck & Co. have for marking everything plainly so that the customer would know better from description the exact nature of what he was buying. After this explanation Mr. Daly went to his hotel. In a short time Mr. Mory called on him there and stated in substance that he had submitted the above-mentioned advertisement to Mr. A. H. Loeb, the vice president of Sears, Roebuck & Co., and that Mr. Loeb said that this course of advertising was unfair and unjust and declared that it must be discontinued, and further that it was against the policy of the house to send out such advertisements. Thereupon, on March 28, 1916, Mr. A. V. H. Mory, chief chemist, wrote to the commission in part as follows: 'The young man who wrote this was in to-day and I pointed out to him wherein he had made a mistake and acted against house policy. He promised to use the soft pedal on all references to the dealer in the future. He tells me that this is an angle that had not occurred to him. He had not thought of the write-up in the light of a criticism of the dealer, so intent was he on pointing out that with our system of marking everything plainly and our facilities for knowing what we are selling the customer would know better from our description the exact nature of what he was buying in the case of those things difficult to judge than if he had them placed before him—which, of course, is true.'"

But assuming, as did petitioner's vice president, that this advertisement does carry the imputation that competitors deal unfairly with their customers, under the circumstances indicated by the quotation ought this advertisement to be the basis of a finding and order? The publication was in the catalogue for March and April, 1916. The complaint was filed nearly two years afterwards. The act authorizes the commission to proceed when it shall have reason to believe that unfair methods of competition are or have been used, "and if it shall appear to the commission that a proceeding by it in respect thereof would be of interest to the public." In a monitory proceeding such as this seems to be, it could hardly be said that it would be "of interest to the public" to predicate action on a transgression for which due amends had long before been made without remotest cause to believe there would be a repetition. To revive a stale advertisement of this nature which the advertiser immediately after the publication distinctly disavowed as having been unintentionally and inadvertently unfair to competitors, and ordered discontinued, without directly or indirectly repeating or renewing it for so long an interval, far from subserving the public interest, might, in my judgment, have the contrary tendency of raising an imputation of oppressive or, at least, uncalled-for action in predicating any proceeding or order on this advertisement.

Nor am I impressed with the authoritative relevancy here of decisions respecting injunctions. In a proceeding such as this, neither remedial nor punitive, decisions of courts respecting injunctional relief in equity are not more analogous than are common-law decisions defining unfair trade practices, arising out of controversies between individuals, as fixing thereby the limitation of the commission's authority of scope.

The suggested modification would necessitate corresponding modification of the commission's findings of facts, eliminating paragraphs numbered 4 and 5 thereof. Paragraphs 2, 6, and 7 (as well as paragraphs 4 and 5) of the findings state the circulation of the several advertisements to have been in each case for "more than two years last past," indicating thereby the two years next before the date of the findings which is June 24, 1918. This is in contravention of the stipulated fact that none of the advertisements were more recent than August, 1917, some of them even antedating the passage, September 24, 1914, of the Trade Commission Act itself. These findings should, in my judgment, be modified to comply with the stipulated fact.

THE CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That an edition of the Congressional Directory for the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress be prepared and published, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, as provided for in section 73 of the printing act approved January 12, 1895, and that the sum of $800 be paid for preparing, compiling, and indexing said edition, one-half of the said sum to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 2480. An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I had intended, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, to ask for an executive session at this time, but it is now so late that I shall not seek to detain the Senate longer. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, May 29, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *May 28, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We lift up our hearts in gratitude to Thee, our Father in heaven, for a Government of the people, by the people, for the people, which affords to the world the greatest example of civil, political, and religious liberty. To think, to do, to dare, to achieve is Americanism.

The flight from America to Europe across the sea in an airplane of American invention, American construction, manned by Americans, is the highest example of American liberty and daring.

We thank Thee for the brave and successful men whose names will live in history so long as history shall be read; and the name of Read will live in the hearts of true men; and glory, and honor, and praise be Thine, for him and all who have added to the glory of mankind. In His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON WATER POWER.

The SPEAKER. A few days ago the Chair, in appointing the Committee on Water Power, named Members by committees inadvertently, instead of following the order of the last Congress. The Chair would ask the consent of the House to change the order in which the names appear on the list of committees. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with to-day. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO COMMITTEES TO SIT DURING SESSIONS.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I ask unanimous consent that that committee may sit during the sessions of the House during this current session of Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be allowed to sit during the sessions of the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Insular Affairs be allowed to hold sittings during the sessions of the House during the present session.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Insular Affairs be allowed to sit during the sessions of the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3157, the Agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. MADDEN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3157, a bill making appropriations for the Agricultural Department, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read the paragraph, under "Bureau of Animal Industry," beginning on page 19, line 9, down to and including line 3 on page 21.

The CHAIRMAN. On page 20, line 23, appear the words "at $48 each." I assume that it should be "$480." Unless there is objection, the Clerk will be authorized to correct it.

Mr. HAUGEN. That is an error in printing.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation of diseases of orchard and other fruits, $75,935: *Provided*, That $8,000 of said amount shall be available for the investigation of diseases of the pecan.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the chairman of the committee if good results have followed from the investigation of diseases of orchards and other fruit trees? In my State of Pennsylvania nearly all of the apple trees are dead and most all of the pear trees. Although the Government has been investigating along this line for a number of years, if it obtained no greater value in a general way than it has in our State it seems to me that the $75,000 expended heretofore has given no value in return.

Mr. HAUGEN. The appropriation is not large. We have a good many orchards in this country. According to the department's statement, a vigorous campaign is being conducted. The field is large, and if we accept the department's report very effective work is being accomplished.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. What can be accomplished in a country where there are as many orchards as there are in the United States with the small sum of $75,000? Is not most of that expended without real results? How can anything substantial be expected?

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman is aware of the fact that we have many projects, and if it is found necessary to spend more money for one project than is carried in this bill transfers may be made from other bureaus. The department is given considerable latitude in making transfers. The department has many projects of great importance. All the committee can do is to accept the statements of the department and give consideration to those projects that seem to be the most meritorious. The report is the best judgment of the committee in making appropriations for the various projects.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I appreciate all that the chairman has said, but does not the chairman think that at times the appropriations allowed are really too small to give effective value to the amounts invested, so that in some cases they are practically wasted?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes. I agree with the gentleman as to that. I believe that in many instances the appropriations are not adequate, and in other instances they are probably too large. But this is the judgment of the committee, and I can freely say that I believe this is one of the best bills that has ever been reported by the Committee on Agriculture. It was carefully considered and every item scrutinized most carefully; and, as I said, this is the judgment of the committee. If later on new projects and supplemental estimates should be submitted, more consideration will probably be given than has been done this time by the committee. But owing to the limited time at our disposal it was thought best to report this bill on the information we had and with the consideration we could give to it in the limited time allowed.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For conducting such investigations of the nature and means of communication of the disease of citrus trees, known as citrus canker, and for applying such methods of eradication or control of the disease as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture may be necessary, including the payment of such expenses and the employment of such persons and means, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and cooperation with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations of growers, or individuals, as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purposes, $196,320, and, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, no expenditures shall be made for these purposes until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by State, county, or local authorities, or by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of such

purposes: *Provided*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I move to strike out the last word. I am in hearty sympathy with the efforts to investigate the nature of the disease of citrus trees. It is a good work, and if there is a necessity for it, it ought to be continued; but in order to illustrate one or two points under this heading I want to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture if he knows how many men are employed under this appropriation of $196,320?

Mr. HAUGEN. I can give the number by referring to the Book of Estimates.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, it is utterly impossible to hear a single word that is said over on the other side, and I move that each of the gentlemen over there be given a megaphone. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hopes that gentlemen will speak loudly enough so that they may be heard, and that those who do not desire to be heard will preserve order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. While the chairman of the committee is searching for the figures——

Mr. HAUGEN. I will say to the gentleman that a large number of people are being employed, many of them temporarily. Of course, there are a number of them who are carried on the annual roll.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman says a large number. One hundred and ninety-six thousand dollars is a fairly large sum of money. How many people are employed?

Mr. HAUGEN. The estimates for 1920 give the number as 138 persons. A number of them do other work in addition to this.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Are they employed in Washington?

Mr. HAUGEN. No; not altogether.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It provides here for their employment in the city of Washington and elsewhere. I want to know about how many of them are located in Washington. The investigation of the diseases of citrus trees is a business that I assume should be carried on very largely in the Southern States, particularly in Florida, where an epidemic may sometimes sweep over an orchard of grapefruit trees or orange trees.

Mr. HAUGEN. As the gentleman probably recalls, this is practically a new item. I think it has been carried in the bill for about two years. At one time it amounted to $250,000. It is now proposed to decrease the amount by $54,000. It is believed by the department that the work will be completed at an early date.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, my information is that the work of investigation of citrus-tree disease has been carried on very successfully, largely with the cooperation of the orchardists in Florida and the people of that State. I believe it to be a very good thing; but since $250,000 was appropriated in the beginning and $196,000 is asked for here, it has seemed to me pertinent to inquire whether we were really in need of the $196,000 to keep this work going. Our latest information from the citrus-fruit country is that the disease has been fairly well stamped out. I know that to be the case with respect to the chestnut blight, because it has swept over the State of Pennsylvania and practically destroyed the trees, and we have none left.

Mr. LEVER. The information before the committee at the last session was to the effect that the disease of citrus trees was practically stamped out in Florida, and that the only serious outbreak of it now is in the Rio Grande Valley in Texas. I think it is expected that within the next two years the citrus canker will be completely eradicated from this country.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I see several Members from the State of Florida present, and if my statement is not correct they can correct me, but I understand that the citrus canker has been eradicated; therefore I question whether this appropriation of $196,000 is necessary.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation of diseases of forest and ornamental trees and shrubs, including a study of the nature and habits of the parasitic fungi causing the chestnut-tree bark disease, the white-pine blister rust, and other epidemic tree diseases, for the purpose of discovering new methods of control and applying methods of eradication or control already discovered, $82,315.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of continuing the discussion of the appropriations for the investigation of tree diseases. We have come now to the appropriation for the investigation of the chestnut blight. We are still appropriating $82,000 for that purpose. When this epidemic struck the country we called it the chestnut blight. I see it is called here the chestnut-tree bark disease, and added to it is the white-pine blister rust and other epidemic tree diseases. Of course the language of this paragraph would enable the department to spend this $82,000 without touching the chestnut-tree blight at all. I observed a minute ago that it seemed worthy of explanation at least that we should provide an appropriation of $196,000 for the investigation of citrus-tree disease, when it is generally admitted that the citrus-tree disease has been practically stamped out. Why continue the whole establishment?

We come now to the chestnut blight, which, so far as the State of Pennsylvania is concerned, is over. The chestnut trees have been wiped out by the blight. It is substantially the same in New Jersey. I do not believe there are any chestnut trees left in New York. I understand the disease has swept Ohio. It has gone down into the Virginias, and I presume is practically over there, but still we are appropriating $82,000. When the disease was at its height the State of Pennsylvania made a very large appropriation to be used in cooperation with an appropriation made by the Federal Government to stamp out the disease. Whether we stamped it out or not I do not know. It ran its full course. Nature seems to have stamped it out, although we spent the money. If the chestnut-tree blight has passed away and gone into the great beyond, I ask the chairman of the committee why we should maintain an institution to continue to combat it.

Mr. HAUGEN. I will quote the statement of Dr. Taylor of the Department of Agriculture on that subject:

Have you given up all hope of its eradication?
Dr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir; of its eradication. We have not for two years past been doing any eradication work.

That is the statement of the chief of the bureau. However, I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that this small appropriation should be continued for the purpose of endeavoring to prevent the spread of the various tree diseases which are mentioned in the paragraph.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, here we have another specimen of the economy practiced by the department. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture quotes from a high authority in the Department of Agriculture, who states emphatically that they have lost all hope of eradicating this disease; that it is all over, and yet we continue to appropriate $82,000. Now, why do we do it? Are we doing it in order that the Secretary of Agriculture, through the influence of bureau chiefs under his direction who want additional clerks, shall be able to continue to draw on this $82,000? I want the new Members of Congress to understand how this thing is done. Here are two cases where we apparently do not need the money, but we are still appropriating for citrus fruit when we are told that the citrus-tree disease has passed by. We are appropriating for the chestnut blight when the department tells us that the chestnut blight is no longer being investigated by the Agricultural Department. Here is $196,000 appropriated in one instance and in another $184,000. They are laid aside so that the Agricultural Department can ultimately make transfers for salaries and increase them without coming to Congress.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman wants to be fair to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent for one minute more, as the gentleman suggests I am not fair.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. I say, the gentleman wants to be fair. His question is directed to the white-pine blister item. If he will read the paragraph he will find that the purpose of the investigation is along various lines, including ornamental trees, shrubs, and so forth.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is true, and I stated it in the beginning; that the paragraph was made broad, so if there was no chestnut blight it could be used for other purposes. That is the clever thing in constructing a paragraph, and I want gentlemen of the House to know that there are more ways than one to lay money aside, so that when it becomes necessary the Secretary can use the money as he sees fit.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Iowa a question. My curiosity was aroused by the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]. Is it a fact that the officials in the Department of Agriculture can take an $82,000 appropriation, or any part of it, and divert it to the payment of salaries for clerks in other departments?

Mr. HAUGEN. There is a provision under the law authorizing the transfer from one appropriation to another in the case

of emergency. I think that rule applies to all departments, and I think it a wise provision.

Mr. CANDLER. Under the law as it exists to-day no such diversion of funds can be made. The gentleman from Pennsylvania must know that. There is no provision in the bill anywhere, or in any other bill relating to the Agricultural Department, permitting the Secretary to divert a fund, and if it was in the bill he would not do it except in justifiable cases. The Secretary of Agriculture has never been guilty of any such thing as that and never will be.

Mr. McKENZIE. I want to say that, in my judgment, it would be a most dangerous practice. Now, I want to ask the gentleman from Mississippi whether or not it has been the practice of the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer a clerk from one department to another in the service?

Mr. CANDLER. Sometimes it becomes necessary, but there has never been a transfer of a clerk from one division to another, or from one department to another, unless report was made of it and it appeared in the bill.

Mr. McKENZIE. Let me ask the gentleman has it been the practice to transfer clerks from a lower salary in one department to another and higher salary in another department without authority of law?

Mr. CANDLER. There has never been a case of that kind without authority of law. It has been done within the provision of the law, report being made to the committee and the committee report to the House.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does the gentleman think the provision of law ought to be amended, if it is within the provision of the law?

Mr. CANDLER. No; there is no provision of law applying to the Agricultural Department in that respect that does not apply to every other department of the Government. I have been one of those who has contended that the Agricultural Department at least, making appropriations for the farmers of this country, should receive equal consideration with any other department of the Government.

Mr. McKENZIE. Suppose, under the law, it is provided that in a certain department there shall be 100 clerks. Does the gentleman presume to say that the Secretary of Agriculture could transfer 50 additional clerks to that department?

Mr. CANDLER. He could not, if it was limited to 100.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is there anything to prevent him from doing so?

Mr. CANDLER. Does the gentleman think that the Secretary of Agriculture, who represents a great department of the United States, would be guilty of any such thing as that? If the gentleman wants to put him in that attitude, he can do it; but I am not going to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For applying such methods of eradication or control of the white-pine blister rust as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture may be necessary, including the payment of such expenses and the employment of such persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, in cooperation with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations, or individuals as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purposes, $220,728, and in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture no expenditures shall be made for these purposes until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by State, county, or local authorities, or by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of such purposes: *Provided*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of taking up the discussion with my friend from Mississippi that he had with the gentleman from Illinois. The gentleman may recall that yesterday a point of order was raised against an increase of salary, and the Chair ruled against the point of order on the ground that the Secretary of Agriculture had statutory law justifying him in making the increase, something that is not done in any other department. No other Secretary of the Government has the right to do what the Secretary of Agriculture has the right to do in this relation.

Mr. CANDLER. The change the gentleman refers to was an increase of salary. The Chair held that it was proper, and if the gentleman has any controversy it is with the Chair and not with the gentleman from Mississippi. In addition, I want to call attention to the fact that no transfer asked about by the gentleman from Illinois can be made from one department to another without the consent of the Secretaries of both departments.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Exactly, and the gentleman from Illinois was talking about the bureaus in the Department of Agriculture while the gentleman from Mississippi was talking about departments in the President's Cabinet. That is where the gentleman was very clever in his answer to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE], and the gentleman is mightily clever in defending the Agricultural bill, but he does not quite get away with it on that point.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] used the identical expressions that the "gentleman from Mississippi" adopted. He was talking about transfers from the departments, as I understood it, and I responded to the question that he asked. A request for transfer from one department to another must originate in one department and be approved by the other, and then it must not be at a higher salary.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Of course, everybody will concede that.

Mr. CANDLER. It must be approved by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used three minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then I must decline to yield further. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] is clever, and he has given the impression that a clerk can not be taken from one department by another without the consent of the Secretary or a joint arrangement between the two Secretaries. Of course that, however, is not the question in issue at all. The question is, Can the Secretary of Agriculture alone take from one bureau in his department a clerk and transfer him to another bureau at a higher salary? I say that he has been doing that very thing. The gentleman said that it had not been done. He answered the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] in that way. There are enough of us here to-day who were here yesterday to remember that we had before us this very question in the transfer of two law clerks, who were receiving $1,600 each, and the creation for their benefit, apparently, of two positions as attorneys, one at $3,500 and the other at $3,250, showing that without coming to Congress at all the Secretary of Agriculture had utilized funds that had been granted him in a lump sum to transfer and to raise the salaries of two clerks.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman can not becloud the situation by invoking the civil-service law, which holds as between the Secretary of one department and the Secretary of another. That is not the point.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. CANDLER. If that occurred, it was not the fault of the Secretary of Agriculture or of the Department of Agriculture, but it was done under the law enacted and authorized by Congress, of which the gentleman is a very active Member. He is in the habit of looking after things of that kind.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman comes around now and admits everything but pleads and extenuates.

Mr. CANDLER. Oh, no; I do not admit everything. It may be true that a man was transferred from a statutory roll to the lump sum; but that was never done unless that man was required to do more extensive service and assume greater responsibilities than he had had before, and then it was never done by the Department of Agriculture or by the Secretary unless a report was made to the committee and the committee reported it to Congress, so it comes back to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and all of us at last.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And everything said on this side is now admitted on the other side.

Mr. CANDLER. Oh, no; we do not admit everything. There seems to be a material difference between us.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GREEN of Iowa: Page 23, lines 8 and 9, after the word "and," in line 8, strike out the words "in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, it will be observed that under the provisions of this paragraph as it now stands the Secretary of Agriculture can require one community to contribute for the purpose of eradicating this white-pine blister rust if they want anything done in relation to it, while other communities may be exempt from contributing. This is manifestly unfair. Moreover, I think all these communities ought to contribute if they want money expended for this purpose, because the benefit is largely a local one. It does not result to the benefit of the whole country. I do not care to make any further statement, but I think this provision giving the Secretary power to discriminate as between different localities should be eliminated from this paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I trust this amendment will not prevail. If the gentleman will take the time to run through similar items to this, he will find this exact language in practically every one of them. In some States it is almost impossible to get the cooperation of the people of which the gentleman speaks, and for which we have always contended, but in ninety-nine out of a hundred cases you will find there is the strictest cooperation, and that the States usually are putting more money into these activities than the Federal Government.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Why should not those other communities contribute if they want this work to go on?

Mr. LEVER. Let me illustrate. Take the white-pine blister rust. It is confined largely at this time to the New England States, but it threatens to spread farther west, and if it ever gets a good foothold it will practically destroy the lumber industry of this country. Let us say that there is a small area in the State of Iowa, and that the danger of it is not well known to the people of Iowa.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I would say that it would be a small area, as we have not any white pine there.

Mr. LEVER. I am trying to illustrate and do not claim to be accurate in my statement. The Federal Government comes along with $5,000 and puts on an educational campaign, arouses the people to the danger of this disease, and then your State legislature will come along at its next session and make an appropriation large enough to meet the funds of the department. That is all there is to it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think all of the communities should be put upon the same basis.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will pass. It proposes to remove the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to these appropriations. I do not wonder that the gentleman from South Carolina has risen to defend the paragraph as written or that he is opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Throughout the brilliant administration of the gentleman from South Carolina as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture the power of the Secretary of Agriculture was enormously increased. There was no time that the gentleman from South Carolina did not approve the extension of the power of the Secretary of Agriculture. I would not say it was done for any political purpose, because that might not be true; but it was an unusual power given to one man to send his representatives and agents into every section of the country to argue with the people, sometimes not to speak on questions of farming, but to tell them certain "policies" were correct. I think there are Members upon the floor who will recall that in their districts they have sometimes had to contend not upon farming questions but upon questions of economics with some gentleman sent out under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BAER. If the gentleman will permit, I desire to say that there is one unusual Secretary of Agriculture who came out to the State to talk about the league of nations and honor for the President, if I may still be permitted to call him President.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I remember one I met in the State of Maine when discussing the potato wart up there, who was very strong for the President politically. Now, that kind of agricultural expert I am not in favor of increasing. He should stick to his business.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman should first address the Chair and then ask the gentleman to yield——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thank the Chair for calling attention to the rule, which is a good one. I can not yield to the gentleman just now. I want to have the attention of the gentleman from South Carolina. The gentleman from South Carolina knows these things very well, and it is hardly worth while to tell him, but I want his attention. He, of course, does not want the discretion of the Secretary removed, as proposed by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN]. While he was still chairman of the committee he tucked into this bill, on page 90—and I ask the new Members to look at page 90 of the bill, in line 19—he tucked safely away back toward the end of the bill, while it was being rushed and pushed through toward the end of the session, this very interesting paragraph:

And not to exceed 10 per cent of the foregoing amounts for the miscellaneous expenses of the work of any bureau, division, or office herein provided for shall be available interchangeably for expenditures on the objects included within the general expenses of such bureau, division, or office, but no more than 10 per cent shall be added to any one item of appropriation except in cases of extraordinary emergency, and then only upon the written order of the Secretary of Agriculture.

So that if we give citrus fruits $150,000 and they do not want it the Secretary of Agriculture can divert it. The gentleman stated it could not be done by law, but he proposes to do it here by law. He can divert it over to the pine-tree blister rust if he so chooses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Well, that is enough, I guess.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa. Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania I do not think is intentionally trying to mislead newer Members of the House. I have made up my mind during the night that the gentleman is ignorantly doing it. He simply does not know any better. He has referred to the proposition on page 90 of this bill, the 10 per cent provision. If the gentleman in charge of the bill, the distinguished chairman of the committee, will not assure the new Members of the House that that provision has been in this bill for 15 years both under Republican and Democratic administrations, then I will resign my seat right now, but the gentleman from Pennsylvania tried to prejudice the newer Members of the House against me and undertakes to say I slipped it in.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The distinguished gentleman.

Mr. LEVER. Now, seriously, in reference to the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa. If you will take the page just passed over, page 22, you will find exactly the same language in there. You will find it in all of these larger appropriations, precisely the same language; and it was put in there after very careful consideration both by the department and by the committee and the House itself. This is not a new provision at all, and the Secretary ought to have the discretion in an emergency to go into a State, whether that State is making an appropriation or not. Of course, I take the position the gentleman takes that after the legislature of the State has met and the matter has been called to its attention, and the State then refuses to cooperate, I would doubt the wisdom of the department going in with its Federal funds, although there might be very good reason for doing so. The white-pine blister rust is not a local proposition by any means. It is a national problem, just as the lumber industry is a national problem, and if the Federal Government is to tie its hands because some foolish State refuses to act, and the white-pine blister rust is allowed to spread all over the country just like the foot-and-mouth disease, I think it is the duty of the Federal Government, in the interest of the industry and in the interest of the people of the country, to deal with the problem from a national point of view and furnish the funds. That is all there is in this proposition.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Does the gentleman think this 10 per cent provision is a wise measure in the interest of economy?

Mr. LEVER. I do; yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman please state to the House some specific illustrations of its value?

Mr. LEVER. Well, now let me tell the gentleman what that provision means. These lump-sum items, most of them, are more or less small. An emergency takes place. The Department of Agriculture has not funds during the absence of Congress. It ought to have a small leeway, by which it might transfer 10 per cent of the funds in order to take care of the emergency. That is the purpose of this.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. There is a specific statute which says the appropriations herein made, covering all, shall be used exclusively for the purposes for which they are set apart.

Mr. LEVER. That is true.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. That is a fundamental law in the accounting system of the Government.

Mr. LEVER. Absolutely.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Now, do you propose by this 10 per cent provision to repeal that general statute in favor of one department?

Mr. LEVER. As it affects the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. You propose, when the Secretary of Agriculture is short in one appropriation for a specific purpose by $10,000, and there is $10,000 remaining in another appropriation, he can go on and turn it over and double up on the appropriation that has been exhausted?

Mr. LEVER. To the extent of 10 per cent; yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Right there is the foundation of some of the worst practices known in the expenditure of public money.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman may be right about that. I can say this, however, that this provision has been in this bill for 15 years to my certain knowledge.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, may I be permitted to say that I am not discussing this with reference to its party origin. I recognize the brilliancy of both of these missionaries, one from South Carolina and the other from Pennsylvania, but when we strike at that fundamental law in the handling of the appropriations of the Congress of the United States you might just as well repeal the statute which says that the appropriations shall be used for the purposes for which Congress sets them apart.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BAER. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 39, noes 65.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation of diseases of cotton, potatoes, truck crops, forage crops, drug and related plants, $87,800.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following as a new paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAKER: Page 23, between lines 18 and 19, add as a new paragraph the following:

"For the investigation, improvement, encouragement, and determination of adaptability to different soils and climatic conditions of pecans, black walnuts, and other nuts, and for methods of growing, harvesting, packing, and shipping of the same, $39,000."

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. RAKER. After the matter is presented I hope the gentleman will withdraw his point of order that this may go into the bill. The bill (H. R. 15018) that passed the House and Senate and went to conference contained this same provision, which is found on page 28, lines 5 to 9. Of course, the Agricultural Committee was anxious to get the matter back before the House. So their haste was commendable in order to get the appropriation through. But I want to call the attention of the committee to this fact, that it is an important investigation that ought to be carried on. I have a letter from the secretary of the California Almond Growers' Exchange, with whom I have been in correspondence a couple of years on his and kindred subjects relating to almonds, as it is an important industry, and he writes as follows:

CALIFORNIA ALMOND GROWERS' EXCHANGE,
San Francisco, Calif., May 22, 1919.

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I take the liberty of inclosing herewith a copy of letter of May 12 from Hon. D. F. Houston, Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, Washington.

This letter is self-explanatory.

It is the earnest hope of the 2,500 almond growers, members of our exchange, that the next Congress will see its way clear to make an appropriation of not less than $39,000 for the purpose of investigation, improvement, encouragement, and determination of the adaptability to different soils and climatic conditions of pecans, black walnuts, and other nuts and for methods of growing, harvesting, packing, and shipping of the same.

Your support in our behalf will be greatly appreciated.

Yours, sincerely,

T. C. TUCKER, *Secretary.*

Now, I desire to read to the committee the letter written by Mr. Houston, the Secretary of Agriculture, to Mr. Tucker, of date of May 12, 1919, which reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, May 12, 1919.

Mr. T. C. TUCKER,
Manager California Almond Growers' Exchange,
311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR SIR: I have your letter of April 19 inclosing a resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the California Almond Growers' Exchange April 11, 1919, urging that, in view of the commercial importance of almond and walnut production, this department undertake the investigation of the culture of these and other nuts, with particular reference to the determination of the varieties which are best suited to propagation for commercial needs.

The statement in the resolution that "Congress has from time to time appropriated various sums of money for pecan investigation" is substantially correct, and the estimates for appropriations for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1919, provided for a continuation of the existing appropriation of $9,000 for investigational work relating to pecan culture, varieties, etc.

The importance of making provision for somewhat similar work with respect to the almond, walnut, and other nuts, which are adapted to various portions of the country, has for some time been appreciated by the department, but in view of the necessity for economy in expenditures during the emergency, it did not seem desirable to recommend a specific appropriation therefor. In the agriculture bill, which was pending at the close of the session of the last Congress, however, a provision, not included in the department's estimate, was incorporated by the Senate Committee on Agriculture "for the investigation, improvement, encouragement, and determination of the adaptability to different soils and climatic conditions of pecans, black walnuts, and other nuts, and for methods of growing, harvesting, packing, and shipping of the same, $39,000."

The effect of this provision, if enacted by Congress, would be to enlarge the department investigations relating to nut culture by the appropriation of an additional $30,000, and to specifically provide for the study of other nuts than the pecan. If this provision is included in the appropriation act for the next fiscal year, which will be considered at the special session of Congress, the department can undoubtedly render important and useful service to the farmers and commercial nut growers of the country, not only with respect to those species of nut-bearing trees like the almond, Persian walnut, and pecan, which have already attained commercial importance, but also with respect to such nuts as the black walnut, shagbark, shellbark, and pignut hickories; the butternut; the hazel; and the filbert. It is a question for the Congress to determine whether, in the light of the financial situation confronting the Nation, the additional appropriation should be made at this time. If the requisite funds are provided, the department will be glad, of course, to undertake the work.

Very truly, yours,

D. F. HOUSTON,
Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California requests five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAKER. Now, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I will.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to ask the gentleman from California if he does not think the proviso beginning on page 27 would furnish the necessary authority?

Mr. RAKER. In what line, if the gentleman will yield?

Mr. WALSH. The proviso at the bottom of page 27, line 25.

Mr. RAKER. Nine thousand dollars of this amount.

Mr. WALSH. Will it not do the work which the gentleman's correspondent is seeking to have undertaken?

Mr. RAKER. Well, it just catches the pecan, but it does not affect the almonds, nor does it affect the other nuts that are referred to in this amendment. You see that the bill has carried this $9,000 on pecans, but no provision has been made in the bill relating to the other.

Mr. WALSH. Would it not be just as well to include those in that proviso—the other nuts that the gentleman is interested in?

Mr. RAKER. It would cover the same point; yes. With an additional appropriation of $30,000 it would be all right.

Mr. WALSH. I assume they are California nuts, largely.

Mr. RAKER. Well, they grow out there; but they grow them all over the United States, and we want to assist this industry whenever we can. Of course, it is not a local matter with me at all, but it affects the entire United States. What helps the second district and California will have my support. Whatever helps the whole Nation will always have my assistance and support. In this instance it is good, because it comes from California.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Are nuts any more indigenous to California than they are to Massachusetts. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAKER. There are some kinds of nuts that are more indigenous to Massachusetts than California, but both States grow good ones, and some of them are pretty hard to crack. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. All those that I have seen from California are pretty good nuts; that is true. [Laughter.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. RAKER. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I would like to ask the gentleman from California whether the Agricultural Committee has had an opportunity to consider this nut amendment?

Mr. RAKER. As I stated before, they introduced the bill at the beginning of the session, and of course they could not have hearings, so they eliminated certain matters that were in conference before.

So I imagine that they have not given it the full consideration that they would like to give it. It is so plain and so just, however, that the mere calling of it to the attention of the committee, I believe, will be sufficient. I feel confident that the chairman of the committee will agree to its adoption.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is the gentleman sure that he has not left out some nut in this amendment?

Mr. RAKER. I do not include some people. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask whether this nut-growing organization in California, the Almond Growers' Association, or whatever its technical name is, has been making

independent observations itself concerning the character of ground adapted to the production of nuts?

Mr. RAKER. I would say that this organization has been doing a wonderful work. They have added a product to this country that will add much to its material wealth. I am satisfied that there are many hundreds of thousands of acres of land where these nuts can be grown to advantage, along the roads and at other places, that would add much to the beauty of the highways and add to our forests and give us hardwoods that are valuable, as well as an article of food in the shape of almonds and walnuts and butternuts and other nuts enumerated here, which would add materially to the wealth of this country. When we have the land ready and have the people ready and willing to spend their money with the assistance of this great Department of Agriculture, we ought to encourage them. They are spending their own money and extending their work as far as they can, but they believe the Government should assist with its wonderful organization in helping to carry out the work of their organization, just as is done with respect to many other organizations and many varied activities, from potatoes to cotton.

Mr. GARD. Is this organization of great financial strength—the California Almond Growers' Association?

Mr. RAKER. I would not say "great." I suppose they have finances sufficient to carry on their own business.

Mr. GARD. Do they desire to be relieved of investigations on their own account, or do they just desire to benefit the public?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, may I have one minute more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Their desire is to assist all those who are interested in the matter, as well as the public generally. It is not selfish, but it is for the benefit and advancement of this great industry, so that we may get the best results that can be had, as in the case of other operations carried in this bill to the same degree and for the same general purposes, and such as have been carried in the bill in the past, making investigations for the purpose of advancing our agricultural productivity.

Mr. GARD. Does the appropriation have the approval of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN]?

Mr. RAKER. Unfortunately I was so busy to-day that I could not see him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, although the amendment has merit, nevertheless I think the gentleman will agree with the committee that it should be given consideration only in connection with many other important items, and as that can not be done at the present time I feel compelled to insist upon the point of order.

Mr. GARD. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa insist upon the point of order?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to disagree with my friend from Iowa, but in the interest of future items I think the Chair is entirely wrong if he is about to hold this amendment out of order. I do not have the language before me, but the fundamental act creating the Department of Agriculture is very broad in its provisions, and very many rulings have been had, as the parliamentarian at the desk knows, holding a provision of this kind to be in order.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the point of order and ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for the privilege of revising and extending my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For acclimatization and adaptation investigations of cotton, corn, and other crops introduced from tropical regions, and for the improvement of cotton and other fiber plants by cultural methods, breeding, and selection, and for determining the feasibility of increasing the production of hard fibers outside of the continental United States, $104,410: *Provided*, That not less than $7,500 of this sum may be used for experiments in cotton seed interbreeding: *Provided further*, That of this amount $3,000 may be used for experiments in the production of New Zealand flax in the United States and for its utilization in the manufacture of binder twine.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAUGEN: Page 24, line 14, strike out the word "less" and insert the word "more."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Th Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation and improvement of cereals and methods of cereal production, and the study of cereal diseases, and for the investigation of the cultivation and breeding of flax for seed purposes, including a study of flax diseases, and for the investigation and improvement of broom corn and methods of broom-corn production, $432,505: *Provided*, That $40,000 shall be set aside for the study of corn improvement and methods of corn production: *Provided also*, That $100,000 shall be set aside for the investigation and control of the diseases of wheat, oats, and barley known as black rust and stripe rust: *Provided also*, That $150,000 shall be set aside for the destruction of vegetation from which such rust spores originate: *Provided also*, That $25,000 shall be set aside for the investigation of corn root and stalk diseases and for the inauguration of such control measures as may be found necessary.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAUGEN: Page 25, line 20, strike out "$432,505" and insert "$452,505."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. I do not know whether I am in favor of this amendment or not, but I assume that the gentleman from Iowa is going to make some explanation of it. I would like to hear it.

Mr. HAUGEN. This is offered in order to include $20,000 for an investigation of flag smut, a new wheat disease. This is one of the most important increases that has been asked for, and it ought to be taken care of at once. It has been suggested that we make a small appropriation at the start, and later, if found necessary, appropriate a larger amount. The department asked for $45,000, but the committee allowed $20,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HAUGEN. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 48, noes 10.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HAUGEN: Page 26, line 5, change the semicolon into a colon and add the following:

"*Provided also*, That $20,000 shall be set aside for the investigation of take-all, flag smut, and related diseases of wheat, oats, barley, rye, and rice."

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is self-explanatory. It sets aside $20,000 for this purpose.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is this a transfer of $20,000 from some other appropriation?

Mr. HAUGEN. Oh, no; it is a new appropriation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A flat increase?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is an increase of $20,000. They asked for $45,000, and we gave them $20,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to ask the gentleman whether it would not be possible to transfer that $20,000 from the citrus-tree item or the chestnut-blight item? There is plenty of money in those items. Why take a new $20,000 from the Treasury and increase the appropriation when you have got money in other lump-sum appropriations that may not be used?

Mr. HAUGEN. To be frank with the gentleman, it does not seem advisable to do that at the present time.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. I suggest that we might transfer $20,000 from the appropriation for the improvement of the Delaware River.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That appropriation was made long since, and is being expended now, and is all being accounted

for; but I see the extreme pertinency of the gentleman's remark. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not expect to talk very much on this bill, but have been calling attention to a few things for the benefit of the new Members, so that they may judge for themselves just how appropriations are gotten through. We are talking about economy, and every one of us knows that there is an urgent necessity for economy. After this bill is passed our distinguished friends upon the other side will go back to the hustings and say, "Ah, the Republicans have taken every bill we prepared and they have swallowed them all in toto and have added to the appropriations that we made." They will charge us with being more extravagant than they were, and they hold the record for extravagance. I only want the Members on this side of the House to know what the situation is. If I am preaching an unfair or an unwise doctrine to my Republican brethren, I hope I may be pardoned; but I wish to observe that unless this side of the House begins to retrench it will have a mighty poor excuse upon which to go to the country when we are charged with levying additional taxes upon the people, as we may be charged in the very near future. [Applause.] Republicans as well as Democrats, I observe, applauded that sentence. I understand how pleased the Democrats are to know that these additions to the Agricultural appropriation bill are coming from this side of the House. I know what they will say. They stand up there solidly to a man and vote for every one of them, while some Republicans are not here to vote against them. [Applause.] Of course, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] stands unanimously alone in his applause on that sentiment. But when we make a lump-sum appropriation here from which the Secretary of Agriculture can make transfers at will, many of which are not being used for the purposes indicated in the paragraph, I do not know why he can not find $20,000 somewhere in some unused lump-sum appropriation to make up this $20,000 which seems to be needed. I am directing attention to these things. I want my Republican brethren to know what they are up against. Next year they will be called upon to meet a deficiency which the Democrats left on our hands of nearly $6,000,000,000.

A MEMBER. Ten billion dollars.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We should not go on increasing appropriations while we are promising the country economy. The gentlemen over there will go to the country and boast that we have added to their appropriation bills.

I know not what others may do, but I am pledged to bring about economy. I believe in it. I believe the Democrats were extravagant. I do not believe the Republicans ought to go on perpetuating the course the Democrats pursued. I believe we should stop increasing these appropriations now and make the Secretary of Agriculture, who has more discretion with regard to appropriations made for his department than any other Secretary in the President's Cabinet, find this $20,000 somewhere else. I do not believe in taking it out of the Treasury when he has already got it in a dozen—yes, in a hundred—separate lump-sum appropriations that he will use for the payment of salaries if you provide this new $20,000 for the purpose indicated. [Applause.] I am opposed to this amendment, even though it is presented by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN]. I propose to vote against it upon the ground that the Secretary of Agriculture can find this money somewhere else. He has enough in his hands to pay this $20,000 without making us appropriate it now and giving our Democratic brethren the chance to go out and say, "Yes; the Republicans swallowed every bill we left for them. Yes; they increased every amount that we charged against the Treasury."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. HAUGEN) there were—ayes 52, noes 37.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For sugar-plant investigations, including studies of diseases and the improvement of the beet and beet seed, and methods of culture, and to determine for each sugar-beet area the agricultural operations required to insure a stable agriculture, $94,115: *Provided*, That not less than $10,000 of this sum shall be used for the development and improvement of American strains of sugar-beet seed and for the establishment of a permanent sugar-beet seed industry in the United States: *Provided further*, That of this sum $12,500 may be used for investigations in connection with the production of cane and sorghum sirup, including the breeding, culture, and diseases of cane and sorghum, and the utilization of cane and sorghum by-products.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out "$94,115," in line 18, page 26, and insert in lieu thereof "$64,115."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TILSON: Page 26, line 18, after the word "agriculture," strike out "$94,115" and insert in lieu thereof "$64,115."

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, the current law carries the amount which I have moved to substitute for this largely increased amount. I have heard no complaints that the amount appropriated a year ago for this current year was not ample for the purpose. Now, without any explanation, this bill comes in with an addition of $30,000 to the item as it stands in the current law. Unless there is some justification given for this increase of more than 50 per cent it seems to me that this amount ought to be stricken out and restored to the amount in the present law.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation carries an increase of $30,000, a transfer from the food-production act. I think the importance of the sugar industry in this country would suggest an increase of that amount.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Certainly.

Mr. TILSON. If that argument should prevail, that every matter in the bill that concerns something of great interest to the country should be increased, then, surely, every item should be increased, and on that basis where shall we end?

Mr. HAUGEN. After taking into consideration the importance of every item, the committee cut these appropriations seven million from what was carried in the food-production act and the regular appropriation bill for the current year. One item alone was cut $3,000,000. The chairman of this committee had lost no opportunity of giving the credit for this bill to whom it belonged. It was introduced by the chairman of the committee in the last Congress and was passed by the House. It is a product of the other side of the House. They have been given the credit for it, and, whether due to negligence or a filibuster, it failed to pass within the limited time. It was decided that the bill should be reported at this session as reported by the last committee, with a very few amendments. Two of the amendments carry large increases. The gentleman's own State of Connecticut is interested in one. If the gentleman does not think that we should protect the States of New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and others against the corn borer, he can move to decrease it. When we reach the battleships, costing $32,000,000 apiece, if the Republican Members decide to establish a record for economy, there is the opportunity. [Applause.] But why spend time in cutting off these little amounts—a salary of $1,100 in a bill affecting 100,000,000 people throughout the United States? Why should we spend a whole afternoon here in proposing an amendment striking out an item of $1,100 for a salary and other small matters of that kind? When the time comes that we are dealing with millions, that is the time to make deductions. Let us pass this bill and not take up the time unnecessarily.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman is very far from the subject when he says that this is an eleven-hundred-dollar matter. In this instance it is $30,000. The gentleman will admit that he has given no justification for it, except the fact that the committee when in control of the other side of the House adopted this item, and the present committee accepted it. Further than that the gentleman has given no explanation to the House for the increase of this item to the extent of 50 per cent, amounting to $30,000.

Mr. HAUGEN. For 20 years I have made an effort here to increase the appropriation for the beet-sugar industry. For several years the greatest amount appropriated was $5,000. The committee recommends increasing it. There are people who believe that a certain trust in an eastern city has a good deal of influence over the price of sugar. Many contend that the sugar industry of this country should be increased, considering its importance. Will any Member in this House object to a small increase of $30,000 to encourage that great beet-sugar industry?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation and improvement of fruits, and the methods of fruit growing, harvesting, and, in cooperation with the Bureau of Markets, studies of the behavior of fruits during the processes of marketing and while in commercial storage, $83,200: *Provided*, That $9,000 of said amounts shall be available for the investigation and improvement of the pecan, and methods of growing, harvesting, packing, and shipping of same.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, line 2, strike out the words "the pecan" and insert the words "pecans, black walnut, almonds, and other nuts."

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I am fortunately situated in presenting the amendment at this time, with the gentleman from Pennsylvania in the chair, because I know I will get the proper ruling, and I will not have the distinguished gentleman to oppose it on the floor if he happens to be against it. [Laughter.]

In this amendment I move to strike out the words "the pecan" in order to make it read properly, and then insert "pecans, black walnuts, almonds, and other nuts." We have an appropriation of eight or nine thousand dollars to investigate pecans, and we want them to make some further study of almonds, black walnuts, and other nuts named in the Secretary's letter. If we fail in this, we will surely be able to get the other House to place it in the bill, and the conferees will allow this important item, I know, to be adopted. So I will not take any more time of the committee, but ask for a vote.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I will.

Mr. DUPRÉ. What necessity is there for investigating black walnuts and almonds? Is there any reason?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; to determine where they will grow, the kind of soil, and climate. After we secure this information we will be able to add that much more materially to our national wealth. Instead of leaving much of this land idle there ought to be these hardwood trees growing. They will add to the supply of lumber in the future and greatly to the food products of the country. Further, it will add to the material wealth of each county and State in the Nation, in the way of planting these trees along our public highways, where the land and climate are suitable. The people have no information at present upon which to determine what they should do with respect to these trees. If they get the proper data they will be able to plant them, and every community in the land will assist. It is material that we should have this work done.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment has been fully discussed and passed upon, and I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAKER) there were—ayes 35, noes 20.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEA of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. CURRY] and myself are considering offering an amendment to this paragraph. He is not at present in the Chamber, and I ask the privilege of returning to this paragraph later for the purpose of offering that amendment at some time before the consideration of the bill is completed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that this paragraph be passed over temporarily. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For horticultural investigations, including the study of producing and harvesting truck and related crops, including potatoes, and, in cooperation with the Bureau of Markets, studies of the behavior of vegetables while in the processes of marketing and in commercial storage, and the study of landscape and vegetable gardening, floriculture, and related subjects, $73,340.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the figures "$73,340" and insert the figures "$60,540."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut offers an amendment, which the clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, line 18, strike out "$73,340" and insert in lieu thereof "$60,540."

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, of course, this is only a very small matter in the eyes of the chairman of the great Committee on Agriculture. An item of only $13,000 is of very little consequence, and this is the increase beyond what was thought sufficient for this purpose during the current year. Of course, it may be a little old-fashioned to speak of such trifles, but it seems to me that even a small amount like $13,000 is worth saving, unless there is good reason given or some explanation for the increase over last year.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. BAER. Was the gentleman here yesterday when I made the statement that the Department of Agriculture expended over $500,000, and the farmers did not get any good out of it? No one has risen to defend it, and does not the gentleman think, for the sake of economy and efficiency, that we ought to do something to cut down the $3,000,000 increase from being spent?

Mr. TILSON. I am trying to cut down all of the items that are not justified. I am perfectly willing to vote for the larger amounts when there is an explanation to justify them. Otherwise, I think it is better and safer not to increase, and I am not proposing to do more now than to stand where the last committee fixed it in the bill that passed through the last Congress and became a law. I am prepared to stand upon that amount, relying upon the good judgment of my friend from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] and his committee. Not having heard any reason why we should at this session increase the amount, I am proposing to stand pat. I am willing to stand upon the item as it is carried in the current law.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman prepared to tell us by what sum the economical Republican majority has increased this appropriation bill at this time over the bill as it passed in the last Congress?

Mr. TILSON. I do not know what the bill passed in the last session carried as it did not become a law, but I have before me the current law for the fiscal year 1919.

Mr. BLANTON. Can the gentleman tell us how many hundred thousand dollars it has been increased over that?

Mr. TILSON. This bill carries $31,000,000 and the current law carried $27,000,000, so that there is an increase of about $4,000,000.

Mr. BLANTON. And that is chargeable to the Republican majority?

Mr. TILSON. It seems to be. So far as I can judge, it will be charged up to the Republicans, because we are actually increasing the items of the bill and we are responsible. I am calling attention to these increases now because now is the time to call attention to them. After they are passed and have become law it will be too late. Of course, this is a small item, only $13,000, but I call attention to it on principle. Unless the increase is explained and justified, I think we ought to reduce the item to the amount at which the current law fixes it.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, in this instance I believe the Republicans will cheerfully accept the responsibility. I refer to the statement of Dr. Taylor, who stated that in this instance there is an increase in the estimate by transfer from the food-production act by an item of $30,000,000 for seed-potato improvements. This is to carry forward systematically those improvements. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BAER], a friend of the farmer, like the present occupant of the Chair, seems to think that every item in the bill ought to be reduced. I take it that if we should strike out everything after the enacting clause it would suit the splendid farming constituency in the gentleman's district in Philadelphia, and might also suit the constituency of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BAER]. Of course, North Dakota does grow some potatoes. The gentleman himself introduced an amendment a year ago asking for $5,000,000, and I understand that he spent many a weary day and night in having it reported by the committee. Now comes an increase of $30,000, and objection is raised. Is the potato industry in this country of enough importance to warrant this increase? The time is going to come when the American farmer is going to demand something more than a few bouquets thrown at him just before election day. Some day he will demand action in this House. Let us act intelligently and consider these propositions in a sane manner and cut out politics.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations in foreign seed and plant introduction, including the study, collection, purchase, testing, propagation, and distribution of rare and valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants from foreign countries and from our possessions, and for experiments with reference to their introduction and cultivation in this country, $82,700.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 6, strike out "$82,700" and insert "$117,700, of which sum the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to expend $35,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purchase of not to exceed 50 acres of suitable land near the city of Washington, D. C., and the erection thereon of all necessary buildings and equipment, for the establishment of a plant inspection and detention station: *Provided*, That not to exceed $10,000 shall be expended for the purchase of the land: *And provided further*, That the limitation in this act as to cost of farm buildings shall not apply to this paragraph."

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against that.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against it.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman reserve it for just one minute?

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve it.

Mr. HAUGEN. The Office of Foreign Seed and Plant Industry receives from 3,000 to 4,000 lots of seeds, bulbs, plants, and other material annually. All this material must be inspected and treated and most of it sent out to stations. It is a matter of economy to have one central plant here in Washington instead of maintaining a plant at every port, and it has been suggested that an appropriation be made for the purchase of about 50 acres and the erection of buildings. It is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas insist upon his point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HAUGEN. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order being conceded, it is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase, propagation, testing, and distribution of new and rare seeds; for the investigation and improvement of grasses, alfalfa, clover, and other forage crops, including the investigation of the utilization of cacti and other dry-land plants; and to conduct investigations to determine the most effective methods of eradicating weeds, $139,780: *Provided*, That of this amount not to exceed $57,800 may be used for the purchase and distribution of such new and rare seeds.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will some one of the committee—I do not see the chairman present—inform me how much of the $139,000 is employed in investigating the methods of eradicating weeds?

Mr. LEVER. I would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that my recollection is that only a relatively small part of it is used. But the eradication of weeds is not so unimportant a proposition as might at first blush appear.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Well, Mr. Chairman, that does not seem to be a very clear statement as to how much is to be used. My idea is the only way to eradicate weeds is by hard work. No system can be found by which you can take weeds out of the ground except by continually tilling the soil. I therefore offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Page 29, lines 11 and 12, after the word "plants" strike out the semicolon and the words "and to conduct investigations to determine the most effective methods of eradicating weeds, $139,780," and insert "$130,000" and a period.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to make any remarks upon the amendment, as I think it is self-evident to all that money appropriated for eradicating weeds is of little or no value to the farmer.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WATSON].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 22, noes 34.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For purchase, propagation, testing, and congressional distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants; all necessary office fixtures and supplies, fuel, transportation, paper, twine, gum, postal cards, gas, electric current, rent outside of the District of Columbia, official traveling expenses, and all necessary material and repairs for putting up and distributing the same; for repairs and the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $358,980. And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to expend the said sum, as nearly as practicable, in the purchase, testing, and distribution of such valuable seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, the best he can obtain at public or private sale, and such as shall be suitable for the respective localities to which the same are to be apportioned, and in which same are to be distributed as hereinafter stated, and such seeds so purchased shall include a variety of vegetable and flower seeds suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture, after due advertisement and on competitive bids, is authorized to award the contract for the supplying of printed packets and envelopes and the packeting, assembling, and mailing of the seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, or any part thereof, for a period of not more than five years nor less than one year, if by such action he can best protect the interests of the United States. An equal proportion of five-sixths of all seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants shall, upon their request, after due notification by the Secretary of Agriculture that the allotment to their respective districts is ready for distribution, be supplied to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution among their constituents, or mailed by the department upon the receipt of their addressed franks, in packages of such weight as the Secretary of Agriculture and the Postmaster General may jointly determine: *Provided, however*, That upon each envelope or wrapper containing packages of seeds the contents thereof shall be plainly indicated, and the Secretary shall not distribute to any Senator, Representative, or Delegate seeds entirely unfit for the climate and locality he represents, but shall distribute the same so that each Member may have seeds of equal value, as near as may be, and the best adapted to the locality he represents: *Provided, also*, That the seeds allotted to Senators and Representatives for distribution in the districts embraced within the twenty-fifth and thirty-fourth parallels of latitude shall be ready for delivery not later than the 10th day of January: *Provided, also*, That any portion of the allotments to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress remaining uncalled for on the 1st day of April shall be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture, giving preference to those persons whose names and addresses have been furnished by Senators and Representatives in Congress and who have not before during the same season been supplied by the departments: *And provided, also*, That the Secretary shall report, as provided in this act, the place, quantity, and price of seeds purchased, and the date of purchase; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from sending seeds to those who apply for the same. And the amount herein appropriated shall not be diverted or used for any other purpose but for the purchase, testing, propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, mulberry and other rare and valuable trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I have an amendment which I desire to offer which is in the nature of a perfecting amendment, and having preference over the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. If it is in the nature of a perfecting amendment, the gentleman can offer it.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman has a preferential right to have it voted on first.

Mr. BLANTON. I desire to offer this amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 31, line 4, after the word "to" strike out lines 5, 6, and 7, and insert the following: "citizens of the United States either upon their personal application therefor or upon lists of names and addresses furnished by Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, for distribution among their constituents, same to be mailed out under the frank of the Department of Agriculture in."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman from South Carolina reserve his point of order?

Mr. LEVER. I reserve it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I am proposing by this amendment to remove garden seeds from politics. I realize in making such a proposition that my remarks fall upon many deaf ears. But I want to place the burden of this proposition upon the Republican majority, which now has control in this Congress, and upon the Republican committee governed by that majority. I take it, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that garden seeds have been too long a creature of politics. I take it that all of us realize that each one of us, wittingly or unwittingly, uses garden seeds each year to further our political interests in our districts. During 20 years as a lawyer in my State, each year I received from my Congressman a package of garden seeds, a package of flower seeds; from my senior Senator, a package of garden seeds and a package of flower seeds; and from my junior Senator, a package of garden seeds and a package of flower seeds, when I did not have a garden, and each time was forced to either give them away or put them in the waste basket.

Mr. CANDLER. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. CANDLER. Will the gentleman assume upon the floor of this House that that was politics, and that this package of seeds received from his senior Senator and his Member of Congress and his junior Senator had any influence whatever upon the distinguished gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BLANTON. I do not say that it had any influence upon me, but I do say that politics then and now causes them to be sent under congressional frank, and I do say that there is not a Member of Congress present here to-day who does not send garden seed each year to the lawyers and the doctors and the preachers and the bankers of his district, and that they are thrown by many in the wastebasket and wasted, thereby wasting thousands of dollars of the people's money every year.

Mr. CANDLER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BLANTON. I certainly will, because it would break my good friend's heart if any restriction was ever placed upon garden seeds.

Mr. CANDLER. Oh, it would not.

Mr. BLANTON. It is one of his pet hobbies.

Mr. CANDLER. It is not, and the gentleman does not mean to be serious in that charge against me. It would not break my heart, because my heart goes out to the gentleman in the very peculiar circumstances in which he places himself at the present time, and I want to keep that heart, in order to try to take care of him. That is the only reason I want to keep it.

Mr. BLANTON. Why not let the seed be sent out under the frank of the Agricultural Department? Does it do honor to my distinguished friend to have his name on every little package of 5-cent garden seed that is sent into the district which he represents? Does it do honor to the distinguished chairman of this committee, does it do honor specially to a Senator of the United States to have his name upon a little package of garden seed? I say that the time has come when a Republican Congress, with a Republican majority, ought to do away with this little system of petty politics and take Congressmen's and Senators' names off the packages of garden seed.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. KING. What is the object of having Members of Congress prepare lists of names of people all over the United States for the benefit of the Department of Agriculture? Is not that for the purpose of building up a list for use in politics by the administration that is in power?

Mr. BLANTON. No; not for the administration, but under the mistaken impression that it will advance the political standing of the Member mailing them.

Mr. KING. What is the difference between the gentleman's plan and the plan here?

Mr. BLANTON. Merely this: That by my proposal garden seeds will be divorced from politics. Even though they have no gardens in many instances and do not want them, we are afraid not to put the names of prominent men on our lists in our districts—the doctors and the lawyers and the preachers and the bankers—because while they may not want them in many instances, yet they do not like for a Congressman and Senator to ignore them.

Mr. KING. The gentleman would deprive poor people in many instances of a package of garden seed.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no, I would not. I am trying to arrange it so that every poor man in the United States may get his seed direct from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. Will not the Department of Agriculture be under the control of the Democratic Party for the next two years?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but that makes no difference. You have the right to say whether those garden seed shall be sent out under the frank of the Department of Agriculture to the people who apply for them and also to the list of names we send.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. How are we going to have that right on this side of the aisle when several points of order against the gentleman's amendment are made on that side of the aisle?

Mr. BLANTON. I assume that if the distinguished chairman on the other side and my good Republican friends do not insist upon the point probably it will not be insisted upon by this side of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I hope that the point of order will not be made and sustained. If made, I want to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, for many years I have opposed this entire paragraph and have voted to strike it from the bill. If the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] desires to do a service to the country, he would make a motion to strike out this entire item. But I observe that the gentleman has not made that kind of a motion. The gentleman's motion is to change the method of sending out these seed, and his change amounts to this: At the present time we get lists from rural carriers, postmasters, and friends, and from those lists we send out the seeds under our own frank. The gentleman now proposes in lieu of that to furnish a list himself to the Department of Agriculture, and from that list the Department of Agriculture will send out these seed. In other words, the gentleman proposes to wipe the frank of the Congressman off these packages of seed, with the distinct understanding in his district that he is the man who furnished the department with the list of persons to whom these seeds should be sent.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman wants to be fair. Will he yield?

Mr. LEVER. Of course.

Mr. BLANTON. Under the provision offered by me in this amendment any poor man in the gentleman's district or in my own can write to the Secretary of Agriculture and have seeds sent to him by the Secretary.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, no. The gentleman does not know his own proposition.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman's bill provides that. I mean the bill coming from the gentleman's own committee.

Mr. LEVER. The seeds are to be sent in this way: "To citizens of the United States either upon personal application or from lists sent by Representatives or Senators or Delegates for distribution, the same to be sent out by the Department of Agriculture." Why confer the privilege upon Members of Congress of furnishing the Department of Agriculture with a list of names to whom these seeds may be sent? There is no politics in that, of course. Here is some poor fellow who has not got enough money to buy a package of seeds. He writes a Member of Congress and says, "I want to get on your list, that marvelous list that you have, that list that opens the door of the Agricultural Department for a package of seeds. Pray put me on it." And my distinguished friend from Texas writes a very courteous letter and says, "In response to your beseeching prayers I have this day transmitted your name to the Secretary of Agriculture, and hereafter you are on this very exclusive list for seeds." [Laughter.] Great politics, gentlemen!

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SISSON. I want to ask the gentleman, who is on the Agricultural Committee and takes a great interest in the work of that committee, if he knows about how many additional clerks would be required in the Department of Agriculture to do this extraordinary lot of work?

Mr. LEVER. I should think that, being a Government agency, it would take several hundred. A private individual might have it done by one-half the number. I insist on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. The bill proposes already that any person who applies to the Secretary of Agriculture direct may have seeds sent to him by the Secretary. I call the attention of the Chair to that feature of the bill. The only change that this amendment proposes is that all of these seeds shall be sent under that condition, the frank of the Department of Agriculture. Personally a man can apply to the Secretary of Agriculture for seeds direct, and if a Congressman has not exhausted the amount allotted to his district, the Secretary under the frank of the department sends to that person seeds. The amendment offered by me merely proposes that all seeds shall be sent in that way, either upon direct application or from a list furnished by tse Congressman. I do not see that it is new legislation. It is merely a change of the mode of carrying out the purpose of the legislation which is already in existence, is clearly germane, and I do not think it is subject to a point of order.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] says it would take several hundred additional clerks. Why should it take one single clerk more than the clerks that are already given to the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. I will ask the gentleman if it is not a fact with respect to the farmers down in his district that the only thing they get out of all the appropriations made by Congress is a little package of garden seed?

Mr. BLANTON. I am now trying to give them something more valuable than mere garden-seed service. I am trying to give them some representation besides sending them a little 5-cent package of garden seed every year, paid for with their own money.

The CHAIRMAN. Unless the gentleman desires to pursue his argument on the point of order, the Chair will recognize some other gentleman.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, in regard to the point of order, I understand it is made on the ground that it is new legislation. I think the point of order is not well taken on that ground, and it is not subject to a point of order on the ground of want of germaneness. It is germane, and it is not new legislation. This bill provides a method for the distribution of garden seed. The amendment is only for the purpose of substituting another method for the distribution of garden seed. That is not new legislation. A proposition of that kind has never been sustained on the ground of new legislation within my memory.

Mr. HAUGEN. However, it is a change of the law, of the organic law.

Mr. TOWNER. The chairman suggested a change of the law. I do not believe that the law provides the specific method for the distribution of these garden seeds. We have from time to

time provided a method of distribution in the appropriation act, and from time to time various provisions have been made for changing this method of distribution. I do not think there is anything in the organic law regarding garden seeds which provides that they shall be distributed in a particular way. It provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall procure garden seeds for distribution, but the method is not provided. That is what this bill does, and that is what this amendment desires to change. It occurs to me that it is clearly within the rule, is not new legislation, and it certainly is germane.

The CHAIRMAN. After listening to the arguments, the Chair is inclined to believe that the amendment is a change of existing law not contemplated by the rule, and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I have made a motion which is pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 29, line 23, strike out the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I have made this motion before, in the past, at which time several prophets upon the other side of the aisle have predicted that I would be found in the future resisting this motion and championing the cause of the distribution of garden seeds. Administrations may come and go, but garden seeds go on forever, apparently; and I would ask my friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], who advances some of the arguments that I had in mind, to glance casually about when the vote is taken upon my motion and see how popular it is upon his side of the aisle and to see how frantic his colleagues are to wipe out this distribution of seeds through the Members of Congress. Why, this item is increased nearly 50 per cent, growing from $242,000 last year to $358,980 this year. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCKEOWN], with those plaintive tones which he can use upon occasion when pleading for his constituents, asked if there were not thousands of farmers throughout the country to whom this little package of garden seeds is the only gift they receive from Uncle Sam. What a shame it is that we do not accompany it with an upright piano or a Ford automobile. But, gentlemen, there is just as much justification for distributing other articles to the farmers, or people who pose as farmers, through the medium of Members of Congress, as there is for spending $350,000 in these times to send out garden seeds. We are going to be asked to remove the tax on luxuries and semiluxuries. We are being asked to remove the tax from automobiles and from furs. Now, if we can strike out some of these appropriations and show a little spirit of economy, I think we will be doing as great a public service as we will by repealing taxes.

Mr. Chairman, in one sense the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], I believe, is absolutely correct. I would not have the list submitted by Members of Congress to the department, but if the seeds are to be distributed they should be sent out directly to the people of the country by the Department of Agriculture, and we should have nothing to do with it. The department has agents in nearly every county in every State. It has a vast army of employees, who are traveling up and down the country, and this department could, without increasing its roll, very easily make arrangements to distribute these seeds direct without our intervention; and I submit that nothing has occurred since this appropriation first began to be made for this purpose to prove its public benefit either to the Department of Agriculture or to the people of the country, but I know that a great many people, including some Members of Congress in both branches, are very much impressed with the idea that because they get a request for a package of seeds they are doing a great deal to stimulate agriculture in regions where farming and agriculture have not hitherto been practiced.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KING. Last year I believe they cut down the allowance to Members of Congress about one-half, from 25,000 packages to about 14,000 packages, and as a result thereof the seed houses raised the price of seeds all over the country from 5 cents a package to 7 cents a package. How much does the gentleman from Massachusetts think it will cost a poor man to buy the packages of seeds that he needs if this amendment which he has offered passes to-day?

Mr. WALSH. Oh, well, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to engage in the business of providing seeds in order to regulate the price of seeds throughout the country, we ought to go the whole hog, and we ought to appropriate four or five million dollars and supply all the people of the country with all the seeds that they need.

On motion of Mr. HAUGEN, the committee rose, and Mr. TILSON having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MADDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that they had had under consideration the Agricultural appropriation bill, H. R. 3157, and had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. GOOD, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and with the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I desire to reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina reserves all points of order on the bill.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, Mr. KAHN, be permitted to address the House on next Monday, after the reading of the Journal, on the result of his trip to Europe and his observations thereon.

Mr. HAUGEN. For how long?

Mr. NOLAN. Until he shall conclude, which will probably be not more than one hour and a half.

Mr. HAUGEN. Not to exceed one hour and a half.

Mr. NOLAN. Not to exceed one hour and a half.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that his colleague, Mr. KAHN, may be permitted to address the House on next Monday after the reading of the Journal for not exceeding one hour and a half. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, is it the intention to displace any appropriation bill that may be under consideration?

Mr. NOLAN. I do not believe that he would want to displace any appropriation bills or business on the Speaker's table.

Mr. GARD. I have no objection. I simply wanted to know.

Mr. NOLAN. I think that should take care of itself.

Mr. CANDLER. The usual request is coupled with the provision that it shall not displace appropriation bills or other privileged matters. I do not think any exception ought to be made in that particular.

Mr. NOLAN. I do not think that is the usual request. The usual request is that after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk the gentleman can have his time.

Mr. CANDLER. Will the gentleman modify his request not to displace appropriation bills? We have a very short time in which to get these bills through. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] is a very good friend of mine, and I am anxious to hear him speak, but I am not willing that it should displace important governmental matters.

Mr. NOLAN. I do not think it is a question of friendship. The gentleman from California is the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and he has made some observations abroad which are likely to affect legislation that will come before the House. I think the House ought to have the benefit of his knowledge.

Mr. CANDLER. The gentleman from California can have all the time he wishes when his own bill comes before the House.

Mr. NOLAN. I want to say that an hour and a half devoted to an address by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] I think will be of interest to the Members on both sides of this House as well as to the people of the country, just as much, and more, than making speeches under general debate and wasting time on appropriation bills.

Mr. CANDLER. Nobody would be more delighted to hear the gentleman from California than would I.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER. The gentleman from Massachusetts has made that objection time and time again.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman understands that when these requests are made they are made out of order by unanimous consent. That is one of the purposes of this request, in order that it may come in out of order, and if the Member had to wait for the appropriation bills to be completed the request would be useless, because there might be no opportunity. It is made in that form.

Mr. CANDLER. Well, I have been here a good while, and I do not remember of a serious exception being made. When

we had nothing else to do we have been glad to hear any of our colleagues.

Mr. WALSH. There has been one this very session.

Mr. CANDLER. I am not willing that the request shall displace appropriation bills.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from California modify his request?

Mr. NOLAN. One of the most important bills to come before the House is the military appropriation bill. The gentleman from California, chairman of the committee, is getting it in shape, and subcommittees have been appointed. They will be busy for some time, and I think the gentleman from California should have time to speak upon these matters even if it should displace appropriation bills.

Mr. CANDLER. I do not think so, and unless the gentleman from California modifies his request I shall have to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi objects.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. MADDEN in the chair.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to address the committee for a few moments on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. I represent almost exclusively an agricultural community. I have no large cities in my district, and yet I have always opposed this appropriation in its present form. I am opposed to it now, and I shall vote to strike out the item in its present form. However, I very much regret that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] was not allowed to be presented to the committee for its approval. There is merit, gentlemen of the committee, in the proposition to allow the Department of Agriculture to send out seeds for the purpose of improving the quality of the crop and to increase the amount that may be raised. It is very necessary that should be done. It is necessary that these experiments should be made throughout the various portions of the United States, in order that it may be known where and under what circumstances crops may be grown successfully or improved.

I am very much in favor of the proposition that this ought to be carried under the direction and control of the Department of Agriculture. [Applause.] It ought not to be considered, and I regret to say that it is now considered as a species of graft on the part of Congressmen. The reproach ought not to be thrown on us that we use the distribution of seeds for political purposes. Under the present system it is so recognized, and for that reason I think this item ought to go out entirely unless it can be modified.

If it shall go out—if the majority believe it shall be eliminated—I hope the chairman of the committee will present for our consideration an amendment or modification by which the Secretary of Agriculture may distribute throughout the United States, under his direction and control, these seeds for the purpose of their being tested for the improvement of the crops of the United States.

I make that statement because I think the question is an important one, important for all of us. It is important because of the fact that if we continue to carry on this existing item in its present form it will continue to be a reproach to Members of Congress.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. If, as a matter of fact, this is a species of graft, and if, as a matter of fact, the chairman of this committee does not propose legislation such as that suggested by the gentleman from Iowa, then will it not be the fact that the distinguished gentleman on that side of the House will be responsible for the want of such a law?

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] seeks to give to this question a political character. I would have supported his proposition, although he is on the other side of the House. I have always supported the proposition to strike the present provision out, no matter by whom the motion was made. I did not say that this is a species of graft. I said that it was so regarded by the country, and it is, and for that reason it ought to be eliminated. I sincerely hope that this question and all other questions that pertain to this committee's business may never rest upon a partisan basis, may never depend upon questions that arise between the two political parties of this country. Gentlemen upon that side have as important agricultural interests to consider as we on this side, and those of us who are interested especially in seeing that our constituents who are agriculturalists receive a fair chance regarding the actions of the Government as affecting their interest should stand for their interests no matter from what side the motion comes. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes—5 minutes to be allotted to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER], 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD], and 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I have heard during several sessions the statement made in the House that was made here today, that the seed distribution is considered by some people as a species of graft, but I want to say that I have never heard any statement of that kind made outside of the House since I have been in Congress, for some eight years. I represent a solid city district, and I have had requests from schools, hospitals, boys' and girls' thrift gardens, and people who live in my district for these garden and flower seeds to plant in their gardens. I have had more requests than I have been permitted to fill with the allotment that I receive. I do not charge that any Member of this House would try to use these seeds for any effect of good to himself politically. I have too high regard for the membership of the House to say that any man fit to sit here would do such a thing. And because a Member gets up here and proclaims himself to be the watchdog of the Treasury, I do not believe that he can put this House or the country in the attitude of saying that because we, through the Department of Agriculture, assist in the distribution of these seeds it is, therefore, a species of graft, and that we should not have the courage to pass legislation here that the country demands. The Members who have spoken in favor of this amendment know that the country wants these seeds, and they know that the Members of Congress are responding to the sentiment of the country and that they will vote practically unanimously to continue them, as they have done in the past.

Mr. RANDALL of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman will be interested in the statement that while I represent a city district I received more than 8,000 individual requests in the mail for these garden seeds.

Mr. DYER. Absolutely. The gentleman from California is well known in this House and throughout the country as an ardent prohibitionist, and I do not think for one moment that he would send these seed only to those people who are prohibitionists, but I know that he sends them to any citizen, just as the rest of us do. We ought to be able to get behind such talk and such utterances as we have heard here against this specific item, and we should not waste time session after session talking about it when we all know that the country wants it and that we will vote to maintain it.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, this question appeals to me as either a gratuity or as an effort to really test out the character of seeds that are sent out to determine whether the seeds grown are good or whether the seeds act as a sort of political advertisement for the individual who sends them out. I would like to have a roll of the Congressmen in which the names of the individuals who receive seeds are recorded. I confess that before I came to Congress I caught up with the idea that was generally current, that this was a species of congressional graft by which the Congressman endeavored to advertise himself. I know that during the war there was a wonderful expansion of the gardening industry and that there were demands unheard of before for garden seeds, that the price went up enormously, as did other things. In the distribution it is difficult to be absolutely fair. I suppose that some of you send to your political newspapers bags of seeds and have them distribute them. Some of you send them, perhaps, to your precinct committeemen, always with the suggestion that they hand them out in part, at least, to friendly Democrats. In other words, in the very nature of the thing, you would be influenced more or less by political consideration. I did my best to see to it that Democrat and Republican alike would have access to those seeds during the exigencies of the war; but I do not believe that we are warranted in continuing, at least, this method of distributing seeds. If it is intended to find out whether the seeds be worth anything, you know and I know that no Congressman ever follows the matter up and no Congressman ever questions whether the seeds are good or not,

and the Department of Agriculture throws off all responsibility. If the purpose for which the law was enacted is to obtain, then it is essential that we turn the matter over to the Department of Agriculture and let some rational method be devised for the distribution of the seeds, that they shall no longer be considered as a gratuity, but that they shall be a real factor in determining the development of agriculture.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I believe the present Secretary of Agriculture and his predecessors for many years back have every year recommended to Congress that this item be dropped out entirely. Some Members have thrown out the hint that perhaps the Department of Agriculture desires to get the opinion of the farmers throughout the country as to the value of the garden seeds. The only effort I know of that the Department of Agriculture has ever made to find out what has been done with seed sent out is under the paragraph ahead of this, the paragraph which provides $57,000 for the purchase, testing, and distribution of new and rare seeds.

Now, I do not think anybody objects to the distribution of new and rare seeds—seeds which the farmer can not buy from the local seed merchant, or perhaps those which are not for sale anywhere in the country, possibly seed which has been brought in here from other countries. A great work has been done along that line in the last 25 years. Some new varieties of wheat have been brought in this country which have produced splendid results, and good results have come also from new grasses and new varieties of seed which the department has been sending out under the section preceding this one. I have never heard anyone make the claim that this congressional seed distribution contains seed of a new variety or that it is of any different quality or better quality than seed which can be bought at every little cross-roads store. Seed can be bought by the farmer just as good as this, some of my constituents think better, for a few cents a package and with very great convenience, and it does seem as though there is no excuse left to appropriate as much money as is proposed in this paragraph.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Certainly.

Mr. DYER. Does the gentleman have in his district school garden farms which children are urged to cultivate by the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes; I think there is some little demand through the country.

Mr. DYER. Has the gentleman requests from such organizations for seeds to be sent them?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes; but I do not think——

Mr. DYER. They have no way of getting them, except to buy them.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Naturally, as long as there are seeds in the United States given away for nothing there will be some demand for them. But that ought not to determine, it seems to me, what we should do on the motion to strike out made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. If we were to send out poison for nothing, there would be some demand for it. As I understand it, the former chairman [Mr. LEVER] is absolutely opposed to this item; the present chairman, I do not know where he stands. May I ask the gentleman from Iowa where he stands on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]?

Mr. HAUGEN. I am opposed to it. The motion is to strike out the whole item. The committee has recommended the appropriation.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I hope somebody will make a motion to recommit this bill and put the House on record on it. It is a reckless waste of money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, this is an item which comes up every year in this bill appropriating the "princely" sum of a little over $350,000 for the distribution of garden seed throughout the country to stimulate the great work of agriculture throughout the length and breadth of this Republic which, in my judgment, is the most serious question that this country has to contend with to-day. [Applause.] It is always intimated by a few Members that there is a species of graft about it. Well, I confess I am not able to comprehend where the graft comes in, and I am not impugning the motives of those who think so, but if there are Members on this floor who think that it is tainted with graft then they should not take the seed. I want to say to those gentlemen, you who entertain that opinion, that if you have some conscientious scruples about using that seed I would like to get them, and I will guarantee that they will go and be planted and be used for the promotion of agriculture and the promotion of these community gardens that are doing more to promote agriculture than any other one thing in this country. [Applause.] Why, they talk about rare field seed. We have a few specimens of them. I get 450 from my district to be distributed to about 15,000 farmers. I am one who believes—you can call it demagogy or whatever you want to call it—and always have believed that the dissemination of these garden seeds to be the personnel of the citizenship of this country does more good than any other one thing the Government does for her people, considering the amount of money expended.

Mr. GALLAGHER. And reduces the cost of living.

Mr. KINCHELOE. And reduces the cost of living and stimulates the great agricultural interests throughout the length and breadth of this country.

Mr. ELSTON. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I will.

Mr. ELSTON. Does the gentleman think the Congressmen of the various districts represent the best agency to give the best distribution of these seeds?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I think I know more about my district than anybody in Washington. [Applause.] I think I am a better judge of where these seeds should go to bring forth the best results to the second district of Kentucky than anybody else in Washington, the Secretary of Agriculture to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I will.

Mr. DYER. How would the Department of Agriculture have any system of distributing these seeds without taking a census or knowing who are farmers and who had ground in which to plant these seeds and things of that kind?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I confess I do not know.

A MEMBER. It would cost $1,000,000.

Mr. CANDLER. If the gentleman will permit, would not the Secretary of Agriculture and the Agricultural Department naturally resort to Members of Congress and Senators of the United States in order to get these addresses of people?

Mr. KINCHELOE. If they have as good judgment as I think they have, those are the only ones to whom they would go, especially Members of Congress, because they are supposed to know the personnel of their districts.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I will.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. From what source does the Secretary of Agriculture secure these seeds in quantities for this distribution?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I could not answer the gentleman about that; I think they buy them at competitive prices.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Out in the general market?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I do not know. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] or the chairman of the committee can tell more about it, but I do not care where they get them; that is not the point I am talking about; it is the sending of them out.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. The question would then turn upon this: If we are expected to be distributing seeds of rare value to assist in the improvement of vegetable production of these different kinds, we ought to know where we get them——

Mr. KINCHELOE. I am not yielding to the gentleman to make a speech in my time; I have only five minutes. I want to see this motion defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this distribution of seeds. [Applause.] I always have been. [Applause.] There is only one section of the country that raises cotton. I am mighty glad it is successful at it. I wish sometimes it would plant more cotton, so that we might have more to use here and abroad, but if there is one thing I wish for the country that raises cotton it is that it would rotate its crops, diversify them, produce its own vegetables, so that it would not have to be dependent upon other sections of the country for those foodstuffs. It ought to raise something more than cotton.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. How many seed houses are there in the neighborhood of Philadelphia?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If I were speaking for the seed houses, I would probably favor this amendment, because I assume that the seed houses are against this free seed distribution by the Government. [Applause.] I am rather glad the gentleman asked the question, because it makes no difference to me whether the seed houses are for or against this proposition. I am very glad that in a bill that proposes $31,000,000 for salaries we can find $360,000 that goes to seed for propagating purposes and to

encourage the small farmer as well as the woman and the child in the city.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to another question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I take it from what the gentleman says that the seed houses in the vicinity of Philadelphia supply these seeds to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I question that very much. However, I do not know. If the gentleman knows more than I do, I wish he would state it, because I do not represent the seed houses any more than I represent anybody else in my district, and I would be ashamed to come here and speak for them alone.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I do not doubt that. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska, though he is taking my valuable time.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I simply want to say that my curiosity was prompted by facts; that in departmental circles for many years it was suggested that the Secretary of Agriculture secure this seed from the seed houses.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have just stated that it was very probable that if the seed houses had anything to do with this proposition they would be in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and would probably be with the gentlemen from the wheat States, who apparently do not care much about the distribution of seed. I do not know whether I am much of a farmer or not, but I hope the gentleman will think this over and see whether I am speaking for the farmer or against him. I said I would like to help the South rotate its crops. [Applause.] And if the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE] is right, and the farmers of his district want seed for the purpose of engaging in some other business than that of raising cotton—though I do not wish them to cease raising cotton—I want to encourage them to do it. It will help them to take care of themselves and they will not be at the mercy of a high-priced food market when they are stuck for food like the people of the great cities are.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I can not in the five minutes. The gentleman is much in favor of the farmers. I will concede that at once. He is one of the best representatives of the farmers on the floor. And he preaches it. Sometimes he denies that I am. In my section we participate in this seed distribution, and we play no "bunk" about it. I am glad to get these seeds, though it is a nuisance to send them out. There is no politics in it. It is no advantage to me. Though the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] says it is of political advantage to some, I would be glad to get away from the distribution and lay it on the Secretary of Agriculture. It would be a relief to my office. I am inclined to think the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE] is wise in his statement that you and I know more about our districts than does the Department of Agriculture, and I would rather trust a Congressman in this practical distribution than some specialist down in the department who is dealing with my people purely in an academic manner.

All the hospitals in my district ask for seed. Why? They want to raise flowers and put them on the window sills in order to give comfort to the patients. The school children in my district ask for seeds, because the teachers have object lessons every day in the growth of flowers, in the production of vegetables, and the children ask for seeds in order that when they go home they may plant them and watch them grow and develop. And perhaps in this way we may be furnishing you gentlemen upon the farms with labor, with intelligent labor, that you will need in the future. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve 10 minutes on this side, inasmuch as I am trying to get a distinguished advocate of the seed distribution to take the time. A debate on this seed proposition would not be any debate at all unless we heard from the very distinguished advocate of seeds, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER], and I insist that he close this debate on this proposition. [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I am a very modest man, as everybody knows, and I would not speak now but for the urgent request of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY]. [Applause.] I love him, and in my heart I can not refuse any request he might make. He is always for the people, and when he asks me to talk it is the voice of the people. I had not intended to say anything. The fact is I declined to occupy any time, taking the position that the Members of Congress whom I had enlightened during all these years might settle this matter without any further discussion upon my part. [Applause.] I thought I had communicated to them sufficient information and knowledge to act upon this great question in the interests of the people of the United States of America without further discussion.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. You have.

Mr. CANDLER. Of course I refer to the farmers, the real strength of this great Republic. And when the Members take it from that standpoint I naturally presume that they will vote down the motion of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and permit this appropriation to remain in the bill. [Applause.] The truth of it is that the gentleman from Massachusetts has grown, of course, in notoriety, and has grown in statesmanship since he has been on the floor of the House of Representatives, and I congratulate him upon that, because he and I are very strong personal friends. But he gained his first fame by making a motion similar to that which he makes to-day, which was promptly defeated, as this motion will be. That had more to do with his fame than all of the motions he has been making during these years, and if he continues along the same line, of course, he will increase his fame in the future. [Applause and laughter.]

His motion will not prevail. It has been considered for many years, and the present consideration of it, I presume, will take the same course that the previous motions have taken heretofore and be defeated.

Let me call your attention to the fact that if you want to be a real statesman you will vote against this motion; otherwise you will vote for it. [Laughter.] The great statesmen in all the history of the Republic from time immemorial down to the present have favored this proposition. It is only those who want to detract from that standard of statesmanship who oppose it. If the attempt to eliminate this item from the bill is successful, the names of those who contribute to it will not appear in the great roll of fame in the future, to be read for all time. If you want to get in line with Thomas Jefferson and Patrick Henry and Benjamin Franklin and all those luminaries of the past, vote for this bill as it is. [Loud applause.]

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I want to ask the gentleman a question. Inasmuch as it has been asserted here that the distribution of these seeds is a species of graft, I want to ask the gentleman if it is any more a graft than the requests we get for Government publications?

Mr. CANDLER. There is no difference in the requests we receive. Of course, every man on the floor of this House has his own standard. If he thinks this seed distribution is a species of graft, that is his standard, but it is not mine. If any man on this floor can be influenced by sending out a package of seed or can buy any of his constituents by sending him a package of seed, you vote against this provision. I have never been bought or bought anybody with a package of garden seed in the past and never expect to do so in the future. [Applause.] For my part, I am delighted always to respond to the requests of my constituents even to the smallest and most infinitesimal matter they submit to me. It may be small to some people, but it is always great to me; and there is nothing that makes me happier than to respond to the request of a bright-eyed, rosy-cheeked little girl in my district for a package of flower seed, and nothing makes me happier than to have some sturdy farmer in my district write to me asking me to send him a package of garden seed or other special seed that is provided in another paragraph of this bill. I do not believe that the influence of that sturdy farmer or of that sweet and innocent little girl is a dishonest influence. On the contrary, I hold that it is a worthy influence, because it is an influence of righteousness and innocent purity. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CANDLER. I am sorry. I was just getting started. I would insist on further time, but I feel sure this amendment will be defeated. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] to strike out all of the language from line 23, page 29, down to line 13 on page 32, inclusive.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is called for.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 34, noes 99.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, on page 30, line 8, I move to strike out the figures "$358,980" and insert "$242,320."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SNELL: Page 30, line 8, strike out the figures "$358,980" and insert "$242,320."

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I voted to strike out this whole amount, as I thought this was a good time to begin the work of retrenchment in expenditures.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I believe the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto is exhausted. But I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may be granted five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. What is it?

Mr. BLANTON. I watched the language closely when the gentleman in charge of this bill asked that the debate close, and if the Chair will refer to the language he will find that it referred only to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts and all amendments thereto, not to this paragraph. Therefore the debate on any other amendment to this paragraph is clearly in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled. The gentleman from New York is not in order. The debate has closed under the agreement.

Mr. HAUGEN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York be given five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. I do not care to go on.

Mr. LEVER. I object if the gentleman from Iowa is going to open this thing up.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman from New York does not care for the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 30, line 8, after the word "elsewhere," strike out "$358,980" and insert "$258,980."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 2, noes 95.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries and field and station expenses, including the maintenance of nurseries, collecting seed, and planting necessary for the use, maintenance, impovement, and protection of the national forests named below.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAUGEN: Page 35, line 16, strike out the semicolon after the word "forests," insert a comma, and add the following: "Including the payment of rewards under regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture for information leading to the arrest and conviction for violation of the laws and regulations relating to fires in or near national forests, or the unlawful taking of or injury to Government property."

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, may I ask if that is the langunge that was carried before?

Mr. HAUGEN. No. Does the gentleman reserve a point of order?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes; I reserve a point of order for the moment. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I notice that that provides punishment for violation of the laws or regulations. What I want to inquire about is whether that is not going a little bit too far, to provide punishment for violation of a regulation, and whether or not there is any precedent for the passage of a law providing punishment for violation of a regulation? Law is one thing and the regulation of a department is another. It is a question in my mind. I think I am in sympathy with the purpose the gentleman desires to reach.

Mr. HAUGEN. The situation is this: On December 23, 1910, the Secretary of Agriculture offered rewards, ranging from $25 to $250, for information leading to the arrest and conviction of any person for willfully and maliciously starting forest fires.

On July 12, 1918, the Comptroller of the Treasury rendered a decision in which he stated that such payments could not be made under the provisions of the law. It is now suggested that the department be given specific authority for offering these particular rewards.

Mr. CANDLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Certainly.

Mr. CANDLER. I will state to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] that this does not involve the question which he suggested a moment ago, of penalties for violations of regulations of the department, but it is confined to rewards offered by the Department of Agriculture for information which might lead to the conviction of people starting forest fires. Forest fires in the history of this country have been very destructive, costing our Government millions of dollars oftentimes. Therefore it is very important that these rewards may be paid in order to secure information leading to the conviction of people guilty of starting these fires. The only object of this is to pay rewards offered by the Department of Agriculture, which the Secretary has not been able to pay because the authority was not contained in the law.

Mr. GARRETT. I see I misunderstood the purpose of the amendment. My attention was distracted when the first part of it was being read, and I got the impression that it was the creation of law here for the punishment of violations. I see that I was mistaken in my impression, and I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAUGEN: Page 66, line 4, after the word "apparatus," strike out the words "and office fixtures and" and insert in lieu thereof "office fixtures, law books."

Mr. HAUGEN. It simply adds law books to the language, giving authority for the purchase of law books.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Umpqua National Forest, Oreg., $13,509.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It is not the unusual name of Umpqua National Forest that I wish to call to the attention of the committee, but it is the increase in many of these items in the national forests, amounting in all, as I figure it roughly, to over $200,000 over and above the current law.

I have always been a very consistent and persistent friend of the national forests and do not wish to weaken them or to interfere in any way with their successful management. However, I have not seen or heard any reasonable explanation given for increasing the appropriation for a considerable number of these national forests, some of them more than 100 per cent, without a single decrease in the whole long list. The aggregate increase in all of them is approximately, if I have made the computation correctly, something over $200,000.

Mr. HAUGEN. There is an increase in this item of $266,074, which will be used as follows: $225,568 for additional fire protection on a number of the national forests; $5,000 for the maintenance of Government stock; $22,002 for the employment of additional forest assistants and scalers and for brush burning and other expenses incident to the increased timber-sale business; $5,304 for the administration of grazing on certain forests; $3,500 for the administration and protection of land added to the Colorado national forest by presidential proclamation; and $4,700 for general administrative expenses on certain forests.

Mr. TILSON. That may be all right for a general explanation, but why the specific increases in the case of specific forests, some of them very much more than doubled in one single year? What is the cause for this?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will be frank with the gentleman and explain that the Forest Service has been a disappointment to a number of us.

Mr. TILSON. Is that a good reason why we should grant a large increase?

Mr. HAUGEN. No; I fully appreciate that it is necessary to carry on the activities of the department.

Mr. TILSON. I agree with that.

Mr. HAUGEN. But the gentleman will remember that only a few years ago Congress was given to understand that in a short time the Forest Service would be self-supporting. It comes far from that. If the gentleman will refer to the report and to the hearings, he will find that the appropriation suggested for 1919 was $5,731,555. The amount required to be paid

for schools and roads, 25 per cent, was $876,334.39; for roads and trails, 10 per cent, $350,533.75, making a total expenditure of $6,958,423.14.

The receipts for 1918 were $3,574,930.07, leaving a net cost of $3,383,495.07, so that the expectation of making the Forest Service self-supporting has not been met. However, that is no reason why adequate appropriations should not be made.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman makes an explanation by wholesale. Let us take one single item, line 11 on page 41, "St. Joe National Forest, Idaho, $32,026." Last year the appropriation made for running this forest during the fiscal year 1919 was $15,830. This bill carries an appropriation of $32,026, or more than 100 per cent increase for this forest, and there are a number of others along the same line. What is the reason for the appropriations for these specific forests being so largely increased? Has the gentleman an explanation?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Iowa will allow me, the explanation is that the activities on these various forests have very greatly increased, and it is anticipated that the activities will greatly increase—lumbering, grazing, and the various and sundry things that are done upon these national forests.

Mr. TILSON. What is it the intention of the department to do with this additional money—hire additional rangers, or in what way is it expected to expend 100 per cent more on some of these forests than is required for this year?

Mr. LEVER. As to the specific items I can refer the gentleman to my report on this bill last year, but I can give him the information that some of this money would go into the forest-protection work, the employment of additional short-time rangers, the employment of timber cruisers, and more careful watching, cruising, and the like of that.

Mr. HAUGEN. Two hundred and sixty-two more men will be employed?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Oh, that is the reason for it, 262 more men will be employed. Now we are beginning to get some real information. Two hundred and sixty-two additional employees at $1,000 each would just about absorb the total increase in these national forest items.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] what the income from the forests was last year from all sources?

Mr. LEVER. The total receipts were $3,572,930.77.

Mr. BOOHER. What were the expenses?

Mr. LEVER. About $5,000,000, in round numbers.

Mr. BOOHER. It lacks $2,000,000 of paying expenses?

Mr. LEVER. That is true.

Mr. BOOHER. There is no possibility of the receipts ever paying the expenses?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, yes; they undoubtedly will in time.

Mr. BOOHER. They are not gaining any?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; there was an increase last year, as the statement before the committee shows. The receipts for the next fiscal year will undoubtedly increase. I think in four or five years the receipts will meet the expenditures.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Pinchot said they would do that 10 years ago.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Pinchot is not now in charge and has not been for some time.

Mr. BOOHER. The receipts are for lumber, grazing, and so forth?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; the receipts from lumber were $1,621,000, grazing $1,725,000, special uses $227,000.

Mr. BOOHER. What are those special uses?

Mr. LEVER. Payment for the use of the land for various purposes—camps, hotels, agricultural purposes, turpentine extraction, and so forth.

Mr. BOOHER. Is it the gentleman's opinion that in the lifetime of any Member of the House the receipts will be equal to the expenditures?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, yes; I have been a member of this committee a good many years, and Mr. Pinchot, the former forester, who is largely responsible for creating the sentiment which established the Forest Service, used to hold out rosy futures to us which might have been somewhat misleading as the output of an enthusiast. I hardly want to criticize him for that, but I am satisfied that the forests can be made self-supporting within three years, and especially if we entered upon a policy of more exploitation than conservation. As far as I am concerned I am committed to the policy of conservation. I think we ought to conserve rather than exploit the forests, but even with a conservative system of conservation the forests ought to be made self-sustaining within four or five years.

Mr. BOOHER. How many acres have we altogether in the forest reserve?

Mr. LEVER. Between one hundred and fifty and one hundred and sixty millions.

Mr. BOOHER. And yet we do not get enough to pay the expenses of its care?

Mr. LEVER. That follows from the statement I made a moment ago.

Mr. BOOHER. The gentleman thinks that in the course of 5 or 10 years we may catch up?

Mr. LEVER. I am satisfied that we will. I will say that if we desire to exploit the forests we could catch up in one year.

Mr. BOOHER. But the exploitation of the forests would not be good policy.

Mr. LEVER. Not at all. An indiscriminate cutting of timber and raising the grazing fees, raising other fees, the Forestry Service could not only be made self-supporting but it could be made a revenue-producing proposition. But even with the conservative conservation measures, if I may use the term, I predict that the forests will be self-supporting and produce a revenue in the next five years.

Mr. BOOHER. How much do we get a month for the grazing of cattle and sheep?

Mr. LEVER. I can not give the gentleman accurate information. I can say this to the gentleman: That beginning this fiscal year the grazing fee has been practically doubled. My recollection is that the grazing of a horse is something like a dollar a month.

Mr. BOOHER. Oh, that would be four or six times what it was before. It used to be 4 cents a month for cattle, and sheep 2 cents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina a question or two. Has it not been the policy of the present administration of the Forestry Service to maintain throughout a moderately fair, just, and conservative course?

Mr. LEVER. It has been, undoubtedly.

Mr. TOWNER. And, notwithstanding that, there has been a continual increase in the amount received from the Forestry Service?

Mr. LEVER. For the past three or four years the receipts have been gradually increasing.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say this in regard to the matter; I have had it called to my attention on two or three occasions: Although I am not particularly interested in it, I think I am justified in saying that the general work of the bureau reflects great credit on the administration of the forest reserves and those who have them in charge. I think they have at the same time tried to preserve the forests that we all desire should be preserved, and they have endeavored to do what they could to increase the revenue from this department. As stated so well by the gentleman from South Carolina, if we maintained a policy of exploitation we could make this service not only self-supporting but derive immediately a revenue from it. But certainly we would not desire to do that. The policy of conservation is a very foolish policy if carried to extremes, but the policy of conservation fairly administered is certainly one of the wisest that we have ever adopted in this country as a national policy.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. What is the policy of the Government with regard to selling timber?

Mr. TOWNER. The policy of the Government with regard to selling timber on the forest reservations is to sell the timber where it can be done and preserve the forest. For instance, a certain number of trees is allowed to be cut on a certain area in each year; the particular trees are picked out, so that it is intended to carry on and preserve and even to increase in certain instances the strength of the forest, and at the same time to derive as much revenue from the trees that may be taken down and carried away as is possible.

Mr. SNELL. Do we not get revenue enough from the timber sold to pay for looking after it?

Mr. TOWNER. We are not able to do so because of the fact that there is not a demand near many of the forest reserves for timber. I do not pretend to be an expert, but from knowledge which I have derived from those who know something in regard to it I would say that we could at this time increase the amount of revenue derived from our forests sufficient to make the Forest Service self-supporting if transportation facilities were available. There are thousands of acres of good forest lands from which thousands of trees could be cut every year, but

they are unavailable because there are no transportation facilities.

Mr. SNELL. It seems to me peculiar that we can not get enough revenue out of the timber sold to pay for looking after it. Where there is no demand for timber, there can not be much necessity for looking after it.

Mr. TOWNER. It takes quite a force to preserve the timber in some localities from timber thieves. That, of course, is a part of the service for which we have to pay.

Mr. SNELL. Could anyone tell whether we get enough out of the timber we sell to pay for looking after that particular part of it?

Mr. TOWNER. Out of the particular timber lands?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I think we could.

Mr. SNELL. I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina that question. Do we receive revenue enough from the timber sold to look after that part of the forest where the timber is taken from?

Mr. LEVER. I should say not.

Mr. SNELL. Then there is no very great advantage in it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a few words on this proposition. I think it is a matter of great importance to this country that the timber resources of the country should be very carefully guarded for the future. The Secretary of Agriculture in a supplemental statement to the Committee on Agriculture when this present bill was being framed asked for an increase in an item for the encouragement of individual forestry. I believe that when the history of this Great War has been written accurately the conclusion will be reached that the forests of France had as much to do with the winning of ultimate victory as any one single factor in the war. It is a curious thing that the black walnut tree has practically been wiped off this continent. Germany had practically a monopoly of all of our black walnut, and when we entered this war we found ourselves in the anomalous situation of being without walnut with which to make our gunstocks, and that Germany was using the black walnut of America to shoot down American boys. Matters of this kind are not spectacular. They do not appeal to the headlines of the newspapers. They do not get the earnest, enthusiastic support of Members of Congress generally, because they are not spectacular, and men who come to Congress, whether they ever gamble or not in the sense of playing poker, are more or less of a gambling disposition. In other words, they are unusually ambitious and risky, and they go for those things that have that element in them. The committee did not allow this estimate because we were trying to follow the bill as it was passed by the House at the last Congress as nearly as possible, but I feel that I ought to say now in advance of the time when the question shall be passed on ultimately that I strongly favor liberal appropriations for the encouragement of forestry upon the farms, because I believe it to be one of the very biggest, fundamental, far-reaching problems of the future. [Applause.]

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask whether the majority of the public forest is what we call virgin forest or cut-over land?

Mr. LEVER. A large part of it is virgin forest.

Mr. SNELL. If it is, how do you expect it to ever be any better than it is now or to get any more revenue from it?

Mr. LEVER. The question of revenue is just simply a question, as stated by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER], of the demand on the one hand and of the ability to get to the stuff on the other.

Mr. SNELL. Simply a question of transportation?

Mr. LEVER. Largely a question of transportation.

Mr. SNELL. The policy of the Government would be to sell more stumpage than they do at the present time if they could get to it?

Mr. LEVER. The policy of the Government would be to sell all ripe stumpage as rapidly as possible and as quickly as they can get to it. The policy of the Government is really one of genuine conservation. The Government does not desire to sell unripe stumpage, and it ought not to do so. A tree gets ripe just as a man does. You do not want to cut the tree down before it is ripe, because it is wasteful.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to address an inquiry to the chairman of the committee or to the former chairman. When the former bill was before this House I took the floor to call attention to the fact that there are a number of employees in the service of the Government mentioned in the Agricultural bill whose salary is given at $240 a year each.

On page 35 we are appropriating $2,485,663 for the Forestry Service, chiefly for employees. On page 44 we are appropriating $2,069,207. That is an increase of between $250,000 and $300,000 over the former bill; and yet, in spite of that fact, every item in this bill having reference to the poorest-paid employees in this Nation—the charwomen—puts them at $240. I do not want to tire you, gentlemen, by trying to fight here for a class of people whom nobody seems to care to fight for, but I think it is mighty hard for a man who has a heart in him to sit here and listen to increased appropriations up to a quarter and a half million dollars and yet there is not anybody on the committee who will have the heart to speak for these people. Two hundred and forty dollars a year means approximately 66 cents a day, and if you gentlemen can afford to place another quarter of a million dollars into the Agricultural bill as a bonus——

Mr. CANDLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUUL. I will yield in a minute.

If you can afford to do that, you can afford to look after this thing. If we can afford to help the trees in the great forest to grow, and pay between $4,000,000 and $5,000,000 to make them grow, we can afford to pay for the time these women work in the various departments, and if we have not any money to pay living human beings who are working for us we have not any money to help the trees grow.

Mr. CANDLER. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUUL. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANDLER. These employees to whom the gentleman refers do not work full time, but they only work a limited time. They only have a few hours to serve and they are very glad to get the positions which they occupy at the salary which is paid, and they are contented with it; so why should the gentleman feel so much disturbed——

Mr. JUUL. The gentleman is not asking a question now, but is making the statement that the employees are glad. I will tell the gentleman that if the gentleman was hungry and somebody offered him $240 a year the chances are that he would accept the $240 rather than starve. I maintain that the United States Government has not sunk down to the point where it is necessary to hire people because they have to take work at $240 a year.

Mr. CANDLER. Well——

Mr. JUUL. I have the floor, if the gentleman pleases. I maintain this: We ought not to pay these people 66 cents a day and ask them to pay 10 cents car fare to get to work in the departments here, and I think it is a burning shame and disgrace to continue to do what we are doing in this bill. Now, here is an additional appropriation of a quarter or a half million dollars in the Agricultural bill, and when the former Agricultural appropriation bill was under debate I had a personal talk with the former chairman and with the present chairman of the Agricultural Committee and understood from both gentlemen that they would do something in the next bill to remedy this evil.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUUL. I will yield.

Mr. HAUGEN. In view of the bonus of $240 provided for in another bill it was thought or decided by the committee not to recommend any increases, with very few exceptions. I take it the gentleman has reference to the charwomen.

Mr. JUUL. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Receiving $240.

Mr. JUUL. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. The charwomen receiving that sum, as I understand it as represented by the department, work only part time. The charwomen who work all the time get twice that amount, or $480, and in addition to that will get the bonus of the higher pay.

Mr. CANDLER. These people work about two hours a day, and if the gentleman feels like he ought to shed tears——

Mr. JUUL. These people work five hours a day, but it does not make any difference whether they work four or five hours if they work just long enough——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JUUL. May I have one minute or two?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman to proceed for one minute? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JUUL. Now, they work just long enough under the terms of their employment. Now, you gentlemen who sit here upon this floor have it within your power to right a wrong,

to cure an evil. For this Congress to go before the people with items like this is stultification itself. We ought not to do it and should not do it. Some gentleman whispered in my ear when talking upon this floor the last time on this subject that they are colored people. The gentleman who presides over this committee to-day has a lot of them in his district, and I have a lot in mine, and I do not like to say that I voted for a bill that contained items of $240 a year for people even for a fraction of time. Now, let us have some conscience and do something. You gentlemen have it in your power to raise these figures. Take out the half million dollars and use it in the direction I have indicated and do something. Do not let us go home with a bill containing items like this. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the motion to strike out the last word, in order to say a word.

A great many people are anxious about the national forests. I am anxious about them. There is no great amount of revenue that comes from them, and the chief use of this service, as I understand it, is in preserving them for the sake of the timber. And I suppose the timber ought to be there always, for some of these national sharps or experts say that the whole United States would dry up if it was not for the timber in the mountains, where the water is chiefly produced by reason of the conservation of the moisture.

A good many things have been entered upon in the name of the preservation of the forests. The school children, the magazines, the Pinchots, the people who did not have much of anything else to do, and some who wanted something to do finally got our southern friends to unite with our New England friends in order to make improvements in the Appalachian forests. Our southern friends were not much interested at first. I do not know, but I have a suspicion that the mountain forests are to be regrown, but that will be in the remote years, say, in 6919 instead of 1919. It will take a long time to restore those original forests, and long before that happens there will be other use found for the land.

Now, I am for an appropriation for the preservation of the forests. The great enemy of the forests, as I understand, is fire, especially in our western country. Therefore we have to have fire fighters. I would vote for this appropriation if these people could all fight fire, if they did not do anything else to bring in the revenue.

My friend spoke of the black walnut, from which the stocks of the guns are made. Now, I want to tell you something. When I was a boy, growing in strength and ability to take a hand, I helped to cut down the most magnificent walnut, poplar, and oak trees in that great forest in Indiana, and that we had to cut down—we did not know we could live on the prairie—that we might be able to plant corn.

But I want to tell my friend that there were no forests in central or northern Illinois to speak of when it was in a state of nature. Now the black walnut is being grown there very largely, the trees being grown there from the seed. All you have to do is to load up a wagon with walnuts, plow a furrow, scatter the walnuts in the furrow, and cover them with the soil. They grow without being cultivated and do not need any protection. And I undertake to say now—and I want the attention of my Illinois colleagues—that there is more timber in central Illinois and northern Illinois—100 per cent more, and I think it is greater than that now—than there was when the wild Indian roamed that country.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman from Illinois will permit, it does not controvert my position at all, but only emphasizes it. The people of Illinois have been planting trees, but other great sections of the country have been absolutely wasting the forests.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, we destroyed the forests in Ohio, destroyed them in Indiana; they were largely destroyed in Kentucky, as I understand it, and in Missouri. What for? That we might have some place in which to plant corn. We did not know that we could live on the prairie.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. I am going to vote for this appropriation. It will do some good. I think it will do more good than harm. But God save us from the horror of conservationists who have enough to live on but who fill up the magazines and get publicity. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

White River National Forest, Colo., $6,272.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. PLATT. I do so in order to ask the chairman of the committee, or some one who knows, whether or not it is a fact that a good many of these so-called forests—for instance, those in Colorado and Idaho, and so forth—are not forests at all, having no trees at all on them?

Mr. HAUGEN. They are included in the Forest Service. I think that is true that some of them have very few trees on them.

Mr. PLATT. You can not make much in selling stumpage on land that has no forest there.

Mr. HAUGEN. But there is some grazing there.

Mr. PLATT. Why are they called "forests" when they are not forests?

Mr. HAUGEN. They are used for grazing cattle and sheep, and a charge is made for the grazing privilege. That accounts for the fact that the grazing receipts are largely in excess of the receipts from the sale of timber.

Mr. PLATT. Unless they are trying to make forests of them I do not understand why they should be called "forests." They are just, generally speaking, public lands. Now, in the State of New York we have a great forest area known as the Adirondack Park, sometimes known as the North Woods, and we run our forestry on absolutely scientific principles. Under the constitution of the State of New York no one is allowed to cut down a tree. The trees stay there until they rot. That is scientific forestry. Nobody gets any good out of the New York State forests except the people who are able to go up there and hunt deer, or occasional tramps and mountain climbers, like myself.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. In reference to the question that the gentleman from New York propounded to the committee, I will say that it is my understanding that the Forestry Bureau is engaged in reforesting some of these reserves.

Mr. PLATT. I have been through the West, and I have seen some of those areas where forests could not be grown even under a century of irrigation.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes. Some of those areas will not grow trees or anything else.

Mr. PLATT. I merely want to say that I think these terms ought to be made to correspond with the facts, and forestry ought to be practiced on land that is either forest or can be forested, not on land where trees will not grow and where trees do not grow.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for the use, maintenance, improvement, protection, and general administration of the specified national forests, $2,069,201: *Provided*, That the foregoing amounts appropriated for such purposes shall be available interchangeably in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture for the necessary expenditures for fire protection and other unforeseen exigencies: *Provided further*, That the amounts so interchanged shall not exceed in the aggregate 10 per cent of all amounts so appropriated.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. DOWELL. I arise for the purpose of making an inquiry of the chairman or other member of the committee relative to the proviso making available and interchangeable, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, 10 per cent of the appropriation. It is stated in the bill that it is for "fire protection and other unforeseen exigencies." Is that the purpose for which it is used? If so, then why, may I inquire, is the specific appropriation made at the bottom of the page, line 21, appropriating $150,000 for this specific purpose?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will my colleague allow me to answer that?

Mr. DOWELL. My interpretation of this is that the language to which I refer will permit the juggling about of something in the neighborhood of $200,000 of this appropriation.

Mr. HAUGEN. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars is an emergency fund.

Mr. DOWELL. But the $150,000 is for the specific purpose of fire protection and unforeseen emergencies. Now, in the language that I have just quoted to the gentleman 10 per cent of the amount appropriated, which is something over $200,000, is made available for the same purpose. If the $150,000 is not sufficient for fire protection, why does not the department ask

for a sufficient amount, and why is the committee placing something over $200,000 here to be juggled about by the Secretary of Agriculture from one to another purpose, or for any purpose for which he sees fit to use it?

Mr. HAUGEN. In years past it has been urgently requested that the $150,000 be made $1,000,000. The committee thought it was not necessary to carry $1,000,000, and that the $150,000 might be sufficient. It has met all requirements, except now and then, when the expenditure has largely exceeded $150,000. So we have a provision here to the effect that 10 per cent may be transferred from one to another in case of emergency.

Mr. DOWELL. Then why does not the committee recommend that it be transferred for fire purposes only, so that it could not be used for other purposes?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is left to the Secretary to determine where these transfers shall be made. Whether wise or not, that has been the policy and we have adhered to that policy.

Mr. DOWELL. I think the committee should determine the amount necessary for each item, and it should allow the Secretary the amount that is necessary, and none of this fund should be subject to transfer from one purpose to another.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am surprised that my friend does not see this, that if this provision were stricken out there would be some money that they could not expend. This fixes it so that they can spend all of it. Does not the gentleman see how necessary that is?

Mr. DOWELL. I understand how it can be used; but what I am inquiring about is why the committee does not see to it that the appropriations which are made are made for specific purposes, and are used for those purposes or else covered back into the Treasury.

Mr. HAUGEN. If the gentleman should give to the committee an estimate of the number of forest fires in a year it might be possible for the committee to estimate the amount that would be required, but we have not had any one to do that.

Mr. DOWELL. What I am calling attention to is the action of the committee in fixing the amount at $150,000. You have said in this report that $150,000 should be set aside for that purpose. Now, if the experience of the department shows that it is entitled to more than $150,000 this committee should have indicated to the House what amount should be appropriated, and if it has not been more than $150,000, then this other permission to transfer should not be authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the selection, classification, and segregation of lands within the boundaries of national forests that may be opened to homestead settlement and entry under the homestead laws applicable to the national forests; for the examination and appraisal of lands in effecting exchanges authorized by law; and for the survey and platting of certain lands, chiefly valuable for agriculture, now listed or to be listed within the national forests, under the act of June 11, 1906 (34 Stats., p. 233), and the act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stats., p. 1095), as provided by the act of March 4, 1913, $107,000.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I want to return to page 43, to ask a question of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to return to page 43 for the purpose of asking a question of the gentleman from South Carolina. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOOHER. I should like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina to tell the committee what is meant by the last seven or eight lines on page 43? What is that for? After all these appropriations for expenses, for these different forests, then you close up with an item as follows:

For necessary miscellaneous expenses incident to the general administration of the Forest Service and of the national forests specified above:
In National Forest District One, $61,700;
In National Forest District Two, $47,800;
In National Forest District Three, $55,200;
In National Forest District Four, $49,500;
In National Forest District Five, $69,740;
In National Forest District Six, $60,800;
In National Forest District Seven, $14,900;
In the District of Columbia, $122,850.

What is that for?

Mr. LEVER. That includes the general overhead expenses in the city of Washington and these various headquarters.

Mr. BOOHER. There is about $500,000 for these items. That is a large sum of money.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; but the Forest Service is a large service.

Mr. BOOHER. You expend a tremendously large sum before you get to that, so there is close to $3,000,000 for the Forest Service.

Mr. LEVER. It is more than that. The total expenses of the Forest Service amount to about $5,000,000.

Mr. BOOHER. I think there ought to be some statement to the House as to where these forest reserves are and why there should be such a large expenditure.

Mr. LEVER. I am not in charge of the bill, and I have not prepared myself to make such a statement. I think I could say something about the forests that might be of interest to the House, but I did not think it was my duty under the circumstances to do it, and therefore have not done it.

Mr. BOOHER. What is the Forest Service in Washington? What is it composed of?

Mr. LEVER. The Forest Service here is located on F Street near Ninth, in the Atlantic Building, I believe, and it consists of a chief forester at a salary of $5,000, and sundry larger and smaller clerks, stenographers, and typewriters. It consists of chairs, desks, and furniture of all kinds such as you would ordinarily find in an office.

Mr. BOOHER. You appropriate for every one of these clerks in that office and for the chief forester under the head of expenses of the Forest Service. Then this amount is in connection with the administration in that office building, it is?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. What is it?

Mr. LEVER. A portion of this fund is expended in the District of Columbia, the amount being $122,850. Seriously, that amount is expended for what is generally described as general administrative expenses, including what you would call in business general overhead expenses.

Mr. BOOHER. That includes the payment of clerks, does it not?

Mr. LEVER. Not entirely; no.

Mr. BOOHER. It includes it?

Mr. LEVER. No; the clerks are set out on the statutory roll, most of them. This would include all expenses such as furniture and various and sundry things of that kind. I have not looked into it since last year.

Mr. BOOHER. It is a pretty large sum, and it seems to me the House is entitled to some more specific information.

Mr. LEVER. It is a large sum.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase of tree seed, cones, and nursery stock, for seeding and tree planting within national forests, and for experiments and investigations necessary for such seeding and tree planting, $145,640: *Provided*, That of this sum the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to use so much as may be necessary, but not to exceed $200, to acquire by purchase land now used as a forest nursery site for the Michigan National Forest.

Mr. WALSH. I reserve a point of order on the proviso. What is the necessity for acquiring this land?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is a small tract of land in Michigan. The location, I believe, is in block 14 of an addition to a town. I do not recall the name of the town; but an office is maintained there, and it is necessary to purchase a small tract of land for $200.

Mr. WALSH. To maintain an office?

Mr. HAUGEN. The office is being maintained at the present time, and this is for the purchase of additional land.

Mr. WALSH. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAUGEN. It is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY.

Salaries, Bureau of Chemistry: One chemist, who shall be chief of bureau, $5,000; 1 chief clerk, $2,500; 1 administrative assistant, $2,500; 3 executive clerks, at $2,000 each; 10 clerks, class 4; 13 clerks, class 3; 2 clerks, at $1,440 each; 20 clerks, class 2; 1 clerk, $1,300; 75 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk, $1,100; 13 clerks, at $1,020 each; 15 clerks, at $1,000 each; 2 multigraph operators, at $1,000 each; 1 clerk, $960; 11 clerks, at $900 each; 2 food and drug inspectors, at $2,500 each; 2 food and drug inspectors, at $2,250 each; 1 food and drug inspector, $2,120; 13 food and drug inspectors, at $2,000 each; 13 food and drug inspectors, at $1,800 each; 1 food and drug inspector, $1,620; 11 food and drug inspectors, at $1,600 each; 10 food and drug inspectors, at $1,400 each; 1 assistant, $1,600; 4 laboratory helpers, at $1,200 each; 1 laboratory helper, $1,020; 4 laboratory helpers, at $1,000 each; 4 laboratory helpers, at $960 each; 3 laboratory helpers, at $900 each; 7 laboratory helpers, at $840 each; 2 laboratory helpers, at $780 each; 24 laboratory helpers or laborers, at $720 each; 2 laboratory helpers or laborers, at $660 each; 27 laboratory helpers or laborers, at $600 each; 1 laboratory assistant, $1,200; 1 toolmaker, $1,200; 3 samplers, at $1,200 each; 1 janitor, $1,020; 1 mechanic, $1,800; 2 mechanics, at $1,400 each; 1 mechanic, $1,200; 1 mechanic, $1,020; 1 mechanic, $1,000; 1 mechanic, $960; 1 mechanic, $900; 2 student assistants, at $300 each; 2 messengers, at $840 each; 1 skilled laborer, $1,050; 1 skilled laborer, $840; 7 messenger boys, at $600 each; 3 messenger boys, at $540 each; 6 messenger boys, at $480 each; 3 messenger boys, at $420 each; 2 messenger boys, at $360 each; 7 laborers, at $480 each; 13 charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $411,670.

Mr. WALSH. I make a point of order upon the words "one administrative assistant, $2,500," at the bottom of page 47 and the top of page 48. That creates a new position not carried in current law, and there is no authority for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the preparation for market, handling, grading, packing, freezing, drying, storing, transportation, and preservation of poultry and eggs, and for experimental shipments of poultry and eggs within the United States, in cooperation with the Bureau of Markets and the Bureau of Animal Industry, $45,000.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice that the appropriation carried in this paragraph is increased $5,000. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee what investigation has been carried on by this department during the past year and what new information have we obtained in the marketing, handling, grading, packing, freezing, drying, storing, transportation, and preservation of poultry and eggs, and what reason is there for an increase of this appropriation this year of $5,000?

Mr. HAUGEN. This is an item that has been carried in the bill for a number of years; increases have been estimated for from time to time and some allowed by the committee. A very good showing for this increase was made by the department.

Mr. SNELL. What definite work are they doing or have they done during the last year?

Mr. HAUGEN. Continuing the work that they have been doing in the past. I will read from the hearing:

The study of the utilization for poultry fleshing of feeds now wholly or largely wasted——

Mr. SNELL. This work has to do with the preservation of poultry and eggs, and so forth.

Mr. HAUGEN. The hearings state that the Bureau of Animal Industry handles the matter of breeding and raising poultry on the farm. The Bureau of Chemistry got into this line of work. The question arose whether birds should be drawn before putting into cold storage. Out of cold-storage problems developed this work. There was a great loss in transportation which could be prevented by experiments in this line. Now, the increased cost of traveling and supplies of all kinds makes an additional fund necessary. The hearing gives a quite extensive report of the work done by this bureau, which is largely a continuation of the work that has been carried on for a number of years.

Mr. SNELL. Do they do anything as to the handling, packing, freezing, and storing of poultry and eggs?

Mr. HAUGEN. They do a good deal.

Mr. SNELL. What have they done in an experimental way as to the shipment of poultry and eggs?

Mr. HAUGEN. They claim that they have done considerable work. They took up the matter with the transportation companies and recommended improvements in the refrigerator cars and in the method of storing which have been of great benefit and value.

Mr. SNELL. It seems to me that if there is not some definite, positive value coming from it, we should cut it out. I can not see anything but a general statement of the department that they want to continue the work.

Mr. HAUGEN. That is the general statement.

Mr. SNELL. I think the time has arrived when we should stop taking general statements on $45,000 appropriations.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Has the gentleman noticed that later on in the bill the Bureau of Markets has extensive appropriations for a variety of things for the same purpose? They have appropriations separate and apart, fixed up in a lump-sum way, so that they may investigate substantially the same things. If the gentleman should move to strike out the paragraph, does he think that the business of the Government would cease to operate?

Mr. SNELL. I do not, and unless there is some special reason better than a general statement, I shall move to strike out the whole paragraph.

Mr. HAUGEN. I trust that if anything is to be struck out we shall not take the Bureau of Chemistry but the bureaus where the larger increases have been made, and in which there may be a duplication.

Mr. SNELL. This is not under the Bureau of Chemistry.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes, it is; but if the gentleman will permit, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee why it is that under the Bureau of Chemistry an appropriation of $45,000 should be made, and under the Bureau of Markets another appropriation made for substantially the same thing, and on page 51, $13,000 should be appropriated for the Bureau of Chemistry to cooperate with the Bureau of Plant Industry and the Bureau of Markets. It would seem as if one bureau was tumbling over the other and getting a separate fund to do the same thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. That is exactly what I am trying to get at. There seems to be a duplication of effort. The only way we will ever stop it will be by beginning to strike out the appropriations for the duplications. You will never stop them unless you quit appropriating for them. I do not know of any better place to start than right here, and unless there is good reason for keeping the paragraph in the bill, I propose to move to strike it out.

Mr. HAUGEN. Let me read to the gentleman from the hearings on page 77. Dr. Alsberg says:

The Bureau of Animal Industry handles the matter of breeding and raising poultry on the farm. The Bureau of Chemistry got into this line of work originally because of certain questions which arose with reference to the application of the food and drugs act to cold-storage problems. The question arose as to whether the birds should be drawn before being put into cold storage. Out of certain cold-storage problems developed this work. Such studies were not at that time being made anywhere else. It might have been done elsewhere, and we are now planning to transfer that part of it which it bears on the Bureau of Markets, the experimental laboratory work remaining where it is.

Mr. SNELL. That is going to be transferred.

Mr. HAUGEN. A part of it is going to be transferred.

Mr. SNELL. Then there is no reason for increasing the appropriation.

Mr. HAUGEN. There is a very urgent request for it.

Mr. SNELL. I do not care about the urgent request; is there an absolute need of it?

Mr. HAUGEN. In the opinion of the committee there is absolute need of it. The committee has not reported a dollar of appropriation in this bill except where the committee thinks it would be wisely and judiciously expended. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the committee reduced the appropriation in this bill by several million dollars from what it was, and when the bill passed the House the Senate committee increased it $5,000,000.

Mr. SNELL. We are increasing it at the present time, and the gentleman says that a part of the activities should be transferred. Still you are increasing the appropriation.

Mr. HAUGEN. But the country and the department is growing every year. We are proud of the fact that they are advancing.

Mr. SNELL. Yes; we have had those general claims until I am sick of it. What I want to do is to keep the appropriations down to what are necessary.

Mr. HAUGEN. I will go as far as any Member in the House to cut out every dollar that can not be wisely and judiciously expended. If anybody can show me where it can not be judiciously and wisely expended, I am for cutting it out.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, in line 17, page 50, I move to strike out the figures "$45,000" and insert "$40,000."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SNELL) there were 28 ayes and 36 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. I do this in deference to a number of gentlemen on this side who are inclined to think that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] did not go far enough.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 50, strike out the paragraph beginning on line 12 and ending on line 17.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] yield to his colleague?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I want to know whether or not the gentleman has any information as to whether cold storage increases or decreases the price of food generally.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is a moot question. Without cold storage, of course, we could not endure very long in large communities under existing conditions.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I know that cold storage is important; but, in the gentleman's opinion, does it increase or decrease the price of food?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. As a primary proposition cold storage would increase the price of food because of the cost of cold storage, but cold storage is absolutely essential to the preservation of food if it is to be preserved for distribution in large communities.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Would it not naturally seem to decrease it because they are able to store it at a time when it is plentiful?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The price of food in cold storage might decrease in the event there should be a glut of food in the market, but the primary cost would be increased unquestionably because of the plant that has to be reared, because of the overhead charges that have to be maintained in order to keep and preserve food. There are suggestions abroad that cold storage enables those who control the cold storage to sometimes control the price of food. I am not intending to discuss that question now. Cold storage is absolutely essential to the preservation of the food supply of large communities. The question of price is one, of course, of regulation. There is some Government regulation of products in cold-storage warehouses. Some people think that regulation does not go far enough. Some contend that by reason of the accumulation of foodstuffs in cold-storage warehouses the price is made higher than it ought to be in view of the supply on hand. Take eggs, for instance. It is always a matter of amazement to me that during the months of April and May and June, when the hens are laying, when eggs should be plentiful, the price should be so high and the difficulty of securing fresh eggs so apparent. The hens are laying now, I will say to my friend from Pennsylvania, and we ought to get fresh eggs at a reasonable price, but somewhere between the farmer and the cold-storage warehouse and the consumer we have to pay the same old price, almost as much to-day as we do in the wintertime.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact I am rather familiar with the cold-storage proposition in the State of Delaware. It increases the price of eggs all of the year around, and for a very obvious reason. The cold-storage man sends out in the prolific months of May, June, July, and to a certain part of August, and he buys up the eggs at the prevailing prices. He buys them carefully.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And he buys them in Iowa, in Nebraska, and in Kansas.

Mr. LAYTON. He buys them everywhere.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And he has to pay the expense of bringing them here. The farmer may not get the price that we have to pay for them in the large cities; he certainly does not.

Mr. LAYTON. And the very fact that he goes and buys these eggs in the prolific months has the tendency to stimulate and keep up the price when the hen is laying, and after he gets his hands on the eggs and puts them in cold storage you pay just exactly what he charges you.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am rather glad the gentleman from Pennsylvania raised this question, because we have had this illuminating speech from the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. LAYTON]. The fact remains that my constituents, who are largely consumers, who do not produce eggs, because they have no farms on which to harbor the hen, have to pay substantially the same price now for eggs that they will pay next December and January. That is under somebody's control. I wish the control might be broken, so that we could get fresh eggs in April and May, when the hens of Iowa and Nebraska and Kansas are laying, at the price at which the farmer sells them, with a reasonable profit to the man who handles them.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, may I correct the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] to this extent—that hens roost, they do not go into harbors. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the Kansas hen lays while roosting she is different from other hens. [Laughter.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Well, they do not even go in a harbor to lay. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the ayes appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. HAUGEN) there were—ayes 29, noes 31.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the handling, grading, packing, canning, freezing, storing, and transportation of fish, oysters and other shellfish, and for experimental shipments of fish, for the utilization of waste products, and the development of new sources of food, $20,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order—I will reserve it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make or reserve the point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I will reserve it.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make some inquiry in reference to this item along the line that has been referred to so much here, of the duplication of work in the bureaus of the various departments. I had supposed the fish industry of the country was under the Bureau of Fisheries, connected with the Department of Commerce. We have all sorts of appropriations for the Department of Commerce for this very kind of work. I can see no advantage to the agricultural interests of the country in placing an item of this kind into the Agricultural appropriation bill. Is it not another instance of this very duplication which has been referred to frequently during this debate to-day and yesterday? I for one would feel, if the point of order is not sustained, unless there was some further explanation given of this item than appears in the report on page 13, it certainly ought to be stricken out. Of course, I do not know what my colleague's point of order may be on it. It evidently is not new in that the report refers to a combination and an increase in the appropriation of $1,000 over what it was previously. It does not appear to me that anything having to do with "the handling, grading, packing, canning, freezing, storing, and the transportation of fish, oysters, and other shellfish, and for experimental shipments of fish," has anything whatsoever to do with an Agricultural appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to be heard?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is not subject to a point of order; I do not concede the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. I make the point of order. This paragraph is not new in the sense that it was carried in the bill last year, and I think part of it was carried the year before, but the mere fact that an item is carried in a current appropriation bill for 1 year or 2 years or 10 years does not make it in order, unless there is specific authority of law in the act creating the department for making that particular appropriation. Now, the Chair yesterday had the organic act before him, and I assume probably has it available at the present time, and there is nothing in the organic act creating the Department of Agriculture which can, by a reasonable interpretation, be considered to include shellfish, fish, and oysters. If they are agricultural products it is certainly a new interpretation to be put upon those particular commodities. They may grow near the shore, but certainly are not the product of agriculture or any agricultural activity.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. The item refers to the transportation of fish, oysters, and other shellfish. That pertains to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or the Department of Commerce. Why, this is a joke.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois is aware, as my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] pointed out, that there is another activity of the Government in the Department of Commerce, the Bureau of Fisheries, making investigations along similar lines to this, issuing bulletins, sending out statements from the commissioner, and endeavoring to increase and stimulate the use of oysters, shellfish, and other fish for food. Now, here is clearly a duplication, but that is more a matter of the merits of the proposition. What I desired to direct the Chair's attention to is that there is nothing in the act creating the Department of Agriculture which permits them to go into marine and shore products and consider them as agricultural activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman I am satisfied the point of order made by the gentleman from Massachusetts will not hold, but I am not able to put my hand at the moment on the statute creating the Bureau of Chemistry. The Bureau of Chemistry is not organized under the organic act of the Department of Agriculture, but is organized under a separate act, and I am confident if I might have the opportunity to examine the statutes I might convince the Chair that there was authority of law under which these investigations can be made, and I ask unanimous consent, if the chairman will permit me, to pass this item over temporarily.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield before he makes that request?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. What chemical problem or discovery in chemistry could be announced to a waiting world by investigating, under the supervision of the Bureau of Chemistry, into the transportation of fish, oysters, and other shellfish?

Mr. LEVER. In answer to the gentleman's question, I will say the matter in which we are directly concerned at this time will not be the information I might give in answer to the gentleman's question, but whether or not this matter is really in order. And at the proper time I would be very glad to try to give the gentleman the lines followed under the investigation. But the gentleman, I am sure——

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to passing the item over?

Mr. WALSH. I think the item ought to be disposed of, either by keeping it in or striking it out, on a ruling. The Chair may intend to overrule the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. I dislike to ask the Chair to overrule the point of order when I am unable at the moment to put my hand on the act creating the Bureau of Chemistry. The act creating that bureau, as I recall it, having examined it at other sessions, confers very, very broad authority on the Bureau of Chemistry, and I think it would be the orderly procedure to pass the matter over temporarily.

Mr. WALSH. All right. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the biological investigation of food and drug products and substances used in the manufacture thereof, including investigations of the physiological effects of such products on the human organism, $15,000.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TREADWAY: Page 50, strike out the paragraph beginning in line 23 and ending in line 26.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, is it not advisable to have a little information as we go along on these items? We are appropriating for the support of the Department of Agriculture for the ensuing year. I suppose there may be—and if there is I would like to have the information thereon—some concrete connection between "the biological investigation of food and drug products and substances used in the manufacture thereof and the physiological effects of such products on the human organism" and an Agricultural appropriation bill. There may be some direct connection between that sort of an appropriation and the support of the Department of Agriculture for the ensuing year, but it is very far-fetched. There are departments of chemistry, I suppose, and chemical opportunity for analysis, and all sorts of things, but just where the connection comes in this kind of a chemical and biological investigation in order to show "the physiological effects of such products on the human organism" I call on the Committee on Agriculture to inform this House. I think my amendment to strike out the paragraph is well in order and should be adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. With pleasure; but I plead ignorance. I can not think of any question that will involve any explanation of that item or information I could give the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is not the gentleman inclined to think that the baking-powder row that ran so extensively a few years ago was conducted under this appropriation or something similar?

Mr. TREADWAY. I think it must have been much larger if it had anything to do with baking powder. This would not have gone very far.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I guess the row is nearly over.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. LEVER) the committee divided; and there were—ayes 34, noes 32.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and Mr. TREADWAY and Mr. LEVER took their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and there were—ayes 43, noes 34.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the study and improvement of methods of utilizing by-products of citrus fruits; and the investigation and development of methods for determining maturity in fruits and vegetables, in cooperation with the Bureau of Plant Industry and the Bureau of Markets, $13,000.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I am one of the new Members, receiving the careful solicitation of this side of the House and of the other side of the House. I happen to come from a farming district in the State of Illinois that enjoys the distinction of being the greatest farming district in the United States. My people sent me here not to ask for preferred legislation, but to see that their interests were conserved and conserved the same as the interests of the constituency of any other Member on this floor. But I submit to you, as a new Congressman, that it is a little bit hard for us to determine, upon these questions of importance, just how we ought to vote, and in behalf of the new Republican Members I want to suggest to the leadership on this side that we get together and not permit a minority to outvote us seven times out of ten.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigation and experiment in the utilization, for coloring purposes, of raw materials grown or produced in the United States, in cooperation with such persons, associations, or corporations as may be found necessary, including repairs, alterations, improvements, or additions to a building on the Arlington Experimental Farm, $100,000.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the attention of the chairman of the committee. Is the object of this paragraph the investigation of vegetable dyes?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; it is a general study.

Mr. LONGWORTH. What I mean is this: Is it confined to vegetable dyes? I observe this provision: "For investigation and experiment in the utilization, for coloring purposes, of raw materials grown or produced in the United States." What do the words "or produced" mean?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is "for investigation and experiment in the utilization, for coloring purposes of raw materials grown or produced in the United States, in cooperation with such persons, associations, or corporations as may be found necessary."

Mr. LONGWORTH. Well, what does it mean?

Mr. HAUGEN. It will take some time to go through the hearings. It is not confined to any particular item, but it is to carry on an investigation. This is a question that has arisen, whether this investigation should be carried on by the Department of Agriculture or by the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Do I understand that this would include the investigation of coal-tar products for use in dyes? I will repeat my question for the benefit of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], who I know has given a good deal of attention to this matter: Is this item confined to the investigation of vegetable dyes?

Mr. LEVER. It is.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And no other?

Mr. LEVER. No other. This item, as the gentleman will recall, I think, was drawn on the floor of the House. It was certainly amended on the floor of the House, and it was drawn with the distinct purpose and idea of segregating and separating the work of the Bureau of Standards from that of the Bureau of Chemistry in the dye investigation.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That is what I wanted to ask. How long has this item been carried in the bill?

Mr. LEVER. This is the second time, as I recall.

Mr. LONGWORTH. How much is this an increase over the first time?

Mr. LEVER. This is an increase of $29,000. This is to complete a building, and it is made necessary by the very large increase of wages and materials and things of that kind.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Have the results of their investigation been published yet?

Mr. LEVER. They have not. The truth of the matter is that their investigation has not gone very far yet.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman state to what extent the vegetable dyes are used in this country, if at all?

Mr. LEVER. My recollection is, from the information I gathered some time ago, that vegetable dyes are not very largely used at this time, but there is no reason why they should not be.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not know of any country in the world where vegetable dyes are used to any great extent, except in certain tropical countries. Now, it seems to me that $100,000 for the investigation of an article that is no longer in general use is rather a gross waste of money, and, not having an answer that would convince me that $100,000 is necessary for this purpose, I withdraw the pro forma amendment, and move to strike out——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Before the gentleman makes his motion, may I call his attention to the fact that the existing law provided an appropriation of $70,720 for the identical purpose set forth here—additions to buildings and things of that kind—and this appropriation is increased from $70,720 to $100,000?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Vegetable dyes as fast dyes are practically prehistoric to-day, and the expenditure of $100,000 to experiment on a prehistoric industry, it seems to me, is excessive. I do not mind carrying a reasonable appropriation for a few years to see if anything can be made out of it.

I withdraw the pro forma amendment, Mr. Chairman, and move to strike out the figures "$100,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$50,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves to strike out "$100,000" and to insert "$50,000."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, this item was put in the bill a year ago, I think, and it was put in here because of the situation then existing in this country with reference to dyes. Of course, gentlemen in this body know that this country for many years was almost entirely dependent upon Germany for its dyestuffs. The committee reporting the bill felt that we ought to do something—everything, in fact, that was possible—that might put this country in an independent position in this regard. This item was then framed by the committee and submitted to the House, and I think on the floor of the House it was so amended that there could not be any possible conflict between the work of the Bureau of Chemistry in the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Standards in the Department of Commerce.

My recollection may be at fault in that respect, but I think the statement was made that very little of the appropriation carried in the present law was expended at the time these hearings were had before the committee, and that this fund was more or less a reappropriation of funds that had gone back to the Treasury. It will be recalled that the Agricultural appropriation bill last year did not get through until very late in the year, and the fund was not available until some time in October or November—I do not recall which month—and a good deal of the work of the department therefore suffered for lack of funds; that is, the new work, and this was one of the new items. I believe that we ought to be rather careful in striking out of this bill items which have been carefully passed upon by the committee under my chairmanship and under the very wise chairmanship of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN], passed upon by the older Members of Congress and repassed upon favorably by a committee almost new in its personnel. I hope the Members will be careful in what they are doing on this proposition. I have no personal interest at all in it. I do not know who is doing this work. I do not know who is at the head of it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How much of this amount is to be expended for alterations and improvements to this building?

Mr. LEVER. I have not looked that up.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There was a similar appropriation in last year's bill. Was not this building repaired then?

Mr. LEVER. No; this is a new building. There were no repairs on this building. This is the usual language used in all the items of this character. The building is not erected yet. It is in progress of erection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There was a similar appropriation in last year's bill.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; the increase in this item is about $29,000.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman says no report has been made by the department. I call the attention of the gentleman to page 19 of the hearings; I will read it.

However, you can take a photograph if you have dyed your plate with a dye which absorbs the rays of light that are present; for instance, if you dye a plate red with a certain dye that will absorb the red rays, then you can photograph objects that can not be photographed with an undyed plate.

These dyes were made in Europe. As the former chairman of the committee has said, we have been dependent upon Germany. Now, if it is desired that dyes shall be made in England and in Germany and to be dependent upon England and Germany, strike out this item. For my part I believe America is the proper place.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Has the gentleman ever heard of a vegetable dye made in Germany?

Mr. HAUGEN. I have read from the hearings.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Has the gentleman ever heard of a vegetable dye made in Germany?

Mr. HAUGEN. The chief of the division calls attention to the work.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman answer my question?

Mr. HAUGEN. I am not familiar with the place where they are manufactured.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the whole point of this proposition is that these dyes are not the dyes as to which Germany has had control of the American market. They are not the dyes that it is necessary to have in this country in order to be able to make explosives or other chemicals. The very reason that Germany has had a monopoly of these dyes is because they are produced by another method than the vegetable method. They are produced out of coal tar, and I venture to say that only a negligible percentage of dyes used in this country are made out of vegetables. Germany has never made an ounce of such dyes in competition with this country. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] asks me if I do not think that this country ought to be self-sustaining in the dye industry. Of course I do; but not in a prehistoric dye industry. Vegetable dyes are used by savages to dye their waistbands, and that is about all that they are used for in the dyeing of clothing; and the idea of expending $100,000 for experimenting in such a proposition as the manufacture of vegetable dyes is to me a gross waste of the public money.

I ask for a vote on my amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio if he will not modify his amendment by moving to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not myself see any real necessity for the paragraph, except as the gentleman from South Carolina says it was inserted a year ago, and they have had no opportunity to make experiments. So far as I am concerned, I would be willing to allow further opportunity for further experimentation, and I think half the appropriation would be reasonable and ample for the purpose.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I will offer a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers a substitute amendment to that of the gentleman from Ohio to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, God knows I want appropriations made for the benefit of the public service. I want all necessary investigation to be made. I am willing to appropriate whatever is necessary for the well-being of the country, but I will not vote for any proposition that further duplicates investigations that are already being made or can be made under organizations now in being.

We have under the Interior Department the Bureau of Standards. We have spent millions of dollars in perfecting that work, and it has been of invaluable use to the whole people. It is well organized, with chemists and experts and everybody that is necessary to conduct all investigations of this kind or of any other kind of a similar nature.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] says that a year ago this was done while the war was on. I apprehend that there has not been a dollar of this money expended, and the Agriculture Department come now with the appropriation increased to $100,000. The war is over. We will soon be in competition with Germany on these dyes from coal tar. When the war was being carried on, on account of the submarines and the fact that we needed shipping, we could have no connection with Germany, and we suffered for 12 months or 2 years perhaps for the want of proper dyes. Necessity is the mother of invention. We went to work and are making to-day all the dyes that we need, and we make them as well as Germany makes them, thank God. [Applause.]

Now, we will need later on a protection of that industry. Germany will undoubtedly compete, or attempt to compete, and undertake to run our people out of the business and get possession of our market as to dyes. We will meet that question when we come to it.

What is the use of expending $100,000 for vegetable dyes. I confirm, so far as whatever knowledge on the subject I have, the statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] that the vegetable dyes belong to past ages.

Now, with all the indebtedness we have got to meet, with the large debt that none of us can calculate, with the enormous taxation of the people who are protesting, and after a bit will not only protest but groan under it, what is the use of making these needless appropriations? God knows how much we are to pay before over four million soldiers, plus their dependents,

have received what is called compensation but which in fact are pensions two or three times higher than any pensions granted by any government on earth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. I think I am safe in saying, after something of an investigation, that the annual payments to our soldiers to be adjudicated by the War Risk Bureau will amount conservatively at the minimum to $500,000,000 annually.

There will be increases and increases. Are you going to repeal that law? God knows we will not—not a line of it. [Applause.] We will keep the pledge we wrote in that legislation when we declared war or shortly thereafter. [Applause.]

Many a mickle makes a muckle. I represent a farmer constituency; two-thirds of them are farmers, owning the best farming country in the world, as good as Iowa—I won't say any better—as good as Missouri—I won't say any better—but we have six States that produce nine-tenths of the meat and cereals produced in the United States.

Now, we have got our hands full. Let us look at it without prejudice and not unnecessarily pass laws that in some instances—I do not say this, though I hae me doots—are chiefly to enable specialists to perform service in which they are deeply interested at salaries that are satisfactory to them, but which will not return to the hundred million people already staggering under tremendous Federal, State, municipal, and other taxes, any adequate results.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask two or three questions solely for information. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] agree that we have outlived the age of vegetable dyes. Have our men learned to make these coal-tar dyes?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, yes. We have been making our own dyes and have been growing and growing in ability to make them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Have they enough machinery running now to supply the United States with these dyes?

Mr. CANNON. Yes. I think I am correct in that. I will ask the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that over $300,000,000 have been invested in the dye industry in this country within the past two or three years, and we are now producing almost as many colors as we heretofore purchased from Germany.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then what is the reason you can not get a shirt with a red stripe through it that will not wash out?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I can not answer the question because, unlike the gentleman from Missouri, I do not wear that kind.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They are the prettiest shirts you can get. I did manage to pick up one, but I could not get more than one.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BOIES. Mr. Chairman, I have just one or two things in my mind to say, and that is that within 24 hours we have had from some reliable source, some newspaper, some report from some department in Washington, the statement that the Americans, still digging into the secrets of Germany, have now in their possession nearly all of those secrets having anything to do with dyestuffs, so that the people of this country will not be bothered in the future in that direction.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOIES. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I simply want to say, in justice to the chairman of the committee who spoke about the use of vegetable dyes, that I think my friend from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] spoke rather hastily when he said that vegetable dyes are a product of past ages. The gentleman is an expert on dyes, but I do not think he would want to say that no vegetable dyes are used at the present time in this country. A very considerable quantity are still being used, and there might be a question as to whether we could not profitably use our vegetable products in that way.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to the testimony of Dr. Alsberg, as it appears on page 18 of the hearings. He states:

We are asking for a material increase to purchase some additional equipment and to extend the work. We believe that this particular work of the bureau has been of great value to the dye industry—

Notwithstanding the statement of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. In just a moment. That is the statement of the chemist, Dr. Alsberg. He continues:

We have during the past year done not quite so much in this connection as we had planned on account of the war. The force of the laboratory has been at work on problems relating to the war, to a large extent. For example, the Medical Corps needed a dye called "vital red." It was necessary for the Medical Corps to study the blood of men who were engaged in flying at high altitudes. The dye was heretofore used only in a small way for laboratory experiments, and was imported from Europe.

As I stated to the gentleman, if he is in favor of having it imported from Europe, manufactured possibly in Germany, well and good, the proper thing would be to strike it from this bill, but for my part, I am in favor of developing American industries. If there is anything that needs encouragement in the United States, it is the dye industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced himself in doubt.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 35, noes 41.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that the motion to strike out is lost?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The committee again divided; and the tellers [Mr. CANNON and Mr. HAUGEN] reported that there were—ayes 36, noes 47.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, it takes a quorum, and I make that point. I think it is adjourning time, anyway.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, pending that, will the gentleman withhold it until I can make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HAUGEN. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. If the committee determines to rise, the Chair having declared the matter lost, what will be the parliamentary status when the committee again resumes its sitting?

The CHAIRMAN. No quorum being present at the time the declaration was made and the point of no quorum being raised, the Chair would rule this question will be up for a vote to-morrow morning.

Mr. HAUGEN. I withdraw my motion, because we will settle it right now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. CANNON. Why, the vote just taken showed no quorum.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa to rise I ask for tellers.

Mr. WALSH. That was withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. That motion is not in order; the Chair is counting for a quorum.

Mr. LEVER. I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. That motion is not in order. The gentleman from Iowa has just withdrawn that motion.

Mr. CANNON. But the gentleman can renew it.

The CHAIRMAN. Ninety-five gentlemen are present, not a quorum.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MADDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3157, the Agricultural appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the subject of the reduction of freight rates on imports coming to the Pacific coast and shipped east.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the question of freight rates on goods entering the Pacific coast and coming East.

Mr. FORDNEY. And to print as part of my remarks the full and complete list of the articles affected by those rates, which I now have.

The SPEAKER. And to print a list of the articles affected by those rates. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, Mr. KAHN, have the privilege of addressing the House

next Monday morning, immediately after the reading of the Journal and disposition of business on the Speaker's table, for one hour and a half on the result of his observations during his recent trip to Europe.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that his colleague, Mr. KAHN, have consent on Monday next, immediately after the reading of the Journal and disposing of business on the Speaker's table, to address the House for one hour and a half on the result of his trip to France. Is there objection?

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice the gentleman who objected this morning is not here. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] made objection before, and I see he is not on the floor.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was not aware that the request was made before.

Mr. LEVER. I think the gentleman from Mississippi made the objection on the theory that the minority leader was temporarily absent, and I do not think he cares to press his objection.

Mr. GARD. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Mississippi based his objection on the probability that there might be an appropriation bill in progress of consideration, and the speech could be deferred until the appropriation bill was finished. But we are assured there will be no appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. I am sure that in a day at furthest the deficiency bill will be reported.

Mr. NOLAN. I will make the statement, if the Speaker will indulge me, that the gentleman from California is going to be busily engaged in getting the military appropriation bill in shape. It is necessary that we have that appropriation bill out of the way before July 1. He would like to have Monday morning to get his speech "off his chest," and I think it is of sufficient importance to Congress and to the people of the country that he be given the permission, despite appropriation bills.

Mr. GARRETT. May I ask the gentleman, if he happens to know—I saw the statement in the papers this morning; whether it is correct or not I do not know, and I am asking the gentleman now—if the Committee on Military Affairs has determined to eliminate the questions of policy from the appropriation bill and is simply going to bring in an appropriation bill?

Mr. NOLAN. I can not say just exactly what they will bring in in the way of legislation, but it is essential that we get the military appropriation bill out of the way making the appropriations for the year, and the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] is busily engaged now in appointing his subcommittees and getting his committee in shape for hearings on that bill; and he would like to make this speech. At least, we would like to hear him make it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, does anybody know whether we are going to have an appropriation bill up on Monday or not?

The SPEAKER. I understand the Committee on Appropriations has the deficiency bill practically ready.

Mr. MONDELL. There will be an appropriation bill before the House at that time. But the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] has just returned from a long and interesting trip in Europe, and I think that the Members of the House will be very anxious to hear him. I want to say in this connection, however, Mr. Speaker, that until our program is disposed of, so far as the appropriation bills are concerned, I trust we will not have many more of these requests for time for a considerable period. I am afraid I might be compelled to object, but I shall not object to this.

Mr. GARRETT. I might suggest a solution of the situation——

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me? In my judgment the deficiency appropriation bill, as I understand it, will be introduced this evening, and will follow the agricultural bill. But I do not think the deficiency bill will take much time.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, we will have other bills that will follow the deficiency bill, and there will be legislation before the House Monday. There is no question about that.

Mr. KITCHIN. Reserving the right to object, if gentlemen on that side feel, of course, it is more important to have an hour and a half speech from the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] on his trip to Europe, and it is more urgent than deficiency bills and other appropriation bills, I hope no Democrat will be discourteous enough to object, but will let him make the speech. They may know how highly important it is. We do not.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will allow me, we hope to have the deficiency bill out of the way before that time.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is just a little joking. I hope nobody will object. I am sure the gentleman from California has a great speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by having printed therein some correspondence with Gen. March in reference to demobilization matters of material interest to the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing correspondence with Gen. March concerning demobilization. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Thursday, May 29, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Youghiogheny River, Pa., from its mouth to West Newton, including a report on existing and prospective water terminals (H. Doc. No. 60); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Red Lake, Minn., and Red Lake River from its outlet at Red Lake to its junction with the Red River of the North at Grand Forks, N. Dak., with a view to devising plans for regulating works whereby the level of said lake and the flow of said stream may be controlled in the interest of navigation, etc. (H. Doc. No. 61); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War, submitting supplemental estimate of appropriations required by the Engineer Department of the Army (H. Doc. No. 62); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 3612) for the relief of the Philippine Scouts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 3613) to provide a commission to secure plans and designs for a monument or memorial to the memory of the Negro soldiers and sailors who fought in the wars of our country; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 3614) to control floods on the James River in the States of North Dakota and South Dakota; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. MAPES (by request): A bill (H. R. 3615) to regulate the height, area, and use of buildings in the District of Columbia and to create a zoning commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: A bill (H. R. 3616) to repeal the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 3617) for the protection, regulation, and conservation of the fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3618) to protect and conserve the halibut fisheries of the Pacific Ocean, to establish closed seasons in halibut fishing in certain waters thereof, and to restrict the landing of halibut in the United States of America and the Territory of Alaska during the closed season established; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3619) to amend section 13 of an act entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States, to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto, and to promote safety at sea," approved March 4, 1915; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3620) to authorize the Commissioner of Navigation to change the names of vessels; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3621) to establish load lines for certain vessels; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 3622) to amend the act approved September 8, 1916, chapter 470, Statutes at Large, Sixty-fourth Congress, relating to pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 3623) to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3624) incorporating the patrol drivers into the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 3625) providing for the erection of a public building at the village of Bath, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3626) to remodel, repair, and enlarge the post-office building at the city of Ithaca, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 3627) providing for the extension and enlargement of the post office and court building at Monroe, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3628) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to cities and town in Louisiana German cannon, fieldpieces, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 3629) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Monroe, Green County, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3630) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Madison, Dane County, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3631) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Dodgeville, Iowa County, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3632) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Richland Center, Richland County, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3633) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Prairie du Chien, Crawford County, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3634) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lancaster, Grant County, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3635) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Darlington, Lafayette County, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 3636) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Union, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3637) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the town of Oneida, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3638) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the town of Lenoir City, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3639) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the town of Coal Creek, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3640) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the town of Rockwood, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3641) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the town of Harriman, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3642) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Roane, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3643) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Campbell, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3644) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Blount, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3645) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Hamblen, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3646) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Jefferson City, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3647) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Loudon, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3648) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Jefferson, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee no Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3649) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Knox, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3650) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Anderson, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3651) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Scott, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3652) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the town of Jellico, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 3653) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, to sell the present public building and site in the city of Clarksburg, W. Va., and purchase a new site and erect thereon a new public building in said city; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 3654) to authorize the governor of the Territory of Hawaii to acquire privately owned lands and rights of way within the boundaries of the Hawaii National Park; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 3655) to provide for the erection of a public building at McGehee, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LAYTON: A bill (H. R. 3656) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Georgetown, Del.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 3657) to amend the act of Congress approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat., 869), for the enlargement, extension, remodeling, rebuilding, reconstruction, or improvement of the Federal building at Alexandria, La., to provide for the demolition of the present building and the construction upon the site thereof of a new building, at a cost not exceeding $375,000; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JONES of Texas: A bill (H. R. 3658) providing for the employment by the United States Government of discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines who were in the service during a period in which the United States was engaged in war, and prescribing the preference to be extended them in filling clerical and other vacancies; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. VINSON: A bill (H. R. 3659) providing for a site and public building for a post office at Tennille, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3660) to construct a public building for a post office at the city of Sandersville, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3661) providing for a site and public building for a post office at Sparta, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3662) to construct a public building for a post office at the city of Thomson, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3663) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Milledgeville, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3664) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Warrenton, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3665) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Gibson, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3666) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Harlem, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3667) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Lincolnton, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3668) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Sparta, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3669) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Irwinton, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3670) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Louisville, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3671) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Crawfordville, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3672) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Sandersville, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3673) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Augusta, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3674) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Thomson, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 3675) to prohibit exportation of rum and other intoxicants to Africa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3676) to acquire a site and erect a building thereon at Springfield, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3677) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Northampton, Hampshire County, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3678) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of South Hadley, Hampshire County, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3679) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Turners Falls, Franklin County, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 3680) to amend an act of Congress of February 17, 1911, entitled "An act providing for the purchase or erection, within certain limits of cost, of embassy, legation, and consular buildings abroad"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3681) to provide for the promotion of certain officers, noncommissioned officers, and privates in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSEY: A bill (H. R. 3682) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Bloomingdale, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3683) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Newton, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3684) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hackettstown, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3685) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wartendyke, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3686) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Lodi, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3687) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Belvidere, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3688) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Blairstown, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3689) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Carlstadt, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3690) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of East Rutherford, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3691) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Englewood, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3692) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hackensack, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3693) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Hasbrouck Heights, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3694) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the township of Hohokus, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3695) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Leonia, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3696) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Oakland, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3697) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Park Ridge, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3698) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Phillipsburg, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3699) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Ridgefield Park, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3700) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Woodridge, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3701) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Ridgewood, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3702) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Rutherford, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3703) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Sussex, Sussex County, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3704) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Washington, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3705) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Midland Park, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 3706) amending the Articles of War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3707) authorizing the enlistment of non-English-speaking citizens and aliens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3708) to provide for the disposition of the proceeds of sales of abandoned and useless military reservations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3709) providing for the relief of retired enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps who served in the military service during the Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 3710) to provide for the erection of a public building at Benton, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3711) to provide for the erection of a public building at Malvern, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3712) to provide for the erection of a public building at Monticello, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McGLENNON: A bill (H. R. 3713) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Belleville, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3714) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Jersey City, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3715) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Nutley, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3716) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Newark, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3717) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Kearny, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3718) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bayonne, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3719) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of East Newark, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3720) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Harrison, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BEE: A bill (H. R. 3721) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of New Braunfels, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3722) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sinton, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3723) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Blanco, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Texas: A bill (H. R. 3724) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 3725) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at New Lexington, Perry County, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3726) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Circleville, Pickway County, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3727) to repeal section 3 of the act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 3728) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Edgard, La., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3729) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Tulane University, of New Orleans, La., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3730) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Loyola University, of New Orleans, La., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 3731) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Pittsburgh, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 3732) exempting honorably discharged service men from payment of income tax to an amount not exceeding $5,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 3733) for the erection of a public building at Central City, Muhlenberg County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 3734) to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the manufacture of optical glassware in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3735) to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the manufacture of chemical glassware in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FREAR: A bill (H. R. 3736) to transfer the Public Health Service from the Department of the Treasury to the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3737) to transfer certain bureaus from the Department of the Treasury to the departments named; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3738) to provide for an auditor general to act on behalf of Congress and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 3739) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Millbrook, N. Y., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3740) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Bangall, N. Y., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3741) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Warwick, N. Y., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3742) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the State Museum, Washington Headquarters, Newburgh, N. Y., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3743) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3744) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Port Jervis, N. Y., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 3745) to reimburse the governors of States and Territories for expenses incurred by them in aiding the United States to raise, organize, and supply and equip armed forces of the United States in the existing war with Germany and its allies and to protect citizens of the United States in Mexico and on the Mexican border; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3746) to declare certain alien children naturalized citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3747) granting to the State of Minnesota certain public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3748) authorizing the erection of a public building at Marshall, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3749) to authorize the erection of a public building at Litchfield, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 3750) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the town of Atglen, Pa., captured cannon or fieldpiece and suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3751) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the city of Chester, Pa., captured cannon or fieldpieces and suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3752) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the Pennsylvania Military College, Chester, Pa., captured cannon or fieldpiece and suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3753) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the Media Local Armory Board, Media, Pa., captured cannon or fieldpiece and suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 3754) to amend sections 8 and 21 of the copyright act, approved March 4, 1909; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 3755) for the erection of a Federal building at Winnfield, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 3756) to amend the war-risk insurance act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 3757) to correct the military record of the officers and enlisted men of the Enrolled Missouri Militia and all other militia organizations of the State of Missouri that cooperated with the military forces of the United States in suppressing the War of the Rebellion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLANTON: Resolution (H. Res. 64) requesting the Secretary of State to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of State.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 65) requesting the Secretary of Labor to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 66) requesting the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 67) requesting the Secretary of the Interior to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of the Interior.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 68) requesting the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 69) requesting the Attorney General to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 70) requesting the Postmaster General to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 71) requesting the Interstate Commerce Commission to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 72) requesting the Director General United States Railroad Administration to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 73) requesting the Civil Service Commission to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 74) requesting the Secretary of War to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable; to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 75) requesting the Secretary of Treasury to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 76) requesting the Secretary of Commerce to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 77) requesting the United States Shipping Board to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Resolution (H. Res. 78) for the appointment of a select committee of 15 on Expenditures in the War Department; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAMSEY: Resolution (H. Res. 79) for an assistant clerk to the Committee on Enrolled Bills; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CURRIE of Michigan: Resolution (H. Res. 80) for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate tariff orders and freight rates and report to the House on or before July 1, 1919; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 73) authorizing the President to extend invitations to other nations to send representatives to the World Cotton Conference, to be held at New Orleans, La., October 13 to 16, 1919; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 74) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 75) proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States to authorize the Congress to enact laws to define and limit the causes for divorce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the development of the merchant marine of the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relating to the labor controversy in the city of Madison; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, urging Congress to pass certain legislation relative to aliens who avoided military service in the present war; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 3758) to reimburse J. B. Patterson, postmaster of Lacon, Morgan County, Ala., for certain postage stamps stolen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 3759) granting an increase of pension to Henry N. Tippett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3760) granting an increase of pension to Willard D. Dennison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 3761) for the relief of William Crawford; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 3762) for the relief of Thomas Curneen, alias Thomas Curtis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3763) granting a pension to Alice A. Parratt Garner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3764) granting a pension to George A. Springet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3765) granting a pension to Charles F. Rich; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3766) granting a pension to Andy Skaats; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3767) granting a pension to James H. Swallum; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 3768) granting a pension to Helen M. Warren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 3769) for the relief of George D. Jones; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3770) for the relief of George W. Bard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3771) for the relief of Cyrus Kennedy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3772) for the relief of John H. Smith, alias Henry H. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3773) for the relief of John W. Yocum; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3774) granting an increase of pension to James H. Nale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3775) granting an increase of pension to Edward H. Harpster; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3776) granting an increase of pension to William Francis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3777) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Gossert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3778) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Bouder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3779) granting a pension to Sarah E. Hood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3780) granting a pension to Mary E. Roland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3781) granting a pension to Laura D. Bricker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3782) granting a pension to Clarence W. Durr; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 3783) granting a pension to Frank Robertson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3784) granting a pension to Laura Wachtel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3785) granting a pension to Elizabeth Daub; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3786) granting an increase of pension to Fannie H. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 3787) granting a pension to William Thornton Parker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3788) granting a pension to Esmeralda C. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOODYKOONTZ: A bill (H. R. 3789) granting an increase of pension to William C. Bowen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HASKELL: A bill (H. R. 3790) granting a pension to John Bleiweiss; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 3791) to pay the heirs of Lewis J. Blair, late lieutenant colonel of the Eighty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, amount found due him by the Court of Claims; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 3792) granting a pension to Henriette Borgstadt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 3793) for the relief of Levi L. Conright; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 3794) for the relief of Patrick Savage; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3795) for the relief of Daniel W. Hand; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: A bill (H. R. 3796) granting an increase of pension to James Gagan, alias James Dillon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 3797) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Hyde; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3798) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte Mayer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3799) granting an increase of pension to John H. Wynn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3800) granting an increase of pension to William Koehn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3801) granting an increase of pension to Albert P. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3802) granting an increase of pension to Mathew Kerwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 3803) granting a pension to Eliza J. St. Clair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGLENNON: A bill (H. R. 3804) for the relief of Edward Johnston; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 3805) granting an increase of pension to Austin Daugherty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3806) granting a pension to Katharine Schellschmidt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 3807) granting an honorable discharge to James H. Davis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 3808) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of George W. Johnson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3809) granting a pension to Mary Jane Chamberlain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 3810) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3811) granting an increase of pension to James T. Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 3812) granting an increase of pension to James Andell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3813) granting an increase of pension to John Purkaple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3814) granting an increase of pension to Amanda L. Sevier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3815) granting an increase of pension to John Read; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3816) granting an increase of pension to John Reynolds; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3817) granting an increase of pension to John T. Temple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3818) granting an increase of pension to David Lemon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3819) granting a pension to Elizabeth Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3820) granting a pension to Abigail Butts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3821) granting a pension to Margia Alice Raines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3822) granting a pension to William S. Harrell, alias James Strawther; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3823) granting a pension to Henry Gass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3824) granting a pension to Amanda Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3825) granting a pension to Ida L. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3826) granting a pension to Hannah Lovell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3827) granting a pension to Sarah E. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHODES: A bill (H. R. 3828) granting an increase of pension to Louisa H. Highley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3829) granting an increase of pension to Stephen D. Compton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 3830) granting a pension to Wesley A. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3831) granting a pension to Peter R. Sines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3832) granting a pension to Harvey Stultz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3833) granting a pension to David Wolf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3834) granting a pension to Eliza Greten; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3835) granting a pension to William Vorhees; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3836) granting a pension to Myron E. Stowe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3837) granting a pension to John Spangler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3838) granting a pension to Francis B. Burgoon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3839) granting a pension to R. D. McManigal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 3840) granting a pension to William Purcell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 3841) granting a pension to William B. Hendricks; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 3842) granting a pension to William J. Ross; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TINCHER: A bill (H. R. 3843) granting an increase of pension to Edward F. Duke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON: A bill (H. R. 3844) for the relief of Della James; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VOIGT: A bill (H. R. 3845) granting an increase of pension to Lenard P. Kehrmeyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 3846) granting a pension to Agnes O'Brien; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3847) granting an increase of pension to Bennett M. Tracy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3848) granting a pension to Samuel S. Daniell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 3849) granting a pension to Francis M. Phares; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the third district of Minnesota, urging retention of war prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), resolutions of Rev. Alvin T. Perkins and members of Congress Heights Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., urging against repeal of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BABKA: Petition of sundry fur dealers in Cleveland, Ohio, urging repeal of tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BACHARACH: Petition of sundry citizens of Hoboken, N. J., in defense of the Jews of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of farmers of Penns Grove, Salem County, and citizens of Gloucester County, N. J., urging repeal of the so-called daylight law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: Petition of the National Garment Retailers' Association (by McCarthy Bros., Laconia, N. H.), advocating the repeal of the luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, telegraphic petition of First Methodist Episcopal Church, Laconia, N. H., in opposition to the change of prohibition law recommended to Congress which will lift the ban on beer and light wines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Anti-Saloon League of New Hampshire, advocating the enactment by Congress of a national law-enforcement code for the thorough enforcement of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Eagle Grange No. 294, Miss Alice E. Charles, secretary, Chatham, N. H., advocating the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Sunday School of the First Methodist Church, Portsmouth, N. H., by M. L. Schurman, assistant superintendent, protesting against action of the President in his recommendation that the prohibition law as affecting wines and beer be repealed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition of citizens of Toledo, Ill., protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of Elliott H. Goodwin, secretary of Chamber of Commerce of United States of America, protesting against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Merchants' Association of New York, urging defeat of proposed repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of certain residents of Schenectady, N. Y., praying for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: Petition of sundry citizens of Bancroft, Klemme, and Burt, Iowa, asking for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOOLING: Petition of Detroit Cadillac Motor Car Co., urging repeal of tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Merchants' Association of New York, urging defeat of proposed repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of Overland Automobile Co., W. A. Mueller, and J. W. Bray, all of St. Louis, Mo., urging removal of tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Jackson Johnson, president Chamber of Commerce, St. Louis, Mo., urging against repeal of daylight-

saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of African Americans, protesting against England, Belgium, and France becoming mandatories over German African colonies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition signed by several hundred wives, mothers, and sisters of soldiers of the Three hundred and eighth Engineers, requesting their return to the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREEMAN: Petition of Gerald Waldo and 16 others of Willimantic, A. B. Roberts and 13 others of Windham, H. M. Jenkins and 178 others of Stafford, Helen F. Hoey and 55 others of Pomfret Center, all in the State of Connecticut, asking for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of William Rollinson and 43 others, all of Canterbury, Conn., for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of E. Frank Morgan, mayor of New London, Conn., and the Jewish citizens of New London, against massacre of Jews in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of retail jewelers of United States, favoring repeal of all excise taxes on retail sales; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, opposing the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Genoa, Ill., favoring repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York City, opposing repeal of daylight amendment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERSEY: Petition of S. P. Archibald, of Monticello, Me., urging repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of D. S. Chadbourne and 29 others, of Mattawamkeag, Me., protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions signed by S. P. Archibald, representing Aroostook and Penobscot, Me., Pomona Grange, against free entry of potatoes from all other countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions signed by Max Cohen, of Bangor, Me., representing 1,000 citizens of Jewish faith in that city, protesting against Jewish massacres in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Medical Society of the State of California urging there be no reduction in appropriation for Public Health Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Imperial County Farm Bureau of California, urging legislation for the land settlement plans for farm homes for soldiers; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KETTNER: Protest of Harriet A. Waldman, president Riverside Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Riverside; Women's Christian Temperance Union of Hemet, and churches, and Hemet Baptist Church, Hemet; First Baptist Church Colored, First Christian Church, etc., San Bernardino; Methodist Episcopal Church, Orange; Imperial Methodist Episcopal Church, and Imperial Methodist Sunday School, Imperial; Needles Methodist Episcopal Church, Needles; First Methodist Church, Yucaipa; Methodist Episcopal and Congregational Church, San Jacinto; Congregational Methodist Church, Colton; First Methodist Church, Anaheim; all in the State of California, against removal of ban on light wines and beer, and urging support of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, protests against luxury tax on sporting goods, etc., by Imperial Valley Hardware Co., El Centro; Hazard Gould Sporting Goods Co., San Diego; and Barker-Ascher Arms Co., San Diego; also protests against luxury tax on furs by Willard H. George, Los Angeles, and Southern California Fur Dealers' Association, Pasadena; also protest against luxury tax on motor trucks and cars by Moreland Motor Truck Co., San Diego, all in the State of California; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest by Board of Trade, San Francisco, Calif., against depriving Interstate Commerce Commission of present power to authorize departures from long and short haul clause; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Sacramento Valley Development Association, favoring Secretary Lane's land development plan; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolution by the California Gold & Silversmiths' Association, Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Needles Union Labor Council, Needles, Calif., demanding the elimination of all aliens from the shops of the Railway Administration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of the John B. Adt Co. and Swindell Bros., Baltimore, Md., against continuation of Labor Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of David M. Andrew Co., contractors, Baltimore, Md., relating to House bill 14893 and House Report No. 976; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of Stephen Chohany, furrier; O'Niell & Co., furriers; Standard Motor Co.; and Motor Car Co., all of Baltimore, Md., urging against revenue taxes on furs and automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Monument Street Methodist Church congregation, of Baltimore, Md., opposing repeal of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Antiprohibition League, Baltimore, Md., urging repeal of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of John J. Greer & Co. (Inc.); Charles H. Rolosan, jr.; and Central Fire Insurance Co., all of Baltimore, Md., urging against repeal of zone advances on advertising pages of periodicals; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LUCE: Petition of Oak Square Methodist Episcopal Church, protesting against repeal of existing prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of many residents of the city of Syracuse, N. Y., for the repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of members of East Avenue Methodist Church, of Norwalk, Conn., protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of members of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Ridgefield, Conn., protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Philadelphia Board of Trade, advocating the return of railroads to their owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of the Oneida Auburn Sales Co., the H. Kleinhaus Co., the Oakland Pittsburgh Co., and Thomas F. Dunn, all of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging the repeal of the sales tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Petition of the Linden Hills Congregational Church; Rev. Stanley B. Roberts, pastor of Bethlehem Presbyterian Church; Robert L. Pollock; Wesley Methodist Episcopal Church; Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Minneapolis, with membership of 2,000, all of the city of Minneapolis; Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the State of Minnesota, with membership of 9,000; Mrs. B. L. Scovell, secretary Minnesota Woman's Christian Temperance Union, all of Minneapolis; and Mrs. Eva Waterman, State legislative superintendent of Minnesota Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Elk River, all of the State of Minnesota, protesting against any repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Civic and Commerce Association of Minneapolis, Minn., strongly urging retention of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of John S. Allen, of Minneapolis, Minn., urging repeal of 5 per cent luxury tax on jewelry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of American Ball Co., per Charles L. Horn, manager, of Minneapolis, Minn., urging reduction of 10 per cent luxury tax on sporting goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Wingate Co., and Minneapolis Retailers' Association, William J. Hayes, secretary, all of Minneapolis, Minn., urging repeal of section 904 of the excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William E. Dunn and various other members of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers of Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of legislation for national ownership and governmental operation of railroads; and resolution of Minneapolis Lodge, No. 260, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, urging Government operation and control of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Midland Motor Co. (Inc.), Minneapolis Automobile Trade Association, H. E. Wilcox Motor Co., and Oakland Motor Car Co., all of Minneapolis, Minn., urging the removal of

excise taxes on sales of automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Minneapolis Fur Merchants' Association, per G. H. Lugsdin, president, Minneapolis; E. Albrecht & Son; Bischoff, Johnson & Lundgren; Joseph Ullmann (Inc.); Gordon & Ferguson; J. Geiger; McKibben, Driscoll & Dorsey, fur dealers, of St. Paul, all in the State of Minnesota, protesting against 10 per cent luxury tax on furs and urging its repeal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Association of Collegiate Alumna in St. Louis, Mo., urging the establishment of the School Board Service Division as permanent division in Bureau of Education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: Petition of Methodist Church and citizens of Athens, Ill., opposing repeal of prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES: Petition of Lodge No. 117, Brotherhood of B. I. S. D. B. and H. of A., of De Soto, Mo., for Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of the National Retail Dry Goods Association of New York City, urging the immediate repeal of the luxury tax, and of Mr. Herman Rosenberg, of 23 West One hundred and nineteenth Street, New York, urging the repeal of the 10 per cent tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Minute Men, urging the deportation of aliens who will not become citizens or declare their intentions of becoming citizens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution by the Association of Collegiate Alumna at St. Louis, Mo., urging the permanent establishment of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Porges & Levy, of New York City, wine and liquor dealers, protesting against prohibition; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, and of the Merchants' Association of New York City, protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Fowlerville, N. Y., with a congregation of 45, unanimously protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of five churches in Perry, N. Y., with a membership of 1,600, protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Rochester (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, protesting against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of East Shelby (N. Y.) Methodist Episcopal Church, protesting against the repeal of the war prohibition law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIEGEL: Resolutions adopted by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, relating to league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, for suppression of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: Petition of citizens of Andover and Canton, Me., asking for repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of South Hiram, Me., asking for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *May 29, 1919.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, by our reverence for the majesty of the law, by our passionate devotion to the high ideals of our national life, by our deep and abiding sense of brotherhood, we desire not only to promote the interests of our people, but to commend ourselves to the conscience of the world. We pray that as we move forward upon the lines of duty, following the truth as Thou dost give us the power to see the truth, we may know that we are following God's own guidance and that Thou hast a great mission for us as a Nation. Bless us in the discharge of the duties of this day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

SEÑOR JULIO MIRA Y BOLIVAR (S. DOC. NO. 16).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of State, which will be read and appropriately referred.

The communication was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 28, 1919.

To the Senate:

The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, in the absence of the President from the country, has the honor, in compliance with the request of the Government of Cuba, made through its minister at Washington, and with the assent of the Secretary of War, to transmit for consideration by the Senate a copy of a note from the Cuban minister at this Capital, dated April 30, 1919, and a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War, also a draft of a joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to permit Señor Julio Mira y Bolivar, a citizen of Cuba, to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point at the expense of the Government of Cuba. The passage of the resolution would be regarded as an act of courtesy by the Government of Cuba, and it would be in accordance with established precedents.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANK L. POLK,
Acting Secretary of State.

Inclosures: From minister of Cuba, April 30, 1919; from Secretary of War, May 13, 1919; and draft of joint resolution.

LIST OF JUDGMENTS (S. DOC. NO. 12).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims amounting to $219,476.26, which have been presented to the Treasury Department and require an appropriation for their payment, etc., which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SCHEDULES OF CLAIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, schedules of claims amounting to $377,838.31 allowed by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874, etc., which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL FOR THE INSANE (S. DOC. NO. 15).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting supplemental estimates of appropriation in the sum of $105,000 required for the support of patients at the St. Elizabeths Hospital for the Insane for the fiscal year 1919, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATION (S. DOC. NO. 17).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War submitting deficiency estimates of appropriation in the sum of $252,285.65 required by the War Department, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

BUREAU OF MINES (S. DOC. NO. 14).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Director of the Bureau of Mines, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the expenditures and disbursements from the fund allotted to the bureau by the President, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

WAR TRADE BOARD (S. DOC. NO. 13).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the Director of the War Trade Board, transmitting, pursuant to a resolution of December 15, 1918, lists showing the number of employees in that department at specified dates and the number discharged during the two weeks previous to that date, which, with the accompanying papers, were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting schedules of useless papers devoid of his-

toric value on the files of the Civil Service Commission in the various district offices, and requesting action looking to their disposition. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] the committee on the part of the Senate. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives thereof.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution.

Whereas there are large areas of arid and semiarid lands in the Territory of Hawaii, particularly on the islands of Kauai, Molokai, and Hawaii, which are capable of being developed and made productive and profitable if water could be made accessible thereto: Be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, requested to amend the reclamation act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. L., 389, ch. 1039), by extending the benefits of said act to the Territory of Hawaii; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, duly certified, be forwarded by the secretary of the Territory of Hawaii to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the Territorial Delegate to said Congress, and to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 13, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii on March 13, A. D. 1919.

_____,
President of the Senate.

_____,
Clerk of the Senate.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 20, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted in the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on March 20, A. D. 1919.

_____,
Speaker House of Representatives.

_____,
Clerk House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution.

Whereas of the highly cultivated public lands of the Territory of Hawaii which have not yet been disposed of to private ownership there remain but approximately 26,000 acres; and

Whereas it is deemed necessary and proper that the said remaining areas of public lands be conserved and administered in such a way as to promote the best interests and welfare of the Territory of Hawaii and the citizens and taxpayers generally; and

Whereas the experiences of the past have demonstrated that the present land laws under which public lands of the Territory are administered are inadequate and are so fixed and unchangeable in character as to prevent the Territorial administration from formulating and carrying into effect a land policy suitable to the peculiar conditions which exist in this Territory regarding the said public lands and to meet the varying conditions in the several parts of the Territory; and

Whereas it has been demonstrated by the recent land drawings held in connection with the Waiakea and Papaaloa homesteads that many homesteaders who became entitled at said drawings to take up homesteads on said tracts were and are financially and otherwise unable to undertake the heavy financial and other responsibilities attendant upon the cultivation of said lots; and

Whereas at said drawings there were available for homesteading a total of 261 lots and there were 2,905 applicants for homesteads who participated in said drawings; and

Whereas but for the inelasticity of the present land laws a sufficient number of properly qualified, capable, and bona fide homesteaders could have been selected from said 2,905 applicants; and

Whereas we believe that the remaining public lands of the Territory should be so administered as to produce the greatest benefit to the greatest number of our citizens and not for the advantage of a small class; and

Whereas the said remaining public lands can be, through proper legislation, so handled and administered as to relieve, in part, the present heavy tax burden and at the same time to build up an independent body of small farmers in this community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, requested to amend the organic act of the Territory of Hawaii substantially in accordance with the proposed act hereto attached and marked "Exhibit A," after adequate provision has been made by the Congress aforesaid to accomplish the purposes set forth in Senate concurrent resolution No. 2 heretofore adopted by both houses of this legislature.

1. So that when any general lease of highly cultivated public lands shall expire, the governor and the land commissioner of the Territory of Hawaii may, in their discretion, withdraw from the operation of the homestead laws of the Territory as now existing not to exceed one-fifth of the area of lands covered by any such general lease, and to lease the same by sale at public auction for a term not to exceed 15 years, upon such terms and conditions as may be advantageous to the Territory of Hawaii: *Provided, however*, That the lower Kekaha cane lands, containing an area of about 3,000 acres, and four-fifths of the Waimanalo cane lands shall be left out of the provision of this resolution; and

2. So that in the case of arid lands which are capable of being converted into agricultural lands by the development of underlying and/or contiguous waters for irrigation purposes, the governor and the land commissioner, with the approval of the land board, may lease such arid lands to any person, firm, or corporation upon such terms and conditions as may be of advantage to the Territory of Hawaii, and for a sufficient length of time to induce such person, firm, or corporation to invest capital in the development of the said water resources for the irrigation of said land, such lease to be without the withdrawal clause now provided for by law; and

3. So that when any general lease of agricultural lands is about to expire, or has expired, or when any homestead lots are not taken up, or taken up and abandoned, the land commissioner, with the approval of the governor, may be authorized to enter into a contract with any person, firm, or corporation for the continued cultivation of said agricultural lands until such time as the same may be opened up and available for homesteading, or until such time as the said homestead lot or lots shall be again occupied by a homesteader or homesteaders, and to require of such homesteaders who thereafter shall occupy said lands that they reimburse such person, firm, or corporation for the expenditures so made in continuing the cultivation of said lands; and

4. So that any person who, or whose husband or wife, shall have previously homesteaded not to exceed 10 acres of public land may be entitled to exercise an additional homestead right; and

5. So as to authorize and empower the governor, the land commissioner, and the land board of the Territory of Hawaii to exercise the power and right of selection of homesteaders in all cases of applications for homestead land, and the right and authority to pass upon the qualifications and capability of any such applicant as a homesteader of such lands; and

6. So as to allow any citizen to exercise a preference right who has, or whose predecessors in interest have, continuously resided on and improved any parcel of public land since January 1, 1909; and

7. So that the commissioner of public lands may be authorized to lease not to exceed 1,000 acres of pasture land without submitting the same to land board for approval; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution and of said exhibit be duly certified and forwarded by the secretary of the Territory of Hawaii to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, and to the Territorial Delegate to Congress.

EXHIBIT A.

An act to amend section 73 of an act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900, as amended by an act approved April 2, 1908, and as further amended by an act approved May 27, 1910.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 73 of an act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900, as amended by an act approved April 2, 1908, and as further amended by an act approved May 27, 1910, be, and hereby is, amended to read as follows:

SEC. 73. That the laws of Hawaii relating to public lands, the settlement of boundaries, and the issuance of patents on land commission awards, except as changed by this act, shall continue in force until Congress shall otherwise provide. That, subject to the approval of the President, all sales, grants, leases, and other dispositions of the public domain and agreements concerning the same, and all franchises granted by the Hawaiian government in conformity with the laws of Hawaii, between the 7th day of July, 1898, and the 28th day of September, 1899, are hereby ratified and confirmed. In said laws "land patent" shall be substituted for "royal patent," "commissioner of public lands" for "minister of the interior," "agent of public lands," and "commissioner of public lands," or their equivalents; and the words "that I am a citizen of the United States," or "that I have declared my intention to become a citizen of the United States, as required by law," for the words "that I am a citizen by birth (or naturalization) of the republic of Hawaii," or "that I have received letters of denization under the republic of Hawaii," or "that I have received a certificate of special right of citizenship from the republic of Hawaii." And no lease of agricultural land shall be granted, sold, or renewed by the government of the Territory of Hawaii for a longer period than 15 years, and in every such case the land, or any part thereof so leased, may at any time during the term of the lease be withdrawn from the operation thereof for homestead or public purposes, in which case the rent reserved shall be reduced in proportion to the value of the part so withdrawn, and every such lease shall contain a provision to that effect. It is provided, however, that whenever a general lease of public lands shall hereafter be terminated, either by lapse of time, forfeiture, or surrender, which lands are suitable and available for homesteading, and which, on the date of such termination, form the whole or a major part of the lands occupied and cultivated by any sugar plantation, the commissioner, with the consent of the governor and of a majority of the land board, may lease not to exceed one-fifth of the cultivated area of the lands described in any such general lease for a term not to exceed 15 years, without such withdrawal clause, by sale of such lease at public auction to the highest bidder, after due advertisement thereof, and upon such terms as the said commissioner, with the approval of the governor and of two-thirds of the land board, shall determine, all of which said terms and conditions shall be set forth in the publication of the notice of sale of any such lease. And it is further provided that in the case of undeveloped arid lands which are capable of being converted into agricultural lands by the development of the underlying and/or contiguous or adjacent waters for irrigation purposes, the governor and the land commissioner, with the approval of two-thirds of the land board, may lease such arid lands to any person, firm, or corporation, upon such terms and conditions as may be advantageous to the Territory of Hawaii, and for a sufficient length of time to induce and justify the investment of private capital in the development of the waters necessary for the irrigation of such arid lands, and such lease shall not have contained therein the withdrawal clause now provided for by law, and shall be sold at public auction to the highest bidder, after due advertisement in the manner now provided for by law, the notice of sale of such lease to contain all the terms and conditions of the same. And it is further provided that the commissioner, with the approval of the governor, may,

at any time within two years prior to the expiration of any general lease of agricultural land, or at any time after the expiration of such general lease, or when any homestead lots are not taken up, or taken up and abandoned, enter into a contract with any person, firm, or corporation for the continued cultivation of any such parcel or parcels of public lands, upon such terms as may be deemed of advantage to the Territory.

All such contracts and agreement shall provide for the continued cultivation of such lands until the same are ready to homestead or ready to be reoccupied by homesteaders, and it is further provided that all such homesteaders shall take such homesteads with the crops thereon, subject to a lien in favor of any such person, firm, or corporation, in an amount equal to the actual cost incurred by reason of such continued cultivation under such contract. The commissioner, with the approval of the governor, may require of any such homesteaders at the time of entering into their special homestead agreement a contract which may be incorporated into such special homestead agreement, to continue the cultivation of their homesteads and to reimburse any person, firm, or corporation, who or which shall have done, under any such contract, any cultivation or other work on such lands for the conservation of the crops thereon to the amount of the actual cost thereof.

All funds arising from the sale or lease or other disposal of such lands shall be appropriated by the laws of the government of the Territory of Hawaii and applied to such uses and purposes for the benefit of the inhabitants of the Territory of Hawaii as are consistent with the joint resolution of annexation, approved July 7, 1898: *Provided*, There shall be excepted from the provisions of this section all lands heretofore set apart or reserved by Executive order or orders by the President of the United States.

No person shall hereafter be entitled to receive any certificate of occupation, right of purchase lease, cash freehold agreement, or special homestead agreement who or whose husband or wife shall previously have taken or held more than 10 acres of any land under any such certificate, lease, or agreement hereafter made or issued, or under any homestead lease or patent based thereon, or who or whose husband or wife, or both of them, shall then own other land in the Territory the combined area of which and the land in question exceeds 80 acres, or who is an alien, unless he has declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States as provided by law, nor shall any person who, having so declared his intention, shall hereafter take or hold under any such certificate, lease, or agreement, continue so to hold or become entitled to a homestead lease or patent of the land, unless he shall have become a citizen within five years after so taking.

No land for which any certificate, lease, or agreement shall hereafter be issued, or any part thereof, or interest therein, or control thereof, shall, without the written consent of the commissioner and governor thereafter, whether before or after a homestead lease or patent has been issued thereon, be or be contracted to be in any way, directly or indirectly, by process of law or otherwise, conveyed, mortgaged, leased, or otherwise transferred to or acquired or held by or for the benefit of any alien or corporation, or before or after the issuance of a homestead lease, or before the issuance of a patent to or by or for the benefit of any other person, or after the issuance of a patent to or by or for the benefit of any person who owns, holds, or controls directly or indirectly other land or the use thereof the combined area of which and the land in question exceeds 80 acres: *Provided*, That these prohibitions shall not apply to transfers or acquisitions by inheritance or between tenants in common.

And land in respect of which any of the foregoing provisions shall be violated shall forthwith be forfeited and resume the status of public land and may be recovered by the Territory or its successors in an action of ejectment or other appropriate proceedings. A noncompliance with the terms of any such certificate, lease, or agreement, or of the law applicable thereto, shall entitle the commissioner, with the approval of the governor before patent has been issued, with or without legal process, notice, demand, or previous entry, to retake possession and thereby determinate the estate: *Provided*, That the times limited for compliance with any such terms may be extended by the commissioner with such approval upon its appearing that an effort has been made in good faith to comply therewith.

The person entitled to take under any such certificate, lease, or agreement shall be determined by drawing or lot, after public notice as hereinafter provided; the land board of the Territory, with the commissioner and governor as ex-officio members thereof, shall examine into qualifications and capabilities of all persons who participated in said drawing in the order of their numbers as drawn and shall pass upon and finally determine, in said order of their number as drawn, the qualifications and capabilities of any such person to undertake and successfully carry on the operations necessary for the successful farming of such lands. When any person shall have been found by such board to be unsuitable and without such necessary qualifications and capabilities, his or her name shall be stricken from the list of applicants, and the next in order, as determined at said drawing, examined, and so on until the homestead lots are all allotted, or the list of applicants exhausted. And any lot not taken or taken and forfeited, or any lot or part thereof surrendered with the consent of the commissioner, which is hereby authorized, may be disposed of upon application at not less than the advertised price by any such certificate, lease, or agreement without further notice. The notice of sale, drawing, or allotment of public land shall be by publication for a period of not less than 60 days in one or more newspapers of general circulation published in the Territory.

The commissioner, with the approval of the governor, may give to any citizen of the United States or to any person who has legally declared his intention to become a citizen, and who shall hereafter become such, which said person has, or who and whose predecessors in interest have, improved any parcel of public lands and resided thereon continuously since January 1, 1909, a preference right to purchase so much of such parcel and such adjoining land as may reasonably be required for a home, at a fair price, to be determined by three disinterested citizens appointed by the governor, in the determination of which price the value of improvements shall, when deemed just and reasonable, be disregarded: *Provided, however*, That this privilege shall not extend to any original lessee or to an assignee of an entire lease of public lands.

The commissioner may also, with such approval, issue for a nominal consideration to any church or religious organization, or person or persons or corporations representing it, a patent for any parcel of public land occupied continuously for not less than five years heretofore and still occupied by it as a church site under the laws of Hawaii.

No sale of lands for other than homestead purposes, except as herein provided, and no exchange by the Territory, shall convey lands exceeding either 40 acres in area or $5,000 in value shall be made. No lease of agricultural lands exceeding 40 acres in area, or of pastoral or waste lands exceeding 1,000 acres in area, shall be made without the approval of two-thirds of the board of public lands which is hereby constituted, the members of which are to be appointed by the governor as provided in section 80 of this act, and until the legislature shall otherwise provide said board shall consist of six members, and its members be appointed for terms of four years: *Provided, however*, That the commissioner may, with the approval of said board, sell for residence purposes lots and tracts, not exceeding three acres in area, and that sales of Government lands may be made upon the approval of said board whenever necessary to locate thereon railroad rights of way, railroad tracks, side tracks, depot grounds, pipe lines, irrigation ditches, pumping stations, reservoirs, factories, and mills and appurtenances thereto, including houses for employees, mercantile establishments, hotels, churches, and private schools, and all such sales shall be limited to the amount actually necessary for the economical conduct of such business or undertaking: *Provided, however*, That no exchange of Government lands shall hereafter be made without the approval of two-thirds of the members of said board, and no such exchange shall be made except to acquire lands directly for public uses.

Whenever 25 or more persons, having the qualifications of homesteaders who have not theretofore made application under this act, except as hereinbefore provided, shall make written application to the Commissioner of Public Lands for the opening of agricultural lands for settlement in any locality or district, it shall be the duty of said commissioner to proceed expeditiously to survey and open for entry agricultural lands, whether unoccupied or under lease with the right of withdrawal, sufficient in area to provide homesteads for all such persons as may be found to be properly qualified and capable as hereinbefore provided, together with all persons of like qualification who shall have filed with such commissioner prior to the survey of such lands written applications for homesteads in the district designated in said applications. The lands to be so opened for settlement by said commissioner shall be either the specific tract or tracts applied for or other suitable and available agricultural lands in the said geographical district and, as far as possible, in the immediate locality of and as nearly equal to that applied for as may be available: *Provided, however*, That no leased lands under cultivation shall be taken for homesteading until any crops growing thereon shall have been harvested.

It shall be the duty of the Commissioner of Public Lands to cause to be surveyed and opened for homestead entry a reasonable amount of desirable agricultural lands and also of pastoral lands in various parts of the Territory for homestead purposes on or before January 1, 1911, and he shall annually thereafter cause to be surveyed for homestead purposes such amount of agricultural lands and pastoral lands in various parts of the Territory as there may be demand for by persons having the qualifications of homesteaders; and in laying out any homestead the Commissioner of Public Lands shall include therein an amount not exceeding 80 acres in area, sufficient to support thereon an ordinary family; and all necessary expenses for surveying and opening any such lands for homesteads shall be paid for out of any funds of the territorial treasury derived from the sale or lease of the public lands, which funds are hereby made available for such purposes.

Nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent said commissioner from surveying and opening for homestead purposes and as a single homestead entry public lands suitable for both agricultural and pastoral purposes, whether such lands be situated in one body or detached tracts, to the end that homesteaders may be provided with both agricultural and pastoral lands wherever there is demand therefor; nor shall the ownership of a residence lot or tract, not exceeding 3 acres in area, hereafter disqualify any citizen from applying for and receiving any form of homestead entry, including a homestead lease.

All lands in the possession, use, and control of the Territory shall hereafter be managed by the commissioner, except such as shall be set aside for public purposes as hereinafter provided; all sales and other dispositions of such land shall be made by the commissioner or under his direction, for which purpose, if necessary, the land may be transferred to his department from any other department by direction of the governor, and all patents and deeds of such land shall issue from the office of the commissioner, who shall countersign the same and keep a record thereof. Lands conveyed to the Territory in exchange for other lands that are subject to the land laws of Hawaii, as amended by this act, shall, except as otherwise provided, have the same status and be subject to such laws as if they had previously been public lands of Hawaii. All orders setting aside lands for forest or other public purposes or withdrawing the same shall be made by the governor, and lands while so set aside for such purposes may be managed as may be provided by the laws of the Territory. The commissioner is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts, prescribe forms of oaths, and, with the approval of the governor and said board, make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this section and the lands laws of Hawaii into full force and effect.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 30, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was finally adopted in the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on April 30, 1919.

_____,
Speaker House of Representatives.

_____,
Clerk House of Representatives.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 29, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was finally adopted in the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii on April 29, 1919.

_____,
President of the Senate.

_____,
Clerk of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution.

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, requested to amend or change the land laws of the Territory of Hawaii in the following respects:

So that all provisions of the organic act relating to the granting of preference rights be amended so as to provide that any citizen of the Territory who has improved and continuously resided upon any portion

of the Government land for 10 years from the 1st day of January, A. D. 1909, except in the case of an original lessee or the assignee of such original lessee, may be granted such preference right.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 8, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted in the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on April 8, 1919.

_____,
Speaker House of Representatives.

_____,
Clerk House of Representatives.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 19, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted in the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii on April 19, 1919.

_____,
President of the Senate.

_____,
Clerk of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution.

Whereas there was passed by the Congress of the United States the act of July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm-loan act, same being "An act to provide capital for agricultural development; to create standard forms of investment based upon farm mortgage on equalized rates of interest upon farm loans; to furnish a mortgage for United States bonds; to create Government depositories and financial agents for the United States; and for other purposes," the intent and object of which was to assist in the financing of farmers, that the development of farming and farm interests might be extended and increased to the benefit of farming industry; and

Whereas the general farming industry in the Territory of Hawaii, if it is to be developed, is in need of as much assistance as that generally demanded by conditions on the mainland: Therefore

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That in order to meet the needs of the general farmers in the Territory of Hawaii, the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to amend the said farm-loan act, approved July 17, 1916, by extending said act so as to include the Territory of Hawaii, the said Territory of Hawaii to be included in one of the 12 districts provided for in said act; and further

Resolved, That certified copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress of the Territory of Hawaii; and that the said Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii be requested and urged to secure the extension of the said farm-loan act to the Territory of Hawaii.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 15, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted in the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on March 15, 1919.

_____,
Speaker House of Representatives.

_____,
Clerk House of Representatives.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 19, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted in the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii on April 19, 1919.

_____,
President of the Senate.

_____,
Clerk of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution.

Whereas in and by section 73 of the organic act of the Territory of Hawaii, it is provided that "the commissioner of public lands, with the approval of the governor, may give to any citizen of the United States, or to any person who has legally declared his intention to become a citizen, or who shall hereafter become such, which said person has, or who and whose predecessors in interest have, improved any parcel of public lands and resided thereon continuously since April 30, 1900, a preference right to purchase so much of such parcel and such adjoining land as may reasonably be required for a home, at a fair price," etc.; and

Whereas the above-quoted provision is a hardship to citizens whose preference rights of purchase of said lands have been impeded by reason of the fact that portions of such lands have been reserved for Federal and Territorial Government purposes; and

Whereas it is expedient that where any such lands are reserved for Federal and/or Territorial Government purposes that the Government of the Territory of Hawaii do give and grant to such citizen applying therefor an equal area of land of the same value, or of an area of land of the same value elsewhere located and situated, or in part of such reserved land and/or in part of land contiguous thereto; and

Whereas it is provided in and by said section 73 that the commissioner of public lands, with the approval of the governor of the Territory of Hawaii, may give to any citizen a preference right of purchase of said lands instead of shall give to any citizen a preference right of purchase of said lands: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby petitioned to amend said section 73, so that that part or portion thereof having reference to a preference right to purchase public lands be made to road that "the commissioner of public lands, with the approval of the governor, shall give to any citizen," etc., and to read that "where any such lands have been or are hereafter reserved for Federal and/or Territorial Government purposes, the commissioner of public lands shall, with the approval of the governor, give and grant to such citizen applying therefor an equal area of land of the same value or an area of land of the same value elsewhere located and situated, and/or in part of such reserved land and/or in part of land contiguous thereto."

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 8, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted in the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on April 8, 1919.

_____,
Speaker House of Representatives.

_____,
Clerk House of Representatives.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 28, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted in the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii on April 28, 1919.

_____,
President of the Senate.

_____,
Clerk of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution.

Whereas the organic act of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900, provides that pastoral lands shall be subject to homesteading in areas not exceeding 80 acres; and

Whereas such areas of pastoral land are insufficient and are responsible for the failure to stimulate general interest in bona fide settlers to take up such lands, the reasons therefor being mainly that on account of the small and insufficient rainfall throughout the districts where most of said lands are located, it requires from 8 to 10 acres of land to maintain one head of stock under normal conditions; and

Whereas, in order that a homesteader can make a living on such lands it is necessary that he be allowed a tract of land in amount from 200 to 1,000 acres, depending upon the nature of the land, in order to properly maintain himself: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That in order to meet the needs of homesteaders desiring to homestead such lands the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to amend the organic act of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900, substantially in the manner and form set forth in the following proposed bill, which the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii is hereby requested to introduce and urge in Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

—

A bill to amend the act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii, approved April 30, 1900.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a new section be added to the act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii, approved April 30, 1900, known as the organic act of Hawaii, to be known as section 73½ thereof and to read as follows:

"SEC. 73½. That the commissioner of public lands shall classify all public pastoral lands belonging to the Territory of Hawaii into two classes; the first class being such lands as from their nature can be plowed and seeded to grass and other forage plants suitable for stock grazing; the second class to be all other pastoral lands which, by reason of the nature of the soil and the topography of the country, are such that preclude the cultivation, modification, or improvement of the same as grazing lands. Lands of the first class to be subject to homesteading, in accordance with the provisions of section 73 of the organic act, in areas of from 200 acres to 500 acres; lands of the second class to be subject to homesteading, in accordance with the provisions of section 73 of the organic act, in areas of from 500 acres to 1,000 acres; the areas of the tracts, in both classes of lands, to be fixed by and subject to the discretion of the commissioner of public lands.

"It is further provided that the commissioner of public lands, with the approval of the governor, may enter into agreements with those having possession of said pastoral lands under lease from the Government, to the effect that such lessees may continue in possession of said lands after the expiration of such lease or leases, under terms and conditions to be fixed by the commissioner of public lands, said agreements to cover the periods following the expiration of such lease or leases, up to and until the homesteader or homesteaders are in a position to take actual possession of such pastoral lands, as may have been allotted to him or them."

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 8, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted in the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on April 8, 1919.

_____,
Speaker House of Representatives.

_____,
Clerk House of Representatives.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 26, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted in the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii on April 26, 1919.

_____,
President of the Senate.

_____,
Clerk of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution.

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii is in great need of money for new roads, school buildings, and other public improvements; and
Whereas the borrowing capacity of the Territory of Hawaii is limited to only 7 per cent; and
Whereas it is for the welfare and progress of this Territory that its borrowing capacity should be increased: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and is hereby, respectfully requested to amend section 55 of the organic act so that the Territory of Hawaii may issue bonds or incur indebtedness up to 10 per cent of the assessed value of property in said Territory.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 30, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was finally adopted in the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on April 30, 1919.

_____,
Speaker House of Representatives.

_____,
Clerk House of Representatives.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 28, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was finally adopted in the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii on April 28, 1919.

_____,
President of the Senate.

_____,
Clerk of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution.

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That whereas the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii has introduced in the Sixty-fifth Congress of the United States, third session, a bill (H. R. 15864) to establish a fund for public works in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes, which bill is in form and reads as follows:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That 50 per cent of the customs and internal revenues collected each year within the Territory of Hawaii for a period of 20 years from July 1, 1918, shall be segregated and held apart in a separate fund by the Secretary of the Treasury, to be designated the Hawaiian fund and to be expended only for public works, including educational and other public buildings, harbor improvements, road building, and educational work to develop the people of the Territory of Hawaii in agricultural pursuits within the Territory of Hawaii as the Congress may from time to time specifically authorize and appropriate."

That the Legislature of Hawaii do heartily and fully indorse the action of the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii in the action above indicated and do earnestly and respectfully petition and urge the Congress of the United States to enact a bill to establish such fund in the form above set forth or in such other form as to the Congress of the United States may appear best, to the end that such fund be set aside for the purposes indicated in said bill; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and the governor of Hawaii.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 30, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted in the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on April 30, 1919.

_____,
Speaker House of Representatives.

_____,
Clerk House of Representatives.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 28, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted in the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii on April 28, 1919.

_____,
President of the Senate.

_____,
Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. SHERMAN. I present resolutions adopted by the Editorial Workers of America, and ask that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Postmaster General Burleson has denied, and continues to deny, second-class mailing rights to daily and weekly newspapers in the United States estimated at 300; and
Whereas the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia has, in a recent decision, stated that it gravely doubts the Postmaster General's authority to continue to deny these rights; and
Whereas the signing of the armistice six months ago has removed all excuse for continuing such restrictions: Be it

Resolved, That the National Association of City Editors, here assembled, believing that the right of a free press, as guaranteed by the first amendment of our Constitution, should not be abridged, demands that Postmaster General Burleson immediately restore these publications to their full rights under the Constitution; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to President Wilson, Postmaster General Burleson, and the President of the United States Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, to be read into the records.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Wenona, Ill., remonstrating against a modification of the war-time prohibition act to permit the manufacture and sale of beer and wine, as recommended in the message of the President, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Illinois remonstrating against the free entry of corn from Argentina and praying that a protective tariff of 6 cents per bushel be restored upon corn, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WARREN presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from the Board of Trade of Rawlins, Wyo., praying for the return to private ownership of the telephone and telegraph lines, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. LODGE. I present a telegram received from an Italian society of New Britain, Conn., which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW BRITAIN, CONN., *May 19, 1919.*

Senator LODGE,
Washington, D. C.:

American citizens of Italian origin of New Britain, Conn., convened in solemn assembly, register their vigorous protest against the attitude of President Wilson on the disposition of the Italian city of Fiume. Imagine Fiume as an American city for centuries, successfully resisting Austrian, Hungarian, and Croatian encroachments on sacred nationality. At the termination of the war of liberation would the United States abandon her daughter city to the cupidity of the Jugo-Slavs under a protest for an outlet to the sea when Jugo-Slavia could utilize a half a dozen Jugo-Slav ports on the same sea? We ask fair play for the Italians, who have been faithful allies.

ST. JOSEPH'S MUTUAL BENEFIT SOCIETY,
GERARDO CASALE, *President.*

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Fraternal Order of Eagles of Lawrence, Mass., and a petition of the Central Labor Union of Fall River, Mass., praying for the repeal of national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Lowell, Mass., remonstrating against the repeal of national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Fitchburg, Mass., praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the New England Transportation Convention held at Boston, Mass., favoring the return to private ownership of the railroads of the country, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. COLT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Rhode Island, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the American Committee for the Independence of Armenia, praying for the independence of integral Armenia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a petition of the Ohio Association, of St. Cloud, Fla., praying for the establishment of a national soldiers' home at that city, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HARDING presented petitions of the Jugo-Slav Republican Alliance of Cleveland, Struthers, and Canton, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the independence of the Jugo-Slavs, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of Aroostook and Penobscot Union Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, State of Maine, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Portland, Old Orchard, Biddeford, South Portland, and Westbrook, all in the State of Maine, praying for the repeal of the so-called "luxury" tax, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CAPPER presented a memorial of the Council of Women's Clubs of Kansas City, Kans., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Local Lodge No. 174, Brotherhood of Railroad Clerks, of Arkansas City, Kans., favoring Government ownership of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WARREN. I am instructed by the Committee on Appropriations to report from that committee a very short bill and one which claims early consideration, as it provides pay for pages, mileage, etc. I report with amendments the bill (H. R. 1200) making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, and for other purposes, and I ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate as in Committee of the Whole proceeded to consider the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Legislative," on page 1, after line 5, to strike out:

The appropriations for mileage of Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and Delegates from the Territories, and expenses of Resident Commissioners, made in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920 are made immediately available and authorized to be paid to Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates from the Territories, and Resident Commissioners for attendance on the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress.

And to insert:

For mileage of Senators, $51,000.
For mileage of Representatives and Delegates and expenses of Resident Commissioners, $175,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 2, to insert:

For compensation of officers, clerks, messengers, and others in the service of the Senate, namely:
Sixteen pages for the Senate Chamber, at the rate of $2.50 per day each, during the session, from May 19, 1919, to June 30, 1919, $1,720, or so much thereof as may be necessary; and from and including July 1, 1919, until the close of the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, so much as may be necessary.
For stationery for Senators and the President of the Senate and for committees and officers of the Senate, fiscal year 1919, $3,000.
For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, fiscal year 1918, $10,000.
For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, fiscal year 1919, $90,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION.

Mr. KENYON. I am instructed by the Committee on Education and Labor to report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 18) to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment, and I submit a report (No. 1) thereon. I give notice that I shall move to take up the bill at a very early date, when I hope it will receive favorable consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR.

Mr. CALDER. I am directed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 41, submitted yesterday by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor or any subcommittee thereof be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

TRESPASSES ON CARRIERS BY RAIL.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The bill (S. 632) prohibiting trespassing upon the cars or trains of carriers by rail engaged in interstate or foreign commerce introduced by me was referred to the Committee on Commerce. It should have gone to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. I ask that the Committee on Commerce be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to that committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECLAMATION OF SWAMP LANDS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The bill (S. 761) to establish a drainage fund and provide for the reclamation of swamp and overflowed lands in certain States was referred to the Committee on Commerce. I think the bill should go to the Committee on Public Lands. The Committee on Commerce has no jurisdiction over matters of that kind, and I ask that it be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NUGENT:

A bill (S. 1021) for the completion of the Fort Hall irrigation project, in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

A bill (S. 1022) to safeguard temporarily, by a license control of imports of potash, the interests of domestic potash producers until trade conditions are readjusted; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. WALSH of Montana:

A bill (S. 1023) for the relief of certain nations or tribes of Indians in Montana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 1024) to make it unlawful and to punish giving commissions, bribes, or rewards to employees, and to accept the same, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1025) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as heretofore amended, and to further regulate commerce among the States and with foreign countries; and

A bill (S. 1026) concerning baggage and excess baggage carried by common carriers in the District of Columbia and the Territories, and common carriers while engaged in commerce between the States and between the States and foreign nations, and prescribing the duties of such common carriers in reference thereto while so engaged, defining certain offenses, and fixing the punishment therefor, and repealing all conflicting laws; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 1027) to establish a bureau of publicity in the Department of Commerce to have charge of all the advertising of the Federal Government; to secure greater publicity for information intended for the general public and coming from the various departments of the Government; to advise and counsel with all private interests regarding foreign advertising; and to cooperate with organized advertising interests of the Nation in promoting and in securing legislation to compel adherence to honesty and reliability in the advertising of all firms and individuals throughout the Nation; and

A bill (S. 1028) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act to amend the laws for preventing collision of vessels, and to regulate the equipment of certain motor boats on the navigable waters of the United States," approved June 9, 1910; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1029) for the construction of a memorial archway at Vicksburg, Miss., and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1030) for the relief of the Philippine Scouts; and

A bill (S. 1031) donating a bronze or brass condemned cannon to Crocker Post, Grand Army of the Republic, at Des Moines, Iowa, for cemetery purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1032) granting to the State of Iowa all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land within the meander lines, as originally surveyed, of the lakes within said State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1033) to reimburse J. Mandelbaum & Sons, of Des Moines, Iowa, for certain duties paid in excess; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 1034) to extend the provisions of the act of June 27, 1902, entitled "An act to extend the provisions, limitations, and benefits of an act entitled 'An act granting pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, known as the Black Hawk War, Cherokee disturbance, and the Seminole War,' approved July 27, 1892";

A bill (S. 1035) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved May 11, 1912;

A bill (S. 1036) granting an increase of pension to John Bush;

A bill (S. 1037) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Lynch (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1038) granting a pension to Emma A. Eustis (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 1039) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Williams (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1040) granting an increase of pension to George F. Behymer;

A bill (S. 1041) granting a pension to Mary D. Cleaver;

A bill (S. 1042) granting an increase of pension to Edward Flannery;

A bill (S. 1043) granting an increase of pension to Joseph N. Foster;
A bill (S. 1044) granting an increase of pension to James Heavrin;
A bill (S. 1045) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Jewett;
A bill (S. 1046) granting a pension to George W. Moore;
A bill (S. 1047) granting an increase of pension to John B. Way; and
A bill (S. 1048) granting a pension to William E. White; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 1049) to provide for the reinstatement in the Public Health Service of surgeons, assistant surgeons, officers, or employees of said service who resigned for the purpose of enlisting and who did enlist in the Army or Navy of the United States during the war with Germany; to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.
A bill (S. 1050) granting a pension to William W. Batterton;
A bill (S. 1051) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Baskett;
A bill (S. 1052) granting a pension to Charles A. Barthrop;
A bill (S. 1053) granting an increase of pension to William Barklow;
A bill (S. 1054) granting an increase of pension to Frederick L. Ballou;
A bill (S. 1055) granting a pension to Preston S. Atchison;
A bill (S. 1056) granting an increase of pension to James H. Allen;
A bill (S. 1057) granting a pension to Leander Alexander;
A bill (S. 1058) granting an increase of pension to Marion Adair;
A bill (S. 1059) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Boynton;
A bill (S. 1060) granting an increase of pension to William Boyes;
A bill (S. 1061) granting an increase of pension to George W. Boring;
A bill (S. 1062) granting an increase of pension to Helen E. Blinn;
A bill (S. 1063) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie G. Bennett;
A bill (S. 1064) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Belknap;
A bill (S. 1065) granting a pension to Thomas Baxter;
A bill (S. 1066) granting an increase of pension to William Sheldon;
A bill (S. 1067) granting an increase of pension to Ezra Rice;
A bill (S. 1068) granting an increase of pension to Augustus A. Rice;
A bill (S. 1069) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Renshaw, alias Charles Dean;
A bill (S. 1070) granting a pension to Catherine E. Ranney;
A bill (S. 1071) granting an increase of pension to John R. Randall;
A bill (S. 1072) granting an increase of pension to Pascal F. Rainwater;
A bill (S. 1073) granting an increase of pension to Wesley C. Sharp;
A bill (S. 1074) granting a pension to Alfred E. Scott;
A bill (S. 1075) granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Schreiber;
A bill (S. 1076) granting an increase of pension to Johanna S. C. Saling;
A bill (S. 1077) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Rutter;
A bill (S. 1078) granting an increase of pension to Canrisa R. H. Richey;
A bill (S. 1079) granting an increase of pension to Wilder Rice;
A bill (S. 1080) granting an increase of pension to Evan Chalfant;
A bill (S. 1081) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Carroll;
A bill (S. 1082) granting an increase of pension to Susan J. Cantrell;
A bill (S. 1083) granting a pension to Frances M. Burroughs;
A bill (S. 1084) granting a pension to Helen A. Burrill;
A bill (S. 1085) granting a pension to Rachel J. Burnham;
A bill (S. 1086) granting a pension to Catherine N. Burlingame;
A bill (S. 1087) granting an increase of pension to Lucy C. Smith;
A bill (S. 1088) granting an increase of pension to George M. Titus;
A bill (S. 1089) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Truesdale;
A bill (S. 1090) granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Troutman;
A bill (S. 1091) granting a pension to James Turner;
A bill (S. 1092) granting an increase of pension to John C. Vennum;
A bill (S. 1093) granting a pension to Delia E. Wall;
A bill (S. 1094) granting an increase of pension to Rodney Wampole;
A bill (S. 1095) granting a pension to George A. Torchio;
A bill (S. 1096) granting an increase of pension to John Welsch;
A bill (S. 1097) granting an increase of pension to Commodore P. White;
A bill (S. 1098) granting a pension to Nellie White;
A bill (S. 1099) granting an increase of pension to Philip J. Wickard;
A bill (S. 1100) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Williams;
A bill (S. 1101) granting an increase of pension to Joseph L. Williams;
A bill (S. 1102) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Wilson;
A bill (S. 1103) granting an increase of pension to Hulda L. Winter;
A bill (S. 1104) granting an increase of pension to John Zellers;
A bill (S. 1105) granting a pension to Mary Standifer;
A bill (S. 1106) granting a pension to Everett L. Stokes;
A bill (S. 1107) granting an increase of pension to Clara Stout;
A bill (S. 1108) granting a pension to Eugene M. Symonds;
A bill (S. 1109) granting a pension to Charles B. Syphert;
A bill (S. 1110) granting an increase of pension to William M. Taylor;
A bill (S. 1111) granting a pension to George F. Thomas;
A bill (S. 1112) granting an increase of pension to William H. Thompson;
A bill (S. 1113) granting an increase of pension to Anna L. Phillips;
A bill (S. 1114) granting an increase of pension to James E. Leonard;
A bill (S. 1115) granting a pension to Ella S. Kyes;
A bill (S. 1116) granting a pension to Patrick Kneasey;
A bill (S. 1117) granting a pension to Rudolph Kals;
A bill (S. 1118) granting a pension to Samuel P. Johns, jr.;
A bill (S. 1119) granting an increase of pension to Jens C. Jensen;
A bill (S. 1120) granting a pension to Lora W. Hughes;
A bill (S. 1121) granting an increase of pension to Ernest Kiene;
A bill (S. 1122) granting an increase of pension to Roxey Pierce;
A bill (S. 1123) granting a pension to George W. Smith, alias George Smith;
A bill (S. 1124) granting a pension to Michael Maloney;
A bill (S. 1125) granting a pension to Edward Madden;
A bill (S. 1126) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McGooden;
A bill (S. 1127) granting a pension to Fred T. Macomber;
A bill (S. 1128) granting an increase of pension to Malcolm J. McNeill;
A bill (S. 1129) granting an increase of pension to Evan W. Loyd;
A bill (S. 1130) granting an increase of pension to Emiles Pomeroy;
A bill (S. 1131) granting a pension to Albert F. Pray;
A bill (S. 1132) granting an increase of pension to Louis W. Pryor;
A bill (S. 1133) granting a pension to Lottie Short;
A bill (S. 1134) granting a pension to John F. Simonson;
A bill (S. 1135) granting an increase of pension to John N. Skidmore;
A bill (S. 1136) granting a pension to Dollie E. A. Smith;
A bill (S. 1137) granting a pension to Sarah E. Muzy;
A bill (S. 1138) granting a pension to John W. Mowrey;
A bill (S. 1139) granting an increase of pension to Elias Morrison;
A bill (S. 1140) granting an increase of pension to Ida J. Morey;
A bill (S. 1141) granting a pension to Penelopie S. Miller;
A bill (S. 1142) granting a pension to Nancy L. Miller;

A bill (S. 1143) granting an increase of pension to Horatio N. Merritt;
A bill (S. 1144) granting an increase of pension to Aaron H. Perry;
A bill (S. 1145) granting an increase of pension to William S. Peacock;
A bill (S. 1146) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Patterson;
A bill (S. 1147) granting an increase of pension to David Patchin;
A bill (S. 1148) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. O'Heron;
A bill (S. 1149) granting an increase of pension to Henry Mygatt;
A bill (S. 1150) granting a pension to Alice Gunn;
A bill (S. 1151) granting a pension to Marie L. Graves;
A bill (S. 1152) granting an increase of pension to Mahala Clemons;
A bill (S. 1153) granting an increase of pension to Asa M. Van Cleave;
A bill (S. 1154) granting an increase of pension to Charles Chandler;
A bill (S. 1155) granting a pension to William Chambers;
A bill (S. 1156) granting an increase of pension to James W. Higgins;
A bill (S. 1157) granting an increase of pension to Hamilton Collier;
A bill (S. 1158) granting an increase of pension to James H. Colby;
A bill (S. 1159) granting an increase of pension to Anstress L. Hendricks;
A bill (S. 1160) granting a pension to Lucina C. Hatch;
A bill (S. 1161) granting a pension to Elizabeth E. Harris;
A bill (S. 1162) granting a pension to Augustus S. Hall;
A bill (S. 1163) granting an increase of pension to William A. De Long;
A bill (S. 1164) granting an increase of pension to Joanna Dean;
A bill (S. 1165) granting an increase of pension to William D. M. Davis;
A bill (S. 1166) granting a pension to Effie M. Crail;
A bill (S. 1167) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Cooley;
A bill (S. 1168) granting a pension to William J. Cook;
A bill (S. 1169) granting an increase of pension to Patrick J. Conway;
A bill (S. 1170) granting a pension to James B. Gillick;
A bill (S. 1171) granting an increase of pension to Francis A. Hoagland;
A bill (S. 1172) granting an increase of pension to Martha Gardner;
A bill (S. 1173) granting an increase of pension to James S. Foster;
A bill (S. 1174) granting an increase of pension to John L. Fisher;
A bill (S. 1175) granting an increase of pension to Adam Eckert;
A bill (S. 1176) granting a pension to Fannie S. Douglass;
A bill (S. 1177) granting a pension to Katherine R. Doolittle;
A bill (S. 1178) granting a pension to Charles Dohr;
A bill (S. 1179) granting an increase of pension to Timothy Hireen;
A bill (S. 1180) granting an increase of pension to James H. Hopkins;
A bill (S. 1181) granting an increase of pension to Alfa V. Freeman;
A bill (S. 1182) granting an increase of pension to George W. Foster;
A bill (S. 1183) granting a pension to Ole Field;
A bill (S. 1184) granting an increase of pension to Pedro B. de G. Fernandez;
A bill (S. 1185) granting a pension to Charles H. Eyerman;
A bill (S. 1186) granting a pension to Willie J. Etheridge;
A bill (S. 1187) granting a pension to Ann L. Elliott; and
A bill (S. 1188) granting an increase of pension to Ephriam D. Edwards; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 1189) to prevent transmission through the mails of advertisements relating to the treatment of venereal diseases and certain sexual disorders; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 1190) to transfer claims for compensation for death or disability under the war-risk insurance act from the Department of the Treasury to the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 1191) granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Mechling (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LENROOT:

A bill (S. 1192) to create a power commission and to define its powers and duties, to provide for the development of water power on public lands and in navigable streams, and for the transmission of electric power, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 1193) for the relief of Bert H. Clark, Maud A. Graham, Grace A. Graham, Lee Hurley, Emma I. Gordon, Mabel H. Dwight, and Nellie A. Pardy; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1194) for the relief of Elizabeth Marsh Watkins;
A bill (S. 1195) for the relief of Alfred Sjostrom; and
A bill (S. 1196) for the relief of Edwin S. Metcalf; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1197) for the relief of Vinson Slasor;
A bill (S. 1198) for the relief of Thomas E. Philips; and
A bill (S. 1199) to correct the military record of Francis M. Benson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1200) granting an increase of pension to George C. Stearns;
A bill (S. 1201) granting a pension to Lucy A. Schriver;
A bill (S. 1202) granting an increase of pension to John E. Rogers;
A bill (S. 1203) granting a pension to Patrick R. Gubin;
A bill (S. 1204) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Fullerton;
A bill (S. 1205) granting a pension to Ulysses S. G. Canfield;
A bill (S. 1206) granting an increase of pension to Francis B. Ainsworth;
A bill (S. 1207) granting a pension to Andrew E. Waterman;
A bill (S. 1208) granting a pension to Martin H. Rickman;
A bill (S. 1209) granting an increase of pension to Edwin S. Metcalf;
A bill (S. 1210) granting an increase of pension to William C. Markward;
A bill (S. 1211) granting an increase of pension to John M. Holmes; and
A bill (S. 1212) granting a pension to Henry L. Henrysen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 1213) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KELLOGG:

A bill (S. 1214) to authorize the Supreme Court to prescribe forms and rules and generally to regulate pleading, procedure, and practice on the common-law side of the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1215) to donate war trophies to the city of St. Paul, in the State of Minnesota (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 1216) to prohibit the display of a red flag or of a black flag or the advocacy of the overthrow of constitutional representative government by force or violence and to fix a penalty therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEWBERRY:

A bill (S. 1217) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Stuck (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 1218) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the New Orleans City Park Improvement Association, New Orleans, La., one or more German cannons or fieldpieces;

A bill (S. 1219) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Tulane University, New Orleans, La., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 1220) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of New Orleans, La., to be installed in the old historic Washington Artillery Hall, one German cannon or fieldpiece; and

A bill (S. 1221) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Monroe, La., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A bill (S. 1222) for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Henry O. Barrett*; and

A bill (S. 1223) for the relief of the owner of the steamer *Mayflower* and for the relief of passengers on board said steamer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 1224) donating captured cannons and unloaded projectiles to the city of Morrill, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GAY:

A bill (S. 1225) to donate 50 cannons to the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (by request of the War Department):

A bill (S. 1226) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1227) to provide for the disposition of the proceeds of sales of abandoned and useless military reservations (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 1228) to permit the widows of officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps to purchase subsistence stores (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 1229) to amend an act approved August 22, 1914, entitled "An act to amend and reenact section 113 of chapter 5 of the Judicial Code of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIELDS:

A bill (S. 1230) granting a pension to Thomas Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARDING:

A bill (S. 1231) for the relief of James Kane (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1232) granting a pension to Benjamin L. Price (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRANCE:

A bill (S. 1233) to repeal an act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," and the act amendatory thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 1234) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Worcester, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 1235) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chelsea, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 1236) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Plymouth, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 1237) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Everett, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 1238) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lynn, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 1239) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Taunton, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 1240) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Marlboro, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; and

A bill (S. 1241) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Tufts College, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1242) for the relief of Harry E. Fisk; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1243) granting an increase of pension to Clarence S. Hall;

A bill (S. 1244) granting a pension to John S. Dodge;

A bill (S. 1245) granting a pension to Wilfred W. Phaneuf;

A bill (S. 1246) granting a pension to Missouri B. Perea; and

A bill (S. 1247) granting a pension to Jennie A. Norton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 1248) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Orono, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 1249) for the relief of Margaret I. Varnum; and

A bill (S. 1250) to correct the military record of Alexander W. Goodreau (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1251) granting a pension to John Francis Buckley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (by request of the War Department):

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 34) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan tents for use at encampments held by Veterans of the World War (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BORAH:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 35) changing the name of the Panama Canal to the Roosevelt Canal; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

By Mr. LODGE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 36) to grant American citizenship to William Francis Griffitt Blackler; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GAY:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 37) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. NEW:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 38) authorizing the loan of aircraft material to educational institutions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOSES:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 39) tendering the thanks of Congress to Lieut. Commander Albert Cushing Read, United States Navy, for his achievement in completing the first trans-Atlantic aeroplane flight; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 40) to regulate the passage of armed troops of a foreign power through territory of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $10,000,000 for the maintenance and operation of the Cape Cod Canal, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TOWNSEND submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $1,800 for salary of clerk in purchasing department of the District Commissioners' office, to be known as chief bookkeeper, intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $50,000 for conducting investigations and study of the nature and habits of the pest known as the camphor thrip and for the eradication thereof, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.

Mr. JONES of Washington submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 43), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

Mr. CALDER subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred the foregoing resolution, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WARREN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 44), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not to exceed $1 per printed page to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate; and that expenses contracted hereunder shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred the foregoing resolution, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS.

Mr. TOWNSEND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 45), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof

to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. NELSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 46), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. CUMMINS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 47), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

REPRESENTATIVES OF IRELAND AT PARIS.

Mr. BORAH. I offer a Senate resolution and ask that it be read and go over for a day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 48) was read, as follows:

Whereas the peace conference at Versailles has assumed to bring about such adjustments between different peoples and nations in Europe as will give the world reasonable assurance of permanent peace; and

Whereas no peace can last or ought to last which does not recognize and accept the principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed; and

Whereas the people of Ireland have asked permission to submit to said conference their plea for independence and for the recognition of the Irish Republic; and

Whereas the very first principles of justice require that every people shall at least be heard by the tribunal or conference which assumes to deal with their interests: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States earnestly requests the American peace commission at Versailles to secure, if possible, for the representatives chosen by the people of Ireland, to wit, Edward De Valera, Arthur Griffiths, and Count George Noble Plunkett, a hearing before said peace conference in order that said representatives may present the cause of Ireland and ask international recognition of the government, republican in form, established by the people of Ireland.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over under the rule and be printed.

EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANT CLERK.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 49) which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be, and is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk at the rate of $1,800 per annum, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise appropriated by law.

BRITISH CENSORSHIP OF AMERICAN MAIL.

Mr. SHERMAN. I offer a resolution, which I desire to have read, and, if the Senate will permit me, I wish to make a brief preliminary statement.

There are certain reputable business houses in Chicago who complain very greatly of the censoring of the cablegrams under which they are carrying on business in Europe. This censoring is by the British authorities. I have specific complaints, naming the occasions and the business transactions concerned. They do not in any manner concern the war or anything connected with the war; they are purely private business concerns. This resolution seeks to express the sense of the Senate. I ask that it be read and properly referred after the reading.

The resolution (S. Res. 50) was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That the continued censoring of mail by Great Britain is no longer required by conditions of war, and that such censoring is largely now for the acquisition of business and commercial knowledge of American competitors; be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the British authorities be requested to discontinue such censoring of mail coming from England to reputable business houses of the United States.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. SMOOT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 51), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

EMPLOYEES' DORMITORIES.

Mr. NEW submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 52), which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

Resolved, That the proper officers of the United States Housing Corporation are hereby respectfully requested to transmit to the Senate information as follows:

(1) Information as to what percentage of the Government buildings known as employees dormitories, situated between the Capitol Building and the Union Station, Washington, D. C., was completed and ready for occupancy November 11, 1918.

(2) Information as to what sum of money has been spent in the construction work in connection with these buildings since November 11, 1918.

(3) Information as to whether the said buildings are now complete and entirely ready for occupancy; and if so, when the work was completed. If work was not completed before May 11, 1919, how many men were at that time employed on them, and when will the work be completed.

(4) Information as to what total revenue the Government was obtaining from the said buildings May 1, 1919.

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES ON RECONSTRUCTION.

Mr. CUMMINS submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there are hereby created six committees, to be known as the joint congressional committees on reconstruction. Each of said committees shall be composed of five Senators and five Representatives in Congress. The members of said committees shall be selected as follows:

The Senators in the manner provided in the rules of the Senate for the selection of the standing committees of the Senate and the Representatives in the manner provided in the rules of the House for the selection of the standing committees of the House.

The members of these committees shall be subject to change from time to time by the Senate and House, respectively, as are said standing committees, and all vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as the original selections were made.

The said committees shall make, respectively, investigations of the subjects hereinafter named and herein assigned to them, respectively, and shall report to Congress from time to time with such recommendations as to additional legislation, or otherwise, as they, respectively, may deem advisable.

The first committee, which shall be known as the joint congressional committee upon the demobilization of the Army and Navy, shall so investigate and report upon the following matters, to wit:

(a) The employment of discharged soldiers and sailors in civil pursuits.

(b) The allotment of lands to returned soldiers and sailors and their establishment in homes upon the public domain.

(c) All legislation which may be required in the proper care for those who have suffered the dangers of war, and especially those who have been disabled and whose ability to earn a livelihood has been impaired.

The second of the said committees, which shall be known as the joint congressional committee upon foreign trade and commerce, shall so investigate and report upon the following matters, to wit:

(a) Duties on imports for the protection and encouragement of home industry.

(b) The development of new foreign markets.

(c) Combinations for the purpose of increasing our selling facilities.

(d) Changes in our banking facilities necessary to cooperate with such trade.

(e) Our merchant marine, including the construction of ships; the continuance of Government ownership and operation, and in general with respect to the various problems of transportation upon the high seas.

The third of said committees, which shall be known as the joint congressional committee on interstate transportation, shall so investigate and report upon the following matters, to wit:

(a) The permanent relation which the Government of the United States should sustain to the common carriers of the country.

(b) Whether the systems of transportation now in possession of and being operated by the Government should be returned to their former owners and operated as heretofore, or whether Government operation should continue with or without Government ownership; or, if private ownership is to continue and private operation resumed, what system of regulation and control will be best adapted to secure efficiency in service, reasonable rates of transportation, and fairness to the capital invested.

(c) The relation which should be established between inland water transportation and the railways, including the control of the former.

(d) All questions relating to communication by wire.

The fourth of said committees, which shall be known as the joint congressional committee on domestic business, shall so investigate and report upon the following matters, to wit:

(a) To what extent, if any, should our laws relating to trusts and combinations be modified.

(b) What cooperation should be permitted in order to increase efficiency, reduce cost, and enable this country to successfully meet foreign competition.

(c) To what extent should the Government undertake to control prices.

(d) Government loans to private enterprises.

(e) Government supervision of capital issues.

(f) The supply and control of raw materials and encouragement in the production of articles that have not heretofore been manufactured in this country.

The fifth of said committees, which shall be known as the joint congressional committee on employers and employees, shall so investigate and report upon the following matters, to wit:

(a) Conciliation and arbitration in labor disputes.

(b) The relation of men and women in similar employments.

(c) Substitution of female employees for male employees, and vice versa.

(d) The organization of permanent employment agencies.

(e) The distribution of labor, including employment of surplus labor on public works.

(f) The sanitary housing of employees and the disposition of houses constructed by the Government during the war.

(g) The freedom of labor, and of employment in its relation to trade-unionism; and wages, hours, and conditions of employment.

The sixth of said committees, which shall be known as the joint congressional committee upon natural resources, shall so investigate and report on the following matters, to wit:

(a) The encouragement of private enterprises in the development of the resources of the public domain.

(b) The tendency toward urban population and the best means of checking it, including the requirements for farm labor and the best means of securing it.

(c) Government loans to farmers.

(d) The distribution of food products.

(e) Our timber problems.

(f) The adequate production and proper distribution of our mineral resources, including coal, petroleum, and other fuels.

(g) The development and control of water power.

Each of said committees is empowered to take up and examine any other subject which in the course of its investigation it finds to be inseparably connected with the subjects herein assigned to it and which ought to be considered in view of the change from the activities of war to the pursuits of peace, and especially the demobilization of war commissions, administrations, bureaus, and other civilian war agencies, and the adjustment of the forces employed therein to private industry and commerce under normal peace conditions.

Each of said committees is authorized to employ such clerical assistance as it may deem necessary, including the services of experts, and may, by subcommittee or otherwise, send for persons or papers, administer oaths, and employ stenographers at a cost not to exceed $1 per printed page to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject before it.

Each of said committees may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate and House of Representatives.

ADDRESS BY EX-SECRETARY M'ADOO.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I have here a splendid address delivered by ex-Secretary McAdoo on the league of nations. It is very logical and forceful. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, inasmuch as the publication of this address in the RECORD will tend to balance the address by Judge Von Valkenberg on the other side of this question, which was ordered printed the other day on request of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], I shall not object to the present publication, but I wish my colleagues to understand that henceforth I shall insist that all requests of this kind shall be sent to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the printing of the address in the RECORD?

Mr. BORAH. I should like to ask if there is any partisanship in the address?

The VICE PRESIDENT. I have not read it.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to inquire if there is any partisanship left on the other side of the Chamber?

The VICE PRESIDENT. I do not know. Without objection, the address will be printed in the RECORD.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. W. G. MCADOO ON LEAGUE OF NATIONS, NEW YORK CITY, MAY 26, 1919.

"A fundamental error into which opponents of a league of nations have fallen is the assumption that by staying out of such a league the United States can maintain a 'splendid isolation,' which will keep us out of future wars. The great war from which we are now emerging shows the magnitude of this illusion. We were not drawn into the World War voluntarily. We tried to maintain our traditional policy of isolation, but failed for the reason that America has grown so great in material, moral, and political influence and is now such a vital factor in the family of nations that no great war involving the leading powers of the world can take place without involving the United States inevitably in the conflict.

"For almost three years after the war broke out in Europe we strove, in pursuance of our traditional policy, to maintain a neutral position. But as the struggle between the belligerents progressed and it became more and more to their advantage in fighting each other to disregard our neutrality and to violate our rights under international law, they proceeded to do so with indifference.

"America's economic status in the family of nations makes it essential that freedom of ocean transit for American life and property shall always be maintained. For many years we have produced much more than we can consume. Our overproduction, stimulated by war, is the greatest in our history. Foreign markets for our surplus are indispensable to the welfare and prosperity of our people. In furtherance of our foreign commerce it is necessary that American citizens, as well as American products, shall be transported upon the high seas without molestation. Germany found it to her interest to use the submarine, in defiance of international law, to destroy American lives and American commerce in her effort to defeat England. The sacred obligation which every Government owes to its citizens to protect them against wrongful aggression forced the American people finally to drop the rôle of a neutral and to assume the character of a belligerent. If we had failed to defend our rights which had been challenged by an arbitrary foe, we should have been respected neither at home nor abroad; we should have found our moral influence destroyed and our legitimate commerce injured to such an extent as to bring distress and suffering to our own people. First of all for liberty, humanity, and our sacred ideals, and next for the vindication of our vital rights, we entered the fight and fought the war to the finish and to victory. We shall have to fight again unless the nations of the earth now organize an instrumentality through which the peace of the world may be preserved, for we shall find ourselves confronted again with aggressions upon our vital rights by one combatant or another or all the combatants who may be engaged in some future European war.

"Our isolation has been destroyed forever. Three thousand miles of the Atlantic are no longer a protection. They are not even a formidable barrier. Gallant men of our Navy will in a few days complete their conquest of the Atlantic in airplanes. What the future development of the world is to be one can picture with reasonable certainty—swifter communication by improved methods as revolutionary in their character as the steam engine was a century ago and capable perhaps of infinitely greater and more remarkable development. More than ever America is interwoven into the very warp and woof of the fabric of the world.

"Our only escape from war in the future is, therefore, to join our power to that of the leading nations of the world and create such a preponderant force capable of benevolent, orderly, and prompt exercise in the interest of peace that war shall be made remote, if not impossible.

"Under the peace settlement new nationalities are taking form and vitality. Self-government of the people, for the people, and by the people bids fair to become the organic system in each of the new nations which will be born of the peace conference now sitting at Versailles. This very democratization of the peoples of Europe will prove one of the most potential influences for the future peace of the world. Self-governing peoples, democratic peoples, do not want war. They are pacific in large degree because of the very responsibility which self-government imposes, and they are receptive, therefore, to counsels of peace when autocratic despots are never willing to listen. With autocracy destroyed and democracy ascendant, America has the opportunity of bringing into existence the greatest charter of human rights and of doing a greater service for humanity than any nation has ever been able to do in the history of all the world.

"No league of nations can be created without America. Her influence is essential not alone to its creation but to its success. Her power, her moral influence, her unselfishness, and her ideals must be thrown into the balance all the time.

"No argument should be required to show the need of a league to secure the future peace of the world, but if it is 5,000,000 dead soldiers and sailors sleeping in the soil of Europe and in the trackless waters of the vast deep, millions of maimed and wounded fighters, millions of dead and outraged women and children, needlessly sacrificed, and millions of civilian men too old to fight, but forced to die from starvation and want, cry out in a mighty but inarticulate chorus for the abolition of war. Humanity, Christianity, civilization, and every noble thing America has professed and fought for demand guaranties of future peace. The masses of men and women everywhere who must bear the burden of debt and toil and sacrifice for years to come to repair the senseless waste of five years of brutal and unnecessary war with one voice demand that the statesmen of the world who now have the responsibility of ameliorating the burdens of humanity shall not fail to provide a remedy.

"It is for these reasons that a league of nations has been proposed as a part of the treaty of peace. The plan suggested is practical and workable. It represents undoubtedly the compromise of many conflicting views and ideals which is inevitable where the interests involved are so extensive and intricate. But it is amazing to have achieved so much at the start. If the plan is adopted and put into effect, resort to war will be made so difficult as to encourage the hope that the greatest scourge of humanity, with the exception of disease and poverty, has been conquered at last. In the brief time at my disposal I can not enter upon an exhaustive analysis of the league covenant, nor is it my purpose to make a technical or legalistic argument. It is my hope to give a general outline of the plan and touch upon those important features of the covenant which relate directly to the prevention of war.

"Thirty-two nations, representing the greatest part of the population of the world and the largest part in area of the soil, are signatories to the plan, which, in general outline, provides

for an assembly or congress of the nations in which each has three representatives and in which each nation has one vote.

"In addition to the assembly, a council of nine is created, in which five of the great powers, namely, the United States, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan, are permanently represented. The other four members of the council are to be selected by the assembly. The council is an executive body and will have in effect the general direction of the affairs of the league. With the exception of matters of procedure at meetings of the assembly or of the council and the appointment of committees, effective action by the council or the assembly requires unanimous vote. This unanimity of action completely annihilates the objections raised by some opponents of the league, that small nations are given the same voting power as large nations. What difference does this make so long as unanimous vote is essential to action? This provision makes conferences and not legislatures of the meetings of the assembly and of the council and destroys completely the argument that the United States will be disadvantaged because it has one vote and is therefore in a minority. Where unanimous vote is essential to action one vote is as potential as all the other votes.

"The first meeting of the assembly and of the council will be called by the President of the United States. A permanent secretariat is established, which is the administrative arm of the league, and all positions under or in connection with the league are thrown open equally to women and men. This recognition of women is a great victory in their fight for equality of opportunity and of civil and political rights everywhere.

"The prevention of war is sought to be accomplished by eliminating, as far as possible, the causes which lead to war through—

"(1) The limitation of armaments.

"(2) Guarantees of territorial integrity and political independence.

"(3) The abolition of secret treaties.

"(4) Compulsory conferences to discuss questions of common interest that may from time to time arise and thereby to bring about cooperation among the nations concerned.

"One of the most serious causes of wars in the past has been the creation of vast armaments and great standing armies, which have been a constant temptation to aggression by that nation which was possessed of a preponderant force. So long as the policy of any one power was to build up great military and naval establishments other powers had to enter into competition as a matter of self-defense. The result was that the leading nations of Europe have been for generations past great armed camps, ready to spring at each other's throats and precipitate wars upon slight provocation or for causes which no impartial tribunal would, upon investigation, consider adequate.

"One of the most important purposes of the league is therefore the reduction of armaments upon an established scale, which will put all the members of the league upon an equality as near as may be in the matter of organized force. Plans for such reductions are to be prepared by the council and submitted to the several governments concerned, but no plans are to become binding on any nation until adopted by it. Congress is not deprived of any of its prerogatives in this matter, but, on the contrary, retains the sole power to determine what armed forces, military and naval, shall be maintained by the United States. If, however, our Congress should adopt the recommendation of the league for reduction of armaments, then no increase in such armaments may be made without the consent of the league for a period of 10 years, at the end of which time the plan will be subject to reconsideration and revision.

"In order to enforce this provision the council is to advise as to how the evil effects of the private manufacture of arms and ammunition can be prevented, with a view to the adoption by governments of the policy of manufacturing for themselves instead of through private interests such war materials as are required for their safety. All members of the league are to interchange full and frank advices as to their military and naval programs in order that each member of the league may know what the other is doing in respect to armaments. This is the first step toward the prevention of war—the limitation of armaments—so that no nation will have a preponderant armed force and be tempted to use it to attack another in the execution of some selfish aim or purpose. The United States is not disadvantaged, but advantaged, by this provision, because it is in line with our historic policy of limited armament and puts all other nations on an equality of armed strength with us.

"Throughout all history one of the greatest incentives to war has been the lust of ambitious rulers to extend their powers and dominion over other peoples and to absorb the territory of other nations. After every great war the map of Europe has been changed and peoples have been transferred from one sovereignty to another without regard to their feelings or interests. The results of the present war are not different from those of all other great wars, so far as changing the map of Europe is concerned, although the motives for such change are this time quite different from those which have heretofore controlled. We are now trying to restore to the different peoples of the world the territories which of right belong to them and to set them up once more as politically independent sovereignties with the added right of self-government. The magnitude of this task is exceeded only by its difficulties. There are so many races in Europe and the intermingling of populations along their borders has been so continuous that there are many areas which can not with accuracy be ethnologically defined. There are, so to speak, twilight zones of populations which are neither predominantly one nationality nor another, and therefore the new nations which are to be established under the peace treaty are in some instances given boundaries which must be tested for a reasonable length of time under conditions of stabilized government before the wisdom of such boundaries can be demonstrated. Moreover, some of these nations will be stronger, of necessity, than others. Their peoples are unaccustomed to self-government and must create a political organization and a status for themselves. This is notably true of restored Poland and Czechoslovakia, which will need for some time guaranties against external aggression which will enable their people to work out their destinies without fear of aggression from their neighbors and under favoring conditions of peace. No less important are these guaranties against external aggression and of political independence to the larger States of Europe than to the smaller. Once it is firmly and clearly established that no nation may commit aggressions upon its neighbors, all may settle down to peaceful pursuits and build up again the prosperity and happiness of their peoples under stable and well-ordered government.

"Article 10 of the covenant, therefore, wisely provides that each member of the league shall respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league. It must be borne in mind that this covenant does not permit the league of nations to interfere in any uprisings or disturbances within a State itself. The right of revolution against oppressive internal authority remains unaffected and unimpaired, and every people is left to determine for itself what its form of government shall be and how its internal or domestic affairs shall be conducted.

"Mr. Root in his admirable essay on the first draft of the league of nations said in support of article 10:

"I think, however, that this article must be considered not merely with reference to the future, but with reference to the present situation in Europe. Indeed, this whole agreement ought to be considered in that double aspect. The belligerent power of Germany, Austria, Bulgaria, and Turkey has been destroyed, but that will not lead to future peace without a reconstruction of eastern Europe and western Asia. The vast territories of the Hohenzollerns, the Hapsburgs, and the Romanoffs have lost the rulers who formerly kept the population in order and are filled with turbulent masses without stable government, unaccustomed to self-control, and fighting among themselves like children of the dragon's teeth. There can be no settled peace until these masses are reduced to order. Since the Bolsheviki have been allowed to consolidate the control which they established with German aid in Russia the situation is that Great Britain, France, Italy, and Belgium, with a population of less than 130,000,000, are confronted with the disorganized but vigorous and warlike population of Germany, German Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, Turkey, and Russia, amounting approximately to 280,000,000 fast returning to barbarism and the lawless violence of barbarous races. Order must be restored. The allied nations in their council must determine the lines of reconstruction. Their determinations must be enforced. They may make mistakes. Doubtless they will; but there must be decision, and decision must be enforced. Under these conditions the United States can not quit. It must go on to the performance of its duty, and the immediate aspect of article 10 is an agreement to do that.

"Mr. Root suggested an amendment to this article providing that after the expiration of five years from the signing of the convention any nation might terminate its obligation under article 10 by giving one year's notice in writing to the secretary general of the league. Snce Mr. Root's suggestion a provision has been incorporated in the revised draft of the covenant which is even more favorable to the termination of the obligation than Mr. Root proposed. Any member of the league may, under the revised draft, withdraw from the league after two years' notice of its intention to do so, provided that all its international obligations and all its obligations under the league covenant shall have been fulfilled at the time of its withdrawal. The effect of the revised covenant, therefore, is to enable any nation to terminate its obligation to respect and preserve the territorial integrity and political independence of the other members of the league after two years' notice of its intention to do so instead of being bound for five years, as Mr. Root suggested. Certainly the United States could not do less than

join in this guaranty, which eliminates one of the most fruitful causes of war and at the same time gives the new nations to be established under the peace treaty the opportunity to organize and erect stable governments, especially when we can relieve ourselves of this obligation at any time upon two years' notice. It is our duty to help these struggling people back to life and to help all the nations of Europe to establish ordered government without fear of external attack.

"The argument that this guaranty will involve us in every European quarrel is far-fetched for the following reasons:

"(1) We can't be drawn into any war unless our Congress first authorizes it.

"(2) After all European armaments are reduced practically to an internal police force basis, any war, or attempted war, will be a small affair, because of the small armed forces available.

"(3) The control by governments of the manufacture of war munitions, and the destruction of great war plants like the Krupps, will prevent would-be belligerents from getting the necessary supplies of arms and ammunition.

"(4) In case of conflict in Europe, the nearby powers would be called on first to provide the necessary forces first, as in case of conflict on the American Continent the United States would be asked to take the matter in hand. But—and I repeat it—in no case is the United States bound to go to war or supply an armed force without the authorization of the Congress.

"Another fruitful cause of war between nations has been secret treaties, under which nations attempted to get advantage of their rivals, and under which intrigues and private understandings of all kinds have worked for distrust, suspicion, and enmity. Article 18 of the revised covenant provides that 'every convention or international engagement entered into henceforward by any member of the league shall be forthwith registered with the secretariat and shall as soon as possible be published by it. No such treaty or international engagement shall be binding until so registered.'

"Certainly no nation imbued with good faith toward its neighbors and genuinely interested in preserving the peace of the world can object to this article of the covenant. When treaties are published, just as are the laws of the United States and of the several States of the Union, so that all may read and understand, the selfish aims and private advantages which have heretofore accrued to nations and to individuals through these pernicious and mischievous secret treaties will become abortive.

"If any one thing has been demonstrated by the Great War, it is that conference and counsel between the great nations is one of the most certain means of preventing international misunderstandings and of making war impossible. Heretofore such conference could not be held except by the voluntary action of all the parties. In 1914, before Germany precipitated the Great War, an urgent effort was made by Sir Edward Grey to bring about a conference of the powers to consider the dispute between Austria and Serbia. Germany refused to enter that conference. She had determined to bring on the war in the execution of long-considered plans, and she knew that if she joined a conference of the powers, where a full and frank discussion of the issues involved would be necessary, war would be averted and her ambitions would be thwarted.

"One of the most powerful arguments for the league of nations is the requirement that the assembly, which consists of the representatives of all the members of the league, and the council shall meet at stated intervals and from time to time as occasion may require, at the seat of the league or at such other place or places as may be decided upon. This provision is mandatory. It provides that the assembly shall meet at stated intervals and that the council shall meet from time to time as occasion may require and at least once a year.

"Suppose that this league had been in existence in 1914, and that upon a threat of war a meeting of the assembly or of the council had been called. Germany would have been obliged to attend. A discussion of the dispute would immediately have followed, and there is no doubt that the terrible war would have been prevented; that 5,000,000 dead men would be alive to-day and 20,000,000 wounded men would have been spared; that the horrors and indescribable sufferings of the civil populations of all the nations concerned would not have occurred; and that $200,000,000,000 of treasure would not have been wasted.

"It is a well-known fact, and Germany has admitted it, that Germany expected Great Britain to keep out of the Great War and that if she had known that Great Britain would make common cause with France, Belgium, and Russia, she would never have precipitated the disastrous conflict. If even a conference of Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, and Russia had been held in 1914, Great Britain would have made this clear to Germany, and the war would not have occurred. If the proposed league of nations accomplishes nothing more than to make certain a conference of the members of the league and of the council at stated intervals for the purpose of discussion and conference, it will have a potential influence upon the peace of the world; it will promote international cooperation instead of international antagonisms and suspicions, which have been the characteristic evil of the old system of secret treaties and artificial balances of power so long maintained in Europe.

"If, however, after limitations of armaments have been secured and guarantees of territorial integrity and political independence have been given and secret treaties have been eliminated and conferences of the powers have been provided for, disputes between nations should arise and take on such an acute form as to threaten war, then the league covenant makes other provisions which almost certainly will result in maintaining the peace of the world. What are those provisions?

"They are, first, for arbitration of the dispute, if it is of a character which the contending nations recognize as suitable for submission to arbitration. Mr. Root's admirable definition of disputes suitable for arbitration has been inserted in the covenant, namely: 'Disputes as to the interpretation of a treaty, as to any question of international law, as to the existence of any fact which if established would constitute a breach of any international obligation, or as to the extent and nature of the reparation to be made for any such breach.' But if the matter should not be considered suitable for arbitration then the contending nations agree that an inquiry into the merits of the dispute shall be conducted by the council, which shall make such recommendations for a settlement as it thinks just and proper, which recommendations must be made within six months after the submission of the controversy. In case either of arbitration or of inquiry by the council, the parties affected agree that they will not go to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the recommendation of the council.

"Without going into further details about these admirable provisions of the covenant, it is sufficient to say that they postpone war until there can be a complete discussion of the dispute either through the medium of arbitration or through the processes of inquiry, and that after award by the arbitrators or a recommendation by the council which makes the inquiry, neither party shall go to war until three months thereafter. During that time, opportunity for mediation and conciliation is offered, and in any event it is provided that the parties affected will not go to war with any party to the dispute which complies with the unanimous recommendations of the council or accepts award of the arbitration.

"Suppose any nation refuses to accept the award of the arbitration or the unanimous recommendation of the council which makes the inquiry and proceeds to make war against the other party to the dispute which has accepted the award or the recommendations of the council, or suppose any nation goes to war, as Germany did in 1914, without notice to anybody. What then happens? The offending nation will be deemed to have committed an act of war against all the other members of the league, and thereupon the other members of the league will (1) sever all trade or financial relations between the members of the league and the offending nation; (2) prohibit all intercourse between the citizens of members of the league and citizens of the offending State; and (3) prevent all financial, commercial, and personal intercourse between the citizens of the offending nation and the citizens of any other State or nation throughout the world, whether a member of the league or not. This is what is called an economic boycott. It is a terrible weapon, which the sane representatives of no nation would defy with impunity.

"Let us suppose again that Germany had been faced in July, 1914, with this terrible economic boycott by Great Britain, France, Italy, Russia, Belgium, and the United States. Is it conceivable that she would have entered upon the mad career of war with certain defeat staring her in the face at the very outset? No nation is strong enough to resist the combined economic pressure of the greatest powers of the world and the moral influence and reprehension of the public opinion of the world. But economic pressure is not the only consequence which a recalcitrant nation would incur, because, if war should actually result, the league covenant provides that the council shall recommend to the several Governments concerned what effective military or naval forces the members of the league shall severally contribute to be used against the offending member.

"I wish to repeat, however, that the United States, as a member of the league, could not be forced into war by the recommendation of the council or by any action of the league, without its consent. The Congress of the United States would have to say whether or not such recommendation should be adopted. The entire subject would have to be submitted to the Congress

by the President for appropriate action, in accordance with the Constitution of the United States, which vests in the Congress the sole power to declare war.

"But if arbitration and inquiry fail, if mediation and conciliation prove impotent, if nine months of discussion and conference do not cool the hot passion for war, if every agency and influence of the league are exhausted in vain, then our opponents say that war will happen and that the league covenant therefore recognizes and sanctions war. It is possible, of course, that war might happen in these circumstances, but it is scarcely conceivable. If it should happen, how could it be said that the league covenant sanctions war because it undertakes to prevent it any more than it can be said that the State sanctions murder because it enacts laws to prevent that crime? In either case the evil is recognized to exist, and because every effort is made to destroy it, by no exercise of the imagination can the attempt be distorted into a sanction of the offense if, after all is done, murder is committed or war occurs.

"We do not abandon the Monroe doctrine by entering the league of nations. That policy is expressly reserved from the operations of the covenant. We can not be made a mandatory of any foreign colony or territory except with our consent, and no amendments to the league after its adoption will be binding upon the United States unless accepted by it.

"In case of attack upon the United States we can immediately repel the attack and defend ourselves. Nothing in the league covenant deprives us of that right, notwithstanding the false claim of our opponents to the contrary. The league has nothing to do with immigration, naturalization, or any of our internal or domestic affairs. We shall control these matters just as fully with membership in the league as without it.

"The extent to which the world has been involved in this greatest of all wars makes the terms and conditions of the peace more complex and difficult than any other peace which has been made in the history of the world. Never have such intricate problems been faced, and never before has the human mind undertaken to grapple with so many of them at one time. A readjustment and a reconstitution of the world is in progress, and the terms of the peace must effect the settlement. There must be some constituted authority or tribunal to which appeal can be made for interpretation of the peace document in cases of dispute or uncertainty, and to which resort may be had for the settlement of the innumerable questions which will inevitably arise out of the treaty or treaties of peace.

"The league of nations has in this respect an essential and important service to perform. The peace can not be interpreted and enforced without the league of nations as the necessary instrumentality and authority.

"The economic problems growing out of the war are a powerful argument for a league of nations. It is estimated that $200,000,000,000 have been expended by all the belligerents in this war. The greater part of these expenditures constitute national debts of the various belligerents and impose a burden upon the masses of their people which it is difficult for them to bear. For generations to come the working men and women of all of the belligerents will be paying with the sweat of their brows for the needless destruction of this war. The oppression of this debt will be felt by the people everywhere, because it is always the masses who suffer most from war. They bear the bulk of the burden, because they are the producers, and it is only by production or the creation of wealth that war debts, like other debts, can be paid. Unless some means are found to prevent war, what hope is there for the masses of men and women in the Old World? If we are to have no league of peace, and the great powers must again engage in competition with each other in preparations for war, which will inevitably eventuate in new wars, then the people of Europe are condemned to unspeakable misery and poverty for the future. They can not support the burdens imposed by the Great War and assume in addition the heavy expenditures required in preparations for new wars. The only hope for the masses is to turn the fruits of their industry into productive channels. The savings of the future must not be wasted upon war preparations but must be devoted to improvement of the conditions under which men and women live.

"Can we not learn a lesson from this and by a league of nations make it unnecessary to load upon the backs of the already overburdened masses an additional burden in preparation for future wars? Can we not leave in the pockets of the people the money which will be wasted in future preparation for war, thereby easing their burdens and contributing to their happiness and prosperity? This is one of the great benefits we may expect from a league of nations. If statesmen of the world fail now to give relief to the suffering masses in Europe there can be no certainty of future peace.

"The terrible excesses of the Russian revolutionists are due to the fixed conviction in the minds of the masses of men and women there that the ruling classes have given them nothing but suffering, poverty, and war; that they have failed utterly to serve the people; that statesmanship has been found wanting; that their misery and their poverty are due to these causes as well as to the fact that property has been accumulated in the hands of the few; and in their groping for a new system which will distribute the benefits of society more equally and save them from the horrors of poverty and of war which they have endured for centuries they are striking out blindly and desperately in an effort to find a remedy. What is happening in Russia will repeat itself in Europe unless the combined statesmanship of the world is equal to the situation. The league of nations will do much to lift the masses of men and women in the world to a higher plane of contentment and prosperity and give them a larger opportunity to participate in the benefits of organized society.

"Another phase of the problem is worthy of consideration at this particular time, especially by America. We are now the dominant financial power of the world. All nations needing capital for governmental use or for their internal development through enterprises of every character must look increasingly to America for the necessary assistance. The history of enterprise in foreign lands is filled with injustices to foreign citizens, representing in many instances a denial of justice or such arbitrary action as to be practically confiscatory. There has never been any properly constituted agency for dealing with international disputes arising out of these matters, and they have frequently led to war or have almost precipitated war between nations. The lack of protection of such investments has discouraged American citizens from making ventures in foreign lands. Such ventures, if legitimately undertaken and justly protected, would operate greatly to the benefit of American commerce and influence. The lack of such protection has operated adversely also to the best interests of those countries which constantly need capital for their development.

"It seems to me that the league of nations offers the agency through which disputes of this character may be taken up and considered in an orderly manner and legitimate investments in foreign countries given adequate protection without resort to force. If this can be accomplished a great incentive will be given to American enterprise in foreign countries, and those nations which need capital will be able to command the requisite supply once it is demonstrated that through the league of nations a forum has been created where disputes about foreign investments may be promptly considered and disposed of. America's opportunity to assist Latin America, for instance, would be immensely enhanced in those circumstances, and the league of nations would be able to confer benefits of incalculable value upon the people of all the Central and South American Republics, the people of the United States, and in fact upon the citizens of every other country who engage in foreign enterprises. For the future of American commerce, therefore, looking at it for a moment from the purely materialistic standpoint, the league of nations would have a stimulating and protecting influence of the greatest possible value. Our business men and bankers who are taking such a keen interest in foreign trade and enterprise should not overlook the advantages of this instrumentality of the league.

"The league of nations is created not, as some people suppose, merely to hold Germany down. It is created to hold all of the allied powers, as well as Germany and all of the Central Powers, down to a peace basis in the future. The league is made necessary not because any number of nations seek to combine their power to oppress some other nations, but because the whole European system of balances of power, secret diplomacy, and competitive armaments, as practiced heretofore, has failed utterly to preserve peace and to save the masses of people from the burdens and horrors of war. If this old system is not destroyed but is deliberately reestablished now, the same bloody wars which have marred European history for centuries will be repeated in the future. A concert of the nations for peace is the only remedy, and the league of nations represents the effort to organize the world for peace instead of for war.

"What will happen if the league of nations is not ratified by the United States Senate? It is an essential part of the machinery for peace. It can not be separated from the peace treaty, because the peace treaty can not be enforced without the league. If no league is created and a simple treaty of peace is attempted, there can be no stability in Europe. A continual ferment of turbulent populations, already overburdened by debt and struggling in poverty, will precipitate new wars in the near future, and we shall have to remobilize the army we are now demobilizing and do the job all over again merely to satisfy the

views of narrow partisans and visionless men. Why should the people of the United States and of the world suffer because these men, or any set of men, are unwilling to have any sort of peace unless they can write the formula? The opponents of the league can not agree among themselves as to the kind of a league or the kind of peace that would satisfy them. They offer no alternative to the present plan. Theirs is a counsel of chaos and confusion and continuance of the present state of war.

"The league of nations has taken a stand for social justice upon an international scale which will have a profound effect on the future of all the peoples concerned. I refer to article 23, which provides that the members of the league will—

"(1) Endeavor to secure and maintain fair and humane conditions of labor for men and women, both in their own countries and in all countries to which their commercial and industrial relations extend, and for that purpose will establish and maintain the necessary international organization;

"(2) Undertake to secure just treatment of the native inhabitants of territories under their control;

"(3) Intrust the league with the general supervision over the execution of agreements with regard to the traffic in women and children and the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs.

"(4) Endeavor to take steps in matters of international concern for the prevention and control of disease.

"What a godsend to humanity an organized effort along these lines will be. All of these objects are of imperative importance. The prevention and control of disease is one of the most serious problems confronting the peoples of the world in the immediate future, because the insanitary conditions in Europe and Asia growing out of the war threaten the health of all the peoples of the world.

"I was struck with the statement of Mr. Henry P. Davison, who has done such splendid work for the Red Cross, and who, just returning from Europe, says, 'Right now there are 275,000 cases of typhus in a line stretching between the Baltic and the Black Seas, and the wave is rolling in our direction. I tell you the distress in the world is frightful, unspeakable. If the people of the United States knew the distress in middle Europe they couldn't sleep.'

"I know the significance of Mr. Davison's statement, because as Secretary of the Treasury I was for six years the head of the Public Health Service of the United States, which has control of the quarantine stations in most of the ports and whose duty it is particularly to fight the spread of contagious and infectious diseases. International cooperation for the control of communicable diseases and for their prevention is absolutely essential to the health of the peoples of the world. And we in the United States are in daily jeopardy so long as there is an inadequate organization in Europe and Asia to fight these diseases. Every ship that comes into our ports may be a messenger of death through some evil germ concealed in its hold or in the clothing or baggage of its passengers. International cooperation will greatly diminish this danger and the machinery which the league of nations will provide is the most practicable plan yet suggested for making effective the measures which are essential to protect not alone ourselves but all the peoples of the world against the dangers and ravages of communicable diseases.

"Is the United States unwilling to join with the other great powers of the world in an effort to preserve peace when it can withdraw from the league at any time on two years' notice? If we are unwilling to use our great power as a victorious and civilized Nation to secure the future peace of the world as the chief fruit of our sacrifices, then 90,000 American boys have given their lives merely to restore the old system of feverish and secret preparations for war in Europe, for conscienceless profits to private makers of war materials and machinery, for the continued imposition of grinding and impoverishing burdens on the suffering men and women in Europe who must pay with the sweat of their brow, the flower of their health, and the very blood of their bodies to keep the old European system alive. Shall we not rather turn our eyes to the beautiful and inspiring picture of peace and, by joining the league of nations, get what our sons fought and died for—a new era of burdens lightened, of prosperity unfettered by the fear of war, and of a peace which will give the masses of the world a chance to realize at last the light of happiness and security?"

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CUMMINS.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. On the 27th day of March last, the senior Senator from the State of Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], who has now become chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, addressed the legislature of his State upon the railroad problem. It is a very valuable contribution to the discussion on that subject, and is of such particular public interest that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD and also as a public document.

Mr. SMOOT. It will be all right to have it printed in the RECORD or as a public document. I would not like to agree to have it printed in both forms.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Then I ask to have it printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. LODGE. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I have here a discussion of river and harbor improvements by the United States by Rinehart John Swenson, Ph. D., department of government, New York University. I present this for reference to the Committee on Printing, in order that the advisability of printing it may be considered by that committee. I ask that the matter be referred to the Committee on Printing for action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that action will be taken.

WAGES OF SEAMEN.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I have a letter from the Secretary of Labor, sending to me, at my request, a report on the wages of seamen on American and foreign vessels operating in and from American ports, by Henry D. Dielman, of the Investigation and Inspection Service. This report gives a great deal of very valuable information, especially with reference to the effect of the so-called seamen's act. I ask that it may be printed as a Senate document.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. KING. Will not that be printed as a part of the report of the Labor Department or of some branch or subdivision of the Labor Department?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not know; it may be; but it will probably be some time before it will be so printed, and I think the report gives information which will be very valuable in connection with legislation that will come up very soon.

Mr. KING. My understanding is that the Labor Department is publishing such reports very frequently; that it does not wait until the end of the year to do so, but frequently publishes reports of some of its subdivisions and agencies, and that this report will, in due course, and perhaps very soon, be published, so that its printing now would really be a work of duplication.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That may be true, but I do not know when this report will come out.

Mr. KING. I should like to see the report printed, but I am afraid if it is ordered printed now it will be a matter of duplication.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If it is not printed for some little time it will not be in form to be available.

Mr. MOSES. I ask that the report be referred to the Committee on Printing for action.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have no objection to its being referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be referred to the Committee on Printing for consideration.

DISPOSITION OF MEAT PACKERS' PRODUCTS.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, a week or so ago there appeared in the newspapers a statement that some 250,000,000 pounds of meat were to be turned back to the packers, to be distributed as they might desire. I had intended offering a resolution to obtain the facts in relation to the matter, but thought it a better plan to write to the Secretary of War. There have been so many inquiries concerning it that I believe it would be advisable to publish the letter of the Secretary of War in the RECORD, which, I think, is quite a satisfactory explanation of the situation, and shows his desire to do something in the matter if he can. I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be published in the RECORD.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BORAH. I am not going to object to the letter being printed in the RECORD, but, as it is not to be read, I want to ask the Senator whether or not the letter disputes the fact, which was published, that this meat was to be turned back?

Mr. KENYON. It does not dispute the fact, nor does it confirm the fact. It sets forth the amount of the meat, and that there has been a conference with the representatives of the

packers with relation thereto. The Secretary states that, if any plan can be devised for placing the meat on the market, he will be very glad to have any suggestion helping along in that direction. The War Department has no way to put the meat on the market. The letter might be read, if the Senator desires.

Mr. BORAH. The only solution of the matter is, then, to send the meat back to the packers and let them determine its disposition.

Mr. KENYON. I think I will ask to have the letter read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the letter.

The Secretary read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 17, 1919.

Hon. WILLIAM S. KENYON,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KENYON: I have just received your letter of May 16. The newspaper articles to which you refer did not carry detailed statements of the facts and undoubtedly created an erroneous impression. The facts are that at present we have as declared surplus products 12,000,000 pounds in 6-pound cans, 7,330,000 pounds in 2-pound cans, 9,000,000 pounds in 1-pound cans, and 378,000 pounds in 12-ounce cans of roast beef. There are 5,600,000 pounds in 6-pound cans, 18,000,000 pounds in 24-ounce cans, 8,500,000 pounds in 1-pound cans, and 4,250,000 pounds in 12-ounce cans of corned beef. There are 15,700,000 pounds in 2-pound cans, and 5,160,000 pounds in 1-pound cans of corned-beef hash. There are 47,219,000 pounds of bacon, 8,686 000 pounds of which is crated and located in Chicago, Baltimore, and Columbus.

The War Department, of course, has no system of retail distribution beyond the very limited commissary stores departments, which are provided for out of products not declared surplus. We have, therefore, no way of disposing of this material directly to the consuming public in America. Canned roast beef has never been sold to the consuming public in America, and the form in which it is packed would probably make it necessary to repack it before it could be offered for sale in this country and any reasonable price realized. There is a market for corned beef in 12 and 24 ounce tins, but the Army sizes are odd, and repacking would probably be necessary before this product would be available for general distribution. There is a very limited market in this country for corned-beef hash, which has until now been sold in small tins, largely upon individual orders, in dining cars and restaurants, but no general household use is made of this as a canned product. The bacon is also a specially prepared and crated product. It contains an unusual amount of salt, and the majority of it is put up in sealed tins for export, and is generally prepared for overseas shipment, so that in some particulars it differs from the product with which our people are commercially familiar.

In order to arrive at some policy with regard to the disposal of these products, the director of sales called a conference in his office, at which a number of officers of the Army and civilian assistants in the department of sales were present, and representatives of several packers were invited to be present to give advice based upon their experience in dealing with the market for commodities of this kind. In view of the fact that large quantities of meat are being sent abroad by the United States through Mr. Hoover's food commission, it was suggested that the best use to make of these products was to reserve them for foreign shipment, effecting sales of them abroad, the reasons for this suggestion being, first, that the products are not prepared in normal marketable form for American markets; second, that the War Department is without any means of directing distribution to the consuming public; third, that the War Department, under the law, is required to sell these products, presumptively, for the market price; and, fourth, that, being already prepared for foreign transportation, their use in that way would obviate the necessity of preparation of other foodstuffs in the same manner and allow the producers to devote their time to the less expensive preparation of foods for home consumption. These suggestions have all been under consideration, and to the extent that the United States is called upon to supply food for foreign transportation, undoubtedly these stocks will be so used.

In the meantime every effort is being made by the War Department to find ways of permitting these stocks of food to be made accessible to the people of the United States, and any suggestion which is brought to your attention and will aid us in that will be most gratefully received. We have asked for sealed proposals for a supply of 2,400,000 pounds of bacon at present at Baltimore. This amount has been offered to the meat packers, meat dealers, and exporters located east of the Mississippi River in carload lots of 30,000 pounds each. Such bids as are received will be opened on May 26. The director of sales is further canvassing the country to discover whether substantial quantities of this food can be disposed of to institutions maintained by States, municipalities, or private philanthropies, which, by reason of their bulk purchases, would be able to use the odd sizes in which these food products are packed. The whole problem, however, is one of difficulty. The War Department will welcome any opportunity to make these foods available to the people of the country. We are, of course, anxious to avoid unnecessary losses and to prevent the purchase of these foods for speculative purposes by persons who have no desire to expedite their economical disposition to the consuming public.

I am deeply grateful to you for calling to my attention your own interest in the matter, and if any suggestion occurs to you or is brought to your attention which will open up means by which we can get these foodstuffs to the people, I will appreciate having the suggestions brought to my personal attention.

Cordially, yours,
NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator from Iowa know why this food was not disposed of through Mr. Hoover in his efforts to feed Europe?

Mr. KENYON. I will say to the Senator that I do not.

Mr. BORAH. It seems that the Secretary of War suggests that there are four reasons why this food should be sent to Mr. Hoover, but that it had not been sent. That was the thought which occurred to me when the letter was first presented. I read in this morning's papers that, notwithstanding our efforts for the last 60 or 90 days, people are still dying for want of food in countries where we are trying to feed them. It seems to me entirely practicable to turn over these materials to the distribution of Mr. Hoover's commission in Europe. I do not understand yet from this letter why that is not done. There may be a reason for it, but it is not explained, it seems to me, in the letter.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, from the description that is given in the letter by the Secretary of War of the kind of food this is and of the way in which it is put up, it might be a good thing to feed it to the Bolsheviki. That might be a good way to get rid of them.

Mr. BORAH. There are a good many people in Europe who, I take it from press reports, speaking seriously, are actually starving, and we are trying to feed them. I simply can not understand why we should hold food in the department here and be worried as to how to dispose of it when it could be made available for the purpose of doing that which we have undertaken to do, and that is to feed Bolshevism out of Europe.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I understand one purpose the Secretary of War had was to make available to the people of this country these food products, if it were possible to do so. I have had some inquiries about it, the letters coming to me complaining that the department did not turn over this food for the use of our own people.

Mr. BORAH. It is apparent from the description of the food that it will not be disposed of successfully in this country. It is not food which can be put upon the market; it seems to have been prepared or put up in such a way that no one would desire to place it upon the market; and it will not come upon the market here. We are using now hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars worth of food in Europe. Why should the Government retain possession of food which can be used in Europe but which can not be used here? Why does it not transport it, as we are engaged in that business, and utilize it for the purpose of feeding starving people in Europe?

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Tuesday next, June 3, 1919, after the routine morning business, I shall call up House joint resolution No. 1, proposing an amendment to the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women, and shall insist upon pressing it to a final disposition.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Monday next, at the pleasure of the Senate, I shall address the Senate on the subject of the league of nations.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 2, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 29, 1919.

ATTORNEY GENERAL.

A. Mitchell Palmer, of Pennsylvania, to be Attorney General of the United States.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL.

Charles B. Ames, of Oklahoma City, Okla., to be assistant to the Attorney General, vice George Carroll Todd, resigned.

Frank Davis, jr., of Cleveland, Ohio, to be Assistant Attorney General, vice Huston Thompson, resigned.

JUDGE OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF HAWAII.

Cornell S. Franklin, of Honolulu, Hawaii, to be first judge of the circuit court, first circuit of the Territory of Hawaii, vice Clarence W. Ashford, term expired. (Now serving under recess appointment.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES.

Thomas G. Haight, of Newark, N. J., to be United States circuit judge, third circuit, vice John B. McPherson, deceased. (Now serving under recess appointment.)

James Clifton Wilson, of Fort Worth, Tex., to be United States district judge, northern district of Texas (additional position created by act approved Feb. 26, 1919.) (Now serving under recess appointment.)

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

A. C. Hindman, of Boise, Idaho, to be United States attorney, district of the Canal Zone, vice Charles R. Williams, resigned. (Now serving under recess appointment.)

Henry Mooney, of New Orleans, La., to be United States attorney, eastern district of Louisiana, vice Joseph W. Montgomery, resigned. (Now serving under recess appointment.)

Thomas D. Warren, of Newbern, N. C., to be United States attorney, eastern district of North Carolina, vice James O. Carr, resigned. (Now serving under recess appointment.)

D. E. Simmons, of Houston, Tex., to be United States attorney, southern district of Texas, vice John E. Green, jr., resigned. (Now serving under recess appointment.)

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Bruce Alexander, of Booneville, Miss., to be United States marshal, northern district of Mississippi, vice W. S. Vardaman, term expired. (Now serving under recess appointment.)

Floyd Loper, of Lake, Miss., to be United States marshal, southern district of Mississippi, vice John G. Cashman, term expired. (Now serving under recess appointment.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *May 29, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven we bless Thee for a beautiful world, a beautiful day, and the grand opportunity we possess for making life more beautiful for ourselves and for others.

Enter into our souls, we beseech Thee, with all Thy transforming power. Make us great in thought, great in love, great in all our undertakings for all that is highest and best in life. Under the leadership of the Prince of Men. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE LINES.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, I move that the reference of joint resolution No. 2, transferring the telephone and telegraph lines back to their owners, be changed from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the reference of the resolution referred to be changed from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, what is the reason for the request?

Mr. MADDEN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that five minutes be given on each side of the question to state the case.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that five minutes be given on each side for explanation. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if this is the wire-control bill?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then the question evidently would be raised in discussion as to which committee it should go to, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman tell us during the discussion, in which I presume he will participate, by which committee we are likely to get the speediest action?

Mr. MADDEN. Of course I can not speak of that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request that each side have five minutes?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. On the suggestion of Judge MOON, I ask that the time be made 10 minutes on a side.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the time be extended to 10 minutes on a side. Is there objection?

There was no objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I will take five minutes, and then I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON].

Some time in 1918 the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported a resolution authorizing the President to take the telegraph and telephone lines of the United States over as a war measure, for the period of the war, and until the proclamation of peace. The President of the United States exercised the power through the Postmaster General of the United States, and that control is being exercised by the Postmaster General now.

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads believes that this is a postal function and feels that inasmuch as the control has been under the Postmaster General and all the activities have been by him, the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads ought to have jurisdiction over the legislation that is proposed to be enacted for the return of the wires to their owners.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Did not the bill providing for the taking over of the telegraph and telephone companies originate with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. MADDEN. That is just what I said. It did.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. So that the action of Congress in taking over the wires was based on a report from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and not on a report from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads?

Mr. MADDEN. That is true. But all the precedents go to show that on all matters that have to do with postal affairs the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads has jurisdiction, and the committee has already given consideration to this question with a view to reporting a bill to return the wires to their owners, and I believe that committee reported a resolution just at the close of the last Congress, which I think would have been enacted had the Congress remained in session a few days longer.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Does my colleague from Illinois think that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads would have had jurisdiction to bring in this measure in the first place?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, certainly; without doubt. It has to do with the communication of intelligence. You can call it interstate commerce, if you will.

Mr. DENISON. Of course, my colleague knows that the action was not taken as a matter of communication of intelligence but as a war measure.

Mr. MADDEN. It was to control the communication of intelligence.

Mr. DENISON. If the President had chosen to exercise this power through the Secretary of Labor, does my colleague think then that this matter ought to come up through the Committee on Labor?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I do not. Of course, it would have been silly to undertake to control it through the Secretary of Labor, because the Department of Labor has nothing in common with the operation of the telegraph and telephone lines.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads had original jurisdiction, why did not that committte claim it in the last Congress when this bill was reported out and passed upon a report from our committee?

Mr. MADDEN. It was reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce before anybody had notice that the bill was before that committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD indicated it.

Mr. MADDEN. It does not matter what the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD indicated. The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads claim jurisdiction, and the bill really belongs to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads at this time.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. Does the gentleman recall that in the last session the House voted to take it back from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and refer it to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce? I have a recollection of that.

Mr. MADDEN. The House took action upon a resolution reported from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have four minutes of time.

On the 22d of July, 1918, the House passed a resolution turning over to the President the control and operation of the wire systems. That resolution did not designate what agency or department of the Government should have such control. By a proclamation of the President on the 22d of July the operation and control were placed in the hands of the Post Office Department. As was stated by the Supreme Court of Louisiana in a recent decision regarding wire control, there was nothing in the

resolution originally adopted which would prohibit the President from turning it over to the Department of Commerce or any other department, so that the operation and control of the wire systems under the resolution are not the main thing, but are mere incidents. The main thing determining the jurisdiction of committees is the original proposition—the wire control, and our committee has always had control of the wire systems. We incorporated in the interstate commerce act years ago a provision making the wire systems common carriers.

We have this strange and anomalous situation, Mr. Speaker, in this House: A resolution, No. 21, introduced on the 19th of May, offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS], providing for the return of the wire systems. On the same day I introduced a bill, House bill 421, having the same purpose in view. Those two propositions have already been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. If you vote for this motion to rerefer this House joint resolution No. 2 to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, you would have two committees having jurisdiction of the same subject matter at one and the same time. It does not seem to me that the House should put itself in that attitude.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I want to call the attention of the gentleman and of the House to the fact that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has set to-morrow as the time for beginning hearings on this matter.

Mr. ESCH. I was about to refer to that.

Mr. ASWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. The gentleman will recollect that the House in the last Congress voted to turn it back to the gentleman's committee.

Mr. ESCH. That is true. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] asked which committee would more expeditiously act on the proposition. I can say that we have set to-morrow morning at 10.30 o'clock to begin the hearings on the resolutions. Our committee will act as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNER. In the management of the hearings, is it the gentleman's idea to take up the matters separately regarding the telegraph and telephone proposition?

Mr. ESCH. I do not wish to commit myself in advance on that proposition, but it seems to me that under the recommendations that we have from the department the whole subject matter will be up for consideration.

Mr. TOWNER. Perhaps it will be more expeditious in that way than in any other way.

Mr. ESCH. I think so.

Mr. TOWNER. If the gentleman will pardon me, there appears now no possible reason why the telegraphs can not be immediately returned to the ownership and management, but there may be some difficulty about the telephones. It occurs to me that one ought not to wait on the other, and certainly I hope the committee will take that view of the case in regard to the hearings. However, I will say I have no doubt whatever that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has jurisdiction of this resolution.

Mr. ESCH. In a letter from the Postmaster General, directed to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON], the former chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, dated May 22, he submits his views with reference to the legislation now pending, and intimates very strongly that there should not be an immediate return without considering the necessity of some additional legislation. In his letter he says that in matters of consolidation and unification of the wire system there should be legislation giving the Interstate Commerce Commission supervisory power. He also says in regard to the regulation of rates, fares, and charges, that that should be a matter for the Interstate Commerce Commission. So the Postmaster General in his letter addressed to Judge MOON would clearly indicate that legislation is necessary before these systems are returned, which clearly comes within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. For these reasons, it seems to me, the motion should not prevail. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMS. I would like two or three minutes.

Mr. ESCH. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has explained this matter so thoroughly that it seems to me not much more need to be said. Who would think of referring a bill to repeal a section or paragraph in a tariff act to any other committee than the Committee on Ways and Means, that reported the bill containing the section sought to be repealed. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce considered the whole legislative question involved in taking over the wires and had before it the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Postmaster General, and reported the bill which was enacted into the law now sought to be repealed. Now it is proposed that the bill to repeal that law shall go to a committee that had nothing to do with enacting the law. It is proposed that it go to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads simply because the Post Office Department was designated by the President as the instrumentality through which the law should be executed.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is a legislative committee, and by a recommendation of the Postmaster General further legislation is proposed in connection with this repeal measure. It clearly would be confusing matters if we sent this bill to any other committee than the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. If the mere execution of a law after it has been enacted gives legislative jurisdiction to the committee having jurisdiction of the departmental legislation of the department designated to execute a law, it seems to me that all distinction between jurisdiction in committees of the House is obliterated. As the chairman has said, there are two other identical resolutions already referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the proper committee, and now we are asked to refer to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads the so-called Steenerson resolution, identical with the other two. Why not send one to the Navy Department? Why not send one to the War Department? The Navy Department has the execution or operation of this law with reference to the radio system. Mr. Chairman, I think it is useless to consume further time on this matter.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in determining what committee ought to be entitled to the resolution, we might refer to the rules of the House with reference to the jurisdiction of committees. The rules say that to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads should be referred matters pertaining to post offices and post roads. The telephone and telegraph systems of the United States are not under the jurisdiction of the Post Office Department merely because the Postmaster General was designated under a proclamation of the President as director general. Until Congress has postalized the telegraph and telephone systems they are not under the Post Office Department.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has always had jurisdiction of them. They passed the law that puts them under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission for certain purposes. And, therefore, until Congress has made them a part of the Postal System, the telephone and telegraph lines of the United States are not properly under the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads; and, as the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has already set in motion proceedings in the form of hearings upon bills to turn back the telephone and telegraph systems to private ownership, and two other resolutions introduced by other Members of the House have been referred to that committee, the Post Office Committee ought not to be given jurisdiction of this resolution merely because it was introduced by a member of that committee; and it strikes me it would bring about endless confusion to take this resolution away from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, where it now is and where it belongs, and divide up the jurisdiction between that committee and the Post Office Committee, which has never had jurisdiction of this legislation.

Mr. DENISON. Inasmuch as this action was taken by Congress as a war measure, the President might very well have designated the Secretary of War to have executed the law, and then, under the reasoning of the Post Office Committee, it would have to be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SIMS. Yes. As a matter of fact, the President might have designated any independent person, who was not in any office at all, to be director general of the telegraph and telephone lines.

Mr. MADDEN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON].

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, it is very well that we understand the facts now before we discuss the question of jurisdiction. The chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads [Mr. STEENERSON] introduced this resolution. It was referred

to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and at a subsequent day it was stated that by inadvertence it had been so referred, that it was a misprint, that it ought to have gone to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will correct the gentleman. It was never referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. The Journal Clerk made a mistake in reading the reference on the back.

Mr. MOON. That may be true; but however that is, it is utterly immaterial. There is no estoppel operating under that state of facts, whether it be one committee or the other, so the suggestion of the Speaker does not interfere with my position at all.

Now, there is a reason for every rule. The rules of this House require that all bills and resolutions relating to the Postal Service shall be referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. It is said that the bill for the taking over of these telegraph and telephone lines was referred to and reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. That may be true. The usurpation of jurisdiction does not give a right. It is also true that in the last Congress the Post Office Committee had this very bill and reported it to the House, and it was on the calendar.

But these are side issues that amount to nothing, and the suggestion made by the gentleman upon those lines a moment ago was altogether impertinent. Now, the reason for the rule is this: The transmission of intelligence is a monopoly under the Constitution. The carrying of letters is a monopoly of the Government. The carrying of telegrams is nothing different from the carrying of letters. The only difference is in the instrumentality by which the intelligence is communicated. Therefore when you come to a question affecting the communication of intelligence, the department of the Government charged with that duty has the exclusive jurisdiction. Following that rule, the House established the proposition in its rules that the committee in this House to deal with questions of that character should be the Post Office and Post Roads Committee.

Now, it is not altogether an open question. The jurisdiction of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads includes the railway mail service, ocean mail service, pneumatic-tube service, and the postal telegraph.

In 1886 a resolution relating to an inquiry as to a monopoly of telegraph facilities was referred to that committee.

In 1887 the bill H. R. 10398, relating to telegraph lines, especially the land-grant telegraph lines, was referred to that committee.

On January 9, 1884, the resolutions distributing the President's message referred subjects relating to postal telegraphy to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are the decisions of this House on that question of jurisdiction. The question was raised as to the power of the Interstate Commerce Committee heretofore in the control of matters of this sort. It is true that the House decided that under the special act referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin they did have jurisdiction over the cables, but it never has been decided, and should never be decided by men of ordinary common sense, that under the theory and system of this Government, under the power vested by the Constitution, and under the rules a question affecting the postal telegraphy of the United States in this House can go anywhere else except to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, unless the House in its wisdom, having the power to refer a bill anywhere it sees fit, should direct it arbitrarily to be sent to another committee. It might refer it to the Committee on Acoustics, to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic, or any other committee, as well as to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Under the rules the motion of the gentleman from Illinois should prevail.

I am sorry I have not time to discuss it, but it seems to me that the jurisdiction is properly in the Post Office Committee, though, of course, you can, if you do not desire to adhere to the rules, send the bill to another committee. It is immaterial personally to me what you do with it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] that the Committee on Interstate Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of this bill and that it be referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. MADDEN) there were—ayes 75, noes 77.

Mr. MOON. I suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that it would be well to call for the yeas and nays on this subject.

Mr. MADDEN. No; I do not care to take the time of the House.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee demand the yeas and nays?

Mr. MOON. No; I simply suggested it to the gentleman from Illinois, who has charge of the matter.

Mr. CANNON. And the gentleman from Illinois declines to ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The noes have it, and the motion is not agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS FOR TO-MORROW.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] if it is intended that the House shall be in session to-morrow?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; the House has agreed to a session to-morrow, on Memorial Day, the order of business being a resolution thanking the soldiers, sailors, and marines, and their relatives and those who aided in the winning of the Great War.

Mr. DYER. Will there be any other business except the services to which the gentleman has referred?

Mr. MONDELL. There will not.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the necessity of supplying certain deficiencies and in order to expedite the passage of the deficiency appropriation bill, with the understanding that the bill introduced by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] may be disposed of in a short time, possibly not more than two hours, the Committee on Agriculture will yield to the gentleman from Iowa for the consideration of that bill.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes. Pending that motion, I would inquire of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] if we can not agree on the time for general debate?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I told the gentleman that I thought that we would need 25 or 30 minutes, but so far as I am concerned I am willing to go ahead with the consideration of the bill without general debate.

Mr. GOOD. I want about 15 minutes in which to explain the bill.

Mr. CANNON. I think we better have about half an hour on a side.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I had a request for time, and just told the gentleman from Iowa that I would not need any, because the gentleman who requested the time was not present. He has now come into the Chamber, and I desire 25 minutes on this side of the House.

Mr. GOOD. Would that be confined to the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. My understanding is that, while it will refer to some matters that are in the bill, it will not be confined to the bill. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL] desires to speak.

Mr. GOOD. I have assured the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] that we would take very little time, and he has kindly set the time in order that we may take this bill up. Can we not get along with 15 minutes on a side?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will compromise with the gentleman and make it 20 minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 40 minutes, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from South Carolina and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that general debate upon the bill be confined to 40 minutes, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from South Carolina. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3478, with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the third deficiency appropriation bill carries $21,629,885.52. It carries $17,507,358.14 less than

the estimates. The bill carries on its face $5,307,379.51 less than the aggregate of the third deficiency bill that passed the House in the last Congress, but the third deficiency bill in the last Congress carried vast sums of money that were not shown on the face of the bill. In reality this bill carries $834,682,674.61 less than was carried by the third deficiency appropriation bill that passed the House in the closing days of the last Congress. That bill carried a provision reading as follows:

The amount of the unexpended balance of the appropriation "General appropriations, Quartermaster Corps, fiscal year 1919," required to be covered into the Treasury by the "second deficiency appropriation act, 1919," is reduced from $2,996,414,707.14 to $2,167,039,412.04.

The War Department came before the committee and asked for a deficiency appropriation of $829,375,295.10, and, instead of appropriating it, Congress simply reduced by a sort of reappropriation the amount that was ordered into the Treasury by the enactment of the second deficiency appropriation bill. The items generally contained in the bill may be grouped under several departments, although there are a great many items of minor importance, many of them audited accounts or actual deficiencies, that I will not have time to refer to in the opening statement.

The State Department carries in the main three items, one for contingent expenses of foreign missions, amounting to $100,000, another for contingent expenses in United States consulates of $50,000, and another item of $50,000 for the relief of American seamen in foreign countries, in which item there is an actual deficiency under the law.

The Treasury Department has items aggregating about $1,000,000 in the bill. It has taken over the lease of the Navy Annex for $40,000, and no appropriation was made in the last bill for that item. There is a lease extending until 1923, and the rental must be provided for. There is an item for the care and upkeep and maintenance of the Treasury Annex of $110,448, another for the increased cost of envelopes of $95,000, and so on down through the Treasury Department.

The bill also carries an item of about $850,000 for the payment of claims on account of the explosion and fire at the munition plant at Morgan, N. J. This is to pay property losses under the findings and report of the Secretary of War.

The Naval Establishment contains some new items, items not found in the former deficiency appropriation bill. They are large items and aggregate about $8,000,000. I do not know how other members of the subcommittee and the committee who heard the testimony view it, but it was an astounding thing to me when I realized that the Secretary of the Navy, at the last session, had made no estimates at all to take care of 11,000 sick seamen in the United States after the 31st day of March, 1919. It was not the fault of Congress. The Navy Department never estimated for a dollar to buy medical supplies, to pay hospital bills, and to take care of 11,000 seamen, who were sick, after the 31st of March, with the funds exhausted, without a dollar appropriated to take care of that work. This bill gives the Secretary of the Navy every dollar necessary to give the most tender and careful treatment to every sailor and seaman in the United States Navy who may be sick. [Applause.]

The sundry civil bill which passed in the last Congress carried an item of $4,002,380 for prosecuting the work of building the railroad in Alaska. Had that appropriation bill passed and become the law, Congress would have appropriated the full amount which was fixed in the law authorizing the building of the roads, to wit, $35,000,000. The Secretary of the Interior feels that this work should be prosecuted at once; that to delay now the ordering of supplies and the organization of its men to prosecute the work during the rest of the year will retard the work and will force the men who are prosecuting that work to do it under conditions not so favorable as during the summer months, so we have incorporated in this bill an item of $1,964,351 with which to enable the Secretary of the Interior to carry on this work in accordance with his plans, but this in no wise increases the limit of cost.

There are also a great many items in the bill with regard to the unusual expenses of United States marshals and clerks and the expenses of bringing jurors to sit in cases of the United States. This extra work was brought about largely by the enforcement of the prohibitory laws around cantonments and Army camps, also the enforcement of the espionage act and the trading-with-the-enemy act. The enforcement of these unusual laws, which were enacted because of the war, brought additional work upon the courts, and therefore the committee has recommended the amount that was necessary to pay these officials. The bill also carries an item of $1,037,700 for special-delivery fees. Under the law each postmaster is entitled to retain 8 cents out of every 10 cents received for a special-delivery letter. These amounts have accumulated. The accounts have been audited, and the postmasters are entitled to it, and it is an actual deficiency and must be paid. Likewise another large item in the Post Office Department is that of providing for additional funds to pay the increased contracts for star-route service. The contracts now that are being made and adjustments under them bring about a condition in which the Post Office Department finds itself with a deficit of a million and a half.

There is appropriated for the continuance of the Employment Service for the balance of this year $272,000. The last bill carried $1,800,000 for this service. Since the time that action was taken on that bill there have been a great many changes. The department itself has eliminated many of its officers and has discharged a good many of its employees. It had $74,000 in cash on May 10. That sum and the money appropriated and carried in this bill will permit the Department of Labor to continue the work which it is now conducting until the 1st day of July.

The bill also carries some new items in regard to the payment of widows of deceased Members. Since action was taken on the former bill five Members of this House have passed away, and under the custom of the House we have appropriated $7,500, a year's salary, to the widow of the deceased Member.

There have also been added to the bill several items for the payment of judgments that have been certified since the former action on this bill.

The committee has found that the War Department actually has a deficit to-day aggregating about $1,144,000,000. But we also discovered that the War Department had large appropriations, large balances, that it would not need. For example, in the Ordnance Department alone there is standing to the credit of that department to-day about $1,000,000,000. It is estimated that it will not require more than $230,000,000 of that sum to apply on the outstanding obligations of that department, and so this bill carries authorization to the Secretary of War to take from the appropriations for ordnance $770,000,000 to pay outstanding legal obligations contracted in some other division of the Military Establishment where there are no funds with which to pay it. We also found that they could take from the appropriation of the Quartermaster Corps $450,000,000 and transfer that sum to some of these other bureaus where there was a deficiency in appropriation.

There was $45,000,000 for the Air Service which would not be needed, which remains as a balance, and we authorize in this act the Secretary of War to transfer where he has a surplus that will not be needed for discharge of the legal obligations for which the appropriations were made over to other appropriations where there is a deficiency and outstanding obligations. We thought it would be unwise to report out here a deficiency bill carrying a deficiency for $1,000,000,000 to supply these deficiencies in certain bureaus of the War Department when there were more than $1,000,000,000 that had already been appropriated for other services which would not be used, and the bill simply makes the businesslike provision that the appropriations which are already made may be used for the discharge of obligations already incurred within some limitations.

The bill also contains a provision which I am frank to say is subject to a point of order. It is new legislation, but it will prohibit a practice that has been indulged in so often, without regard to what administration is in power—the practice of a bureau chief or the head of a department writing letters throughout the country, sending telegrams throughout the country, for this organization, for this man, for that company to write his Congressman, to wire his Congressman, in behalf of this or that legislation. [Applause.] The gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Sherley, former chairman of this committee, during the closing days of the last Congress was greatly worried because he had on his desk thousands upon thousands of telegrams that had been started right here in Washington by some official wiring out for people to wire Congressman Sherley for this appropriation and for that. Now, they use the contingent fund for that purpose, and I have no doubt that the telegrams sent for that purpose cost the Government more than $7,500. Now, if was never the intention of Congress to appropriate money for this purpose, and section 5 of the bill will absolutely put a stop to that sort of thing. [Applause.]

I want now to call attention to a provision which has been the law for some time, but a law to which a good many of the departments pay little attention, a law which I think should be strictly observed; and that is the law with regard to requiring the departments to so allot their appropriations for various services, by the quarter or by the month, that there will not be a deficiency at the end of the year. Hereafter when departments come before the Committee on Appropriations and ask for a de-

ficiency they must show that they have scrupulously observed the statute and have not set out at the beginning of the fiscal year to create an organization that will result in a deficiency and thus require large sums to meet the deficiency.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman advise me where in the bill that particular reference is?

Mr. GOOD. It is in section 5 of the bill.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Where the committee has authorized the taking of an appropriation from one bureau to be used for another, when there is a deficiency, does the bill direct the department where the money must be used?

Mr. GOOD. No. The bill only directs the source from which it shall come. We went into that matter, and we believed that there were so many places where there were little appropriations; and, as the gentleman knows, a great deal of our operation is 3,000 miles away, and it would take a good deal of time to get these reports in. Gen. Lord, the Chief of the Finance Division, could not tell us exactly the funds to which they would be allotted, and so we put in a provision that no part should be used for services in the District, and that the Secretary of War should at the next session report to Congress the funds to which these appropriations were diverted.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Is it intended by section 5 to prevent the employees or officers of the Government from communicating directly with their Representatives in Congress?

Mr. GOOD. No; that is expressly reserved.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. It says "through proper official channels."

Mr. GOOD. They have, of course, the right to communicate, just as before, with their Members of Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. The words "through official channels" should be eliminated if that was not the intention.

Mr. GOOD. It was not the thought of the committee to hamper in any degree or limit or restrict those communications that pass from the Members of Congress to the heads of the various executive departments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL].

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, the other day I listened with a great deal of care to the speech made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] concerning the things that he had seen on his recent trip to France and Germany, and particularly his opinions with reference to the attitude of the various governments with which we were allied in the war and their peoples, and his reasons for opposing the league of nations.

It so happened that at the close of the last Congress the Military Committee of the House of Representatives arranged to make an official visit to France and the army of occupation; and, being a member of that committee, I had the great pleasure and distinction of going with the chairman and other members of the committee, 13 in number, over the whole of France and the occupied territory of Germany and Belgium. After that committee had returned home I went to London, spent two days there, and then returned a week later.

America might have started sooner; fortunately she did not arrive too late, for there is no question but that America arrived in time to turn the tide of battle. All agree that the American soldier is superior to any other soldier in the world. [Applause.] He is the biggest soldier, he is the smartest soldier, he carries the best guns and shoots the most rounds of ammunition, he has the best equipment and the highest ideals of any man who ever fought for any cause in the history of the world, and it was only natural when men of that kind and character were matched against those of the breed of our enemy that victory followed. We see here on the map the territory in shade over which our soldiers passed. When we realize that at no time were they compelled to retreat, except for a few hours, and then immediately advanced; when we see the strategic importance of their operation we must be convinced that at least the final pressure that brought about a victory for America and her allies was applied by the American Army.

The most cruel thing that any man can say in discussing this war is to say that America won the war. I would not take from the laurels of any man who served in our foreign army the smallest meed and I would not under any circumstances permit any man to cast aspersions upon their valor, their integrity, or their ability, but it is cruel to say of a nation that fought for four years, that gave of its best blood, that made the sacrifices that the French and British and Belgians and Italians made, that America won the war, intimating by that that the sacrifices of those people had been in vain.

Let us remember that when the German horde started across Belgium the Belgian Army went out and, almost to a man, died in the defense of their territory and held that horde until the French and British could come to the defense of their land and of civilization. [Applause.] And let us remember that in the closing days of the war, when victory was just about to come, that two American divisions were fighting side by side with the Belgian Army, and in one day the Belgians took over 6,000 prisoners. Let us not forget those things.

And as for the French, the stand of the noble French at Verdun will be sung and told in song and story for more than a thousand years as comparable with the valiant defense made by the Greeks at the Pass of Thermopylæ. No man can stand and look at that battle field and see the great hills that have been shot away to the depth of 6 feet and imagine that France had not something to do with winning the war. They went there and they died there, and then others came and died, too. When the great cry went up, "They shall not pass," France wrote into the history of the world a record that every man who loves liberty and independence and has regard and respect for his home and his women will always revere.

I am proud of the Frenchmen and the fight they made. I think if you go to Ypres, as we did, and go over the territory between Mont Kemmel and Vimy Ridge, where the English and the Scotch and the Irish, where the Australians and Canadians were, and who in allegiance to the British flag died in the service of their country and in the service of democracy, you can not help but marvel that it was possible for human beings to exist there, much less to fight there. I stood on the hill where you could see over a distance of at least 20 miles in every direction. There was not a tree, nor a house, nor a bush, nor anything except the débris of battle in confusion, and the whole terrain was as full of shell holes as the ocean is of waves. Each indentation was filled with a slimy, greasy, green ooze, from which pestilence was rising even then. To say that men who fought there and died there and those that came to fight where others had died had not a part in the winning of this war is to be inhuman and cruel.

Never again will there be a battle in which so many people died or in which greater sacrifices were made than around Vimy Ridge and Mont Kemmel. There are places there where there were towns, but where there was not even one single brick left, much less one on top of another. I saw places which they told me had been villages of from 1,500 to 3,000 people in which there was not the slightest vestige of anything that indicated that there had ever been a human habitation there. The only débris in sight was the railroad iron, the twisted rails, pieces of old tanks, pieces of cannon and guns, and thrown-away parts of uniforms—horrible and depressing beyond description. I say that it is cruel for anyone to say that those nations did not help to win the war. The idea that we wish to convey to the American people is that America made a supreme effort, and the supreme effort of America was the balance of power, and it was the compelling force that caused the Germans' retirement and their final capitulation.

It is very easy for you to understand it if you will look at the map here. On July 18, 1918, the farthest German advance, and the one that was then being pressed, was at Chateau-Thierry. It was here that we read in the newspapers that the marines had turned the Germans back, and let us not have a misunderstanding about that. The marines were there. A machine-gun company had come in across the river. A bridge had been thrown up to stop the German advance, and they drove the Germans out of Chateau-Thierry and shot up the town.

But the real fight that forced the German retirement from Chateau-Thierry was caused from the operations of the First and Second Divisions and a division of French troops under Gen. Mangin. The First Division was under Gen. Summerall and he stood on the battle field here and pointed out to us the hardships that had been overcome by the American forces, the manner in which the operation was carried on, and the extreme valor of the American soldier, which made it possible for that victory to be obtained.

Now, let me see if I can explain it to you. The First Division and the Second Division were brought in in the neighborhood of Soissons. On the little map here you can see it plainly. They were brought in at night, and the Germans did not know they were there and did not expect them. In the morning following the night in which they moved into position, the First Division on the left and the Second on the right and the French division

in between, making a corps, just at the break of day, when there was a considerable fog, began the advance under a barrage laid down by the American and French artillery, the like of which the Germans had never seen, and which they have since learned to respect, for our guns spoke in an accent the Hun could understand. The object of that advance was to cut the railroad and the highways that fed the German troops that were pressing on through Chateau-Thierry. At the same time pressure was started from the other side, not with the expectation at once of pressing through, but to keep the Germans on that side busy. This advance went forward on schedule to the first two objectives.

On the third objective the First Division made its objective, but the French to the left found they could not come up, and it was necessary for us to adopt new tactics which the field officers there had never used before, and throw another force in to protect their flank. The third and fourth objectives were taken. The railroad and the highway from Soissons to Chateau-Thierry were cut, and the German Army moved back to a new line to the north, thus straightening out the salient there.

The next operation was almost of the same character at St. Mihiel, shown on the map. Here the Twenty-sixth Division came from the left, and the First, the Forty-second, the Eighty-ninth, and the Eighty-second came in from the right. Now, the center of that fight was Mont Sec, a beautiful and wonderful hill rising out of the surrounding territory, and giving a point of observation for many miles, upon which had been built for many hundreds of years a beautiful village. Following the war of 1871, the Germans in their peace treaty of 1874 provided that the French should not fortify this hill for a period of 40 years; and 40 years almost to a day after the signing of that peace treaty the Germans started their hordes into France by this gateway that was made by reason of the failure of the French to fortify that hill. But the Germans did not fortify it either. They were too supremely confident of their victory, and their lines had pressed forward until they felt that it was not necessary. Our generals in preparation of this great battle prepared a plan of attack, and gave it to an American general and sent him to Switzerland, where he "lost it" to a German spy. The plan of attack outlined was that the American forces were to go on to Metz by an operation to the right.

The attack was pulled off a day ahead of time, but the Germans knew that they were coming, having learned it from a prisoner; they knew what had happened at Soissons. They were desirous of defending Metz, and they pulled their forces back and went all along the line clear up into Belgium, and pulled the finest and best troops that they had in their long line and sent them hurry-scurrying to meet the expected advance of the Americans to the right of Metz.

The Germans began moving troops out of the St. Mihiel salient, and the pressure was so great that the German line crumpled and many thousands of them surrendered.

While the battle was actually in operation a thing happened that perhaps had never been done before, at least not since Jackson's campaign in the Civil War. The forces that were sent in there to be the shock troops, to take that salient, while they were actually in battle were pulled out and transported farther along the line, and began an operation that finally extended on to Sedan and cut off the line of communication between Germany and her occupied territory in France. The armistice was then asked for and granted. In a little while longer, with the advance that the Americans were then making, the whole of the German Army to the west of Sedan would have been cut off from its base of supplies and would either have been compelled to surrender or else fight a war by itself and supply itself from its occupied territory, which was an impossibility.

While this fighting was going on two American divisions were fighting with the Belgians on the northern end of the line, and two American divisions—the Thirtieth and the Twenty-seventh—were fighting with the British up on the Hindenburg line.

I saw this battle field. It is marvelous that human beings were able to take it. It was here that Hindenburg, the greatest German strategist, laid the corner stone of his defense, where he felt that for all time the German Empire should have its outpost. There were pill boxes every few hundred yards along the whole of the line, barbed-wire entanglements, trenches, and here, particularly at the great canal built by Napoleon, 3 miles of it underground in a tunnel, and for about 3 miles before you get into the tunnel to the right, as we advanced across there was a great cut. The tunnel and the cut were both fortified with cannon and machine guns and with pill boxes, camouflaged so that you would not see them when you were almost standing upon them. Across that territory, swept by machine-gun fire for the distance of a mile and a half, the American Volunteer Army, two divisions of the National Guard, marched to victory, when the finest and greatest troops in the world before that had tried and failed. [Applause.]

So in that respect, if one limits the application of the phrase, "America won the war"; but for pity's sake do not be so cruel as to use that expression, for it is so easily misapplied and misunderstood. America brought the final pressure that won the war, but do not forget that while America was pressing here and doing these things of great strategic importance the whole of the battle line was under movement, and the armies of the Allies marched forward to victory, but at an enormous sacrifice, and in those closing days the English, the Scotch, the Irish, the Anzacs, and the Frenchmen died by the hundreds of thousands, while our deaths were only something like 72,000.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CALDWELL. Certainly.

Mr. LAZARO. Instead of quarreling as to who won the war, does not the gentleman think we had better be satisfied to quote the language of Admiral Schley at the Battle of Santiago——

Mr. CALDWELL. "That there is honor enough in it for us all." Yes; I think so. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment under the five-minute rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN.

For expenses of the Alien Property Custodian authorized by the act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, including personal and other services and expenses incident to the acquiring and rental of quarters in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence not exceeding $4, traveling expenses, printing and binding, law books, books of reference and periodicals, supplies and equipment, and maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, $90,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the chairman whether the number of employees under this branch of the service has been reduced.

Mr. GOOD. They have been reduced from 550, at the time the former estimate was made, to 473. This amount is necessary to carry on the work with that reduced force.

Mr. WALSH. I notice in the hearings that the committee asked a representative of the department to lay before the committee the salaries paid the employees of this office. Can the gentleman state how many attorneys this officer has under him?

Mr. GOOD. I can not.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman know the salaries that are paid to any of them?

Mr. GOOD. We have had no response to the inquiry that was made in regard to the salaries that are paid out of the funds of the aliens. Mr. Dreher, who represented the Alien Property Custodian, said that they would attempt to get that information for us as quickly as they could, but it involved an examination of more than 27,000 separate estates. He has assured us that he is at work on that matter, but that it will take 10 days to get the information that is required.

Mr. WALSH. The Alien Property Custodian has had $900,000 appropriated, and he is asking for $90,000 to carry him to July 1, 1920. But he has available for the handling of these trust estates funds received from the sale of this alien property. It seemed to me that the committee or the House ought to have some information as to how much of this fund he has received from the sale of estates, how much has been diverted or used for the payment of salaries of attorneys.

Mr. GOOD. The position taken by the Alien Property Custodian is this: That certain expenses connected with the property of aliens could be paid, but the expenses that are incurred in the payment of salaries of the 473 employees that are now employed by the department could not under the law be used for that purpose. They claim that they reduced the force immediately after the failure of the last deficiency bill to a point where they can not carry on this work with a further reduction. The committee saw no way but to give them the amount of the reduced estimate.

Mr. WALSH. I appreciate that, but may I ask if this official is still taking charge of the property of aliens and advertising it for sale?

Mr. GOOD. I think so.

Mr. WALSH. And he expects to do so——

Mr. GOOD. Until the treaty of peace is signed and ratified. That is their position.

Mr. WALSH. With reference to this item the law provides that the moneys received by this official in the sale of alien property shall, minus the expenses, be covered into the Treasury, there to be held until disposed of by Congress.

Mr. GOOD. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. If that is so the committee should be in possession of information as to how much money has been covered into the Treasury, how much has been used for the payment of attorneys. This is one of the bureaus, I think, the committee will find on further investigation that has a considerable number of attorneys in its employ in connection with these trust estates so called. That is, under the law they are held in trust until disposed of, and the money covered into the Treasury. I trust the gentleman will persist in his inquiry and get the information he endeavored to secure when the hearing was held.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to say in support of what the gentleman has said that the subcommittee requested that a statement be furnished showing the name of every individual employed by the Alien Property Custodian. The Alien Property Custodian is entirely willing and anxious to furnish such a statement. It necessarily calls for considerable work, but just as soon as it can be prepared he will submit it to the Appropriations Committee so that it will be available to Members of the House.

Now, I want to make a statement in regard to what the chairman of the committee said in relation to the appropriations carried by this bill. It is true that this bill carries $5,307,379.51 less than the bill reported by the committee of the last Congress. It should, however, be said that the appropriations thus made were made to take care of the departments of the Government from that time—February—to July 1. Manifestly a bill reported at this time for the purpose of carrying on the work of the Government in the various departments only from this date to July 1 should carry much less than the bill reported in February. Again, we must remember that this bill when introduced in the last Congress carried appropriations of many millions for the War Risk Bureau and the Pension Bureau which were carried in the deficiency bill that passed a few days ago. Had those items been included in this bill it would be much larger than the previous deficiency bill.

With reference to the statement made that it carried $800,000,000 less, that is true, and the House ought to know the reason why. When the War Department came before the Committee on Appropriations after the armistice that committee, through Mr. Sherley, conducted hearings for the purpose of ascertaining how much could be covered into the Treasury. The result of those hearings was reported here in what was known as the third deficiency bill. The department estimated how much they could cover back by canceling contracts, by salvaging material, and reducing expenses. After that the Quartermaster General came before the committee and asked for $800,000,000 to cover extraordinary expenses reported to the War Department in February of this year on bills that accrued abroad. It became necessary for the Appropriation Committee in the deficiency bill to reduce by the sum of $800,000,000 the amount that we proposed to cover back into the Treasury, and the department proposed to use this $800,000,000 in settling its accounts. That bill failed.

In this bill we are able to save that $800,000,000, and the House should know and the country should know that it is due to the efficiency of the War Department that, in canceling their contracts, salvaging material, and reducing expenses, they find to-day that they can turn back to the Treasury $800,000,000 more than they anticipated last January and February. [Applause on Democratic side.] By the exercise of good business ability, they were able to do that. The suggestion to use this $800,000,000 as provided in this bill came from the War Department, and the committee agreed to it. Not only is that true but the committee in this bill has given to them greater powers than they ever had before. In this section referred to by the chairman, it will be found that they have the power to use this sum of $800,000,000 that they are recovering from ordnance, aircraft, and the other departments, to pay any expenses of the War Department; and, revolutionary as that may be, I know the committee is justified, because the economical administration of the War Department in this matter justifies the placing of that trust in them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It should also be called to the attention of the House that with regard to the statement made by the chairman of the committee that the Navy Department failed to estimate for a sufficient amount of money to pay for the care of sick and wounded seamen, while that is true, it is not exactly correct. The fact is that when the Navy Department, through its Surgeon General, came to the committee—I was not then a member of the deficiency subcommittee but am informed by the Surgeon General—he was told to submit his actual deficiency at that time and the Congress would take care of it. There was a misunderstanding, and he submitted a deficiency as of the date that he appeared before the committee, but regardless of whether that was a mistake or not, it is not correct to create the impression that the Navy Department would not have been able to take care of the sick and wounded seamen, because the House should know that the Navy, unlike other departments of the Government, has a peculiar system of accounting. It has what is known as general accounts, advance, under which they can pay any shortage in any one department. As to the wisdom of that, I am not prepared to say. I have never served on the Naval Committee, and therefore do not undertake at this time to approve or criticize. But the fact is that the Navy could have drawn from general accounts, advance, for every dollar that was necessary to take care of every wounded and sick sailor or seaman in the service of the Government, and if this bill were not considered at this time they would do it, and the Navy has the funds in that account to do it. Of course, in turn they would have to charge it up against the Surgeon General, and some time later we would have to make good the deficiency. There is no justification, however, for creating the impression that the department failed to provide sufficient funds to take care of the sick sailors and seamen.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I did not intend to say anything to reflect upon the action of the committee or of Congress. I want to say to the gentleman that when the estimate was made for supplies for the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Navy up to March 31, 1919, without making any estimate at all to supply deficiencies after that date, it was not made by mistake, but was made in pursuance to an order issued by the Secretary of the Navy. There was no mistake about it, and when I heard it I was hardly able to repress the feelings that I had for an official who knew there was a deficiency from the 31st of March until the 1st day of July and never estimated for it. I am not making idle statements with regard to that. I know what I am talking about.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman kindly read the order?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, I have not the order.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I know the gentleman has not, and I know that the gentleman will never have it. I know that the Surgeon General spoke to the chairman of the committee and understood the chairman of the committee to say that he wanted him to report the actual deficiencies, and the committee would then take care of it, and the bill that was then reported by that deficiency subcommittee the gentleman from Iowa voted for on the floor and in the full committee.

Mr. GOOD. Of course.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Without any criticism.

Mr. GOOD. Of course. I knew absolutely nothing about it at the time. I knew nothing about it until the matter was brought to the attention of the subcommittee at this time, that the estimate only covered up to the 31st day of March.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I am satisfied the gentleman does not do himself credit. He is an exceedingly active man on the committee, and I am satisfied that he knew something about it, or at least should have known something about it.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that I did not know about it and I did not know about it until about the time we commenced the hearings. With regard to the amount that was covered in, I am not going to make a plea or a statement that the War Department has been so economical in its expenditures that it has been able to save this money. When the Committee on Appropriations reported out the second deficiency bill we repealed about $8,000,000,000 of contracts and authorizations and about $7,000,000,000 of appropriations, and the committee did a wise and patriotic thing when it did that. It did not attempt to take from a single branch of the Military or Naval Establishment a dollar that was necessary. It attempted to leave them more money even than would be necessary for such purposes, and it was discovered that the War Department, not the Congress, not the committee, had made a mistake. The gentleman well knows that the committee followed the advice of the War

Department and did not want to take, and did not take, a dollar more than the War Department said they should give up. The War Department made a mistake. They did not know and could not know some of the things that were transpiring on the other side. They could not know—and I do not blame them for that—the state of their balances. They figured also on getting British ships to bring back American soldiers. They figured on an army of 500,000 men by July 1, whereas we will have an army of more than a million men on July 1, and, therefore, these calculations—true, the calculations of the War Department and of Congress—were out of joint. The only thing I am saying is that the other bill did provide practically for a reappropriation of $829,375,000 by reducing the amount which was covered into the Treasury under that former act. This does not do it. We simply reach out and find these balances and provide that they shall be used to pay for expenses, to pay for contracts already entered into, in bureaus where there is a deficiency.

The Clerk read as follows:

The unexpended balances on June 30, 1919, of appropriations for additional and temporary employees for the Civil Service Commission made, respectively, in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, and the "first deficiency appropriation act, 1919," are reappropriated and made available under the same conditions for the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Can the chairman of the committee advise me how much the Civil Service Commission has had from the President's fund, if anything, for this purpose?

Mr. GOOD. The Civil Service Commission asked $5,000 for necessary traveling expenses, including those of examiners. There was carried in the former bill $4,000, and the President has since given them $10,000 for that purpose.

Mr. WALSH. Now, I would like to ask for just what particular traveling expenses was that expended? This commission is provided for in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and I would like to know what extra travel this commission has had to perform as the result of the war emergency, if it was the result of that emergency.

Mr. GOOD. Well, out of that fund are paid the traveling expenses of the commissioners, the examiners, and persons who are employed by the Civil Service Commission to conduct examinations; and because of the war, I take it, their work was very largely increased, but they are not asking for any appropriation, and this bill does not carry any, as the gentleman knows, for that purpose.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that it does not; but what traveling do the commissioners have to do? They are supposed to be here in Washington, if I understand it.

Mr. GOOD. They do not travel very much, but their examiners do travel. They hold examinations in various centers of population at various times, and these examiners travel from place to place.

Mr. WALSH. How much unexpended balance from this item was reappropriated and made available?

Mr. GOOD. That is under the items on page 3, lines 11 to 17?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. About $12,000.

Mr. WALSH. Now, does the gentleman know whether any of the appropriations asked for are made necessary or any of this deficiency has been created by reason of change in the personnel of this commission recently?

Mr. GOOD. A change in the personnel of the commission?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. No; I think not. I think it is only for the employees under the commission.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 17, page 3, insert the following:

"*Provided*, That the act entitled 'An act to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses,' approved March 3, 1919, so far as it relates to preference in employment to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, be amended to read as follows:

"'That hereafter in making appointments to clerical and other positions in the executive branch of the Government in the District of Columbia or elsewhere preference shall be given to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, and widows of such, if they are qualified to hold such positions.'"

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. GOOD. I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I trust the gentleman will not make it at the proper time. I will say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and to the Members of the House that this is necessary. Recently I took up the matter with the representative of the Civil Service Commission in my city concerning the appointment of a soldier who was seeking a position there in the zone supply office, Quartermaster's Department of the Army, a soldier who had returned from service. I wrote a letter to the gentleman in charge of the civil service there, calling his attention to the act of Congress to which I have referred, that preference should be given to these men, and asked him to carry that in mind when he considered this man's appointment. He replied to me, and said that under the law, as advised by the Civil Service Commission, he could not give preference to this man or to any man, soldier, sailor, or marine, in Government employ at St. Louis unless he was discharged by reason of disability incurred in the line of duty, which was an act of Congress passed a good many years ago. I took it up with the Civil Service Commission in Washington, and received the same information. The act of Congress of March 3, 1919, had this provision in that law:

Provided, That hereafter in making appointments in clerical and other positions in the executive departments and in independent Government establishments, preference shall be given to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, and widows of such, if they are qualified to hold such positions.

Now, let me direct the attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], the chairman of the committee, to the statement which I wish to make. The Civil Service Commission stated that, notwithstanding that law which we passed as an independent section of the census act, that it only applies to men employed or contemplated to be employed in the executive branch of the Government in the city of Washington; that it does not apply to any soldier, sailor, or marine who seeks a position in the Government service in St. Louis, Chicago, New York, or any other place, and therefore, in order that men who desire to seek a position in the Government service in other cities outside of the District of Columbia may be eligible for consideration under this act of Congress and to give to them the same consideration that we give to men seeking employment here in the District of Columbia, it is necessary to amend this act as I have provided.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. I will.

Mr. LANGLEY. I am not sure of what the gentleman stated. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the Civil Service Commission now holds that is their construction?

Mr. DYER. They hold it. They told me they even submitted it to the Attorney General of the United States, and he said, and advised them, that it only applied to men in the Government establishments in the city of Washington.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course the only way in which the gentleman from Missouri seeks to amend is by adding the words "or elsewhere"?

Mr. DYER. In the District of Columbia or elsewhere.

Mr. MADDEN. That is what I mean, that he desires to add the words "or elsewhere" to what is already in the law. Of course, the construction of the law by the officers with whom the gentleman has conversed is entirely proper. Executive departments of the Government mean Washington only, and by putting in the words "or elsewhere" it will make it comprehend the whole United States, and those words certainly ought to be in it.

Mr. DYER. I think that was the intention of the Congress, and I hope that it may be so amended. It has been drawn with care and covers the point.

Mr. RANDALL of California. The gentleman's amendment covers provisions in favor of soldiers, sailors, and marines who hold an honorable discharge.

Mr. DYER. Yes.

Mr. RANDALL of California. The gentleman is aware that a great many sailors are not being discharged, but are being put on the inactive list. How does the gentleman cover that situation? In our State we have a tax law in regard to soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in time of war and have an honorable discharge, but now the tax collectors are refusing to give that exemption to sailors who have not an honorable discharge.

Mr. DYER. I think it is a matter of construction. I doubt if we could put it in this amendment at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DYER. I think they would construe that to mean that any man who had served and had been placed in an inactive status would be included in this provision with any man who was honorably discharged.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Regardless of the law, what is the attitude of the various departments of the Government for reemploying former employees who were compelled to leave and go into the military service?

Mr. DYER. I will say to the gentleman that we had that matter up at the last session, and we passed a provision that compels Government officials to reinstate men who had honorably served in the war with Germany. We had some trouble until that provision was put in by the Congress, but since that time I have had no complaint, and the Government officials are, of course, presumed to carry out the act of the Congress.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman says there was some trouble at that time. In all fairness to the department, does not the gentleman think it fair to say that the department had no authority under the law to turn away employees and take over honorably discharged soldiers?

Mr. DYER. I think the gentleman's statement is entirely proper, and that is the way I intended to state it. When these soldiers and sailors gave up their positions and went away, men and women were appointed under the civil-service law to take their places, but it was difficult to get them out unless a law was passed to that effect.

Mr. Chairman, I hope and sincerely trust that this amendment may be agreed to, especially, Mr. Chairman, in view of the great service that men have rendered in this war, and for the further reason that to-morrow is Decoration Day, a day set apart by a grateful people and a grateful Nation to honor the memory of those brave and heroic Americans who have made our country what it is. They have given us the honor and prestige of the greatest and most loved nation in all the world. On the eve of that day we are considering this matter which is of so great importance, because the country and the people and the Congress want this small preference given to these men.

It says they must be qualified if they receive the appointment. This preference is only in case they are found qualified under the rules and under the law to pass these examinations. We have men returning from overseas, and men who have returned, who can hold positions in the Government service in various places in this country. They can perform the duties. I have had men come to me who have been wounded, who have lost limbs, but yet who are able to do work of some kind in the Government service in my city, as they are doing elsewhere. Others who have served but have not been wounded seek positions in Government service. They can do the work. And yet these men are without opportunity to secure employment in civil life in the Government service in the Government that they fought for, that their comrades died for, and, gentlemen, it is most unjust and most unfair. We are only amending the law to cover what Congress intended, and I sincerely hope we will be able to do it; so I ask of the distinguished chairman of the committee to withdraw his point of order and let the committee vote upon this amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with what the gentleman has said and the purpose he desires to accomplish; but I know, and he knows, that a deficiency bill is not the place to amend laws of this kind that should be amended, and therefore I am compelled to make the point of order.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. DYER. Let me call the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to the fact that it was in a deficiency appropriation bill in the last Congress, of which the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Sherley, was chairman, upon which we wrote the provision of the law that says that the honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines in the present war must be restored to their positions in the Government.

Mr. GOOD. That was a limitation.

Mr. DYER. A former chairman of the Committee of the Whole House said it was in order, and the amendment was voted on and agreed to. We have a precedent. We had a dividing vote, and the Chair was sustained, although appealed from, that you can put legislation of that kind upon an appropriation bill, because it is only a limitation and does not provide for an increase in appropriation. It is thoroughly in order. In the last Congress, in a deficiency bill presented to this House by the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Sherley, it was written into the bill and is the law of the land to-day.

Mr. GOOD. The last deficiency bill did not become a law.

Mr. DYER. It was the second one that I refer to. It became a law, and that provision was in it, offered by me upon the floor. A point of order was made against it. The point of order was debated, and the Chair ruled in favor of the provision. An appeal was taken from the decision, and the Committee of the Whole sustained the Chair.

That is a precedent, Mr. Chairman, which I suggest compels attention, and I beg the gentleman to withdraw his point of order. We ought to give this matter consideration. The people want it, and the soldiers and sailors and marines are entitled to it.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, it is clearly legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. Does the gentleman from Iowa insist upon the point of order?

Mr. GOOD. I insist upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the duty of the Chair to rule in accordance with the rules, no matter how meritorious a suggestion may be that comes from the floor by way of an amendment. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri is so clearly contrary to the rule that the Chair is obliged to sustain the point of order.

Mr. DYER. Will the Chair permit me to call his attention to a ruling of the Chair on the same proposition in the last Congress, on the second deficiency bill, when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] was in the chair? He is a very able and learned Member of this House and an expert in parliamentary law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed by the parliamentary clerk that that is not this proposition at all.

Mr. DYER. The proposition went further than this, Mr. Chairman, if you pardon me. That proposition compels an executive department to reinstate in the Government service these men who were honorably discharged and returned home. It compels them; this only says they are to be given a preference if they are qualified under the law for the positions. This is not as strong as the precedent to which I have invited the attention of the distinguished chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is still informed that the situation is entirely different in this case. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri is so clearly legislation upon an appropriation bill, contrary to the rule, that the Chair is obliged to adhere to his decision.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri appeals from the decision of the Chair. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the committee?

The question was taken; and upon a division there were—ayes 103, noes 2.

The CHAIRMAN. On this vote the ayes are 103 and the noes 2. The decision of the Chair is sustained.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. Did the Chair say 93 ayes or 103?

The CHAIRMAN. One hundred and three.

Mr. DYER. Then I withdraw the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Distribution of card indexes: For services of assistants at salaries less than $1,000 per annum and for piecework and work by the hour, including not exceeding $500 for freight charges, expressage, traveling expenses connected with such distribution, and expenses of attendance at meetings when incurred on the written authority and direction of the Librarian, $2,142.25.

Mr. GOULD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order in order to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves a point of order.

Mr. GOULD. I want to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if this will in any way increase piece rates for handling the distribution of cards or salaries in any way?

Mr. GOOD. This estimate was made on the present rates of pay, but on an increased demand for cards.

Mr. GOULD. No increase of rates?

Mr. GOOD. No increase.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make his point of order or withdraw it?

Mr. GOULD. I withdraw it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws his point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For maintenance, care, and repair of automobiles, motor cycles, and motor trucks owned by the District of Columbia, that are not otherwise provided for, including such personal services in connection therewith not otherwise authorized, as the commissioners shall in writing specially order, $4,000.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph for the purpose of asking the chairman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan reserves the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MAPES. What is the purpose of this appropriation?

Mr. GOOD. This is purely a maintenance item. It is for the repair and maintenance and all expenses connected with the care of the various automobiles, automobile trucks, and motorcycles. The hearings revealed the fact that the District had 26 automobiles, 6 trucks, and 11 motorcycles. Out of this appropriation, which was originally $18,500, there was an actual deficiency. Their funds are exhausted, and they have already incurred obligations with regard to the upkeep and maintenance of these cars and motorcycles.

Mr. MAPES. Does the language in lines 20 and 21, reading as follows:

Personal services * * * not otherwise authorized—

mean that the work has not been authorized by law?

Mr. GOOD. No. That is the current law. We have not changed in the slightest particular the current law under which the appropriation was made.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For additional cost to the various departments of the District of Columbia government for telephone service for the months of May and June, 1919, due to increased rates effective May 1, 1919, $2,300.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, if I understood correctly, this is the item that provides for the increased cost of telephone service. I would like to ask when this increase came to be apparent, when it began, and how much of an increase there is?

Mr. GOOD. The item of $2,300 is for the increased cost of the telephone service in the District for the months of May and June. The Postmaster General, under the authority given him, has increased the rate, and the total annual increase over the present rate amounts to $13,831.40, and the amount here is for two months. The regular appropriation was only sufficient to meet the expenses for the entire fiscal year, without reference to any increase in the rates.

Mr. WALSH. So that the contract which the District had with the telephone company has apparently gone by the boards since the Postmaster General has taken command, and we are paying at the rate of $1,150 per month more for the telephone service since it has become a governmental facility in spreading intelligence. Is that the case?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; I think that is the case. It is the increase in the rate of phones used by the District.

Mr. MAPES. In that connection, have not the State authorities in several of the States secured injunctions preventing the companies from collecting the increased rates on the ground that the Government had control of the wires?

Mr. GOOD. I know nothing about that except what I have seen in the newspapers.

Mr. WALSH. I think the public-utilities commissions of several of the States have taken the matter into court.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I notice one thing—that the Postmaster General has increased the long-distance telephone rates 144 per cent, on an average, all over the United States. He has increased the local rates to subscribers here from $4 to $5, so that each one who has a telephone in his house now, although he has a contract obligating him to pay $4 a month, is compelled to pay $5. He is compelled now, if he wants a telephone put into his house, to pay $7, whereas prior to the Government control he had to pay nothing. If he wants to send a telegram, he must pay 20 per cent more than he ever paid before. I hope the House in its wisdom this morning did the right thing when it sent to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the consideration of the question of the return of the telephone and telegraph lines, and that we will get a report back quickly, as a result of which we will be able to do away with these excessive and unjust charges.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TREADWAY). The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

For dust prevention, cleaning, and snow removal, including the same objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, $34,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $6,000 may be paid from this appropriation as additional compensation from March 5 to June 1, 1919, to laborers in the street cleaning department, so as to make their rate of compensation for that period equal to the rate paid them prior to March 5, 1919.

Mr. WALSH. I reserve a point of order on this item, for the purpose of asking how many of these laborers get this additional compensation, and how did it happen to end on March 5, 1919?

Mr. GOOD. On March 5, 1919, the commissioners found there would be a shortage in this fund if they continued the then force at the then rates of pay. They made a reduction in the force and they reduced the pay of those who remained on the force, with the statement that it was necessary to reduce their pay, but that the commissioners would ask Congress to appropriate money sufficient to pay them their regular salaries just as if there had been no deficiency in that appropriation. I think they are being paid $3.10 and $2.70 and that their former pay was $3.58 and $3.26. They discharged about 200 of their employees, and my recollection is that there are about 100 or more who will receive something under this provision if it becomes a law.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, it is very apparent, from evidences which are visible to everybody, that something happened to the street department of the District of Columbia. The streets have never been in such bad condition as they have been during the past few months.

Does this $6,000 take care of this withheld compensation for the entire street force?

Mr. GOOD. It takes care of the compensation that was deducted from the pay of certain laborers from the 5th of March on until the 1st of June.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to investigate conditions affecting the existing contract for the collection and disposal of ashes in the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, with a view to determining whether any adjustment should be made in the compensation paid, or to be paid, thereunder and to adjust the same if the facts disclose the necessity for such adjustment: *Provided further*, That additional compensation, if any, paid as authorized herein shall not exceed the sum of $22,000 for the year. And the said commissioners are further authorized, if in their opinion such action shall be to the best interests of the District of Columbia, to hereafter conduct any or all of the operations involved in the collection and disposal of city refuse of every kind as municipal functions, and for that purpose to purchase or lease the necessary plants, buildings, and land, to purchase or hire horses and horse-drawn vehicles, passenger-carrying and other motor-propelled vehicles, equipment, and machinery, and to employ expert and other personal services and labor, and to pay traveling, maintenance, incidental, and contingent expenses: *Provided*, That products arising from such operations conducted as authorized herein may be sold and the proceeds arising therefrom shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the United States and the District of Columbia in equal parts: *Provided further*, That any or all operations herein authorized to be conducted as municipal functions may be put into effect as such upon the expiration of any of the existing contracts for the collection and disposal of city refuse or upon the failure of any of the present contractors to properly perform the work covered by their contracts: *Provided further*, That it shall be unlawful for any employee of the District of Columbia engaged in the removal of garbage, ashes, miscellaneous refuse, dead animals, or night soil, or for any employee of a contractor doing such work for the District of Columbia, to accept any gift, except from his employer, in money or any other thing of value for any service performed in connection with the removal of city refuse as hereinbefore described; and it shall be unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation, except such employer, to pay or offer to pay, any money or to make any gift to any such employee for such service; that any person violating the provisions of this paragraph shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall, upon conviction, be fined in a sum of not less than $5 nor more than $40 for each such offense.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that paragraph.

Mr. MAPES. I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved by the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DYER. I think it is clearly subject to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. There is legislation all through the section.

Mr. GOOD. This same provision was put in the last bill on the floor of the House. The situation, as I understand it, is this: The person who has the contract for the disposition of ashes in the District of Columbia has failed, and the work now is being carried on by his bondsmen. The contract was made at a time when labor conditions were altogether different than they are at present, and it was stated on the floor of the House, I think, when the matter came up before, that the contractor claims to have lost in the neighborhood of $50,000 or $60,000. At any rate, he is a bankrupt. He desires a much larger amount than the limitation fixed in the bill. The matter was thrashed out so thoroughly on the floor of the House and was agreed to so readily by the Senate that the committee did not go into it, because of the short time we had and because it seemed to be the practically unanimous judgment of the last Congress that this item should go in. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that I think unquestionably the item is subject to a point of order.

Mr. DYER. I think there is no doubt that this item is subject to a point of order. When an attempt is made to get something passed that really is demanded and necessary and to which there is no objection the Committee on Appropriations make a point of order.

Now, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] is chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and that committee is composed of very splendid members, and they are charged with the responsible duty of presenting legislation in the House for the District of Columbia. That is not primarily a part of the duty of the Committee on Appropriations, and when they draw the line, as they have this morning, I think it is very proper that we should insist upon the rule.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAPES. I think what the gentleman from Missouri says about legislation upon appropriation bills is perfectly correct, and I understood it was to be the policy of the Rules Committee of the House in this Congress not to report rules making in order legislation upon appropriation bills. Probably there is no very good reason why this proposition should not have been referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and been reported by that committee so as to make it in order on this bill under the rules of the House. At the same time, as I understand it, the situation which this provision attempts to remedy is critical, and some legislation of this kind ought to be passed. I arose not to make the point of order upon this particular item, on account of its importance, but to suggest to those who are interested that there are those who feel that the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia should make points of order against all legislation on appropriation bills relating to the District of Columbia. There are those also who think that the appropriations for the District of Columbia should be reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia instead of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations; that instead of the Committee on Appropriations reporting legislation for the District of Columbia the Committee on the District of Columbia should report the appropriations for the District. I merely wish to say that those in authority should bear this situation in mind. When there is an important proposition of this kind to be considered there is no particular reason why it should not be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and if that committee should report it the legislation, as I understand it, would then be in order on an appropriation bill.

As far as I am concerned, I withdraw my reservation of the point of order on this particular item.

Mr. DYER. I believe I have the floor, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. DYER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SISSON. We adjusted this ashes and trash question in the last Congress. There is no legislation that will enable us at this time to take care of the ashes. As the gentleman knows, the prices of everything went up, and we went into the price of horse feed, and so on. The gentleman who had the old contract is busted, and he can not carry out the ash contract, so the District Commissioners were absolutely helpless unless they should readvertise. To have readvertised the contract at that time would have cost the District of Columbia a great deal of money. The commissioners could have proceeded against the bondsmen, but a proceeding against the bondsmen would not remove the ashes if the District Commissioners had no facilities for doing that, and I am glad the chairman of the committee, my friend from Michigan [Mr. MAPES], is looking into this matter, and I trust that the District Committee will bring in some legislation taking care of this whole situation. If that could be done, the Appropriation Committee would not be embarrassed by being compelled to make provision from time to time to take care of the ash contract.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to make the point of order?

Mr. WOODYARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a short statement.

Mr. DYER. I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. WOODYARD. Mr. Chairman, I am in an embarrassing situation in regard to this paragraph. I know very little about it further than a few moments ago some gentlemen called me out in regard to a plant being erected on West Virginia Avenue.

Mr. SISSON. This paragraph has nothing to do with that.

Mr. WOODYARD. In a way it has.

Mr. SISSON. The gentleman is referring to the trash contract. It does not affect the ash contract, which is contained in this paragraph.

Mr. WOODYARD. Except in a general way, so far as the operation of all these plants are concerned. At least, that is the impression that these gentlemen have. Eight or ten of them waited on me 20 minutes ago. I did not know that the bill was up.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The trash matter is altogether a different matter. The committee has examined that and it will be referred to the District Committee for legislation.

Mr. WOODYARD. I confess that I am not entirely familiar with the matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I am familiar with the whole thing. This matter will save the District of Columbia over $70,000. If it had not been for me, the District would have been put to an expense of $70,000. This man was induced to go on, although he bankrupted himself, on the agreement that he would get at least one-quarter or one-third of his losses. But I want to say to the gentleman that this has nothing to do with the trash contract.

Mr. WOODYARD. The gentlemen are objecting to this provision, or at least they want an amendment, and I did not know that the bill was up.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The same gentlemen came to see me, and I told them that the matter would be taken care of hereafter, but could not be taken care of on this bill. I am taking up the trash matter and expect to assist them along this line, but this is wholly foreign to the trash matter.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the item is subject to a point of order. I do not believe that it should be made. We have simply followed the action of the House in the last Congress. The committee did not report the matter out originally, but it was adopted on the floor of the House and passed the Senate. The situation the gentleman from West Virginia fears will not arise. The committee felt that it was urgent and that relief should be given, and we followed the direction of the former House. But if the gentleman wants to make the point of order let him make it, so that we can go on.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statements that have been made I will ask unanimous consent that this paragraph be passed over that I may investigate it. I do not want to do any injustice.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the paragraph be temporarily passed over. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, how long is it to be passed over?

Mr. DYER. Until we finish reading the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. To be brought up after the completion of the reading of the bill. Is that the understanding?

Mr. DYER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bathing beach: For amount required to reimburse the life guards, clerks, laborers, and help at the bathing beach pool after July 16, 1918, who received during the period of their employment only 50 cents per day, $1,330.46.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to have the chairman of the committee explain this item as to the 50 cents a day. Who are the employees and what were they doing that they only received 50 cents a day?

Mr. GOOD. The demand for use of the bathing beach during the past summer was so heavy that the funds were not sufficient to carry on the work. These boys act as guards of persons who are making use of the bathing facilities of the beach. They are high school boys and they received about $3 a day until the commissioners got to a point where they saw that the funds would soon be exhausted. They told the boys they would like to have them remain as a patriotic service and do the work for the balance of the year and work for 50 cents a day. As I say, they formerly received $3. The commissioners said that if they would remain they would come before Congress and ask for an appropriation, and we felt that the pledge the commissioners made in that respect ought to be carried out.

The Clerk read as follows:

Night schools: For teachers and janitors of night schools, including teachers of industrial, commercial, and trade instruction, and teachers and janitors of night schools may also be teachers and janitors of day schools, $12,000: *Provided*, That payment is authorized to all teachers who taught in the night schools during the period from March 8 to March 22, 1919, inclusive, at the rate of pay they were receiving on March 7, 1919, this payment to be in addition to the nominal sum of $1 which such teachers received for the service rendered.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the proviso. What happened from March 8 to March 22?

Mr. GOOD. On the 22d of March the night schools were discontinued and the teachers' pay was a nominal sum. They agreed to work for $1 a day, and the amount carried here is to pay them the rate of pay that they formerly received, taking care of it between those two dates.

Mr. WALSH. And how was it that the funds ran out so that they could not pay them the regular rate of pay?

Mr. GOOD. Because they did not have enough money.

Mr. WALSH. Was not there enough money appropriated or was it due to the increase in the number of teachers?

Mr. GOOD. There was an increase in the enrollment and an increase in the number of teachers.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of a point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 18, strike out the word "teachers" and insert in lieu thereof the word "employees." In line 19, strike out the word "taught" and insert the word "served."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For board care of all children committed to the guardianship of said board by the courts, incuding the same objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, $39,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I call attention to the fact that line 1, page 14, reads as follows:

For board care of all children, etc.

Should not that read "board and care"?

Mr. GOOD. It should be "board and care."

Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by inserting the word "and" between the words "board" and "care," in line 1, page 14.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 1, after the word "board," insert the word "and."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. This deficiency has been increased some $4,000 over what was in the former bill. What is the necessity for that? Is there an increase in the number of children?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the amount stated here is the actual estimate made by the board that is in charge of these children. As I recall, there are about 2,000 children who are taken care of out of this appropriation. The number of children in free homes amounts to about 1,250, and the number in institutions and boarded by private families, as given by the commissioner, is 650. I think perhaps he is mistaken in that, because that leaves 100 unprovided for. At any rate, the commissioner stated that he could not get along with the amount carried in the bill; that their funds were exhausted. The board for the children in some instances is back and remains unpaid, and they are running bills at the institution. He stated that it would take all of the $39,000, and they did not believe that would be sufficient to pay the actual care and board of these children.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, the $39,000 is an addition to what was appropriated previously in the District appropriation bill?

Mr. GOOD. One hundred and twenty thousand dollars was appropriated before.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, the original estimate was $39,000. The committee reported $35,000. The representatives of the board informed the committee that they were called upon to pay more for board than they were at that time, and this represented an actual deficiency.

Mr. WALSH. These children are not those who are committed to institutions?

Mr. GOOD. Some of them are.

Mr. WALSH. Has the rate of board at the institution increased?

Mr. GOOD. I do not believe there was any statement made in regard to that, but I suppose that board has increased in the institutions as it has in private homes, and, as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] states, the amount is a closely estimated deficiency and the commissioners felt there was not enough granted on the previous bill.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GARD. I desire to make an inquiry of the chairman of the committee regarding this item. Sometime ago there were extended publications in Washington newspapers concerning some of these boarding contracts where the children were compelled to work in surroundings that were unhealthy. Can the gentleman tell me whether under this item we are now discussing children who are sent out by the Board of Children's Guardians into private homes where these private homes are paid and they then utilize the children's services in work sometimes improper for the children to do?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. Of the 2,000 children that are under the care of the board, 1,250 are in free homes, and, as I understand it, are not a charge on the charity of the government of the District.

Mr. GARD. They are in what are called free homes?

Mr. GOOD. Free homes, and some of these children are old enough to work and, of course, do work.

Mr. GARD. Then are some sent out to homes where board is paid for them in private homes?

Mr. GOOD. Some are. The small children are either taken care of in some of the institutions or in homes where they find provision for them and pay the board.

Mr. GARD. Does the gentleman think that is a good provision for the care of children? I am interested in that subject and I would like to ask whether this seemingly new system, so far as it applies to the District of Columbia is concerned, is a proper one—sending them out to homes to do a lot of work sometimes proper and sometimes improper.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that I have not thoroughly investigated that matter, but I understand that this board has its inspectors and investigating officers and they make an inspection ever so often with regard to every home and every institution to which a child is committed. I think it is the purpose of the board to surround these unfortunates with proper environment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time may be extended for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman recalls, does he not, various extended publications in Washington newspapers having to do with certain places where children were placed, one of them being a bakery, I believe, where the children themselves made some complaint and ran away from the place and returned to the regular home? Of course, those are mere instances, and an instance is apt to arise in a thoroughly good system. What I am trying to get at is whether or not the gentleman and members of this committee think that this method of farming out the children and very often paying the person who has the child is a good system, whether the community ought not to take care of these unfortunate children in such a way that their education and physical well-being may at all times be cared for.

Mr. GOOD. I think the committee did not consider that phase of the matter at all. All we could consider here was to see that the bills that have been contracted for up to the 1st of July are paid and the Government's obligation discharged.

Mr. GARD. I understand.

Mr. GOOD. I think something might be said with regard to placing a child in a Christian home, where it would be surrounded by the best influences and brought up to be a useful citizen, and it might develop better there than in an institution where there might be 2,000 of these unfortunates, as we have in the District.

Mr. GARD. The present situation is really to take care of the deficit.

Mr. GOOD. That is all.

Mr. GARD. And the gentleman has not investigated generally the proposition of the care of these unfortunate children.

Mr. GOOD. We have not.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. As I understand it, that matter does not come within the jurisdiction of the gentleman's committee, but rather of the District of Columbia Committee.

Mr. GOOD. The Committee on Appropriations always carries an appropriation for the care of these children.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. But is not the matter of care directed by the District of Columbia Committee?

Mr. GOOD. That is under a law with which the committee has nothing to do, except to provide funds to carry it out.

The Clerk read as follows:

JUDGMENTS.

For payment of judgments, including costs rendered against the District of Columbia, as set forth in House Documents No. 1788 and 1822 of the Sixty-fifth Congress, third session, and House Document No. 12 of the present session, $8,303.25, together with a further sum to pay

the interest at not exceeding 4 per cent per annum on said judgments, as provided by law, from the date the same became due until the date of payment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This item is to provide for the payment of two judgments——

Mr. GOOD. It provides for the payment of several judgments.

Mr. WALSH. There are only two individuals involved, are there not?

Mr. GOOD. No; there are more than two individuals.

Mr. WALSH. One of them is a former assessor and the other is a police officer.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman has in view the increase in the item. The item carried in the previous bill was $3,729.55. Now that amount has been increased to $8,303.25, and that increase is to take care of three additional judgments. There are eight judgments all told.

Mr. WALSH. What about these six judgments which do not involve the former assessor and former police officer who were dismissed?

Mr. GOOD. They were judgments regularly entered by the court. No appeal has been taken from them. I think in one or two cases there was an appeal to the court of last resort, and that appeal resulted unfavorably to the District, and they are judgments which have been certified in the regular way and nothing remains but their discharge by an appropriation.

Mr. WALSH. Well, I see in the concluding lines of the paragraph you say, "interest as provided by law from the date the same became due until the date of payment." Does that mean interest on the judgments from the date they are entered?

Mr. GOOD. The language is the same as that certified by the commissioners. I assume it is from the date of the rendition of the judgment, and we have only followed the language of the previous act and the language of the commissioners.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I will yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. REAVIS. The date they would become due would be a matter of law, would it not? And whether that is the date of the rendition of the judgment or the date of the adjournment of the term of court at which it was rendered, this appropriation would care for it from the time it was due as determined by the law.

Mr. WALSH. Well, of course, it would if one part of this phraseology does not limit or pertain to the other. It says, "4 per cent per annum on said judgments, as provided by law, from the date the same became due until the date of payment."

Mr. REAVIS. Of course, the language of the section does not say from the date the same became due according to law, but the only way the date it became due could be ascertained would be by law.

Mr. WALSH. Of the entering——

Mr. REAVIS. Of the entering of it.

Mr. WALSH. I so understand, and I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for clarifying the situation.

Mr. REAVIS. The gentleman is entirely welcome.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn——

Mr. WALSH. No, Mr. Chairman; I was expressing my thanks to the gentleman from Nebraska for clearing up the matter about which I had some doubts. I now desire to ask the gentleman from Iowa, chairman of the committee——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WALSH (continuing). A question in reference to the two judgments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to ask the gentleman with reference to the judgments in favor of Mr. Kalbfus and Mr. Wood, how the committee happened to include them in this appropriation bill when they were specifically excepted from the bill which was reported, as I recall, at the last session of the Sixty-fifth Congress?

Mr. GOOD. These judgments were rendered some three or four years ago. In one case the commissioners had employed, as I recall, Mr. Wood as a policeman and Mr. Kalbfus as an assessor. The commissioners discharged them. They were denied the right, as I understand it, to perform the services for which they had been employed. They took the matter into the court, brought action on their claims, and the court rendered judgment in each case. The amount of the judgment of Wood was $1,246, with costs amounting to $22.65, and the judgment in favor of Mr. Kalbfus was $2,415, with costs amounting to $20.35. Those judgments were appealed, or, rather the cause was appealed, and the right they have to sue under the contract was affirmed by the appellate court. After that the case proceeded to trial and the judgments were rendered by the court and no appeal has been taken from those judgments. They are drawing interest at 4 per cent, and after full consideration the committee felt that Congress ought to respect the judgment of the court; that we ought not to set up our judgment as to whether or not those men were entitled to their pay after the court had determined that they had a legal claim and had rendered judgment against the District.

Mr. WALSH. Well, here is this case of the assessor. The judgment was rendered May 22, 1915, by the Court of Appeals. The case was remanded to the lower court. The commissioners were directed to restore him to his former position, and he thereupon brought suit to recover the salary.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. What is the cause of all this delay from 1915 to 1919 in getting judgment and computation of costs and interest in order that the appropriation might be made?

Mr. GOOD. Well, I really do not know, I only know——

Mr. WALSH. Well, I notice the commissioner who appeared before the committee took occasion by his way of explaining this delay to call attention to the fact that they need some more judges in the District of Columbia, which sentiment they have been known to express upon former occasions at a less plausible excuse, but nothing is said in reference to reforming the judicial system of the District, which I think might well eliminate some of these delays.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of asking a question. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if the item here of $8,303.25, on the top of page 15, is a charge against the National Treasury entirely, or does the District of Columbia pay out of its tax levy the usual one-half?

Mr. GOOD. The United States pays one-half and the District of Columbia pays one-half.

Mr. JUUL. This is like any other item of expense in the city?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

For additional employees in the Department of State, $20,000: *Provided*, That not more than six persons shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding $1,800.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee what service these additional employees are expected to perform?

Mr. GOOD. In the State Department?

Mr. REAVIS. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. The State Department has been putting on additional employees ever since the outbreak of the European war.

Mr. REAVIS. They have all been doing that.

Mr. GOOD. In some of the bureaus of the State Department there has been a reduction. This item here is an item simply to take care of the pay of the additional employees that were authorized under a provision of the legislative bill. After the outbreak of the European war we carried, as I recall, one paragraph, and later, I think, two paragraphs, for the pay of additional employees. They were called "additional employees." We retained the statutory roll, but tried to keep that roll intact, so that a comparison could be made with the force that existed before the war and the new force. Now, they carried, therefore, a roll known as "additional employees," and there is an actual deficit in that department, and I am not sure that this appropriation is sufficient to make good that deficit by a couple of thousand dollars.

Mr. REAVIS. That does not answer my question. It is here provided that "not more than six persons shall be employed hereunder at the rate of compensation not exceeding $1,800." Now, what are these additional employees to do in the State Department? What service are they to perform?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REAVIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The item does not propose to enable them to employ additional employees, but to continue those that they now have. Under the statement of the representative of the department they would have $13,000 in June to apply to the pay roll to pay the clerks now in the employ of the department. Now, among those clerks there are six of them receiving salaries which they can only continue to receive in case

the language is included. This does not provide additional employees, but provides only for the salaries of the employees now in the department from now until July 1.

Mr. REAVIS. In other words, these six persons are not to perform any particular or new service, but the appropriation is merely to take care of the employees that the State Department has added.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Under the legislative bill we have given a sum that would enable them to employ additional employees, but they would have to be dismissed from the service unless this amount is appropriated July 1.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me if there is anything in the condition in Washington now that is scandalous with reference to wastefulness and expenditure of money it is the employment of unnecessary clerks down at these departments. I must admit that I can not understand the psychology that inspires the heads of the departments to hold onto employees when they have no earthly use for their services. This Congress has done everything it can to rid the country of the service of these unnecessary people, even going to the extent of offering to bribe them by paying their railroad fare home if they would just separate themselves from the service. There is not a Member of Congress who is at all familiar with the condition in these departments that does not know that there are hundreds and thousands of these employees drawing salary who are giving the United States no service whatever. I believe it would be a good deal better if the Appropriations Committee of this House, instead of coming in and asking additional appropriations for extra and additional employees, would cut down their appropriation and send several thousand of these unnecessary people back to the places whence they came.

We are raising a tremendous sum of money in this Nation by taxation and by bonds. If the Republican Party is to justify the confidence that the country recently expressed in it, we have got to economize in these expenditures. [Applause.] And about the first place to exercise economy is to cut loose from the service these employees who are giving nothing in return for the money that is being paid to them. [Applause.] We have criticized this extravagance on the part of the Democratic Party and are appointing committees to investigate the wasteful methods employed. We can not expect a very cordial reception of such efforts if we likewise are guilty of the thing we condemn.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I want to oppose the motion to strike out the last word.

I agree with much that has been said by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS], and yet I think it would be unwise if, because we had an impression there were too many employees in some departments, we should recklessly proceed to cut down an appropriation for employees in this department, where there is no extravagance shown in the employment of clerks.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. I realize very fully that the situation can not be met in this bill, but I have been so irritated, as all other Members of Congress have been, by the wastefulness going on in the department that I thought somebody ought to mention it.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. In this particular department the situation is that the department asked Congress for $500,000 for temporary employees during the next year, and Congress gave them $200,000; and unless more money is appropriated one-half of the employees will have to be discharged. It only illustrates the fact that at this time it would be exceedingly unwise not to give this appropriation to continue these employees until July 1. The work of the State Department has increased, and so far as my information goes there is no criticism of that department having more employees than it needs. I do not believe it has.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREIGN INTERCOURSE.

United States consulates: For contingent expenses of United States consulates, including the same objects specified under this head in the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, $50,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WALSH. I notice this item is under the head of "Foreign intercourse." Supplementing in a feeble way the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS], I should like to direct the attention of the committee to the fact that this appropriation apparently has been reduced from $250,000 to $50,000. A gentleman from the State Department appeared before the committee, and apparently in their estimates they wanted $917,000 for telegraphing and cabling, and when asked how that enormous sum could be used or had been used in telegraphing or cabling, he said—and I assume that some of these clerks that are to be employed or who have been employed at sums not exceeding $1,800 have been at work on this particular job:

You will understand that it is necessary for the department and the mission in Paris to know what is going on all over the world; they must know the political developments that are taking place; they must know the course of affairs in an economic and military way and every other way, because it is upon that information that all of their acts are based. Now, when formerly we could be content with information about a certain few countries in the world it was a different proposition, but now we have added to that certain few countries practically every country on the globe, and everyone is figuring in this international condition at present.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. REAVIS. On the statement that a request was made for how much money?

Mr. WALSH. Nine hundred and seventeen thousand dollars is the estimated expense for telegraphing alone out of the fund that the President has put at the disposal of this department.

Mr. REAVIS. And in the explanation made by the representative of the Department of State the statement was made that it was used in cabling all over this world?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. In spite of the fact that during the progress of this war we have been in contract with all the cable owners for the use of their lines absolutely free?

Mr. WALSH. Yes. He says:

One telegram may contain three lines and another telegram six pages.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the nature of the communications that are sent?

Mr. CARR. The communications are communications setting forth the exact conditions, the exact internal developments in these countries—what the political situation is, what the economic situation is, what is likely to happen, and so on. It is that information that makes it possible to sum up the whole world situation and really see what ought to be done in a given situation.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom are these communications sent?

Mr. CARR. They are sent to the American mission in Paris and they are also sent to the department.

The CHAIRMAN. To what extent is this increased expense due to the American mission in Paris?

Mr. CARR. Of course, a very great deal is due to the mission in Paris, because our delegates must have information as complete as that possessed by the delegates of other Governments; but it is also due to the necessity that the department should know what is going on.

The CHAIRMAN. In the absence of the American mission in Paris it will not be necessary to send these long communications as to all the developments in the United States?

Mr. CARR. Oh, no; and when the treaty of peace is signed and the war ends there ought to be a very large decrease in the amount of telegraphic expense. Next year, unless all calculations go wrong, there ought to be an enormous decrease in the amount of this expenditure.

I imagine that one of the three-line telegrams that were sent over there was to the effect that Congress had convened with both branches of it in control of the party that was in the minority during the past months of the Sixty-fifth Congress, and possibly one of the 6-page or 16-page telegrams that have been sent was on account of various and sundry activities of certain gentlemen sometimes eminent and permitted to be prominent in the party which reposes itself on the other side of the aisle. I think that the committee on both sides of the aisle—and I am willing to confer credit to the gentlemen on the subcommittee who prepared this measure—are to be congratulated that apparently they have not made available any of the appropriations in this bill for cables and telegrams about items of politics, economics, and military affairs. Some of these telegrams, they think, may be reimbursed, but that will be a comparatively small amount. The chairman then directed the attention of Mr. Carr, of the State Department, to the fact that the Secretary of War has written a number of times that he was sending communications for discharges of American soldiers abroad by mail, because he could get service by mail more promptly than he could get it by wire or cable. Of course that is not astonishing if the State Department was sending 16-page telegrams commenting on and setting forth the political situation in the United States for the benefit and information of the mission in Paris and the department in France, and, as I say, I desire to compliment and congratulate the committee upon eliminating any possibility of any part of this appropriation being used for these extraordinary and surprising expenses.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Treasury Department Annex, Pennsylvania Avenue and Madison Place: For equipment of the building, including rugs and carpets, awnings, window shades, window ventilators, and bottle water coolers, $3,000, to continue available during the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. What is the necessity of continuing this appropriation for rugs, carpets, and bottle water coolers during 1920?

Mr. GOOD. Part of the annex is not completed, and will not be completed for some months, and the appropriation was made in one sum for the entire estimate of cost for supplying this equipment; and inasmuch as it can not be used or put in, part of it, until next year, the provision was inserted that it should be continued available during the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. WALSH. Which is the Arlington annex?

Mr. GOOD. It is all one building. It is where the old Arlington Hotel stood, now occupied by the War Risk Insurance.

A wing has not been completed yet, and that is designated as "the annex."

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the reservation, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF AUDITOR FOR WAR DEPARTMENT.

The unexpended balance of the appropriation of $100,000 for additional employees contained in the "second deficiency appropriation act, 1919," is reappropriated for the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOOD: Page 18, line 14, after the word "balance," insert "on June 30, 1919."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For reimbursement of certain customs laborers at the port of New York for expenses for meals and car fares at unusual hours, incurred in connection with the emergency guarding of German and Austrian vessels, piers, and the appraisers' warehouse during the period from February to August, 1917, inclusive, $910.15.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return for a moment to a paragraph on the preceding page, entitled "Office of Auditor for the War Department," for the purpose of asking a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to return to the preceding page for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I observe in the hearings a statement of the Auditor for the War Department to the effect that he has the enormous amount of $6,000,000,000 of unaudited claims in his department, and the statement is somewhat alarming to me. Does the gentleman know what that is for?

Mr. GOOD. I can only say that there has been appropriated, as the gentleman knows, about $24,000,000,000 for the Military Establishment, and that the work thrown upon this department has been enormous.

The auditing of the claims has been delayed because of a great many circumstances. Some of the auditing was done abroad. Some of it had to be done there, some of it had to be done here, and the work has been accumulating. As far as this item is concerned, my recollection is that there is a balance of about $45,000 that he has not expended this year or will not expend, and he carries that over for next year so as to permit him to catch up with this work. Congress has been giving him an additional force. My recollection is that the legislative bill for next year carries quite an addition to that force.

The auditing of a claim depends upon getting information from a great many different sources at times, and therefore they are held up, and there has been a great deal of complaint with regard to the claims of relatives of deceased soldiers. These matters have been held up quite a while, and the auditor has explained that to the committee. He feels that he is doing the best he can under the circumstances, and that in the near future he will be able to bring his accounts somewhat nearer to the current date.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman will find the statement to which I refer on page 101 of the hearings——

Mr. GOOD. About $6,000,000,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. From which it appears that there are something like $6,000,000,000 of unaudited accounts. I was not complaining so much of the work of the auditor, who gives a fairly satisfactory explanation of why he is so much behind, but what caused me so much anxiety was that I was wondering if this $6,000,000,000 was something that we would subsequently be asked to provide for in addition to all these enormous amounts that we know are to come upon us at this session?

Mr. GOOD. No; the gentleman will understand that in the War Department, as well as the Navy Department, when a check has been drawn by a disbursing officer the check is paid, and then the account goes to the auditor, and he audits the account. I think practically none of these accounts of this class that he has charge of are audited until after they are paid.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. This then is something for which the payments have been made already?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. They will not have to be paid in the future?

Mr. GOOD. No.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If the gentleman will look on page 106, he will find an illustration of these accounts, where Mr. Beatty says that an account which did not involve a very large sum of money might involve 20,000 people. He says:

It may be a cantonment proposition somewhere on the cost-plus plan, and it might not involve so much money on any one particular project, but there are all of the pay rolls, and I must see that the pay rolls are properly signed or that a receipt by the men who worked on the job is given, and it might involve 20,000 people, even though the amount of money might not be so large.

It was stated that the accounts coming back from the other side will fill three large freight cars. This office audits all those accounts. So far as I am concerned, I wanted him to do this just as rapidly as possible, and in examining the representative of the office in the committee I expressed the desire to know just how many clerks he needed in order to have his office catch up with his work so that there might be no unpaid claims of soldiers among these claims in his office.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

The limitation in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919 as to the number of delivered sheets of United States currency, national-bank notes, and Federal reserve currency to be executed is increased from 123,000,000 to 129,000,000, of opium orders and special tax stamps required under the act of December 17, 1914, from 687,300 to 725,000, and of checks, drafts, and miscellaneous work from 5,052,800 to 14,452,800.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to call the attention of the gentleman from Iowa to a typographical error in line 23, on page 19, where there is a period instead of a comma.

Mr. GOOD. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk change the period in line 23, after the figure 7, and that he insert a comma instead.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In the reading of the bill just now the words "Federal reserve notes" suggested to my mind the fear that some Members have, which was expressed in private conversation by them after they listened to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] the other day, that the Federal Reserve Board is permitting an undue inflation of Federal reserve notes. There are a good many achievements of this country during the war of which we can be proud. While not the greatest achievement, I think it is a great achievement the way this board met the situation during the last few years. Instead of being alarmed over the volume of Federal reserve notes outstanding I think we should be very much gratified that the board has been able to keep the volume as low as it is. Instead of there being a continued increase of Federal reserve notes there are decreases being made in the volume, and I think if the Members of the House knew the Federal Reserve Board as I do they would not be fearful of their overlooking the dangers of inflation. The board have been aware of the effect of an increased volume of Federal reserve bank notes, but there are some evils that are greater than an inflation of the currency. The Federal Reserve Board had to meet certain situations during the war, and I believe it is nothing but fair to them to say that, free from any partisan thought, they handled the problems that confronted that board during the war in such a way that I think when the future history of this country comes to be written it will be said that one of the most remarkable achievements of the war period of the United States was the achievement of the Federal Reserve Board in maintaining the financial situation in this country as stable as it was and as it is now.

On November 16, the nearest date after the signing of the armistice as to which we have exact information, there were in round figures $2,562,000,000 of Federal reserve notes outstanding. On April 25 there were $2,549,000,000 outstanding. That shows a small net reduction.

I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that in April, when the Federal reserve banks had outstanding notes to the sum of $2,549,000,000, they, at that time, held paper in their vaults, bills which they had discounted for member banks throughout the country, secured by Government war obligations, to the extent of $1,760,000,000. In other words, gentlemen, there is a great volume of Federal reserve notes outstanding that have been issued for the very necessary purpose of taking care of the war paper of the Government. Now, I think that the only hope you can have for a healthy deflation of the currency is going to come from the retirement of bills that the Federal reserve banks have had to rediscount for member banks. In other words, member banks have loaned money to you and me to buy Government bonds. The only way you are going in a substantial way to decrease that further inflation of the currency is by you and me saving and retiring the debt we owe for bonds out of our savings. When we do that we will remove that part of the inflation of our currency.

Some experts estimate that that can be done in 8 or 9 months. I do not believe it. Some say that it will take 10 years, and I believe the gentleman from Ohio said that it would be 10 years. But, to sum it up, the great bulk of the inflation of Federal reserve notes was brought about by the war necessity and handling war obligations of the Government. The banks extended the customers' credit to buy bonds and the Federal reserve banks rediscounted the bills of the member banks to secure the one billion seven hundred million war obligations to the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROSE. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have one minute more, in which I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not think that the banks themselves are responsible for the condition he refers to, for the reason that they invited the people to borrow the money to buy bonds of the Government? Now, the gentleman complains that inflation is caused by their conduct.

Mr. WINGO. I am very sorry that the gentleman got the idea that I am complaining of the banks, for I am not. The point I make is that the Federal Reserve System had performed a wonderful service. I am not criticizing the banks, but I am answering the suggestion and allaying the fear that some gentlemen had that instead of the Federal Reserve Board trying to check inflation they were increasing it. But the contrary is true, and my suggestion is that you and I have got to help the banks by saving and paying our debts which we have incurred for the purpose of buying bonds. The way to help the banks is out of our savings, to reduce the war obligations, reduce the credit secured by war obligations in rediscounting.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. STEVENSON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have one minute more that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. I want to ask the gentleman if he has looked into the question of what the gold reserve is in proportion to the Federal reserve notes?

Mr. WINGO. I do not recall the exact percentage, but the gold reserve is ample. We are the only Nation on the face of the earth that is really solvent at this time, and whose finances are in better shape than anyone could have hoped at the beginning of the war. There is no question as to the satisfactory condition of the gold reserve. There is nothing to be alarmed at. The situation is a good deal better than I two years ago thought it would be at this time.

Mr. STEVENSON. It is around 76 cents, probably 78 cents in gold reserve to every dollar of Federal reserve notes, and the Government has 100 cents of obligation of the banks that have got reserve notes and 76 of gold.

Mr. WINGO. There is no question of solvency, it is a question of how we may help decrease the inflation by saving and paying the debts we owe for the purchase of bonds so that part of the currency may be retired. It, of course, will not do to deflate too rapidly, as the evils that would result would be greater than those of inflation. After all, the thing most desired is not so much to reduce prices but to reach a level that is uniform. I have no fear but that in due time, without disturbance, the processes of orderly readjustments will bring us to such a level.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the payment of the claims for damage to and loss of private property occasioned by the explosions and fire at the plant of T. A. Gillespie Co., at Morgan, N. J., which have been agreed upon by the War Department and the claimants, and in amounts not exceeding those which are enumerated and scheduled in House Document No. 1735, parts 2 and 3, of the Sixty-fifth Congress, third session, $852,106.49.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. What authority of law is there for settling these claims. I knew there had been an investigation, but I did not recall any act authorizing the settlement and payment of the claims.

Mr. GOOD. The act of November 4, 1918, carried this provision:

Claims occasioned by explosions and fire at plant of the T. A. Gillespie Co., Morgan, N. J.: The Secretary of War is directed to consider, ascertain, and determine the amounts due on all claims for damages to and loss of private property occasioned by the recent explosions and fire at the plant of the T. A. Gillespie Co., at Morgan, N. J., and report the amounts so ascertained and determined to be due the claimants to Congress within two months from the date of the approval of this act.

In pursuance of that act we have already appropriated two hundred and sixty-eight thousand and some odd dollars. The former third deficiency bill carried $714,813.58. Since that time the Secretary of War has certified that he has adjusted and settled claims to the extent of $137,292.91.

Mr. WALSH. Well, if he has settled a lot of these claims he must have done it under some other provision of law than the paragraph that the gentleman has read, because the Secretary of War was only to consider and ascertain the amount due and report the amounts to Congress. There is no authority of law in that act for the Secretary to go up to New Jersey and determine these amounts due and make settlement and then come in and ask for an appropriation in a deficiency bill.

The purpose of reporting it to Congress I assume was so that Congress might pass upon those claims and authorize somebody to settle.

Mr. GOOD. The matter has been treated a little differently from the course outlined by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. The act of February 25, 1919, carries an appropriation of $268,211.26, and when the third deficiency act was under consideration the committee had before it the certificate of the War Department with regard to claims aggregating $714,813.58, and this committee had before it in addition to that the last certificate by the Secretary of War on February 27, 1919, which is an additional list. The names are given, the amounts claimed, and the amounts allowed by the board. The War Department did constitute a board to investigate these claims and make a report, and their report is before Congress and this appropriation is simply to provide the funds to pay the claims as allowed by the board.

Mr. WALSH. It seems to me that in a matter involving some $913,124, that is, combining this appropriation with what has previously been paid out, there ought to be no doubt with reference to the authority of the department to make the payments. The act to which the gentleman refers, the first deficiency appropriation act, approved November 4, 1918, authorized the Secretary of War to investigate and determine the amount due. Apparently there was nothing contained in this authorization——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes, and still further reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. There was nothing in that act, which is the only authority here conferred upon the officials, relating to a finding of the liability of the United States for these claims, and I do not recall that any commission has ever reported to Congress that the United States is liable for this tremendous damage, resulting in loss of life and widespread destruction of property. Apparently the liability has become admitted, inasmuch as the Secretary has proceeded to settle some of these claims; but, Mr. Chairman, if the Secretary has proceeded to determine the amount of these claims and has settled them, and has made payments, that fact is no warrant for this appropriation in the bill, unless there is specific authority of law existing for it. I have examined the hearings held when they were asking for some $718,000, and I find nothing——

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman making the point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I am reserving the point of order and endeavoring, by stating a few facts, to ascertain whether or not the Committee on Appropriations can point to any specific authority or has secured any specific information with reference to this item. It is quite a sizeable appropriation. The total of the whole affair will amount to $1,000,239, as I understand it from the hearing held on the matter, and that is a rather sizeable sum to be paying out upon certificates of the Secretary of War or anybody else, unless Congress has heretofore authorized it by lan-

guage about which there can be no doubt. I leave it to gentlemen more learned in the law than I to say whether directing the Secretary of War to consider, ascertain, and determine the amounts due on all claims for damages covered by fire at the plant of the Gillespie Co. and to report the amount so ascertained to Congress within two months from the approval of the act, contains any authority for the Secretary to pay the claims and then come in and say that he has paid them; that here is a certificate; and to let him have the money in the deficiency bill.

Mr. GOOD. They have not been paid.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does the gentleman contend that any of these claims had been paid in advance of the appropriation? Certainly none could be, because there was no appropriation out of which to pay them. As I understand it, they were paid for after the appropriation was made.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, well, the gentleman from Oklahoma is not so guileless as to believe that this department or any other department has refrained from spending money during the past several months simply because there was no appropriation made.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does the gentleman contend that any of these claims have been paid in advance?

Mr. WALSH. I certainly do, because the chairman has made the statement.

Mr. GOOD. Not in advance. The claims that have been paid are those claims for which an appropriation of $268,211.26 was made.

Mr. HASTINGS. Everybody else understood it the same way except the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. GOOD. When the claims were certified the appropriation was made to cover them. I want to say to the gentleman there are about 9,000 of these claims. They are small claims. The claims carried in this instance are certified here in House Document 1735, and they range all the way from $5 or $6 up to $16,000. There is one claim here for a church, just for the glass destroyed in it, amounting to $16,000. That amount was allowed by the board. At the time the original act was passed the Secretary of War asked a lump sum with which he could pay them, and it was determined that instead of giving the Secretary of War power to settle these claims there should be a report to Congress. Now, there is a report to Congress, and this item was reported out upon the theory that inasmuch as the Government was operating this plant at the time of the explosion—and the act I have referred to indicates the intention of the Congress to pay the claims that might be found to be due—the items should be reported as the claims were adjusted.

Mr. WALSH. Does this document the gentleman has referred to contain any authority other than the act which the gentleman has read?

Mr. GOOD. None at all. There is no other authority than the provisions of the law to which I have called his attention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman [Mr. WALSH] will not make the point of order. I want to call his attention to the fact that there are many thousands of these claims. It was a terrific explosion. The Government owned the plant. I have not examined the payments that are to be made if the appropriation is allowed, but we went into it very fully in the last deficiency bill before any appropriation was made. We had the commission before us, and I have no doubt that the commission was a competent one. I doubt if the item is subject to a point of order; but if it is, I want to express my own opinion to the gentleman that the point of order ought not to be made, because it struck me that the commission which made the investigation was a wonderfully thorough commission, as it also struck the former chairman of the committee, Mr. Sherley.

If they are ever to be paid, what would the gentleman suggest in respect to their payment?

Mr. WALSH. Well, I would suggest, in reply to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, that I think there ought to be no doubt under the law that there is specific authority to pay these claims. Furthermore, I think there should be a specific finding on the part of somebody that the United States is liable for the damage which has been caused. Why, this explosion only occurred October 4, 1918, and I wish to commend this plan of adjustment and payment of claims to some gentlemen who have had claims pending here before the Congress for, lo, these many years. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS] and some of these other gentlemen have claims upon the calendar, and they never can be reached, but here is a method which the gentleman and some of his colleagues might well follow, to insert an innocent paragraph authorizing the Secretary to determine and ascertain the damages and then come in and get that claim through on a deficiency bill.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will allow me, the Secretary of War was authorized by law, as I recall it, to make this investigation. He appointed a commission, and the commission has made the investigation. People were burned out of house and home and killed, and all that kind of thing, and that commission reported to the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of War sends it, as I understand it, to the Congress with a recommendation for an appropriation. From every standpoint it seems to me that the point of order is not well taken. Now, it is ready for appropriation, and I believe it ought to be appropriated for, and I might state, in addition, to the gentleman, so far as the propriety of his point of order and the insisting upon it is concerned, that it would be a great mistake further to delay, with the many injuries which were inflicted upon that population—men, women, and children, mostly poor people and laborers—as I said, from every standpoint the appropriation ought to be made. Hence, if there be doubt about the authority to make the appropriation, after the action that has been had and the ascertainment of the damages by a competent and vigilant commission, I want to appeal to the gentleman, even if subject to the point of order, that in good conscience the point of order ought not to be made.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will not press the point of order. It is true that the Secretary of War is authorized to ascertain and determine the amount due these various persons. Now, there are about 9,000 claimants, and I want to say to the gentleman that while it is true there is no real express authority to pay them, I rather think it was the intention of the Congress at the time to expedite their payment, and, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] explained, a board has investigated this, and in looking through the amounts I see that the report and findings of the board in many cases is much less than the amount claimed. It has all of the earmarks of having been thoroughly investigated. There are so many claims running through it I am afraid if we put up a big establishment, create a bureau or court to determine them, that the expenses of the court would amount to as much as the claims, and I hope the gentleman will not press his point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation as recommended in this bill is of considerable amount. It is a result of an interpretation placed upon legislation by somebody which I do not understand, nor do I recall anything said in support of the contention that it was intended by Congress when the board reported that there should be nothing further to do but to pay the claim, but I appreciate that some two hundred and odd thousand dollars have already been paid, and I see the justice in the claim that it would be unfair to prevent the payment of other claims which have been treated the same way as those which have been paid, and, although it is against my better judgment, I am going to yield to the statement of the gentleman from Illinois and the chairman of the committee and withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts withdraws the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

From appropriations of the Quartermaster Corps, $450,000,000.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I have had some correspondence with the zone finance officer in regard to the payment of the bonus of $60 authorized by Congress. There has been some delay in the payment of that sum to each of these soldiers who had been discharged at the time of the passage of the act. I wish at this time to ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to insert in the RECORD, without reading, a letter explaining the difficulties of that department in regard to the payment of that sum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the letter to which he refers. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The letter referred to is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
ZONE FINANCE OFFICE,
Washington, May 28, 1919.

Hon. WILLIAM L. IGOE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR SIR: I have your letter of May 24, 1919, with inclosures, concerning the claim of Mr. E. W. Maunder, 4344a Warne Avenue, St. Louis, Mo., for the bonus of $60 authorized by the revenue act of February 24, 1919.

By the same mail there was received your letter of May 26, 1919, inclosing a letter from Mr. Maunder, in which he stated that he had received the check and discharge certificate.

With reference to your inquiry concerning the apparent failure of this office to answer correspondence concerning bonus claims you are advised as follows:

While the provision for the payment of the bonus was under consideration by the Congress this department began its preparation for the payment, and as soon as it became reasonably certain that the bonus would be at a flat rate of $60 for officers and enlisted men alike a requisition was made on the Treasury Department for specially printed checks for use in the payment of the bonus. It was then necessary to devise forms of abstracts on which payments should be listed, and, under Treasury regulations, it was necessary to secure the approval of the Comptroller of the Treasury before the form could be used. It was also necessary to secure from the Comptroller of the Treasury a decision covering the conditions of discharge which would warrant the payment of the $60 bonus.

Immediately after the actual passage of the act instructions were sent by telegram and cable to all commanding officers authorizing the payment of the bonus with the final pay at the time of discharge on and after February 26, 1919, and steps were immediately taken to assemble the personnel required to establish an entirely new section of this office for the handling of the bonus claims. Approximately one and one-half million men had been discharged from the Army between April 6, 1917, and February 24, 1919, the date on which the revenue act was approved, and consequently a force of several hundred people was required to perform the work. As a nucleus of this force several experienced clerks were transferred from other branches and sections of the office, and all the typists and clerks who could possibly be obtained by transfer or appointment were immediately employed. It was, of course, necessary to train the new personnel, and naturally the work proceeded slowly in the beginning. However, within about two months after the passage of the revenue act all claims received in proper form had been paid.

During the month of April a request was made upon the stenographers and typists in the other branches of the office for voluntary overtime work after the regular hours, and for a period of about two weeks over 500 stenographers and typists gave freely of their own time and without additional compensation in order that payment of the bonus might be completed at the earliest possible date. This only shows the spirit on the part of the personnel of the office, and is mentioned as an instance of the efforts which were made to expedite the payments. The time of every clerk and typist was employed with the one purpose of paying the claims as promptly as possible, and on many days over 40,000 checks were mailed, and in one or two instances the number exceeded 50,000 in one day.

Up to date about 1,350,000 claims have been paid and from 2,000 to 3,000 are still being received each day. Payments are now being made on a current basis, and the only unpaid claims in this office are those which are irregular in some respects or those with which no address was furnished.

During the first 10 days in March over 1,000,000 claims were received, and it was quite impossible to pay them in the order in which they were received and neither was it possible to arrange all claims alphabetically before they were listed for payment. In order that there might be an alphabetical index of payments for purposes of ready reference, an additional carbon copy of each check was made. As the mailing address was written on the face of each check and the checks forwarded in window envelopes, the retained carbon copies are positive evidence of the date of mailing and the address to which mailed.

While the payment was proceeding at the rate of from 40,000 to 50,000 per day, it was, of course, impossible to have the carbon copies of the checks alphabetized currently, and for that reason it was equally impossible to answer correspondence definitely and promptly. Therefore, as a matter of necessity, every effort was first made to accomplish the payments, and when all the accumulated claims had been paid a large force was set at work on alphabetizing the carbon copies of the checks in order that inquiries might be promptly and definitely answered.

You may be assured that at the present time every effort is being made to answer all inquiries concerning unpaid claims, but it is noted with satisfaction that the number of such inquiries is diminishing very rapidly, which indicates that the claimants have in most instances received their checks. It is quite probable that nonreceipt of checks is in some instances due to the fact that discharge certificates were missent. It is known that some discharge certificates have been sent to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, Treasury Department, which, of course, was not concerned in the payment of these claims. However, any discharge certificates received by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance have been forwarded to this office for payment, and have been paid. Similarly this office received many claims from men discharged from the Navy or Marine Corps and forwarded the discharge certificates to the proper disbursing officers of the Navy and Marine Corps.

The Bureau of War Risk Insurance has been requested to circularize its mail and correspondence sections, calling attention to this matter, and it is believed that arrangements have been perfected which will result in having forwarded to this office any discharge certificates which have been, or may be, received by that bureau.

Very respectfully,

P. L. SMITH,
Colonel, Quartermaster Corps,
Zone Finance Officer.

The Clerk read as follows:

From appropriation, Air Service, Production, $30,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to offer an amendment in regard to the correction of a typographical error?

Mr. GOOD. The bill I have before me has the word "Production" properly spelled. If the copy which the Clerk has does not correctly spell the word, I ask unanimous consent that the correction may be made.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will make the typographical correction referred to. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, $1,270,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make the transfers of appropriations herein authorized: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing sums shall be transferred for the payment of personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War shall transmit to Congress on the first day of its next regular session a statement showing the amounts transferred to or from any appropriation account under the foregoing authorization.

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question, which is this: In the report from the Committee on Appropriations, on page 2, it says:

The previous bill carried the following provision:

"The amount of the unexpended balance of the appropriation 'General appropriations, Quartermaster Corps, fiscal year 1919,' required to be covered into the Treasury by the 'second deficiency appropriation act, 1919,' is reduced from $2,996,414,707.14 to $2,167,039,412.04."

Or a difference of $829,375,295.10. In place of that to which I have just referred the present bill carries the clause which the Clerk has just read, under title "Military Establishment." I would like to ask the chairman to explain just what the clause in the present bill means, with reference to the clause read or referred to in the second deficiency appropriation bill for the last year.

Mr. GOOD. The sum of $7,000,000,000 of the appropriations which had been previously made for the Military Establishment were repealed by the second deficiency act, 1919; contract authorizations were also repealed. It is ascertained that in the repeal of $2,996,414,707.14 from the appropriation known as "general appropriations, Quartermaster Corps," they have taken away from that department too much money, and the Secretary of War, in the third deficiency bill, or rather the Director of Finance, War Department, asked for a new appropriation of $829,375,295.10.

Now, that language was put in in that way so that it would not be necessary to make a direct appropriation. In other words, it reduced the amount covered into the Treasury, so to speak, by the former deficiency bill by $829,375,000. Now, that was not the fault of the War Department or the fault of the committee or of anyone else. It was simply because of the vastness of the problem. Congress was attempting to reach out and cover into the Treasury money that might be expended through the extravagance of some officer. Now it is found in the War Department that there are deficits in certain appropriations, that there are some balances in others, and that if the balances are transferred in the appropriations referred to they will take care of practically all of the deficiencies in those appropriations where there is a deficiency.

Mr. WASON. Then, as I understand it, the second deficiency appropriation bill, so called, of the Sixty-fifth Congress, on the face of it, appropriated about $27,000,000, but by this wording, attempting to cover into the Treasury certain appropriations that had before been made, they really left for the use of the department $829,375,295.10, which the department in charge of the Military Establishment could use? And that sum being available, with about $27,000,000 appropriated in that bill, made a total of $855,375,295.10 for expenditure by the War Department during the present fiscal year instead of the sum of $27,000,000 plainly and specifically provided in that deficiency act?

Mr. GOOD. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, $128,558.62: *Provided*, That no part of the foregoing appropriations shall be expended for any purpose at any branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers that maintains or permits to be maintained on its premises a bar, canteen, or other place where beer, wine, or other intoxicating liquors are sold.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In relation to this matter of disabled soldiers, I want to direct the attention of the committee to an injustice, it seems to me, which we did in our desire to equalize everybody in providing for the disabled soldiers of the National Army. I was out at Walter Reed Hospital yesterday and saw a young man from my country, a first lieutenant, who had lost his arm. He called my attention to the fact that he was certified as being 50 per cent disabled and was entitled, therefore, to one-half of the pay of a private, to wit, $15 a month. Now, he was in the National Army. He was a man with business which was worth $2,500 a year to him. He went into a training camp. He got to be first lieutenant, and in the Argonne Forest he lost his arm just at the shoulder, and now is entitled to $15 a month as compensation.

On the other hand, a first lieutenant who is in the Regular Army—and this is where the injustice appears—in the same ward suffered the same way and is retired at three-fourths his pay, which amounts to about $157 a month. Very naturally the distinction between the man who went into the National Army and who suffered exactly the same disability and was given $15 a month and the man who was put on at $157 a month is bound to raise considerable criticism, and properly so. In the same hospital there is a colonel who lost his leg. He is certified at

about 50 per cent disability, and he is given $15 a month compensation, half of a private's pay. A colonel in the Regular Army who has the same disability is retired at around $325 a month. Now that is a condition that is arising everywhere, and the members of the committee that have charge of the legislation relating to that in this House are going to be confronted with a pretty persistent demand from those who have been in the National Army to bring about some appearance of justice as between the men who served in the National Army and the men in the Regular Army.

Now, with the privates it is practically all the same. I remember the reason why that legislation was enacted in that way. I recall very well the enthusiasm with which we here decided to put everybody on an equality in this matter of compensation; and they put a private and an officer on an equality. But if you do that and do not put the Regular Army officer on the same plane, you have done a great injustice to the man who went into the National Army. And under the head of disabled soldiers I desire to call the attention of this House to that condition.

I find it bobbing up from my district every day, and I take it the balance of you will be hearing from it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the care, maintenance, and treatment of patients in naval and in other than naval hospitals, $4,500,000.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this morning when there was some discussion about this particular item the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], stated that the Surgeon General did not request sufficient funds for the work of the Surgeon General's Office because of an order from Secretary Daniels that he should submit an estimate only for the ascertained deficiency as of that date. I then expressed the hope that the chairman of the committee would place that order in the RECORD. And I want to renew that request, because the Surgeon General states that he never received any order of Secretary Daniels except the customary formal order that has been sent every year, asking that estimates for deficiencies be filed.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman I do not have the order, but I will try to get it, and if it is not forthcoming I will ask the Secretary to come before the committee.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I wish the gentleman would, because the gentleman says the Surgeon General was influenced by an order which the Surgeon General says he never received. I am satisfied the gentleman is misinformed and that no such order was issued. And the fact is, that when the Surgeon General was before the committee, as shown by the hearings on page 391 of the third deficiency appropriation bill, held by a subcommittee composed of Mr. Sherley as chairman, Mr. EAGAN, Mr. SISSON, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. VARE, the question was asked of the Surgeon General by Mr. SISSON:

This does not include any future expense at all?

Admiral BRAISTED. No, sir.

Mr. SISSON. This is the actual amount of money which you have expended?

Admiral BRAISTED. Yes; and the thing I want you to understand today is that I can not see how there can help being more deficiencies as we go along, because there is no appropriation to cover it.

I think the record shows that the Surgeon General not only asked for $1,095,000 then but he specifically informed Congress that that was an ascertained deficiency as of that day, and that he had no further appropriations to cover future expenditures, and therefore, I think, that the failure to appropriate can not be charged solely to him, but Congress must assume part of the burden for any misunderstanding that occurred, as the result of which no sufficient appropriation was made at that time. I say that in fairness to him, because our own records show that he informed the committee that he had no appropriation to cover further expenditures.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. The admiral also said in a hearing before our committee, on page 135, that he took the actual deficiency at the time and was not estimating for the rest of the year. I had asked him the question—

But this estimate, Admiral, did not come in until the 1st of February, 1919—February 21. The Navy Department then estimated that for the balance of this fiscal year you would only require $1,090,546.57.

Admiral BRAISTED. We took the actual deficiency at the time and were not estimating for the rest of the year, while we are estimating in this for the deficiency for the remainder of the year. To make that clear, we asked for a deficiency in the second deficiency appropriation bill of $1,000,000, which was granted; then there was an actual deficiency on March 31 of $1,563,981.94, which covered that period. We are now estimating a deficiency for the fourth quarter of $2,000,000.

That clearly bears out the statement I made, that Admiral Braisted only made an estimate at the former hearings up to March 31.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that my time be extended for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman calls attention to what Admiral Braisted stated at the hearings on this bill, and he accurately quotes him; but as I said this morning, the Surgeon General took the position that he understood from the chairman of the committee that he was to submit the estimates of his actual deficiency. He did so, and then he came before the committee and made the statement, and our records show that he made the statement time and again, on pages 390 and 391, that $1,095,000 covered an actual deficiency already existing, but did not cover the future. The statement he made was that he understood the chairman of the committee wanted the deficiency as of that date, and that Congress would take care of the amount to carry the bureau to July 1, and he said he wanted the committee to understand—

I can not see how there can help being more deficiencies as we go along, because there was no appropriation to cover it.

The only statement I make now is that it can not be said that he left the committee under the impression that he had money enough to conduct that work until July 1, when he specifically said he did not have a dollar. Congress knew it; and if we did not appropriate it we are as much to blame as he was.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Does the gentleman move to have the last word? [Laughter.]

Mr. GOOD. No; I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I see that I have been misunderstood by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. I did not intend to convey the idea that Admiral Braisted or anyone from the Navy Department left the impression that the department estimated for some service that was denied it. What I was complaining about was that at the former hearings the estimate of the Navy Department was for the care of hospitals and hospital supplies and expenses only to March 31.

At the time they appeared before the committee before there was an actual ascertained deficiency at the end of the first three quarters of $1,090,000, and that is all the department asked for. What I was complaining of was that there was no estimate at any time for the deficiencies for the fourth quarter, and there was no appropriation out of which to pay them. I think the gentleman will share in that, because the law places upon the administrative heads the duty of estimating for deficiencies not for a quarter but for the balance of the fiscal year.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman says again there was no estimate. The statement I made was that Admiral Braisted said he understood from the chairman of the committee that he was to submit the actual deficiency. He did that, and he went on and told the committee—and the record shows it—that he did not have a dollar to carry on the rest of the work for this fiscal year, so that it is simply a question as to whether he was properly informed.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman knows that the chairman of the committee has nothing to do with the manner or form of submitting estimates or anything with respect to them. The law provides how the estimates shall be submitted, and the law places upon the heads of the departments the duty to estimate all of the expenses of the Government. These estimates must be sent to the Secretary of the Treasury and transmitted to the Speaker of the House. The chairman of the committee has nothing to do with it, and it was the duty of the Navy Department to submit those estimates; and the gentleman will agree with me, I know, in the interest of good administration, that the Navy Department and every department of the Government must estimate for the expenses of their own particular department; and when there are deficiencies they must estimate for the deficiencies to the end of the fiscal year, especially when the Congress was about to adjourn under the provisions of law, and there was no Congress in session to appropriate the money to make good the deficiency.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ORES, METALS, AND MINERALS.

The sum of $41,500,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation heretofore made for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of those ores, metals, and minerals which have formerly been largely imported, or of which there is or may be an inadequate supply," approved October 5, 1918, shall be covered into the Treasury immediately upon the passage of this act.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WALSH. This item was in the last bill, as I understand it, but it carried only $40,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. It has been increased to $41,500,000.

Mr. GOOD. That is the amount repealed.

Mr. WALSH. That is the amount covered into the Treasury?

Mr. GOOD. That is the amount covered into the Treasury.

Mr. WALSH. That leaves $8,500,000 in the Treasury to operate?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does that $8,500,000 take care of the salaries of the people engaged in adjusting these claims?

Mr. GOOD. It is available for salaries, I suppose.

Mr. WALSH. It might be interesting to know that under some authority, probably contained between the lines of the act approved March 2, 1919, the Secretary of the Interior has appointed a commission the membership of which embraces the names of one or two gentlemen who had distinguished careers in this body and also in the other branch of the legislative department of the Government. I notice that the Hon. John F. Shafroth and the Hon. Martin D. Foster have been appointed as two members of this commission, together with Mr. Philip N. Moore. I notice further from the hearing that the appointment of the first two dates from March 6, 1919, at $750 per month, and that of Mr. Philip N. Moore from March 14, 1919, at the rate of $10,000 per annum. Here, apparently, the present administration has set a new fashion in the appointment of commissions. The appointments are "for the period required to examine and settle the claims." Of course, this commission will act with great haste, probably equaling that of the commission appointed by the department, which settled claims for damages occurring in October, 1918, so that payments were made in the spring of 1919.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to say for the information of the gentleman—and I know for his gratification—that I understand this commission expects to conclude its work very rapidly. Their hearings are to begin June 7. They expect to go through the West and conduct these hearings on all of these claims, as I understand it, and to complete the hearings within about two months, and upon their return to Washington quickly settle all these claims; so I do not think the gentleman is warranted in his conclusion that any great delay will be incurred by this commission. Certainly it will take no longer to adjudicate the claims after the hearings are concluded than it will to conduct the hearings.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I assume that the gentleman is familiar with the hearings on this bill. He knows that although the appointments were made very shortly after the adjournment of the last session of Congress, at the time those hearings were held before the Committee on Appropriations, on the 20th day of the present month, some two months and a half after their appointment, no claims had been paid or allowed, and there were about 500 claims which had been filed.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LONGWORTH. What is the legislative authority for that salary of $10,000?

Mr. WALSH. There is no legislative authority specifically fixing any salary in this act which was approved March 2, 1919. The gentleman will recall that that was the law which authorized the Secretary of War to settle war contracts under one plan and the Secretary of the Interior to settle mining and mineral claims under a somewhat similar plan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WALSH. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that his time be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONGWORTH. How is it possible to pay that large salary of $10,000 without any legislative authority for it?

Mr. WALSH. I assume that the only authority is that it is an item of expense in connection with the duties of the Secretary of the Interior in determining and adjusting these claims.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does the law provide for a commission to assist him?

Mr. WALSH. There is nothing in the law that I have found or can find authorizing the delegation of that duty to any new appointees.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Why, then, make the distinction in favor of a civilian as against a former Member of this body or another body? Why pay this distinguished civilian more than we are paying those who are technically and quite properly termed lame ducks?

Mr. WALSH. I have no official information upon that, except that the gentleman knows that since 1913 the country has had inflicted upon it vast numbers of commissions and boards that have been fearfully and wonderfully constituted.

I assume that it is to keep up that sort of a thing that they fixed the salaries of compensation without rhyme or reason.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to inform the gentleman from Ohio that Philip N. Moore, who is the civilian serving on the commission, is one of the most efficient engineers in the United States. When I heard of his appointment I was very glad, indeed, because I was surprised that he would serve at all. I presume it would be necessary that at least there should be one expert on the commission. I assure the gentleman that no better choice could be made than that of Mr. Moore.

Mr. WALSH. I doubt whether Mr. Moore knows anything more about it than the former Member of the House, Mr. Foster, who has been chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In answer to the gentleman from Ohio the law provides in Thirty-fifth Statutes at Large, page 1027:

SEC. 9. That hereafter no part of the public moneys, or of any appropriation heretofore or hereafter made by Congress, shall be used for the payment of compensation or expenses of any commission, council, board, or other similar body, or any members thereof, or for expenses in connection with any work or the results of any work or action of any commission, council, board, or other similar body, unless the creation of the same shall be or shall have been authorized by law; nor shall there be employed by detail, hereafter or heretofore made, or otherwise, personal services from any executive department or other Government establishment in connection with any such commission, council, board, or other similar body.

I can not believe that the Secretary has in fact appointed a commission. I do not believe that is what has been done. I think the persons are serving as employees. I think the appointees, while referred to as a board or commission, are really serving as employees of the department.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Would the gentleman construe that act as permitting the Secretary to pay one man the whole appropriation?

Mr. GOOD. I imagine it would give him the power to secure personal services. The act provides for the payment of expenses incurred by the Secretary, including personal services, traveling, subsistence, and other expenses in the proper prosecution of the work, both in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

Mr. LONGWORTH. He could pay one man $100,000, if he saw fit? I think that is extremely loose legislation.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman read the law under which the Secretary of the Interior acted, as I understand, in appointing these three gentlemen to act as a board or a commission or whatever you may choose to call it to take the necessary proof, adjudicate the claims, and report to the Secretary. You may call it a commission or call them merely employees; they are clearly authorized by the statute which the gentleman just read.

The act did not undertake to limit the amount of salary that should be paid, but I take it if the record was investigated it would be found that the gentleman from Ohio, just as I did, voted for it without offering any amendment to limit the salary.

Mr. GOOD. I do not believe under this section of the Statutes at Large the Secretary of the Interior would be authorized to use any part of the sum in payment of the salaries of commissioners. He would be empowered to pay for personal services.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is what has been done. These gentlemen were appointed to take proof on the claims, adjudicate them, and report to the Secretary of the Interior. It is a difference between tweedledum and tweedledee whether you call them commissioners or employees. The Secretary of the Interior

clearly has the right to designate and employ persons to take the proof, adjudicate the claims, and report to him, because it is impossible for him to do it himself.

Mr. GOOD. The point the gentleman does not get is that this is a commission. It was referred to by Mr. White as a commission. I think he spoke loosely when he referred to it as a commission. And yet if they are appointed not only to do the work but settle the claims it would seem there was some justification for that designation, and if that has been done I think the Secretary's attention has never been called to the statute that prevents any appropriation being used for the payment of expenses or salaries of a commission.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Does the gentleman from Iowa have any hope of disposing of this bill before the usual adjourning time?

Mr. GOOD. I hope to dispose of it before we rise.

Mr. LEVER. Not before half past 5 or 6 o'clock?

Mr. GOOD. No; I think it would take that long to read the rest of the bill. Many of the items are simply audited claims. I think we have passed the most of the items upon which there is any controversy.

Mr. LEVER. And there will be nothing else taken up tonight after this bill is disposed of?

Mr. GOOD. At the request of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], when this bill is concluded I shall move to adjourn.

Mr. LEVER. Before I take my seat, for the edification of the present occupant of the chair, I desire to observe that here is a lump-sum appropriation of $108,000,000, and there is no limit as to salaries, according to the statement of the chairman of the committee, even up to $100,000. Yet the Appropriation Committee is the committee of all committees to set a model for other appropriation committees.

Mr. GOOD. We had nothing to do with this, and were opposed to it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This was done by another committee, and did not come from the Appropriation Committee.

Mr. LEVER. Well, I have succeeded in arousing the committee. [Laughter.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Not to exceed $100,000 of the appropriation for expenses of the Fourteenth Census contained in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920 shall be made available from and after the passage of this act for preliminary expenses in preparation for the Fourteenth Decennial Census, including books of reference, printing, alterations, and repairs to buildings, the strengthening of floors, the purchase and installation of freight elevators, the construction of fireproof vaults, the rental of a garage, and personal services in the District of Columbia; and such part of the appropriation for the Fourteenth Census contained in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920 as may be necessary is hereby made available for the rental of card-punching, card-sorting, and card-tabulating machinery for use in tabulating census statistics.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be instructed to correct the spelling of the word "reference," in line 23, page 39.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Labor, during the remainder of the fiscal year 1919, to maintain the present organization established under appropriations contained in the sundry civil appropriation act approved July 1, 1918, for the furnishing of information and the rendering of assistance to wage earners throughout the United States during the present emergency, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, per diem in lieu of subsistence at not exceeding $4, traveling expenses, rental, and maintenance of quarters in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, heat and light, telegraph and telephone service, supplies and equipment, and printing and binding, $272,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order for the purpose of eliciting some information. Without any authorization of law or legislation as a basis therefor, the committee is attempting to appropriate to carry on the employment service $272,000. The hearings upon the deficiency bill had during the closing hours of the last Congress disclosed the fact that on February 1, 1919, the director of this service had on hand then unexpended the sum of $1,543,400, according to his own testimony. In resisting an effort to appropriate $10,000,000 for this service in the closing hours of the Congress, I called attention to the fact that here in the last six months of last year—that is, through a six months' period—this Employment Service, without any authorization of law, without any law whatever authorizing it, had expended during those six months for salaries of officers, $1,967,962.81; for rent of offices for six months it had expended $229,239.11; for per diem expenses it had expended in six months $164,380; for traveling expenses it had expended $74,803.19; for furniture, et cetera, according to the report of the director—and I do not know what the et cetera was for—but for furniture, et cetera, it had expended $361,495.21; for printing and stationery for six months, $172,862.41; for telephones, $168,036.79; for miscellaneous, without any further itemizing of that, merely calling it "miscellaneous," it had expended in six months $146,498.46. I then called attention to the fact that the director general of that bureau, according to his own testimony, had 513 big-salary drawers here in the city of Washington drawing salaries from the people's money of from $6,000 a year down, and that it was his intention, had the appropriation passed, to increase all of these salaries in a very substantial sum. For instance, he was going to increase his own salary from $6,000 to $7,500 a year, and so on down the line. I called attention to the fact that he had established an office in that department without any authorization of law whatever, giving a Negro a position drawing $4,380 a year and calling him Director of Negro Economics in the Employment Service, and that he had given another a job, calling him the Assistant Director of Negro Economics, at $1,740 a year.

Because I called the attention of Congress to these facts and because I made a point of order against the $10,000,000 appropriation, and thereby prevented him from spending this $10,000,000, the Director General of this Employment Service, through his Texas agents, immediately by wire took out of my district every single agency that had existed there, as a punishment to the Representative of that district for doing what he thought was his duty. For instance, he had several men employed at Brownwood, Tex., in my district, and he took them out, took their positions away from them. He had several men employed at Abilene, my home town, and he took their positions away from them, shipped the furniture out, and discontinued the office. At Laredo, Tex., not in my district, he had four men employed, at salaries from $140 per month down, three of them Mexicans; and in Amarillo, Tex., in the northern part of the State, he had four men employed on big salaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Hold on; reserving the right to object, does the gentleman want that time?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I want it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then why did not the gentleman make the request?

Mr. BLANTON. I would rather have my good friend from Minnesota make it. And what has become of the service? I will tell you. Notwithstanding the fact that he had left $1,543,400 yet to expend, he took all of these agencies out, and what did my people do? They, through their chambers of commerce, employed a man at $75 who has been doing the work himself that four men on behalf of the Government, drawing big salaries, hitherto had been doing. One man at $75 a month has been doing the work at Brownwood. One man at $75 a month has been doing the work at Abilene. I want now to read a letter that comes from a soldier boy still in the service, to show in what way this Employment Service has been handling the business of this Government.

I read a letter which is headed "Eighty-ninth Company, First Regiment, Sixth Provisional Brigade, United States Marine Corps, Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, May 19, 1919." This is a young marine who is still in the service, still doing service for his country in a foreign land, and he writes me concerning my criticisms of the Employment Service as follows:

I was fortunate enough to come in close touch with almost every case that you mentioned, while I was employed by the Southern Dry Dock and Shipbuilding Co., of Orange, Tex. Time and again the employment bureaus would send us "ship carpenters," who, after a few hours' trial proved to be ordinary "house carpenters" at the best. The result was that they were let out of work, and when they appealed to the employment representative they found out that the agent ceased to be interested in them as soon as our signature to a paper stating that they had been employed had been obtained.

Then, again, there was the case where real skilled mechanics joined our force through the employment agency, who refused to line up with the local carpenters' union, and these men were actually discharged on the pretense of poor work, whereas I was well informed that the real cause was their attitude toward organized labor. I was myself forced out of a good position with another yard in Orange, caused by agitation of union leaders who corrupted my department. This was when I was in charge of the time and pay departments. After I went with the Southern Dry Dock Co., where we were working on Government contracts, I foolishly joined the American Federation of Labor, but had reasons to regret it soon after, for time and again (if you remember) the entire town of Orange was tied up with strikes which caused fatal delay to essential war work. It was then that I refused to go out on a strike, and remained as a guard while the yard was closed down. Things went from bad to worse, and although I had the backing of the directors I became weary and discouraged at the opposition which I

had to contend with, and again applied for enlistment in the service of my country at Houston, and was accepted by the United States Marine Corps. This was after I had been rejected by every other branch of the service, and also the local draft board when I offered to go as a supernumeral. I have the doctor's certificate yet.

There is one more point that I wish to state. I was placed on the "exemption" list by the Emergency Fleet Corporation, which I am led to believe was influenced by the labor organizations, for I can well remember that few, if any, of the active workers belonging to the union were drafted. I later waived claim to this exemption, and was consequently as good as let out of the union when I remained at the yard when the strike was in progress.

From what I read in the papers after I enlisted last July, I saw where the strikes were kept up, and expect that I will meet with trouble when I return, but I am determined now that I can make a living independent of these unions, and mean to do it, if not in Orange in some other place, for I have had a good education and plenty of experience in all office work, especially time and pay work.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against this clause.

Mr. UPSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes the point of order against the clause.

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve it on behalf of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. UPSHAW. I simply wish to ask if it is the purpose of the gentleman from Texas to make the impression by this line of argument and the reading of this letter that it is unwholesome or an unpatriotic thing for a laboring man to join a labor union?

Mr. BLANTON. I do, unless the labor union purges itself of the inclination to disregard the law of the land, to purge itself of strikes and boycotts, to purge itself of the anarchy that prevails and dominates the labor organizations of this country.

Mr. UPSHAW. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask for five minutes more.

Mr. GOOD. I hope the gentleman——

Mr. BLANTON. I ask to have five minutes; I have not taken up much time on this bill.

Mr. GOOD. I know, but it is now 5 o'clock——

Mr. BLANTON. I intended to get 20 minutes in general debate.

Mr. SEARS. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Chair would like——

Mr. SEARS. I withdraw the objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection to the request is withdrawn. The gentleman from Texas requests an extension of time of five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. UPSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I do.

Mr. UPSHAW. Does the gentleman not agree that if money——

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, if the gentleman is going to make a speech on behalf of the labor unions of Atlanta, Ga., I prefer that he shall use his own time and not use up mine. [Laughter.] I will not yield any further.

Mr. UPSHAW. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. For a mere question I will.

Mr. UPSHAW. Does not the gentleman agree that if money has a right to organize itself——

Mr. BLANTON. I am not discussing that question now; I am discussing——

Mr. UPSHAW. That the laboring man has a right to assemble his own labor with the labor of his neighbor in overalls in order to guarantee the same protection?

Mr. BLANTON. I am not discussing that question. I am discussing the fact whether or not the people's money ought to be wasted and misused in maintaining here in Washington 513 men drawing large salaries when there is no law for it. Why not propose a proper law? I am in favor of a proper employment service that will do justice to all laborers alike. Why did not the committee bring in a bill here for a proper service? Why, the President of the United States asked for it, and I am willing to carry out his request if the proper legislation is presented, as up to this time I have done everything asked by the President, but I am not going to see any more money wasted solely in behalf of one class of people of this Government when there is no law for it; but it is brought in here and tacked on as a rider to an appropriation bill. Our men in the service will receive little benefit from this expenditure. I would rather give it to them direct than to let this horde of large-salary drawers waste it.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GOOD. I want to say to the gentleman that the last bill that passed, the third deficiency bill, carried $1,800,000——

Mr. BLANTON. And it carried $1,800,000 as a rider more than it should have carried or was authorized by any law.

Mr. GOOD. I want to point out to the gentleman this, that there is now pending——

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has plenty of time, and I do not want him to take up all of my time. I want to say this: I want to say that this Employment Service, without legislation authorizing it, has gone beyond the power and function of its office and duty. The President of the United States is not personally familiar with the manner in which this money has been wasted or the details of the business. He took it for granted that the service would be run in behalf of all the laborers of this land and in their common interest, and never dreamed that such facts exist as detailed in the letter of this young marine now doing service in Cuba. When the President requested us to provide a United States Employment Service, he intended that we should provide a proper one, with all appropriations safeguarded through the restrictions and limitations of proper legislation. Why, if any of us should now attempt to amend the paragraph of this bill providing this appropriation this committee would prevent us by making points of order. We have plenty of time between now and July 1 to pass a proper measure, with proper safeguards, restrictions, and limitations.

It has sent these directors of Negro economics, or their agents, down to Denison, Tex.—not in my district, but in my State—to organize the colored cooks of that town into a domestic union, telling them that they are foolish to stay there in Denison and draw $15 and $20 and $30 a month when by unionizing they can demand $75 and $100 a month, like the colored employees in Washington.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Texas whether he understood that this does not propose to establish a permanent organization of the Employment Service, but simply provides for the carrying on of the existing offices only to July 1.

Mr. BLANTON. I understand. In addition to this money Mr. Densmore had on February 1 we are proposing by this rider to give $272,000 more, a waste of the people's money on these pay rolls here in Washington. I make the point of order on it.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order for a minute?

Mr. BLANTON. If you will just let me finish.

Mr. GOOD. I thought the gentleman had finished.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman reserve the point of order or make it?

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve it for the present. I want to finish.

I will go just as far as any man in Congress to carry out the recommendation of the President if you do it in a proper way. Bring in a proper measure here, that will give us a chance to put safeguards around it, that will give us a chance to say to Mr. Densmore, "You shall spend so much for certain things and not spend the people's money in the way you have been wasting it." If you will do that, I will go to the blue-sky limit with you, and I know how to play the limit. I will play the limit with you if you will bring it in in a proper measure that will do justice to all laborers alike, but I am not going to stay here, even though I am a new Member, and sit passively by and let the people's money be wasted by riders.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order at the request of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GOOD. I would like to see if we can not come to an agreement on this matter. I personally feel that the item is subject to a point of order. I do not believe there is any legislation authorizing this provision. When the sundry civil bill was before the House in the last Congress, the gentleman from Tennessee who presided rendered an opinion that, I think, is absolutely sound, and I do not propose to argue for something that I think is unsound, so far as the law of the case is concerned. But I want to point out to the gentleman that there is now pending in the Committee on Labor a bill to create this service. The committee found that we had on hand, on May 10, $74,000, and that it would require, to carry on the work until the 1st of July, $347,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. In just a minute. We deducted the cash and we gave them only the amount necessary to pay this very, very

greatly reduced salary roll up to the 30th of June; and now what I wanted to suggest to the gentleman is this: Realizing it is subject to a point of order, I wanted to ask the gentleman, in the interest of good administration, in the interest of permitting this department, if Congress does not pass a law creating a department, to wind up its business in an orderly way.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for two short questions?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Has Director Densmore withdrawn and eliminated the agencies in the gentleman's district?

Mr. GOOD. The agencies in the district I represent have been taken over, I think—I have not examined it—by the local boards of trade, and so forth.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, the second question.

Mr. GOOD. I think there is an agency existing at Des Moines.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman know how many thousands of dollars of the money of this Government Mr. Densmore, the director of this Employment Service, wasted in an effort to get Mooney, a convicted felon, released from California law and justice? Does the gentleman know how much of this $272,000 that you propose to give him, more than the $1,543,400 he already has, that he may yet waste in trying to get Mooney released from California justice? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. GOOD. The amount is reduced now to such a low sum I do not believe he can waste very much, if anything. The amount before, as the gentleman can see, was estimated as $1,800,000—almost $2,000,000—and he will now only have available, with cash on hand, $347,000. I was only appealing to the good judgment of the gentleman from Texas to withdraw his point of order so that the department can exist until time is given to see whether we could get legislation, or, if not, the department be wound up in an orderly way.

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to send him and his 513 payroll drawers down to Texas and up into Iowa in order to let them help harvest the wheat crop and the oat crop, and thereby do some real service for their country.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Texas, who said he would possibly favor legislation if brought in by a proper committee, that by granting the appropriation asked by the gentleman from Iowa this would be wound up and the committees of this House would have an opportunity to legislate.

Mr. BLANTON. We have plenty of time. When a committee wants to act it can act mighty quick.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I want to occupy the floor for just a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to discuss the point of order?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, in view of the very great personal feeling that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has exhibited against those who are in charge of this bureau, I am very fearful that nothing I can say will induce him to withdraw his point of order. With his personal feeling and with the personal controversy which I have noticed in the newspapers has been going on between the gentleman from Texas and certain officials in the labor organizations, of course I have nothing to do, and I do not propose to say anything on that subject here. I had hoped that the gentleman would permit this appropriation to go through without making the point of order. So far as I am concerned, I am not altogether satisfied in my own mind that it is subject to a point of order. But I realize that after the very thorough discussion held at the last session of Congress and the decision which was rendered by my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], who, I think we will all admit, is one of the very best parliamentarians in the House, the Chair is likely to follow the precedent set by him.

But I want to call this fact to the attention of the gentleman from Texas: He has just admitted upon the floor of this House that he would support legislation upon this subject because the President of the United States has requested and recommended it. Now, there is, as was stated by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], a bill pending before the proper legislative committee of this House seeking to enact legislation upon this subject. If that bill is reported, as in all probability it will be reported, very soon, the gentleman from Texas has indicated that he will give it his support.

Now, if we deny to this organization or this activity the amount of money recommended by the Committee on Appropriations, their organization will be dissipated and disbanded; they will have no organization in any of the States of this Union. The result will be that after the legislation is adopted it will be necessary, at great expense to the Government, to build up a new and complete organization.

Now, the gentleman from Texas has complained because an order went forth, as he says, to deprive certain constituents of his of positions after he had taken his position here upon the floor of the House with reference to this appropriation. I want to say to the gentleman that there were several offices in the State of Tennessee, from which I come, which were discontinued after the appropriation went out of the deficiency bill at the last session, for the simple reason that the director did not have the money with which to continue those offices; and I dare say that, in spite of the unjust personal attack which the gentleman from Texas made upon the director and his work, he was actuated in what was done in Texas only by the fact that he did not have money enough to continue those offices.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I will state to the gentleman from Tennessee that the State of Texas to-day can take care of every idle laborer in the United States and furnish labor in the wheat and oats fields of Texas.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then the gentleman's State is very fortunate, because it is not true with respect to many of the other States of the Union. I want to say to the gentleman that the need of service of this kind was considered so important in my State that, when Congress failed to make the appropriation last March necessary to carry on this work until July 1, the Legislature of the State of Tennessee appropriated $7,500 to supplement the fund in the State of Tennessee and enable this activity to continue in behalf of the honorably discharged soldiers who have been in France fighting the battles of our country and in the camps waiting to be sent over, and who are coming back here in need of the opportunity to obtain lucrative positions. [Applause.] The gentleman is denying to them the opportunity of knowing where to find lucrative positions by making a point of order on this appropriation.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman know why his legislature did that? I will tell him. It did that for the same reason that my legislature met and demanded that we support the $10,000,000 appropriation—because Mr. Gompers asked them to do it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that we do not have legislatures of that kind in the State of Tennessee. The Legislature of the State of Tennessee is not controlled by the demands of any individual, whether it be Mr. Gompers or any other individual. They made the appropriation simply because in their judgment it was rendering an important service in the State of Tennessee, and they did not desire to see all the offices closed down and these discharged soldiers and sailors deprived of the opportunity of knowing where they can secure lucrative employment.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FORDNEY. I believe the gentleman is in error when he states that there is a surplus of labor in the country. I do not think that with a fine-toothed comb, if you will search the country over, you will find a man out of employment who wants employment. [Applause.] I know that I have appeals from all over the country stating that industries are running shorthanded because they can not find laborers; and that is not only so in one industry but it is in every industry in the land, especially among the farmers of this country.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that I have no personal knowledge, but every day or two we see statements in the newspapers that there are many men unemployed in certain sections of the country. Now, granting that what the gentleman says is correct, that there is not a surplus of labor, there is undoubtedly a surplus of labor in certain sections of this country, I dare say in many of the larger cities of this country or in certain particular portions of the country, and if that be true, then we ought to have some agency to distribute that labor where it is needed, so that the country can get the benefit of it.

Mr. FORDNEY. I can also show the gentleman clippings which I have from the State of Mississippi, which I visited just a few days ago, and statements were made there from the pulpit by the ministers, and those statements were influenced by the very men whom the gentleman from Texas speaks about, state-

ments that there are men looking for employment; yet at the same time half the mills in that country are closed down or running short-handed because of the scarcity of labor. It is a propaganda paid for by the money exacted from the taxpayers of this country, preached from the pulpit, printed in the newspapers, and the newspapers paid to print it, by money taken from the taxpayers, unjustly spent, instigated by the very element that the gentleman from Texas is talking about. It is not true that there is a lack of employment. There is a scarcity of labor all over this country, and it can not be otherwise. More than a quarter of a million of our men have been killed or wounded. There has been no immigration to this country, there has been a great emigration from this country, in the past four years, there has been a greater demand for labor, there has been greater production in the country, and then gentlemen talk about a surplus of labor. It is folly; it is false; it is not true. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair reminds the gentleman that we are not now proceeding under the five-minute rule. The point of order has been made, and the Chair would like to have some information on the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. The point of order is pending, and I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas insist on his point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. I do.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask the gentleman to reserve his point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. At the request of the gentleman from Alabama, I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order has been made, and the Chair is entitled to hear a discussion upon the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I should like to open that discussion with a few remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has spoken several times, and discussion on a point of order is within limitations to be fixed by the Chair. The Chair will endeavor to hold gentlemen discussing the point of order to the five-minute rule.

Mr. DYER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DYER. I understand the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], chairman of the committee, has in effect conceded the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa did state that, but then the point of order was reserved, and the whole question thrown open again for discussion. While the discussion was going on the gentleman from Texas was making up his mind, under the reservation of the point of order, whether he would make it or not. He has now made it, and the Chair is willing to hear him upon the point of order, and asks the gentleman to confine himself to that.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I take it the parliamentary status is as follows: The chairman of the committee, Mr. GOOD, who is recognized as a parliamentarian in this House, has conceded that the point of order is good.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Texas this question: Does the gentleman contend that there is no law for the insertion of this paragraph in the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. There is no law whatever, Mr. Chairman, authorizing this appropriation, and the chairman of the Appropriation Committee will not contend otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Iowa to speak upon that point. The Chair assumes that the gentleman from Iowa does not contend that the insertion of a provision in an appropriation bill, after the purposes of the bill have been effected, for the period of a year, gives authority for the insertion of a new paragraph in another appropriation bill?

Mr. GOOD. No; I do not. If the item carried in the bill was subject to a point of order and there was no authorization for it, the mere fact that it was carried for one year would not make it permanent law.

The CHAIRMAN. Provision is made in the paragraph for the maintenance of the present organization under provisions made in the civil-service act approved July 1, 1918. What warrant of law is there for the establishment of that organization therein referred to?

Mr. GOOD. None at all, except in the appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no warrant of law for it?

Mr. GOOD. I do not think so. There are those, however, who contend that there is. Others contend that there is not. There is no authority in the law creating the Department of Labor, or in any amendment to that law, that creates this service or makes provision for carrying it on, except as a war measure in the appropriation bill out of an emergency fund.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that there is no law for the establishment of the organization provided for in the paragraph the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes out of order. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. Will not the gentleman postpone that until after we complete the bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; I want to make it in connection with what has just been said.

Mr. GOOD. And the gentleman will limit his remarks to five minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think five minutes will be sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to participate in the discussion of this appropriation bill. But I can not give my own consent, feeling as I do on the great and vital question of the real interests of labor and capital in the United States of America, to allow to go absolutely unchallenged what I regard as a very passionate and unjustified attack by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] on organized labor in this country in his speech a few minutes ago.

The President of the United States, in his address delivered to Congress by a written message a few days ago, emphasized as the matter of paramount importance for the consideration of the Congress, in this reconstruction Congress, as it has been called, this very problem, and uses this language:

> The question which stands at the front of all others in every country amidst the present great awakening is the question of labor; and perhaps I can speak of it with as great advantage while engrossed in the consideration of interests which affect all countries alike as I could at home and amidst the interests which naturally most affect my thought, because they are the interests of our own people.
>
> By the question of labor I do not mean the question of efficient industrial production, the question of how labor is to be obtained and made effective in the great process of sustaining populations and winning success amidst commercial and industrial rivalries. I mean that much greater and more vital question, how are the men and women who do the daily labor of the world to obtain progressive improvement in the conditions of their labor, to be made happier, and to be served better by the communities and the industries which their labor sustains and advances?

I will not attempt to elaborate that suggestion. The President goes on and says:

> We must see to it that our returning soldiers are assisted in every practicable way to find the places for which they are fitted in the daily work of the country. This can be done by developing and maintaining upon an adequate scale the admirable organization created by the Department of Labor for placing men seeking work; and it can also be done, in at least one very great field, by creating new opportunities for individual enterprise.

The gentlemen from Texas professes to be a friend and admirer of the President of the United States, but here the President in his appeal to the Congress of the United States places this question of labor and the interests of organized labor as paramount for the consideration of Congress and suggests that instead of enlarging and increasing the antagonism between capital and labor that we use of our talents here to harmonize these interests into a status of partnership and cooperation. The President urges the retention of the Employment Bureau as one of the great means to accomplish that end, and yet the gentleman from Texas seeks to destroy it by making captious and technical points of order against the appropriation.

If the gentleman feels as he professes himself toward the President of the United States, I appeal to him even at this late moment to withdraw his point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; I have only five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the words of the gentleman be taken down, when he says that I was captious. I made the point of order in absolutely good faith, and I ask that his words be taken down when he says that I made it captiously and without reason.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist upon that point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. I have no chance to answer that, and if the gentleman proceeds in abuse, I do ask it. If he will leave the abuse out of his speech and confine himself to good argument, I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama will proceed in order.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I submit to the Chair that I was proceeding in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair simply restates the proposition.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I want to say, further, that I am unwilling to let go unchallenged the statements made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] when he stated that "anarchy prevails in and dominates the labor organizations of this country." I challenge and repudiate that accusation as wholly without foundation and as a cruel injustice to the hundreds of thousands of laboring men in this country who are affiliated with organized labor. Their loyalty and patriotism needs no defense at my hands. They proved it in the trying days of our late national peril. Organized labor does not stand for anarchy; on the contrary, it is the deadly enemy of the I. W. W. and Bolshevism, and intends to assert its just rights within the law and under the law. Every sensible man, every thoughtful man in this House, every man who is anxious about the future in this country from an industrial and social standpoint, must recognize the truth and wisdom of the remarks of the President of the United States, that this is one of the real, paramount, and vital questions for the Congress of the United States in its deliberations.

The Clerk read as follows:

For refund of head tax paid on account of 81 aliens in transit through the United States, whose departure therefrom after the period prescribed by the immigration regulations was caused by interrupted passenger sailings to Europe incident to war conditions, $648.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want my distinguished friend from Alabama——

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to ask that the gentleman confine his remarks to the item under consideration.

Mr. BANKHEAD. To the argument here?

Mr. GOOD. To the item under discussion.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the chairman expect me to sit here idly by and let my good friend from Alabama put things in the RECORD without any reply whatever?

Mr. GOOD. I must insist that the gentleman confine himself to the paragraph under discussion.

Mr. BLANTON. I think the gentleman will save time to let me speak for five minutes—not to hold me to the usual rule.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred members present, a quorum.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers on that.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no question of tellers upon the announcement of the Chair that a quorum is present. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of Labor is authorized to make settlement for $11.85 from the appropriation for expenses of regulating immigration for the fiscal year 1919, in payment for advertising erroneously ordered without previous compliance with the terms of section 3828 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. When my distinguished friend from Alabama——

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken, and the gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. BLANTON. I think we ought to have a quorum present.

Mr. GOOD. I make the point of order that that point is dilatory.

Mr. BLANTON. Other business has transpired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The sum of $40,000,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriations heretofore made for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to provide housing for war needs," approved May 16, 1918, shall be covered into the Treasury immediately upon the passage of this act.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman of the committee as to the unexpended balance of this Housing Bureau appropriation. You are converting back, I see, $40,000,000. Does the gentleman know whether the Housing Bureau has ceased to function?

Mr. GOOD. No; it has not ceased to function. It has about $60,000,000 worth of property, including $11,000,000 of cash on hand, and after this item was put into the bill at $40,000,000, they claimed they were making some additional loans to street railway companies that had extended their lines to the houses, and that the statement they put in the record, which will be found on page 376 of the hearings, is not a recent statement.

It is barely possible we may have taken back a little too much, but we thought we would leave it just as it was, because it was based on the financial statement they made which showed they only had $60,000,000 of property, including $11,000,000 of cash, and that the $40,000,000 had not been touched, and that would be covered back into the Treasury.

Mr. ALMON. Would the gentleman kindly explain briefly the nature and the character of the Housing Bureau's activities at this time?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, the Housing Bureau has a great many activities aside from the dormitories that it is conducting here in Washington. They are conducting restaurants, rooming houses and everything of that kind.

Mr. ALMON. I mean in the way of house construction. Has it ceased to function in the way of the construction of houses?

Mr. GOOD. Houses under construction have been completed to the extent of 98 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Charles A. Sulzer, $2,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 11, after the sum "$2,000," insert "which sum shall be paid to his estate."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WASON. I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question in reference to line 3.

Mr. GOOD. To pay to the widow of Charles August Sulzer?

Mr. WASON. Yes; I understand there was a contest and Mr. Sulzer died before the certificate of election was issued to him. I do not object to the payment at the proper time, if Mr. Sulzer would have been entitled to a seat. It seems to me at this time that we ought to wait and ascertain what the fact is. I am informed by the Clerk that there is a notice of a contest in his office.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from New Hampshire the amendment has been agreed to and unless——

Mr. WASON. I am not referring to that; that relates to a contest in the last session.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's motion?

Mr. WASON. I am merely making an inquiry of the chairman with regard to line 3.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman from New Hampshire that had Mr. Sulzer lived until this time he would have been entitled to a seat in this House with all the privileges which a Delegate has in the House, and if he had died then he would have died while a Delegate in the House. He died as a Delegate-elect to the House, and until that contest had been decided he would have been a Delegate in the House, and in case of his death his widow would have been entitled, under the broad spirit which has always prevailed in this House, to this appropriation. It is a mere gratuity, and the committee thought that we would not consider that condition.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I have been informed that the certificate of election was really issued prior to Mr. Sulzer's death, but it was probably on account of Mr. Sulzer's absence and sickness that he had not heard of the issuance of the certificate.

The Clerk read as follows:

JUDGMENTS IN INDIAN DEPREDATION CLAIMS.

For payment of the judgment rendered by the Court of Claims in an Indian depredation case, certified to the Sixty-fifth Congress, third session, in Senate Document No. 427, $300; said judgment to be paid after the deductions required to be made under the provisions of section 6 of the act approved March 3, 1891, entitled "An act to provide for the adjustment and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," shall have been ascertained and duly certified by the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of the Treasury, which certification shall be made as soon as practicable after the passage of this act, and such deductions shall be made according to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, having due regard to the educational and other necessary requirements of the tribe or tribes affected; and the amounts paid shall be reimbursed to the United States at such times and in such proportions as the Secretary of the Interior may decide to be for the interests of the Indian Service: *Provided*, That said judgment shall not be paid until the Attorney General shall have certified to the Secretary of the Treasury that there exist no grounds sufficient, in his opinion, to support a motion for a new trial or an appeal of said cause.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. May I ask the gentleman from Iowa about the proviso on page 49, line 15:

Provided, That said judgment shall not be paid until the Attorney General shall have certified to the Secretary of the Treasury—

And so forth. That is a rather novel situation, is it not?

Mr. GOOD. I think the proviso is superfluous. I think lines 19 and 20 practically cover the same thing.

Mr. GARRETT. That "the right of appeal shall have expired." I was just wondering about the necessity for that.

Mr. GOOD. I think it is superfluous because under lines 19 and 20 it could not be paid until the right of appeal had expired.

Mr. GARRETT. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order and move to strike out the proviso beginning in line 15 and ending with line 18.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 49, strike out the proviso beginning in line 15 and ending in line 18.

Mr. GOOD. And put a period at the end of line 14 instead of a colon.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For Smithsonian Institution, preservation of collections, tional Museum, $2.60.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a typographical error in line 4, page 54. The word "National" is not complete.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to correct the error.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the error referred to will be corrected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Any officer or employee of the United States who, after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, is held to have violated or attempted to violate this section, shall be removed by such superior officer from office or employment. Any officer or employee of the United States who violates or attempts to violate this section shall also be guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. In line 5, page 63, it says "with the power of removing him, is held to have violated or attempted to violate this section." Would it not be better if that word "held" were stricken out and the word "found" substituted?

Mr. GOOD. I think that would be an improvement.

Mr. WALSH. I offer an amendment to strike out the word "held," in line 5, page 63, and substitute the word "found," because this is ample notice in the hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 63, line 5, strike out the word "held" and insert in lieu thereof the word "found."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer this because I think it is customary, after a hearing has been held upon alleged violation of law, to hold, when the determination is made, that it is a finding. You would not say a "holding." So if it is made to read "is found to have violated or attempted to violate this section" it would be better.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Page 62, line 24, after the words "United States," insert "in the discharge of their official duties."

Mr. GOOD. I do not see any objection to that.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that in line 2, on page 63, the same thing is carried—"which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business." I thought it meant the same thing.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I think the amendment I offer is necessary in order to explain the provision. Otherwise the employees might be held to be violating the penal section if they should communicate with their Members of Congress, except through official channels.

The CHAIRMAN. That paragraph has been read.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I know it has been read, but I am offering an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been passed.

Mr. GARRETT. The paragraph has already been passed.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I was under the impression that the bill was being read by sections, not paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not raising the question, except to mention that the paragraph has been passed.

Mr. GARRETT. And it is subject to a point of order for that reason. But, Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman will want to insist upon that amendment. If the gentleman will permit——

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Either that amendment should be adopted or the words "and employees" should be stricken out. Employees have no official function to perform in communicating with Congress.

Mr. GARRETT. They would have to send it through their superiors, or whoever it might be.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Do you want to apply military rules to civil employees of the Government, and provide that they shall have to communicate with Congressmen through their superior officers instead of direct?

Mr. GARRETT. They do now. That is, in an official way.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Employees have no official function to perform in communicating with Congress. I think to prohibit communications from employees except through official channels is un-American. They have a constitutional right to communicate with their Representatives in Congress, without their letters passing through the hands of their superior officers, any suggestions they may have to offer. With a view of clarifying the language, I offered the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GARRETT. If you say "in the discharge of their official duties," you limit them in the matter of the discharge of their official duties, and then the question immediately arises as to whether or not, in recommending legislation through their officials, employees are discharging their official duty. You are subjecting your official to all sorts of dangerous criticism, and perhaps worse, if you put in the words "in the discharge of his official duties," because it might be held that when he recommended legislation he was not discharging any part of his official duty at all.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. A former President of the United States some years ago issued an Executive order that no employee of the Government should communicate with a Member of Congress concerning public business except through official channels, and it invited a great deal of criticism. It was very unfair and humiliating to the employees of the Government, and after several years a law was passed permitting them to communicate with Members of Congress on official matters and abrogating the Executive order.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. I heard that a Federal judge had issued an injunction against an official of the Government of the United States communicating any information to Congress. I do not know whether that is true or not, but I understood that occurred.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I think this language is unfortunate, in that it will have the effect that I mentioned unless my amendment is adopted.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. I will say to the gentleman from Idaho that I think all communications from public employees, where they are using official funds, should be through official channels. This is a limitation on the use of public funds.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I agree with the gentleman, but the use of these words, "official channels," should not apply to employees.

Mr. DENISON. No. I do not understand it that way. I take it that it simply prohibits employees or officials of the Government from using public funds in communicating to Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I am in favor of that prohibition, but I think we should either strike out the words "and employees," who have no official function to perform in communicating with Congress, or else put in the explanatory words suggested.

Mr. DENISON. It is sometimes hard to tell what is an employee and what is an official.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for an extension of five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho asks an extension of five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to direct the attention of the gentleman from Idaho to what seems to me to be an inconsistency in his amendment. His amendment would prevent Government officers or employees from communicating through proper official channels requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business. It would prevent that, unless it was in the discharge of their official duties. Now, it might well be that an officer or employee might want to recommend some action for the more efficient conduct of the Government's business, and he could not do that unless it was in the discharge of his official duties.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. It is all right for an officer to do that, but an employee has no such function to perform officially of that character, and it will simply have a tendency, as I remarked, to dissuade the clerks from expressing their opinions about the conduct of public business through their individual Members of Congress. They frequently offer suggestions of great value, and they should not be prohibited from doing so. All Members of Congress may not be well informed.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Of course, I assume that the gentleman would not want the clerks or employees of the Government to use public funds in explaining what they want done?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. No. I am in favor of the provision, as I said, except I suggest the insertion of these explanatory words, which can not do any harm, and which it seems to me will clarify the language and protect employees of the Government in their right to express their opinions concerning legislation and the conduct of the public business without securing the consent of some bureau officer to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill, as follows:

SEC. 6. That this act hereafter may be referred to as the "third deficiency appropriation act, fiscal year 1919."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman from Iowa to the fact that a reservation was made to a proviso on page 8.

Mr. GOOD. It is at the bottom of page 6, extending through to line 18 on page 8. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] had reserved a point of order.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I have talked with the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Minnesota, who understand that situation, and from the information I have received I think it should remain in the bill. I wish to withdraw the reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri withdraws the reservation.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOOD: On page 7, line 8, after the word "year," insert "which sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated."

Mr. GOOD. The comptroller has advised the committee that under the language as carried in this bill and in the former bill payment could not be made unless an appropriation was made.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to the item on page 3 in regard to the Civil Service Commission, in order that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] may offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to return to page 3 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I reoffer the amendment which I previously offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DYER: Page 3, at the end of line 17, insert the following:

"*Provided*, That the act entitled 'An act to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses,' approved March 3, 1919, so far as it relates to preference in employment of honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, be amended to read as follows:

"'That hereafter in making appointments to clerical and other positions in the executive branch of the Government in the District of Columbia or elsewhere preference shall be given to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, and widows of such, if they are qualified to hold such positions.'"

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the law as it now exists, with the exception of the words "or elsewhere." In other words, it gives the benefit of the provisions of this law to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines to enter the Government service wherever there may be an opportunity outside of the District of Columbia, which it applies to now. I discussed it in detail a few moments ago.

I prepared this in consultation with the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations. I think it is a very necessary amendment, and I ask for a vote.

Mr. GARRETT. If I understand correctly, while this refers to the census law, it really is general in character.

Mr. DYER. It is general legislation.

Mr. GARRETT. In other words, that legislation which was passed in the census bill was general legislation. It was not confined to the census employees alone?

Mr. DYER. No.

Mr. GARRETT. But applied to all departments of the Government?

Mr. DYER. To all departments of the Government, and it has been construed by the Attorney General as applying only to the departments in the city of Washington. My amendment is to make it available to all parts of the country, that is all.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It applies that amendment to all departments of the Government throughout the Nation?

Mr. DYER. Yes; wherever there is Government service, that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] desire to be heard on this amendment?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. GOOD. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. I desire to perfect the gentleman's amendment with another amendment.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman is entitled to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. BLANTON. After the words "of such" insert "and to the wives of injured soldiers who themselves are not qualified."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. That was in the other law, I think.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON to the amendment offered by Mr. DYER: After the word "such" insert the following: "and to the wives of injured soldiers who themselves are not qualified."

Mr. BLANTON. So that it will read——

The Clerk read as follows:

So that the amendment as amended will read:

"That hereafter in making appointments to clerical and other positions in the executive branch of the Government in the District of Columbia or elsewhere preference shall be given to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines and widows of such and to the wives of injured soldiers who themselves are not qualified, if they are qualified to hold such positions."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were 32 ayes and 20 noes.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there demand for a separate vote on any amendment?

There was no demand for a separate vote, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. GOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. SHERWOOD, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for two weeks, on account of sickness in his family.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, May 30, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Bureau of Fisheries for the Fairport (Iowa) biological station, fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 63); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Information, submitting an estimate of appropriations required by the Committee on Public Information for the expense of closing the work of the committee (H. Doc. No. 64); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War, submitting supplemental estimates of appropriations required for the Military Establishment and National Guard for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 65); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 3850) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate a captured German cannon to the city of Holden, Mo.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIDDICK: A bill (H. R. 3851) to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Glasgow, Mont., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 3852) to provide a method for disposing of intoxicating liquors now or hereafter in possession of United States court officials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 3853) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of St. Joe, county of Dekalb, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 3854) to repeal the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3855) to provide a division of tuberculosis in, and an advisory council for, the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 3856) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Russellville, county of Logan, State of Kentucky, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3857) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Glasgow, county of Barren, State of Kentucky, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3858) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Franklin, county of Simpson, State of Kentucky, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 3859) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Lamar, State of Mississippi, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3860) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Marion, State of Mississippi, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3861) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Jackson, State of Mississippi, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3862) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the soldiers' home, Beauvoir, county of Harrison, State of Mississippi, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3863) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Hancock, State of Mississippi, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3864) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Simpson, State of Mississippi, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3865) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Lawrence, State of Mississippi, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3866) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of George, State of Mississippi, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3867) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Stone, State of Mississippi, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3868) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Jefferson Davis, State of Mississippi, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3869) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Pearl River, State of Mississippi, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARSS: A bill (H. R. 3870) to provide for the erection of a public building at Cloquet, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 3871) providing one captured German cannon for the town of Brookville, county of Franklin, State of Indiana, as a memorial to the soldiers, sailors, and marines of Franklin County, Ind., who participated in the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3872) providing one captured German cannon for the city of Newcastle, county of Henry, State of Indiana, as a memorial to the soldiers, sailors, and marines of Henry County, Ind., who participated in the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3873) providing one captured German cannon for the city of Greenfield, county of Hancock, State of Indiana, as a memorial to the soldiers, sailors, and marines of Hancock County, Ind., who participated in the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3874) providing one captured German cannon for the city of Connersville, county of Fayette, State of Indiana, as a memorial to the soldiers, sailors, and marines of Fayette County, Ind., who participated in the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3875) providing one captured German cannon for the town of Liberty, county of Union, State of Indiana, as a memorial to the soldiers, sailors, and marines of Union County, Ind., who participated in the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3876) providing one captured German cannon for the city of Richmond, county of Wayne, State of Indiana, as a memorial to the soldiers, sailors, and marines of Wayne County, Ind., who participated in the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3877) providing one captured German cannon for the city of Rushville, county of Rush, State of Indiana, as a memorial to the soldiers, sailors, and marines of Rush County, Ind., who participated in the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3878) providing one captured German cannon for the city of Shelbyville, county of Shelby, State of Indiana, as a memorial to the soldiers, sailors, and marines of Shelby County, Ind., who participated in the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3879) providing one captured German cannon for the town of Knightstown, county of Henry, State of Indiana, as a memorial to the soldiers, sailors, and marines of

Knightstown, Ind., who participated in the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 3880) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the town of Lafollette, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 3881) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Downieville, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3882) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Angels Camp, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3883) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cedarville, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3884) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Adin, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3885) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Weaverville, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3886) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Anderson, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3887) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Dunsmuir, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3888) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lincoln, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3889) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Roseville, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3890) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Colfax, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3891) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Portola, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3892) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Jamestown, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3893) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Corning, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3894) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Greenville, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3895) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Markleeville, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3896) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sutter Creek, Calif., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK (by request): A bill (H. R. 3897) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey a right of way to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3898) authorizing the grant of a right of way through reservation No. 13, in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3899) making an appropriation for the erection of a bridge over the Eastern Branch of the Potomac River in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3900) amending section 985 of the Code of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3901) making an appropriation for the erection of a bridge from South Capitol Street to Poplar Point, in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3902) making appropriation for the opening and grading of Firth Sterling Avenue, in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 3903) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved May 11, 1912, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3904) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish in the War Department and in the Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as 'the Army and Navy medal of honor roll,' and for other purposes," approved April 27, 1916; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 3905) authorizing payment to certain Red Lake Indians, out of Chippewa Indian funds, for garden plots surrendered for school-farm use; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3906) to enlarge and extend the post-office building at St. Cloud, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 3907) making an appropriation for the extension of Massachusetts Avenue in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 3908) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of New Port Richey, Fla., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIDDICK: A bill (H. R. 3909) to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Lewistown, Mont., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 3910) to establish a fish-cultural station in New Mexico; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 3911) to provide for the registration and Americanization of aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 3912) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the counties of Walla Walla, Whitman, and Yakima, State of Washington, six German cannons or fieldpieces each, for distribution by the boards of county commissioners; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3913) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the counties of Adams, Asotin, Benton, Columbia, Franklin, Garfield, Grant, Kittitas, and Klickitat, State of Washington, three German cannons or fieldpieces each, for distribution by the boards of county commissioners; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 3914) to amend the act of March 19, 1918, entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. IRELAND: A bill (H. R. 3915) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Neponset, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3916) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Ladd, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 3917) to donate one captured cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Franklin, Tenn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 3918) for the permanent appointment as commissioned officers of certain noncommissioned officers who were called to active service under temporary commissions as officers between the dates of April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOX: A bill (H. R. 3919) for the erection of a public building at Lufkin, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3920) to increase the limit of cost for the Federal building and site at Orange, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAMSEY: A bill (H. R. 3921) for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building at Phillipsburg, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 3922) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 8 of an act entitled 'An act for pre-

venting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes,'" approved March 3, 1913; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 3923) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Westerly, R. I., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 3924) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon each to the cities of Ocala, Fernandina, Starke, Bronson, MacClenny, Lake City, Live Oak, Madison, Mayo, Jasper, Perry, Monticello, and Gainesville, all in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3925) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate two German cannons to the University of Florida; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 3926) authorizing the donation of German cannons to the city of Dalton, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3927) authorizing the donation of German cannons to the city of Calhoun, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3928) authorizing the donation of German cannons to the city of Trenton, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3929) authorizing the donation of German cannons to the city of Cedartown, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3930) authorizing the donation of German cannons to the city of Dallas, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3931) authorizing the donation of German cannons to the city of Buchanan, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3932) authorizing the donation of German cannons to the city of Rome, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3933) authorizing the donation of German cannons to the city of Somerville, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3934) authorizing the donation of German cannons to the city of Marietta, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3935) authorizing the donation of German cannons to the city of Chatsworth, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3936) authorizing the donation of German cannons to the city of Cartersville, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3937) authorizing the donation of German cannons to the city of Ringgold, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3938) authorizing the donation of German cannons to the city of La Fayette, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3939) authorizing the donation of German cannons to the city of Menlo, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 3940) authorizing the donation of one cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Cusseta, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3941) authorizing the donation of one cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Bowdon, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3942) authorizing the donation of one cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Franklin, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3943) authorizing the donation of one cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Buena Vista, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H R. 3944) authorizing the donation of one cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Hamilton, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3945) authorizing the donation of one cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Greenville, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3946) authorizing the donation of one cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Talbotton, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3947) authorizing the donation of one cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Carrollton, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3948) authorizing the donation of one cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Newnan, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3949) authorizing the donation of one cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Lagrange, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3950) authorizing the donation of one cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Columbus, Ga., to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 3951) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chillicothe, Ohio, one German cannon, fieldpiece, and other trophies of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3952) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Logan, Ohio, one German cannon, fieldpiece, and other trophies of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3953) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lancaster, Ohio, one German cannon, fieldpiece, and other trophies of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3954) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of New Lexington, Ohio, one German cannon, fieldpiece, and other trophies of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3955) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Circleville, Ohio, one German cannon, fieldpiece, and other trophies of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 3956) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Loveland, Ohio, one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 3957) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Florence, Ala., two German cannons or fieldpieces with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3958) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Moulton, Ala., two German cannons or fieldpieces with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3959) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Athens, Ala., two German cannons or fieldpieces with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3960) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Decatur, Ala., two German cannons or fieldpieces with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Scottsboro, Ala., two German cannons or fieldpieces with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3962) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bridgeport, Ala., two German cannons or fieldpieces with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3963) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hartselle, Ala., two German cannons or fieldpieces with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3964) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Stevenson, Ala., two German cannons or fieldpieces with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3965) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sheffield, Ala., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3966) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Albany, Ala., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3967) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Tuscumbia, Ala., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3968) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Huntsville, Ala., two German cannons or fieldpieces, with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 3969) to extend the provisions of the pension act of May 11, 1912, to the officers and enlisted men of all State militia and other State organizations that rendered service to the Union cause during the Civil War for a period of 90 days or more and providing pensions for their widows, minor children, and dependent parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 3970) to provide for the enlargement of the public building at Cumberland, Md.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3971) to increase the limit of cost and provide for the reconstruction of the Federal building at Hagerstown, Md.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: Resolution (H. Res. 81) to allow the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce to appoint a clerk to said committee; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. IRELAND: Resolution (H. Res. 82) authorizing the appointment of Mrs. Mary C. Adams as attendant for the ladies' reception room of the House of Representatives during the Sixty-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Resolution (H. Res. 83) authorizing the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department to appoint a clerk for said committee; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LANGLEY: Resolution (H. Res. 84) to print for the use of the House of Representatives —— copies of the speech of Hon. F. C. HICKS on The American Flag; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. DYER: Resolution (H. Res. 85) directing the Secretary of War to furnish the House the number of commissioned officers on duty in the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RAKER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 76) to suspend the requirements of annual assessment work on mining claims during the continuation of the war in which the United States is now engaged and until midnight of December 31 of the year following that in which such war is concluded; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 77) declaring May 30 of each year to be a national holiday which shall be known as Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAHN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 78) authorizing the giving of credit for service in the junior and senior divisions of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRISP: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 79) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the city of Dawson, Ga., tents and cots for use of Confederate veterans in their State convention June 17 and 18, 1919; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 80) to correct an error in the wording of the appropriation of $71,000 made in the act approved July 9, 1918, and to authorize the Secretary of War to pay said sum to respective parties entitled thereto; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial from the Chamber of Deputies of Belgium relating to the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 3972) granting a pension to John L. Race; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEE: A bill (H. R. 3973) for the relief of the Longini Mexican Hat Co., of San Antonio, Tex.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3974) for the relief of Lena Garagnon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 3975) granting an increase of pension to Sidney S. Canter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 3976) granting a pension to Louisa Donnelly; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 3977) for the relief of the legal representatives of Donnelly and Egan, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 3978) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Leeper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 3979) granting a pension to Cynthia L. Anthony; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 3980) granting an increase of pension to Joseph N. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 3981) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Dunham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 3982) granting an increase of pension to Harry Olstot; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 3983) for the relief of Emma Pierce; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3984) for the relief of Thomas Bayton and Bertha M. Hartt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 3985) for the relief of the estate of Juan Martinez y Sanchez; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 3986) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint Albert C. Read and John H. Towers commanders in the permanent establishment of the Navy, and Patrick N. L. Bellinger lieutenant commander in the permanent establishment of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3987) to provide for the payment to Mrs. Mary Esther Fisher Benoit of insurance money of Alphonse V. Benoit, late private, Company A, One hundred and sixth Infantry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 3988) granting a pension to Hannah Barrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3989) granting an increase of pension to George Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 3990) granting compensation to Charles Fortier; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3991) granting a pension to Emil J. Olsen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3992) granting a pension to Richard M. Van Dervort; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3993) granting a pension to Charles Dueber; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3994) granting an increase of pension to Wilson B. George; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3995) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3996) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hook; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 3997) granting a pension to Annie K. Squier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3998) granting a pension to W. W. Treadway; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3999) for the payment of certain soldiers' claims for back pay growing out of service in the Army of the United States, as reported by the Court of Claims; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 4000) granting a pension to George McFoster; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4001) granting an increase of pension to Harry Weinheimer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4002) for the relief of Edward J. Sharp; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 4003) granting a pension to Catherine Hartless; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 4004) granting a pension to Richard McNeely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4005) granting a pension to Minerva E. Layman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4006) granting a pension to Alsinda Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4007) granting a pension to Joseph Miley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4008) granting a pension to George H. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4009) granting a pension to Anna Hall Richmond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4010) granting a pension to A. S. Radford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4011) granting a pension to Charles H. Payne; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4012) granting a pension to Alfred Rivers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4013) granting a pension to Hugh T. Roberts; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4014) granting a pension to George R. Robinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4015) granting a pension to John E. Schilling; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4016) granting a pension to Howard Shaver; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4017) granting a pension to Lloyd Shaver; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4018) granting a pension to Michael Mulvey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4019) granting a pension to Brent S. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4020) granting a pension to Mathias Kennedy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4021) granting a pension to Miller Kincaid; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4022) granting a pension to Francis A. Keelan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4023) granting an increase of pension to James H. McGill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4024) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. McCafferty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4025) granting an increase of pension to John C. McKinney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4026) granting an increase of pension to Beckwith A. McNemar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4027) granting an increase of pension to George W. Linn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4028) granting an increase of pension to Jesse B. Jemison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4029) granting an increase of pension to Marian A. Jaques; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4030) granting an increase of pension to John C. Lazier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4031) granting an increase of pension to Seymour Norman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4032) granting an increase of pension to James A. Mahaffey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4033) granting an increase of pension to Silas M. Starkey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4034) granting an increase of pension to Emanual B. Silcott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4035) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin A. Reeder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4036) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Roe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4037) granting an increase of pension to John Right; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4038) granting an increase of pension to Oakley Randall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4039) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Roper; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4040) granting an increase of pension to John W. Oldfield; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4041) granting an increase of pension to Frank Shaver; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 4042) granting a pension to Otho L. Peterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: A bill (H. R. 4043) to reimburse the California Shipbuilding Co. for its expenditures over the price named in the contract for the U. S. lighthouse tender *Cedar;* to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 4044) granting a pension to Joshua Griffith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIDDICK: A bill (H. R. 4045) for the relief of Wallace Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4046) authorizing the issuance of patent to the Milk River Valley Gun Club; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 4047) granting an increase of pension to Elijah H. Spencer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 4048) to reimburse Abbie J. Foster for safe destroyed by burglars; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4049) to reimburse Lieut. Col. George D. Graham, dental surgeon, United States Army, for rent of quarters at Honolulu, Hawaii; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4050) to reimburse Henry H. Stevenson for safe destroyed by burglars; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4051) to reimburse the Farmers' Savings Bank of Brandon, Iowa, for currency destroyed by fire; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 4052) granting an increase of pension to John L. Wheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4053) granting a pension to Louisa C. Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4054) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Henry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4055) granting a pension to John E. Root; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 4056) granting a pension to Louise B. Rice; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4057) making appropriation for payment of claims of John Sevier, sr., and John Sevier, jr., in accordance with report and findings of the Court of Claims as reported in House Documents Nos. 131 and 1302, under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, known as the Bowman Act; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4058) granting an increase of pension to Rufus F. Gibbs; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4059) granting a pension to James C. Claxton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 4060) granting a pension to Charles E. Redburn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 81) tendering the thanks of Congress to those associated in the achievement of accomplishing the first trans-Atlantic flight of an airship from America to Europe; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 82) to pay damages to Roberta McKenzie Osborne; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BABKA: Petition of Jugo-Slav Republican Alliance, relating to peace deliberations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BEGG: Petition of Farmers' Progressive Club of Republic and Greenspring, urging repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: Telegraphic petition signed by Rev. Benjamin Lonexe, Lakeport, N. H., on behalf of the Ministers' Association of Laconia, N. H., and vicinity, in opposition to the President's recommendation removing the ban on wines and beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, letter of Frank P. Tilton, Whiteface, N. H., advocating universal prohibition in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, telegram from the Manchester (N. H.) Buick Co., advocating the removal of the manufacturers' war tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 40 residents of Rockingham County, N. H., advocating the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 16 residents of Rochester, N. H., advocating the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 111 residents of Carroll County, N. H., advocating the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Hooksett Grange, of Hooksett, N. H., asking the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition of citizens of Potomac, Ill., against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: Petition of Protestant churches of Clinton, Mo., for passage of a strong and effective bone-dry law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 11 citizens of Clinton, Mo., for strong bone-dry law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition with nine signers of Drexel, Cass County, Mo., against repeal of war prohibition and for speedy enactment of laws to enforce prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of master butchers of St. Louis, urging retention of zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of 25,000 tennis players, Magnolia Tennis Club, C. C. Dyer, and George F. Stevens, all of St. Louis, protesting against repeal of daylight-saving act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of American Brake Co., St. Louis, Mo., urging congressional appropriations for maintenance of railway equipment; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of J. I. Case Threshing Machine Co., St. Louis, Mo., asking repeal of tax law on passenger cars and trucks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Inland Machine Works (Inc.), St. Louis, Mo., asking repeal of luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Frederick Roth and W. A. Barrett, of St. Louis, asking for removal of tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EAGAN: Resolution adopted at mass demonstration held in the Star of Israel Synagogue, Hoboken, N. J., for the defense of Jews in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Association of Collegiate Alumnae, urging the continuance of United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of La Crosse, Wis., protesting against section 904 of 1918 Federal revenue tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of sundry citizens of the town of Earl, Ill., opposing repeal of the war-time prohibition measure; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of Jugo-Slavs of De Kalb, Ill., concerning matters relating to controversies between Italy and the Jugo-Slavs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of P. A. McDonald, of Boston, Mass., asking for legislation to delay the operation of war-time prohibition law beyond July 1, 1919; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, the Traffic Club of New England, F. R. Murdy, Roxbury, Mass., and the Jordan Marsh Co., Boston, Mass., protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: Petition of sundry citizens of the first congressional district of Vermont for repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HERSEY: Petition of George B. Daw and 51 other farmers, of Dover, Me., urging repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Delaware State Association of Graduate Nurses, urging relative rank for nurses in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING: Resolutions passed at mass meeting at Kewanee, Ill., urging repeal of espionage laws and release of political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition signed by Mr. A. L. Hulstadt and other farmers of Altona, Ill., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition signed by John Anderson and 16 other members of Swedish Methodist Church of Kewanee, Ill., protesting against any repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KRAUS: Petition of sundry citizens of Miami County, Ind., in favor of the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of the Seitz Auto Co., Baltimore, Md., urging repeal of tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of G. Feikin & Son, furriers, Baltimore, Md., protesting against 10 per cent tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Brigham-Hopkins Co., Baltimore, Md., opposing Department of Labor Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Felippe A. Broadbent, Baltimore, Md., urging right of suffrage for the residents of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of Corkran, Hill & Co. (Inc.) and Florence W. MacCarthy Co., Baltimore, Md., against repeal of zone advances on advertising pages of periodicals; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of L. W. Kennedy, W. D. Bradenkopf, John C. Thomas, J. Bannister Hill, jr., Morris Whitridge, Louis Levison, James B. Hessarg, Richard J. White, Talbot M. Jenkins, and T. Parkison Mitchell, all of Maryland, protesting against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Model Garage, Middletown, Walter Scott, distributor (Marmon), Baltimore, Md., protesting against tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUCE: Protests by Massachusetts Women's Christian Temperance Union, Newton Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, Weston Methodist Episcopal Church and Sunday School, and the Baker Memorial Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protest by Jewish citizens of Marlboro, Mass., against massacres of women and children of Jewish faith in Poland and Galicia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of many residents of Cortland County, N. Y., favoring the repeal of the tax on soda water and ice cream, which is contained in the existing revenue law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a petition of the Azaris Literary Society, of Syracuse, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of the Merchants' Association; Alfred E. Marling, president chamber of commerce; Herbert Appleton; Hotel Bossert; H. R. Cashoff; Miss Lullu Montgonemy; and Miss Marjorie Whittle, all of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition from sundry citizens of Norwalk, Conn., in opposition to repeal of the war-time prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of West Redding, Conn., and Grace Methodist Sunday School, Bridgeport, Conn., opposing the repeal of the prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY: Petition of workers of Marion County, W. Va., requesting repeal of espionage act and release of all prisoners held thereunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of majority of Jewish population of Wheeling, W. Va., urging responsibility for Jewish pogroms in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NOLAN: Resolution by the San Francisco Labor Council, favoring President Wilson's fourteen points and the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of A. L. Burt Co., New York City, and Oakes Manufacturing Co., Long Island City, N. Y., urging against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of New York Institute for the Education of the Blind, favoring passage of House bill 16016 to secure increased facilities for providing printed matter for the blind; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: Petition of Methodist Sunday schools of Morgan County, Ill., against repeal of prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, Jacksonville, Ill., and Methodist Episcopal Church, Pleasant Hill, Ill., opposing repeal of war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Pittsfield, Ill., favoring repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Grace Methodist Church, Janesville, Ill., against repeal of war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Picker Bros., of New York City, protesting against the war-time prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Grass, Freedman & Co. (Inc.) and A. N. Leventhal & Co. (Inc.), New York, urging the repeal of 10 per cent tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the city of New York, opposing the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the National Bank of Commerce, New York City, urging the retention of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Mr. Harold W. Stimpson, of the Ajax Rubber Co. (Inc.), New York City, opposing continuation of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of Eastman Kodak Co. and its employees, protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petitions of citizens of the city of Grand Junction and county of Mesa, Colo., protesting against repeal of the prohibition law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of the National Reform Association, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against any legislation that would repeal or modify existing law against manufacture of wine and beer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, papers supporting House bill 2825, granting a pension to Arthur A. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALTERS: Petition of Slovenian Republican Alliance, Johnstown, Pa., relative to the rights of the Jugo-Slavs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WASON: Memorial of the Sullivan County (N. H.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union Institute, urging the enactment of the prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Methodist Sunday School of Bethlehem, N. H., protesting against the lifting of the ban on light wine and beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of W. E. Roy and 80 other residents of Walpole, N. H., and vicinity, urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Will B. Connor and 22 other residents of Sutton, N. H., and vicinity, urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of C. P. Farrer and 38 other residents of Henniker, N. H., and vicinity, urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of W. E. Bishop and two other residents of Lisbon, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of W. E. Stearns and 105 residents of West Rindge, N. H., and vicinity, urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of C. T. Rossiter and 19 other residents of Claremont, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of John Robertson and 40 other residents of West Hopkinton, N. H., and vicinity, urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Frank E. Cutting and 71 other residents of East Weare, N. H., and vicinity, urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of G. A. Hart and 83 other residents of East Jaffrey, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Dean S. Russell and 102 other residents of Keene, N. H., and vicinity, urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of William Truland and one other resident of Lancaster, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Golden Rod Grange, No. 114, of Swanzey, N. H., requesting the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of M. L. Ware Grange, West Rindge, N. H., requesting the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Mount Prospect Grange, No. 242, of Lancaster, N. H., requesting the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *May 30, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of light and life, liberty and hope, justice and mercy, love and the sweet affections of the human heart, we thank Thee for the spirit of patriotism which moved the men of this body to set apart this holy day in memory of the brave soldiers who, in answer to the call of the colors, left home, native land, and all that they held dear to go to the rescue of our sister nations, who were fighting an insidious foe for liberty, right, and justice.

All hail to the American soldier, who turned back the tide of war and brought peace to a suffering world.

We come with praise for the living and tears for the dead, sympathy for the wounded and maimed, for the fathers, mothers, wives, and children who sacrificed their dear ones on the altar of liberty. Comfort them, we beseech Thee, in Thine own way.

Out of the twilight of the past
We move to a diviner light,
For nothing that is wrong can last;
Nothing's immortal but the right.

May the memory of the great sacrifices the lovers of liberty and truth have made live on as an example to those who shall come after us. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. FULLER of Illinois was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House papers in the case of Herbert A. York (H. R. 14802, 65th Cong.), without leaving copies, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Also, papers in the case of Thomas F. Duffy (H. R. 13534, 65th Cong.), without leaving copies, no adverse report having been made thereon.

TENDERING THANKS OF CONGRESS TO THOSE WHO SERVED IN THE GREAT WAR.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, House joint resolution 67, tendering the thanks of Congress to those who served, or gave others to the service of, the country in the Great War, is now in order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I present the resolution, House joint resolution 67, which by previous order of the House was made the order of the day.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution 67.

Resolved, etc., That the thanks of Congress are hereby extended to those who served in the armed forces of the United States in the war against the Imperial German Government and who, through their patriotic sacrifice, steadfast fidelity, brilliant strategy, and courageous service, secured a victorious peace, gave to the world a new insight into the high ideals and lofty purposes of America, and left to future generations a splendid heritage of heroic achievement and noble devotion to duty.

That the thanks of Congress are hereby extended to those who served in the various auxiliary forces, whose humane and benevolent work at home and on the field of battle contributed so greatly to the comfort and support of our valiant warriors.

That the thanks of Congress are hereby extended to the mothers, wives, and relatives who, patriotic and uncomplaining, gave their nearest and their dearest in the hour of the Nation's need, and its deep and heartfelt sympathy is extended to those whose kindred fell, or were permanently disabled in the great struggle.

That Congress reverently expresses its profound appreciation of the sublime act of those who made the supreme sacrifice by giving their lives for their country and their country's cause.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the consideration of the resolution be controlled one-half by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the time for debate upon the resolution shall be divided equally, to be controlled one-half by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and one-half by himself. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know if the gentleman has in mind any limitation upon the time that should be allotted to each Member who desires to speak. I apprehend there will probably be a number of requests.

Mr. MONDELL. I have not it in mind at this time. I have had requests for time varying from 5 to 15 minutes in each case, covering a period of about two hours and a quarter. Whether all of the gentlemen will be here, I do not know. Whether they will all desire to speak as long as they expected, I do not know. I assume that about two hours and a half would be consumed upon this side as the matter now appears.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman from Wyoming that the time to be allotted should be left largely to the control of the gentlemen who have charge of the time on the respective sides.

Mr. MONDELL. I expect to alternate with the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HEFLIN. Yielding from 5 to 6 to 10 minutes to each person?

Mr. MONDELL. Several gentlemen have asked for as much as 15 minutes. That is the longest time that has been suggested by any one speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming that the time be equally divided, to be controlled one-half by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those who are unable to be here to-day, and those who are here but who are not able to participate in the debate—for we know that many are necessarily absent making patriotic addresses elsewhere—be granted the right to extend their remarks in the RECORD, for the period of five legislative days, upon the subject of the resolution and subjects appropriate to Memorial Day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD upon this resolution for not exceeding five legislative days. Is there objection?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would there be any objection to making that 10 days?

Mr. MONDELL. I think it is not good practice to extend that privilege over any considerable period of time. Personally I would have no personal objection to 10 days, but I do not think it is good practice. I think my friend will agree with me that it is not. It occurs to me that whether gentlemen are here or not, they can prepare within five days what they desire to say on the subject.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I know some Members who are absent at this time and who probably will not be back within five days, who would like to avail themselves of that privilege.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I think the gentleman ought to consent in this matter for 10 days, because it is a very important matter and many Members are very busy on committees.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if any Member can not get in within five days he can secure an extension at some other time and insert the remarks he desires. This matter of allowing over 10 days or two weeks is bad practice. If any gentleman can not get in within five days, the House will undoubtedly give him the right to insert his remarks in the RECORD after that time.

Mr. MONDELL. And my request, of course, includes the right to those who speak to-day to extend and revise their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE FOR THE DAY.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], a soldier in the recent war, to act as Speaker pro tempore for the day. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen of the House, before I begin my remarks on the resolution I wish to say that it has occurred to me that there is possibly an unintentional omission in this resolution. We had hoped and expected and believed that it embraced all of those who had conspicuously served and sacrificed, but in writing the second paragraph of the resolution the last time a slight change was made which leaves the paragraph in a form which I fear does not with sufficient clearness include thanks to the members of the selective-service boards, men many of them veterans of former wars, who could not give their services in the field but who did render conspicuous service at home. At the proper time I shall ask that, on page 1, line 13, after the word "served," there be added the words "on the service boards"; or, if gentlemen prefer, "on the selective-service boards." Then, at the beginning of line 14, in order more clearly to embrace the character of this particular service, to insert, before the word "humane," the word "patriotic," so that the paragraph will read:

That the thanks of Congress are hereby extended to those who served on the selective-service boards and in the various auxiliary forces whose patriotic, humane, and benevolent work at home and on the field of battle contributed so greatly to the comfort and support of our valiant warriors.

The world is slowly emerging from under the shadow of the greatest and most devastating war and the most widespread and awful attendant terrorism, murder, pestilence, and famine in all the history of mankind.

At the beginning we hoped that our beloved country and its people would not be brought within the devouring and desolating flame of the world conflict, but the realization of that hope was impossible. The conflict that shook the very foundations of the world had its beginning in the clash of views on questions of such primary importance to all mankind that it was inevitable that we should become involved. Our country has grown so great and powerful, its interests are so widespread, its influence so all-pervading that we can not escape issues that involve the liberties of all mankind.

History will never adequately record and the human mind can never fully grasp the sum total of the misery and agony that the war and its attendant troop of horrors has brought to mankind, but we may at least take consolation in the fact that through the black and somber pattern which the demons of war have woven are shot the countless golden threads of idealism, loyalty, fidelity, faith, and devotion unto death which with the passing of the years will give the dominant tone to the picture as mankind, holding these virtues in grateful remembrance, shall seek to forget the horrors of the war.

No tongue or pen has yet given adequate expression to the matchless heroism of dauntless Belgium, the invincible gallantry of France, the unconquerable spirit of Briton, the fervid valor of Italy. They constitute a story that will make the history of the days of the Great War an exhaustless mine of matchless inspiration to mankind through all the centuries to come.

America's contribution to the war was invaluable from the beginning, for our limitless stores of food and war material were at all times the main reliance of the gallant Allies. Our entrance into the war as a fighting and effective force heralded the turning of the tide. Without detracting from the credit and the glory due the gallant nations and peoples that fought the good fight from the beginning, it may be said without boasting, and has been said by generous spokesmen of all the Allies, that it was the weight of our influence, the magnitude of our preparation, and, above all, the matchless valor of our men, that turned the scale, transformed impending defeat into glorious victory, and won the war. [Applause.]

While the names which will forever recall deathless deeds of heroism lie thick upon the pages of the history of the Great War as the leaves of Vallombrosa, none will shine brighter or hold so sacred a place in our hearts as Cantigny, Chateau-Thierry, the Argonne Forest, St. Mihiel, and all those fields where the valor of the citizen-soldiers of America humbled the pride and broke the lines of the veteran legions of military autocracy.

Our boys are returning from overseas and from the camps and training fields, where they have been faithfully performing the duty assigned them. The forces are being demobilized, the citizen-soldier is returning home, our people are laying aside the tasks and duties of war and taking up the occupations of peace, and it is fitting that we shall express the Nation's thanks and the Nation's appreciation of all those who served and sacrificed, and I have suggested that we do so in the following words:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 67) tendering the thanks of Congress to those who served, or gave others to the service of, the country in the Great War.

Resolved, etc., That the thanks of Congress are hereby extended to those who served in the armed forces of the United States in the war against the Imperial German Government and who, through their patriotic sacrifice, steadfast fidelity, brilliant strategy, and courageous service secured a victorious peace, gave to the world a new insight into the high ideals and lofty purposes of America, and left to future generations a splendid heritage of heroic achievement and noble devotion to duty.

That the thanks of Congress are hereby extended to those who served on the selective-service boards and in the various auxiliary forces, whose patriotic, humane, and benevolent work at home and on the field of battle contributed so greatly to the comfort and support of our valiant warriors.

That the thanks of Congress are hereby extended to the mothers, wives, and relatives who, patriotic and uncomplaining, gave their nearest and their dearest in the hour of the Nation's need, and its deep and heartfelt sympathy is extended to those whose kindred fell or were permanently disabled in the great struggle.

That Congress reverently expresses its profound appreciation of the sublime act of those who made the supreme sacrifice by giving their lives for their country and their country's cause.

Mr. Speaker, no resolution we can draw, no words we can command, fitly or fully express our heartfelt thanks and our sincere appreciation of the loyalty and devotion of our fighting men, those who served and ministered unto them, or the good folks at home who with tearful eyes bade the boys Godspeed and then turned to every good work which supported the men in the field and armed the Nation to its task.

With reverence we express the Nation's appreciation of those who gave their lives that the world might be a better place for others to live in, and in our heart of hearts we hold as the objects of our special care the gallant men who have returned to us with the honorable scars of war and those bereaved ones who mourn the unreturning brave. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker [applause], I take it this resolution will pass unanimously. I think it surely should.

It is eminently fitting and proper that the Congress in this public manner return the heartfelt thanks of our country to the men who served her so valiantly and so victoriously in the most stupendous war in the entire history of the human race, but American men, women, and children have already demonstrated their gratitude and pride in every way which human ingenuity could devise. We are only doing in solemn and official manner what the great, proud, pulsing, loving heart of America has expressed in enthusiastic and impromptu fashion. What we say will matter little, but what our soldiers did will never fade from human memory so long as the world endures. They demonstrated American prowess in arms to all the nations of the earth and raised our country's fame to a pinnacle of exceeding glory.

In my Arlington speech on Decoration Day, 1913, I said: "America is the most peaceable Nation on the globe, but at the same time is the most martial. The truth of this seeming paradox was proved in 1861, when at the first tap of the drum a whole people sprang to arms. In April, 1861, there were not 20,000 soldiers within the broad confines of the Republic, while in April, 1865, the continent trembled beneath the iron tread of 2,000,000 of as fine soldiers as the sun ever shone upon, some in blue and some in gray." It has been marvelously demonstrated in the World War just closed, wherein in a few months we accomplished the miracle of sending two millions and a half of armed men across the sea who turned the tide of battle on the red fields of France. So long as the world admires courage their valor will be chanted in song and celebrated in story. [Applause.]

While our soldiers in Europe were winning imperishable renown, we had 2,000,000 more in training camps in our own country fretting their hearts away because they were not permitted to join their brothers in arms "over there." Such a colossal achievement has no parallel in the annals of war. [Applause.] In addition to the four and one-half millions actually in the

Army and Navy service of our country, we had enrolled 13,000,000 more of military age in reserve. No such demonstration of warlike prowess was ever witnessed in any nation since God said "Let there be light." Let us fervently hope and pray that there will never be occasion or opportunity or necessity for a repetition of this astounding chapter in our history. May universal and eternal peace be the compensation for all the blood and treasure spent in the awful cataclysm which befell half the world.

"Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." That is one of the most beautiful and philosophical sentences written by John the Disciple whom Jesus loved. This paraphrase of that sentence is equally true and philosophical: "Greater love and higher honor hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his country, or offers so to do." Therefore all honor, all glory, all love be to the brave, patriotic, and self-sacrificing men of America who buckled on their armor and went forth to fight at the call of their beloved country.

There are tears for "the unreturning brave"; there are aid and tenderest compassion for the maimed and those whose health was broken in the service abroad or in home camps; there is a high resolve to succor the war widows and orphans in their sore distress; there is heartfelt gratitude to the living and the dead; there is sympathy unspeakable for the fathers and mothers whose sons lost their lives in the awful tragedy; there are profoundest thanks to Almighty God that He brought us through the bloody conflict safe and strong and hopeful for the future of our own country and of the whole world. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER]. [Applause.]

THE AMERICAN SOLDIER.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, America is proud of her soldiers, but not because they constitute a part of a military machine. The pride of Rome in her legions, the pride of France in the disciplined troops that followed Napoleon, the pride of Germany in her vast military machine has never been hers. The pride of America in her soldiers has ever been that they were citizen soldiers, called from their peaceful pursuits to service and sacrifice for the preservation of their liberty, the safety of their country, and the security of their homes. They served not for military distinction, not for fame or glory, not for place or power, but in fulfillment of their obligations as citizens, because they believed that any sacrifice was better than the surrender of all they held dear. It is this that has ever lent distinction to their service. It is this that has ever made their supreme sacrifice so solemn and so sacred.

Away back in the colonial days, when the Pilgrims landed on the rock-bound shores of New England, this service began and such sacrifice was made. To face the midnight attacks of their savage foes the Colonials became sentinel soldiers, guarding their first rude homes. To protect the westward migrations that through trackless forests, across uncharted plains, over snow-capped mountains, onward, ever onward toward the setting sun, moved to the occupancy of a continent, the pioneer became a soldier.

And then came the Revolution, a war of colonists against a powerful monarchy, a war of home-loving people against armies trained under Wellington in the Peninsular campaign, against professional soldiers, veterans of a hundred battle fields. The American soldier then was such as Paul Revere, who rode out under the silent stars through Lexington to Concord carrying the signal for the independence of a nation. They were men like those who—

> By the rude bridge that spanned the flood
> Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
> 'Twas there the embattled farmers stood
> And fired the shot heard 'round the world.

They were men like those who, during the terrible winter of Valley Forge, lived on flour mixed with water baked into cakes at open fires, of whom Lafayette wrote: "They were in want of everything; they had neither coats, hats, shirts, nor shoes," who left their bloody footprints in the snow and for the betterment of whose condition Washington stole away to kneel in agonizing prayer. They were the backwoodsmen under Ferguson and Morgan and Greene, who drove Cornwallis from the South and made possible his final surrender at Yorktown. These were the soldiers that ordained freedom for a continent and builded a nation which now leads the world.

Alike in character and purpose were the soldiers of the Civil War. The soldier of the Civil War was a soldier because he was a citizen, a husband, a father. He was simply, unaffectedly, earnestly a patriot. He loved his country because it sheltered his home, protected his family, guarded his fireside. He could say with Cicero, "Our country is the common parent of us all. Dear are our ancestors, dear are our children, dear our relatives and friends; and all these loves are contained in love of country." He had learned in his home life to be faithful and brave and true, and faithful and brave and true as he was at home so was he on the field of battle. No hardship could discourage him, no danger could dishearten him. Such was the soldier of the Civil War. Perhaps as never before men were uplifted and ennobled by devotion and sacrifice. The youth of the land were inspired. Their hearts were touched by fire. It was theirs to learn at the outset that life was a profound and passionate thing, and that death in a righteous cause is the supreme service man can render to his fellow men. Thus over and above the sordid plains of selfishness they saw the snowy heights of honor and of glory.

And then came the War with Spain. It was a little war, as wars are measured, but in its effects on the Nation it was tremendous. It was an unselfish war. It had in it no purpose that was not just and high. The call to arms was a call that made response a noble deed. In the cause of liberty and humanity again America unsheathed the sword. There was a veritable revival of patriotism. Our country had a larger meaning. Our flag had a greater beauty. The best of our youth went out from shops and factories, from the cornfields of the North and the cotton fields of the South, college boys and cowboys together in the ranks following the flag. The heroic age had come again. There was not in all the borders of the land a youth but knew there was something dearer than dollars and more to be desired than place or power, and by that knowledge they were uplifted and ennobled.

Plato declared that the soldiers of Marathon and the sailors of Salamis became the schoolmasters of Greece. True, indeed, was that statement; and so the soldiers of these, our wars, have been our teachers—teaching us the value of liberty, the sacredness of human rights, the blessings that are ours under a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

The American soldier of the present war was of like character and conduct. He went into the war with a full realization of what it meant. He was not given to speculation as to what was the particular reason which justified our participation in the war. But he knew that we had used every honorable means to avoid it and that those means had failed. He knew that we had suffered indignities and injuries which no self-respecting nation could ignore. He knew that the German attack was not only against Belgium and France and England, but was against civilization itself, and that if it succeeded our own liberties and our own institutions would be in peril. He knew that the mighty power he went to fight was the most powerful, the most ruthless, the most savage and relentless that ever drew the sword. Above all he knew his country called him and that no patriotic American ever had or ever could refuse that summons.

The American soldier passed no sleepless nights in solitude watching the armor he was to wear when next day he should receive the accolade of knighthood. He had no desire for display, no thought of distinction, no motive but duty. He loved his country and he knew its history. He shared in its ideals and believed its principles. He believed that this Government of ours was the best the world possessed or had ever known. He felt himself a part of it. It was his—his not only to admire and to love, but to serve and preserve.

And so he went across the seas to unknown dangers—to hardships, to wounds, to death—with a smile on his face and a prayer in his heart for the dear ones left at home. And how big and manly they looked as they went away. Well might the Red Cross nurse say as she saw them leaving the ship in France: "They are so big. They tower over everyone, and have great broad shoulders and big voices—just real, real men." Vigorous and strong, alert and virile, with keen and kindly eyes, and wearing ever the smile that comes from a true heart and a clean mind, they were the very incarnation of youth, wearing its glamor like a shining garment. [Applause.]

It was not strange that they excited the admiration of all who saw them. And how well they bore their part! It was our own martyr poet, Alan Seeger, who wrote his mother:

> Be sure I shall play the part well, for I was never in better health nor felt my manhood more keenly.

That was ever their thought, to play well their part, and they entered upon their work with the keenest interest and the most intense desire to succeed. With a confidence that came from accustomed success, with an assurance that was born of a knowledge of their capabilities, with a purpose so vigorous that failure never entered into their calculations, they entered upon their mighty task. And yet there was nothing of bravado in their attitude. They knew they must be taught, they knew they must learn their lessons, and there never were more mod-

est pupils than they were, learning the lessons of modern warfare from their experienced teachers.

And how the children loved them! I was shown with great pride a picture which a big stalwart farmer boy sent home to his family. He was marching along the street with one little one on his back, another on his arm, and still another holding his hand. And they were all proud and happy!

It occurs to me there is much in the striking fact that the soldier selected to send home to his family this simple picture of himself rather than one that might show him and be distinctive of his service as a soldier in the ranks.

In battle there were never better, braver soldiers than our own home boys, most of whom had never before carried a gun or fired a shot. In this war horrors had been magnified to an unimagined degree. But they were accepted as inevitable and met without a murmur or a tremor. In the trenches plastered with mud, stealing snatches of sleep on a board set into a wall of clay; watching the shells burst, wondering where the next would fall; dodging the bombs from flocks of airplanes; fixing their masks when the oncoming waves of poison gas came down the line; standing for hours at a peephole, watching for the enemies attack; fixing bayonets and crouched for the signal for "over the top"; rushing forward toward a storm of shrapnel, with smoke and flame and the thunder of the guns making a veritable hell of the battle field—these are some of the things they experienced when sometimes but a few weeks from home.

But they met all these with a smile and a jest. Even the seriously wounded sent to the hospitals kept their courage and good spirits. One of them wrote:

> Hospitals have become quite the rage among our best people. Almost all our upper classes are staying at them. For ridding yourself of useless appendages, finding out about yourself, your construction and interior decoration scheme, hospital treatment can not be beaten. Never attempt the vulgarity of getting up at mealtimes and thus betraying your base Army origin. Insist on having all your meals served as you recline on your cot.

In a hospital a visitor paused at the bedside of a youth whose head, both arms, and chest were covered with bandages. "Hello, my man," he said, "how are you feeling?" "Fine, sir, fine." was the reply. "You see I was very lucky, sir; I got a whole shell to myself."

Another, visiting a hospital after a severe battle, said:

"Not one word of regret, not a tear, not a complaint in a hospital full of torn, mangled, dismembered boys, many of whom had not been six weeks in the front ranks."

And as they lived and fought and suffered, so they died. After the battle of Chateau-Thierry a French writer visited the battle field and wrote to a Paris paper the next day:

"These wonderful Americans fight like our own French poilus did the first year of the war. Their beautiful young bodies were lying straight out and their faces were always toward the enemy."

[Applause.]

One of our own boys writing home said:

"This morning I went over the battle ground; it was raining. I found one of our boys in the thick of a wheat field. He was still warm, but he was dead. He had fixed his wounds as best he could. He had his mother's and sweetheart's pictures in one hand and his letters from home in the other. He had died looking at them."

Innumerable incidents like these could be given. In the letters home sent by those who survived the stories of heroic bravery in the face of almost certain death, of sacrifices made to save a wounded comrade, of the deliberate choice of death rather than surrender, could be multiplied almost indefinitely.

And now in this our day of victory we have met to honor those who served so well and are returned to us and to pay the tribute of our loving remembrance to those who will return to us no more, who now sleep on the hillsides of France, who have made for us the supreme sacrifice.

Many of you have seen Daniel C. Frenche's "Angel of Death and the Sculptor." It is considered one of the most beautiful pieces of statuary yet produced by an American. In the midst of his work the young sculptor chiseling at the face of his sphinx, his form tense with the eagerness of his desire, his face lit up by the fire of his ambition, is suddenly interrupted. The angel of death touches him as with uplifted hand he aims to strike another blow. Transfixed he stands and turns to meet his fate; dauntless, yet with the anguish of the hour struggling for the mastery; brave, yet with the awful thought of buried hopes, of broken plans, of blasted ambitions pictured in his saddened eye and quivering lip.

How well that typifies those who have made the supreme sacrifice in this war. Not one only but thousands of brave young hearts whose uplifted hands were busy carving out their ambitious plans, their eager desires, their earnest hopes, did the angel of death touch with his cold, inexorable hand.

And so our hour of victory is saddened by its awful cost. We strive to strike a pæon, but it wanes into a dirge. We strive to remember only the gallant array, with banners flying and armor bright, but we can not forget the gaps in the ranks. We strive to think of the hero as he leads the column "over the top" to glorious victory, but our thoughts will turn, in spite of us, to that dear one whom the dumb turf wraps in its mantle of silence "somewhere in France." But it is said, "No bar of endless night exiles the brave." And to us now they stand transfigured in the halls of memory, secure from change, beautiful forevermore, and with the light of the eternal morning in their eyes.

Mr. Speaker, we shall not be worthy of our position as American representatives unless we shall from such remembrances feel a deeper love for the country for which they gave their lives and a greater feeling of responsibility for the trust imposed on us that we may make and keep it ever worthy of their sacrifice.

> For the youth they gave and the blood they gave,
> For the strength that was our stay,
> For every marked or nameless grave
> On the steel-torn Flanders way,
> We who are whole of body and soul,
> We have a debt to pay.
> For the youth they gave and the blood they gave,
> We must render back the due;
> For every marked or nameless grave
> We must pay with a service true;
> Till the scales stand straight with even weight
> And the world is a world made new.

[Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, our soldiers were drawn from the body of a brave and mighty people. They represented the vigorous and intrepid manhood of America. An Ohio boy who came to Camp Sheridan, in my State, was the chauffeur of a wealthy young man in Cleveland, but in the great army of democracy he became the captain of his former employer, then a private in the ranks. Our soldiers were the soldiers of the people. The story of the American soldier's advent into war and his brilliant triumph in battle reads like a thrilling romance. I saw him turn from the peaceful pursuits of life, bid father and mother good-by, don the uniform of his country, and embark upon a sea thick with deadly mines and murderous submarines. And there he stood undaunted, with the light of battle in his eye, proud to be the guardian of American liberty. [Applause.] It is well and fitting for us to pay the tribute of our love to the boys who met the supreme test of their day and staked their lives to preserve American liberty.

Peter the Hermit, addressing the Crusaders to the Holy Land, said:

> Brave knights, remember the deeds of your ancestors.

Edmund Burke said:

> They who care nothing for the deeds of their ancestors need not look forward to the doings of their posterity.

Mr. Speaker, we love the records of our people. We point with pride to their doings in the drama of history. The courage displayed by the soldier in battle represents the character and courage of the people at home. We are not only satisfied with the conduct of our boys on the battle fields of France, but we are proud to claim them as our representatives and happy to have the world judge us by the record that they have made. [Applause.] I shall never forget the spring of 1918, when the Germans were blasting and burning their way toward Paris. We dreaded to see the headlines in the newspapers. The Germans were advancing and driving back the Allied Armies. The only doubts and misgivings that we ever had arose from the fear that Germany would break through the lines before our boys could reach the battle front in France, but when we learned that they were there we breathed a sigh of relief and looked forward with perfect confidence to the day when they would strike the decisive blow and it would all be over "over there." [Applause.]

Gentlemen, in the darkest hour of the world's history our boys took our flag and crossed the sea. It became the bow of promise and the bow of hope to the war-worn armies of our Allies. They turned to the American soldier as did the Israelites of old to Aaron to stretch forth the healing rod and give the land deliverance. [Applause.] Fathers and mothers, weeping over their sons dead in battle, praised and hugged the flag of our country; their daughters, living in dread and fear of the brutal Hun, kissed and caressed its sacred folds. [Applause.] Aye, the mothers of France and their daughters kissed the rifle barrels of our soldiers and with tears streaming down their

faces said, "You will save us; won't you?" [Applause.] And our brave boys, thinking of home, mother, sister, wife, and sweetheart, looked into the sad and sorrowful faces of these heroic and long-suffering women of France and said, "Yes; we will drive out the murderers or die in the attempt." [Applause.]

Our brave boys unfurled Old Glory against an army whose mighty forebears had conquered imperial Rome. They carried it against an army whose seasoned warriors had driven back for three years the mighty armies of the people of Napoleon and Wellington. And from their first baptism of fire to their victorious march toward Berlin through the gates of Sedan they displayed a skill and courage in battle that sent terror into the ranks of the enemy and won for them the love and admiration of the civilized world. [Applause.]

The President of France said of them:

They flung themselves into the combat with manly contempt of danger and smiling disregard of death.

[Applause.]

Marshal Foch, of France, said:

These American soldiers ask nothing better than to go to their death.

[Applause.]

Sir Robert Borden, premier of Canada, said:

The American soldier brought victory out of defeat on the western front.

[Applause.]

This is the glorious record of the American soldier. When Gen. Haig said to his men, "Your backs are to the wall. There is nothing to do but to die," and when the brave French soldiers were worn and weary and covered over with blood and sweat, fighting on but falling back nearer and nearer to Paris, the American crusaders of liberty—the marvel and miracle of the age—were hurrying to the battle front in France. [Applause.]

The record of their service is radiant with heroic achievements. And at Chateau-Thierry the night before that mighty drive Germany had marshaled the pick and flower of her army in front of the American line. Here stood the hitherto victorious Prussian Guard. They had rested for this occasion and were now in the pink of condition, all dressed in new uniforms to be worn in the march upon Paris. Germany had driven back the army of Belgium, of France, and of Great Britain, and now she desired to add one more star of glory to her crown before she ended the war in victory and she determined to break through the American line and defeat the American Army. Ah, that awful night before the mighty drive. The President of France was making ready to move the seat of government from Paris; men and women and children were fleeing panic-stricken from the city. The mighty drive was imminent. The world was on tiptoe. Our boys, brave, undaunted, and determined, were ready and waiting for the morrow. [Applause.]

In the dead of the night our officers went up and down the line and said to our heroic soldiers, "Boys, you must hold them to-morrow." And our boys answered back, "We'll hold 'em." Realizing that Germany would make the most stupendous effort of all to break through at that point, just before day our officers came down the line again and said to our boys, "You must hold 'em, boys. They must not pass." And our brave boys answered back, "We'll hold 'em. They shall not pass." [Applause.] These were the words of the brave soldiers of the Rainbow Division and the brave American marines coming from every State in the American Union. [Applause.]

The great day dawned. The mighty drive was on. Germany was bombarding Paris across a distance of 75 miles with the biggest gun in the world. Her aeroplanes were dropping bombs on the city. German artillery was thundering on the western front. Bulletins from the scene of battle were going into Paris. The first bulletin to Paris read about like this: "Germans advancing, French fighting bravely but falling back. Americans holding." Second bulletin: "Germans advancing, French still fighting bravely. Americans counterattacking." [Applause.] Third bulletin: "Germans still advancing. French fighting heroically. Germans in full retreat, losses heavy, as Americans advance." [Applause.] Next bulletin: "There are no Germans south of the Marne save the wounded and the dead." [Applause.] America had struck the decisive blow and had saved the liberty of the world. [Applause.]

Brave soldiers, God forbid that we shall ever prove recreant in our obligations to you for your heroic service to your country and to the world. [Applause.] These men, Mr. Speaker, fought in the greatest war of all history. No soldier before them ever rendered service of such far-reaching importance. They stood not only between us and the overthrow of our Government and the loss of our liberty, but they saved the civilization of the world. [Applause.] They rendered a service to mankind that will live until the sun grows cold and the leaves of the judgment book unfold. [Applause.] And where are they, the Hapsburgs and Hohenzollerns? Gone. They all are gone. Autocracy has fallen. The sword of the Kaiser has perished. Democracy is triumphant and God's cause is marching on. [Applause.] All hail to our brave boys who fought for and saved civilization and liberty. [Applause.] All hail to the living American soldier, and all hail to their brave comrades who sleep in France where the poppies grow! [Applause.] Sleep on, brave soldiers; sleep in the mellow moonlight of our own proud memories. You have achieved the last supreme adventure, and you died in the noblest cause that ever engaged the services of a soldier. [Applause.] Sleep on until the glad reunion time with your brave comrades who survive; sleep till the light of eternity's morning shall break beyond the mystic mountains. Your names are preserved in the Valhalla of American fame and written in the Lamb's book of life. [Loud applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN]. [Applause.]

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I heartily approve the resolutions offered by the gentleman from Wyoming, proposing a vote of thanks to the men who served in our Army and Navy in the Great World War.

It is altogether appropriate that the Congress of the United States on this sacred Memorial Day should suspend its ordinary business and pass a resolution in recognition of the service these men rendered their country and humanity.

Our soldiers, seamen, and marines are clearly entitled to the profoundest thanks we can express. They richly deserve the highest praise we can bestow. They are eminently worthy the deepest gratitude we can feel.

They performed a service to their country under circumstances and conditions which commands our highest admiration. Their service was rendered in a great crisis—in a time of need, in an hour of danger, when all we had was at stake. In this critical juncture these men donned the uniform of their country, marched forth at the call of duty, guided their country safely through the perils which beset it, and carried the flag to victory.

It was a hazardous service which these men performed. It endangered their health, exposed their bodies to wounds and mutilation and placed their lives in jeopardy. In performing this service 71,000 died of disease, 230,000 were wounded, and 50,000 were killed in action. But on and on they went, never retreating, always going forward, ever advancing until the German Army surrendered.

This service required personal sacrifice on the part of our soldiers. They left their homes, bid good-by to friends, relatives, fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, and sweethearts. They closed their business establishments, relinquished positions, gave up employment, left institutions of learning, and lost opportunities of every kind and character. Congress can not by any vote of thanks, nor can the American people by any expression of appreciation, compensate these men for the sacrifices they have made. But these brave men will, nevertheless, appreciate our kind words. So let this vote of thanks be recorded, and let us all in the future years avail ourselves of every opportunity, by word and by deed, to encourage, to cheer, and to honor these men, who in an hour of public danger and at such great personal sacrifice rendered such signal service to their country.

Furthermore, in rendering this service these men displayed extraordinary courage, splendid bravery, and sublime heroism. Above all, it was an unselfish service, freely given for others. So we honor our soldiers, seamen, and marines of the Great World War. We salute them as heroes, patriots, and benefactors!

ALL WERE HEROES.

The vote of thanks which Congress expresses to-day extends to all the soldiers, seamen, and marines who served in our Army and Navy in the Great World War. We make no distinction between the men who were called overseas and those who were in training camps at home. They all manifested the same magnificent spirit, the same willingness to make, if necessary, the supreme sacrifice in the service of the country. But it was the fate, or shall I say the privilege, of some to be called abroad and to participate in those great battles which added so much to the glory of our country. These men fought with skill, initiative, dash, courage, and bravery never surpassed. They met every requirement. They failed in no particular. They demonstrated that the American soldier is the best on earth. They added honor, renown, and glory to their country. They earned the eternal gratitude of all mankind. They turned back the tide of German barbarism and saved Christian civilization.

Through their unselfish, heroic, and noble deeds the torch of liberty and freedom will burn throughout ages to come with increased light and luster.

THE FUTURE.

We know not what the future may bring forth. May peace ever reign in this beloved country. May war clouds never again rise above our national horizon. But, whatever may come, let us never cease to honor the soldiers of this Republic. Any nation that neglects the men who have served in its army and navy and who have fought its battles thereby exhibits an ingratitude unworthy a great, generous, patriotic people.

The influence of the deeds which our soldiers perform will not end to-day, to-morrow, next week, or next year. It will go on and on forever. The country which they saved will remain the home of millions of the happiest people on earth. The flag which they followed and for which they fought will continue to be the emblem of liberty and freedom and a light to the people of every nation on earth. Through the service which these men—our soldiers, seamen, and marines—performed the Union will live, our free institutions will endure, the Stars and Stripes still wave, and the good which these brave men did will abide with our people, and among all the nations of the world, until time shall be no more. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY]. [Applause.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, this is the greatest Memorial Day our country has ever known. For more than half a century this day has been sacred in our annals. Annually we have paid homage to the brave men of the Rebellion. For the past 20 years we have added to their number the departed of the Spanish War, and to-day grouped with all those heroes, whose number of dead is increased as the years roll by, we add the nearly 80,000 of our citizens who have made the supreme sacrifice during the World War.

It is fitting that the resolution under which these exercises are being held does not refer solely to those who lie buried in foreign soil. Honor is due, and will be gladly paid, to the survivors of all three wars for whom this day is set aside.

The resolution rightly includes those not actually in the armed forces, together with the mothers, wives, and relatives who sacrificed so much that victory might be attained. It is therefore very apparent that since the establishment of Memorial Day this one is the greatest and most important.

We will never disassociate Memorial Day from its original object, but we can very rightly add to it the honors due heroes of later periods in our country's history. It is very proper to act on the pending resolution, and Congress is the only place where the official thanks of the American people can be recorded to the 4,000,000 Americans engaged in this most recent struggle between the nations. It was through congressional action they were called upon to perform their patriotic duty, and it must therefore be through our action that they shall receive due recognition of their services. I join most heartily with my colleagues in this body in voicing my approval of the pending resolution.

RECORD OF TWENTY-SIXTH DIVISION.

Let me make special reference to some of the organizations in which Massachusetts was particularly interested, and a few individual men of whom there should be permanent mention in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Together with all other sections of the country we take pride in the local organizations. I desire to incorporate in my remarks a brief summary of the statistics of the Twenty-sixth Division, taken from the official program of the parade held in Boston last month.

The Yankee Division was organized in Boston August 22, 1917, from units of the National Guard troops of the New England States and a quota of National Army troops at Camp Devens, Mass. It was trained at various places in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. It sailed from Hoboken, N. J., September 7, 1917, and landed at St. Nazaire, France, on September 21, 1917. For four months the division was in the training area and furnished details for various lines of work, making preparations for the large body of troops which began to arrive soon after January 1, 1918.

The division took part in eight different campaigns, receiving its baptism of fire in the Chemin des Dames sector and using the first rolling barrage of fire ever fired by American artillery; in the Toul sector, being engaged with the enemy at Bois Brule (Apremont) April 10, 12–13; Seipcheprey, April 20, 21; Humbert Plantation, May 27; Richecourt, May 30; Xivray-Marvoisin, June 16; in the Pas Fini sector, where the Twenty-sixth relieved the Second Division, the line running through the famous Bois de Belleau and the villages of Vaux and Bouresches, with the town of Chateau-Thierry a short distance to the southeast; later in the Aisne-Marne offensive, the division repeated its attacks during the week of July 18–25 and netted a total distance of advance of 17½ kilometers, freeing the towns of Torcy, Givry, Belleau, Epieds, Trugny, and Etrepilly; the Rupt sector, occupied prior to the St. Mihiel offensive; in the St. Mihiel offensive, attacking by a night march in order to occupy Vigneulles, thus effecting a junction between the American attacks on the west and south of the St. Mihiel salient; in the Troyon section, freeing the villages of Thillot, St. Maurice, Vigneulles, Vieville, and Hannonville, all of which held a civilian population that had suffered for four years under German occupation; the last action being in the Meuse-Argonne offensive, where the division was for 26 days continually exposed to severe artillery and machine-gun fire, finishing with a month on the famous Verdun front, which was a month of suffering and of glory.

Either the division as a whole or portions of it were cited or commended 19 different times in American and French orders.

It is extremely gratifying to me that the first of these citations for any former National Guard organization was given, on April 26, 1918, to the One hundred and fourth Infantry, which contained four companies from my district.

The division captured 3,148 prisoners and its total casualties were 11,955.

It may be further noted that the first American to capture a German prisoner was Sergt. John Letzing, of Company E, One hundred and fourth Infantry, Twenty-sixth Division, who received the war cross.

AWARD OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDALS OF HONOR.

It is particularly fitting to refer to the award of the congressional medal of honor to two privates of the Twenty-sixth Division, and I herewith insert the verbatim copy of General Orders, No. 20:

The medal of honor was awarded to two privates of the Twenty-sixth Division in the following terms:

HEADQUARTERS TWENTY-SIXTH DIVISION,
AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES,
France, March 8, 1919.

General Orders, No. 2.

The division commander is pleased to announce the award by the President, in the name of the Congress, of the medal of honor to the following-named enlisted men for acts of gallantry and intrepidity, above and beyond the call of duty, performed in action against the enemy while members of this command:

Pvt. (First Class) George Dilboy (deceased), Company H, One hundred and third Infantry. (Medal awarded Dec. 5, 1918.)

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action with the enemy on July 18, 1918, near Belleau, France.

After his platoon had gained its objective along a railroad embankment, Pvt. Dilboy, accompanying his platoon leader to reconnoiter the ground beyond, was suddenly fired upon by an enemy machine gun from 100 yards. From a standing position on the railroad track, fully exposed to view, he opened fire at once, but failing to silence the gun, rushed forward with his bayonet fixed through a wheat field toward the gun emplacement, falling within 25 yards of the gun with his right leg nearly severed above the knee and with several bullet holes in his body. With undaunted courage, he continued to fire into the emplacement from a prone position, killing two of the enemy and dispersing the rest of the crew.

Pvt. (First Class) Michael J. Perkins (deceased), Company D, One hundred and first Infantry. (Medal awarded Feb. 20, 1919.)

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action with the enemy at Belleau Bois, France, October 27, 1918.

Pvt. Perkins voluntarily and alone crawled to a German "pill box" machine-gun emplacement from which grenades were being thrown at his platoon. Awaiting his opportunity, when the door was again opened and another grenade thrown, he threw a bomb inside, bursting the door open, and then drawing his trench knife, rushed into the emplacement. In a hand to hand struggle he killed or wounded several of the occupants and captured about 25 prisoners, at the same time silencing seven machine guns.

(Signed) HARRY C. HALE,
Major General Commanding.

FINAL REVIEW AND PARADE.

With thousands of other citizens of New England, it was my privilege to witness the final review and parade of the Twenty-sixth Division at Camp Devens on April 22 and at Boston on April 25. With these two events the brilliant history of the Twenty-sixth Division as an organization was brought to a close, but the memory of their achievements will be their richest legacy to all future generations.

I watched those two parades with mingled feelings of gladness and of sorrow. Gladness that New England's sons had so nobly acquitted themselves; sorrow that there lay buried in foreign soil so many of their comrades.

The most impressive event at Camp Devens was witnessing an elderly man as he was escorted across the field and presented to the commanding officer. All others were in uniform, he alone being dressed in civilian garb. Why this distinction? This elderly man was the father of Michael J. Perkins, and the commanding officer pinned on his breast the congressional medal

of honor which had been awarded his son on February 20, but which the father received for his son who lay buried "Over There."

The distinguishing feature of the Boston parade was the passing of the wounded soldiers in at least 500 automobiles, followed by a large white flag, with a golden star, having beneath it the significant figures 1,730, the number of men of the division who had willingly made the supreme sacrifice and whom the division had left behind on its return to this country.

The division returned to Camp Devens and was at once demobilized. Thus ended the glorious service and splendid record of this division, it having the proud distinction of being the first National Guard organization to be sent overseas as well as rivaling in brilliancy of record any other National Guard or National Army organization.

Mr. Speaker, you readily can see my purpose has not been to render flowery praises to the Twenty-sixth Division but simply to make their achievements part of our record in consideration of the pending resolution.

New England also furnished another complete division, known as the Seventy-sixth. This division was only for a short period under fire but, like the Twenty-sixth, acquitted itself valiantly.

Our men were, of course, scattered throughout many different organizations and in all places were found ready and willing to do their entire duty.

TRIBUTE TO COLLEGE MEN AND WOMEN.

New England abounds in educational institutions and I think we can do no less than make special mention of the gallantry and great achievements of the college men and women in the war. Almost at the breaking out of the war the training camp was substituted for the classroom. Every college can to-day be proud of the record of its undergraduate students.

We have frequently read of the work done by the Smith College girls, young ladies selected particularly as physically able to endure the hardships of war service and splendidly equipped and supported by their college mates at home.

WHITTLESEY AND "THE LOST BATTALION."

I desire to incorporate as a part of the permanent record the services of one of the men from my district who proved himself an especial hero of the war. Lieut. Col. Charles W. Whittlesey, much better known as "Go-to-Hell Whittlesey," before entering college resided with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Frank R. Whittlesey, in Pittsfield, Mass. He graduated from Williams College and later became a practicing attorney in New York City. From there he entered the first Plattsburg training camp. He was commissioned a captain and was later assigned to the Seventy-seventh Division.

The special feat that he performed in holding out against strong German forces, which surrounded his battalion in the Argonne Forest, made him the idol of the United States when the cables bore the early reports of the wonderful experience of this section of the Three hundred and eighth Infantry. His reply to the demand to surrender was in three well-known words.

Perhaps the story is most concisely told in the following extract from an editorial which I give herewith:

> The bit of profanity in the story not even the most pious American would have deleted. To the "lost battalion"—it was trapped in a hollow in the Argonne Forest—came a message, typewritten in the best German headquarters style:
>
> "Americans, you are surrounded on all sides. Surrender in the name of humanity. You will be well treated!"
>
> Maj. Whittlesey, the American commander, had no typewriter, and his reply was verbal. The Germans understood it. There has probably never been a terser response to an enemy sure of his prey and demanding capitulation. Whittlesey's profanity pleased his men so much that their cheers rolled over to the German lines.
>
> * * * But the battalion, with its rations exhausted, was providentially found at last and restored to the Seventy-seventh Division by its American brothers in arms. The beleaguered men would not be starved out; they would not be shelled or sniped out; they hung on with waning strength but stout hearts, their ammunition running so short that orders were given to fire only point blank at an advancing German. Day after day passed without relief. At last it came when hope of rescue had been given up. * * * The glory of their heroic resistance can never fade.

So to-day Massachusetts joins hands with her sister States in extending its hearty thanks to her and their valiant sons. From the days of the Revolution, Massachusetts has always been prominent in the martial affairs of the Nation. This war was no exception. The valor of her sons was tested and found true in war's crucible. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW]. [Applause.]

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the inspiration of such an hour as this is all-compelling. Vital and patriotic as are the demands of routine legislation to which we address ourselves every day, it seems, after all, that it would almost profane the holy impact of this Memorial Day if the wheels of necessary legislation were to grind steadily on without our pausing as the grateful lawmakers of a grateful Nation to lay our tribute of love, and maybe of tears, at the feet of the living and the graves of the dead who offered their all for the safety of America and the freedom of the world.

Frankly, I am yet just a bit under that feeling of repression which any brand-new Member of Congress feels when he has any measure of commendable modesty in his soul, and under this feeling of restraint I first declined when I was invited by his honor, our beloved minority leader, to have some part in the patriotic utterance of this hour. But I soon "moved to reconsider" when I thought of the fact that a declination in favor of the older Members might mark me as recreant to the first call of duty; and if I know my heart I came here, as Henry Grady used to say, "with a sense of consecration," determined, in the language of the country-school patron, to "sign for a full scholar" as a Member of the Sixty-sixth Congress. And to be right honest about it, Mr. Speaker, I plead guilty to the soft impeachment of loving to make a speech when I have something to say. I came by it naturally. My father, who was a teacher as well as a farmer, was a cross between a Frenchman, an Englishman, and an Irishman, and my mother was a full-blooded woman, and I just had to talk when I reached this mundane sphere.

Ever since that hour at high noon on the 4th of March, when I was born a Member of this historic body, I have felt that I would love for my first speech in this House to be an earnest plea for an all-embracing Americanism. No one who was present can ever forget that hour. When the swing and the sweep of the patriotic war songs were yet upon the audience, when we had sung "America" and "The Star-Spangled Banner" with a zest and a spirit it seemed I had never heard before, when that mighty audience had been electrified beyond the power of words by that wonderful voice in the gallery that rang out like a silver bell above the chorus of thousands—

> Turn the dark clouds inside out
> Till the boys come home—

and then when somebody devoutedly called for a serious note, and Uncle JOE CANNON—God bless him—sent the request that was a sermon from his honored gray hairs for us to sing "God be with you 'till we meet again," and tears, crystal with the light of the skies, flashed answer in a thousand eyes, with many Congressmen not ashamed of this tender evidence of reverence and love, I was gripped and swayed and "made over" by a scene that will make me a better American forevermore. I saw Republicans and Democrats, who but an hour before had been glaring at each other, scolding at each other across party lines, now merged into one great American brotherhood of God-fearing patriotism that would have made the spirits of Washington and Lafayette; of Abraham Lincoln, the typical American; and Henry W. Grady, who died, as John Temple Graves eloquently said, "literally loving a nation into peace," I tell you, my colleagues, it was enough to make these enthroned and immortal spirits, "who rule us from their urns," foregather yonder in the citadel of the eternities and lift new voice of praise and thanksgiving to the God of Nations! [Applause.]

And I came away from the holy impulses of that high and ardent hour, determined that I would never make a bitter, narrow, partisan speech on the floor of this House. And while I am a Democrat, without apology, and know why I am what I am, and while I expect to stand uncringingly for the fundamentals of my political faith, I here and now declare, what every other patriot in this House must surely feel, that the cardinal plank of my congressional creed will be an unselfish stand for 100 per cent Americanism and an emancipated humanity.

I indorse with all heartiness what I heard a great and good man say the other day—that he believed that the supremest need of this reconstruction Congress was a party armistice at least for the period of reconstruction legislation, a season when that intrepid spirit of fellowship that made young Democrats and young Republicans, scions of the bravest American sires, charge side by side up Vimy Ridge and up through the Argonne Forest against a common foe, may have opportunity here to do its perfect work as we build together for the future of America and the safety of all mankind. [Applause.]

That was a high day in American fellowship, a new era, if you will, in the prophecy of upward-reaching humanity, when William Howard Taft, a former Republican President, and Woodrow Wilson, the present Democratic President, walked arm in arm on the platform in New York and blended their honest hearts and mighty voices in behalf of peace for a war-stricken, sorrowing world. What a splendid picture, if war is ever splendid, when the legions of liberty became the legions

of God as they fought side by side for the overthrow of selfish autocracy in order that the nuptials of Peace and Liberty might be celebrated in the Temple of Happiness among the children of men. And how much more splendid, surely the Prince of Peace must see, when the emancipated, enlightened nations of earth shall clasp their hands in a sacred covenant that swords shall be beaten into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks, while the hungry heart of a forward-looking humanity shall climb daily upward in subjective and objective development—

Upward toward the better through God's restless tide of years.

Inasmuch as many honest but mistaken Americans in both parties have forgotten the issues involved long enough, and the path by which peace was won long enough, to call for America's President to stay away from the peace table during the most eventful crisis in the history of mankind, I find myself greatly inclined to ask these gentlemen, in all good fellowship, if they have forgotten who is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of this Republic? And I would like to know if it is not the right and the duty of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy to go where the Army and Navy have already gone for the glory of the American flag and the battling legions of eternal right? [Applause.]

And I believe, too, that we face the challenge of a new national vigilance for the proper guardianship of that red-blooded Americanism which we champion to-day. Because I believe with Emerson that America is God's best national effort in behalf of the human race; because I believe that these American ideals should be kept pure and inviolate for all that they may mean to this Nation and humanity. I believe that in the reconstruction guardianship of the fruits of our victory no friend of Prussian autocracy and no sympathizer with a godless and flagless Bolshevism should be allowed to set foot on American soil for a thousand years. This is not a narrow policy; this is simply a sane application of the doctrine of "safety first." And for the sake of this "safety first" I believe that the 10,000,000 aliens in this country who have been content to seek their fortunes under the protecting ægis of the American flag, but who have refused to be assimilated by American ideals, should be dug up to the very last man and made to kiss the American flag that protects them or go back to the lands from which they came. [Applause.]

Thoughtful men are everywhere agreed that despite our baptism of sorrow, in which so many stars of service have been turned into stars of gold, America and Americans emerge from their part in the greatest war of history infinitely richer in our subjective life and infinitely stronger in the affections of mankind than if we had stood aloof while freedom shrieked and democracy wept and died. We have had the birth of a new patriotism. Time was when we looked upon the Stars and Stripes as a beautifully decorated flag, fit only to be given to the breezes on the Fourth of July; but now, since this flag has been dipped in human tears, drenched in human sorrow, and consecrated afresh by American blood, we look at our flag with a new devotion—often through "a mellow mist of tears"—as the insignia of a Nation's hopes and the emblem, thank God, of freedom everywhere. We have had the birth of a new national solidarity. It can never again be "North" and "South," as it used to be. Four boys in khaki stood on the sidewalk one night as I came down from my office in Atlanta. Throughout the war I have made it a rule, as many of you have done, to shake hands with soldiers on every side, and say to them, "I could not go to the front and fight, my boy, but I can give a handshake, wrapped up in a God bless you, to the boy who went or was ready to go for me. I shake hands with you for your mother and your country and hope you will be a soldier of the cross as well as a soldier of the flag."

And may I turn aside to say just here, Mr. Speaker, that I know but one thing more beautiful in all the world than the American flag; that is the American boy in uniform, who was willing to die to keep that flag floating over your home and mine. [Applause.] And I believe that the man who was "ready and rearing to go" is just as much a hero in spirit as the man who went over the top.

But back to my boys on the sidewalk. "Where are you from?" I asked of one. "Georgia," was the reply. "And you?" I asked of the second. "Georgia," came the answer. "And you?" I asked of No. 3. And with a voice as sharp as a knife blade he answered, "New York State." And the same answer came from No. 4. And then I put my arms around them all as near as I could and said: "This is one of the beautiful compensations that the war has brought—the sons of those that followed Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson and the sons of those that followed Grant and Sherman fighting side by side for one common flag and fraternizing together in a happy quartette of beautiful faith and friendship." This, Mr. Speaker, is the new Nation that we have to-day. And the last capstone in the temple of our new national fellowship will be laid in wonder and in joy—the wonder of the onlooking world and the joy of the children of all the gallant soldiers of the sixties who fought and fell on either side—when this Government shall declare that there shall be no longer any lines of cleavage between the loyal sons of "Uncle Sam"—that the same pension benefits shall be shared alike by the Blue and the Gray—for the fast-thinning lines of the soldiers of the South, "grizzled, grand, and gray," have marched in unmurmuring loyalty for half a hundred years to the Treasury of the Nation and helped to pay the pensions of their victorious brothers—yea, and have proven the limit of their unfailing Americanism by giving their sons and their grandsons through two victorious wars on the altar, thank God, of our common flag. [Applause.]

And we have brought out of the war another great blessing in the birth of a new world vision and fellowship, for we have learned that America can no more "draw her immaculate robes aside" and live apart from the rest of the world than China could build a wall around herself and live without national stagnation and international death.

But if I were called on to pack within one sentence humanity's greatest victory as the result of this war I would declare that it is a new discovery of the value of humanity itself. Through the weary centuries human life has been a chattel. A star-chamber session of kings and kinglets—a flip of a coin or a turn of the thumb—and nations, without warrant, without inclination, and without consultation, have been thrown at each other's throats before the rising of another sun. That day, thank God, is forever passed. And it is America's proud boast and her priceless heritage that she has helped to decree that never again shall small and helpless nations be changed overnight on the checkerboard of kings. But I believe, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, that the greatest compensation that has come to America's inner life has been the birth of a new unselfishness and a new spiritual power. "Others," "others," "others"—this is the new word in the American vocabulary. It has been written anew on the lintels of the American heart and on the burnished ceiling of the American sky. [Applause.]

The sweetest story that has come to me among all the wonderful stories of faith and heroism that the war has furnished was brought by a wounded soldier fresh from France. He told my friend, Dr. W. F. Powell, pastor of the First Baptist Church, of Asheville, of how a brave American boy had told him and his companions on the deck of the ship and around the camp fire in France of his last day with his mother in America—how they went together to church and sat together at the Lord's table. Together they heard the minister say, again and again, "This is my body broken for you." And then that brave American mother said as her first-born went away: "It is breaking my heart for you to go, my son, but it would break it worse, far worse, for you not to want to go. If you must die in freedom's cause, remember that your sacrifice is well pleasing to your Master, whose sacrificial death you commemorated to-day." Over the top the brave boy went, and was shot to pieces in no man's land, and was carried bleeding and dying to the emergency hospital, where Red Cross nurses and doctors supplied by your unselfish love bent over him with tender ministries to the very gates of death. And when one of the doctors came into the death chamber he smiled through his tears and said: "You can't tell me—I know that that Christian soldier saw his Savior face to face before he died. And casting his eyes on His broken and bleeding form he smiled like the dawn of the heaven into which he was going, and said, 'Lord Jesus, this is my body broken for you.'"

Ah, men and women of America, rejoicing to-day in our blood-bought freedom, let us determine as individual units in our great new-born national fellowship, in our measureless mission to the sons and daughters of men, that if our soldiers were ready to break their bodies for us and for humanity let us be ready to break our purses and all our selfish ideals in order that America may be kept clean for them—for those who stagger back to us maimed or blind, reaching out their hands for encouragement from the Nation for which they offered their all. We have learned that if it required a sober soldier to fight well it will require a sober citizen to live well, and this is America's new mission to the peoples who have been set free. It was a high note, Mr. Speaker, in the address of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] when he declared that the cost of this war—this colossal task thrust upon an unprepared and pacific Nation—is all forgotten in the glory of the victory that has been won; and to the sacred guardianship of the fruits of that victory we pledge again on this National Memorial Day "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

This, Mr. Speaker, will be our most fitting, our most grateful, memorial of our heroic sons whose deathless valor we commemorate to-day! [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]. [Applause.]

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply stirred by most eloquent remarks made by my colleagues on this Memorial Day. I know you will pardon me if to my mind there comes this thought—that the best way to honor the dead soldier is to protect the living, to take care of those who have been left to us, and those who are dependent upon the soldiers who died. The pay envelope of the soldier will be much more useful to his family if it has in it some of the coin of the realm and it is not filled entirely with glory. It is a beautiful thing and a due and proper thing to place flowers upon the graves of our dead, but it is up to the Congress of the United States in the next few weeks to provide flour and bacon and bread for the living. I trust it will not be improper to suggest on this sacred day the high duty that lies at the door of this Chamber to equalize and make just laws for those soldiers who have come back, to bring those back home who ought to be home, to hurry the confirmation of the treaty of peace, that American soldiers may be brought back to American shores. In my city there are 600 women who have sons or husbands in Siberia. You can do no greater honor to the men who died for this country than to bring back those boys from the country to which they were not sent by order of the Congress of the United States.

One of my friends, Lieut. Alfred M. Barlow, who has just left the gallery, decorated by medals of honor for bravery, who lost a leg; under our present laws, although he was a farmer and can never work at it again—under the law of compensation fixed by Congress he will enjoy the magnificent income of $7.50 per month. He was a volunteer soldier. If a man in the Regular Army, of the same rank, met with the same misfortune he would draw fifteen times that amount for life. Let us correct some of these things; let us pledge ourselves on this Decoration Day to satisfy the mothers of the boys who are buried over there. I know I realize the heroic desire to those who wish to educate the mothers that it is heroic to leave their sons' remains over there; but, Mr. Speaker, human nature is the same the world over. The mother's love wants her son's remains brought back. It lies at the door of this Chamber to see to it that it is done, and that the son of the poorest mother shall have the same chance, and the same opportunity, and the same honor, of being brought back by his Government as the son of those more prosperous in life.

There are 10,000 questions pressing upon us now; and may I not ask in this one minute that is given to me that we pledge ourselves within the splendid thought of my colleague who has just taken his seat and forget partisanship, forget everything but the actual debt that we owe to the loved and to the dead, and that the highest honor we can pay to the soldiers who made the sacrifice is to deal justly and fairly with the old Grand Army of the Republic, the Spanish War veterans, and the soldiers of this war who are left living with us? [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I am an American, proud of my country, its past, its present, and its future, for I believe it is now and is destined to continue to be the greatest force for good among all the Governments of the world. To-day we call from the mists of memory into the strong light of appreciation our reverence for the American soldier, living and dead, who has given of his service in order that liberty and justice might be preserved to his fellow men.

This is Memorial Day, in which the beautiful custom of decorating with flowers the graves of our soldier heroes is observed.

From the Southland, after the Civil War, over grave of friend and erstwhile foe, first came this expression of floral tribute and rapidly did spread until now there is not a village, hamlet, or countryside which does not participate in the celebration of this national holiday. This year Memorial Day has a much greater significance than ever before, for not only are the great transports on sea hurrying to bring home to their loved ones the young men who marched in battle array in lands across the sea in order that our great governmental institutions might be preserved for us through all time and the sacred rights of American citizens be so firmly established that no monarch could question them even with the backing of powerful military forces, and in order that the very spirit of military oppression be crushed, lest in the end it crush us, a great free people, but also because overseas are sleeping in soil which should be ceded American territory the bodies of thousands of American boys who can never return to us in life, but whose services will be cherished throughout all America so long as its history shall endure.

By these our national life has been made rich and its richness in loyalty, unselfishness, and sacrifice acknowledged by the nations of the world. Wherever our flag flies to-day there are rejoicings and tears, but always appreciation for the gallant American man at arms who has never fought a fight in which he did not believe he was in the right. This for man and nation is the final accomplishment. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER].

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is quite superfluous for me to say that I cordially indorse the sentiments expressed in these resolutions. I think we are all agreed that the thanks of Congress and of the country are justly due to those who carried our flag to victory across the sea, and to all those at home, here or elsewhere, who aided in achieving the great victory over autocratic power and the rule of force. It is to be hoped that never again can the peace of the world be overthrown or ruthlessly assailed by an outlaw nation.

It is quite appropriate that to-day, in these exercises, the distinguished gentleman who now occupies the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Hon. ROYAL C. JOHNSON, should preside over this meeting, for he affords a striking example of the patriotic young men of America who gladly offered all for the honor and glory of the American flag. He gave up his seat in Congress to go out and take his chance as a private soldier and won deserved promotion from the ranks by reason of his splendid service, and we are all glad to-day that his constituents at home in his absence recognized his service and returned him to his seat in Congress. All honor to such as he; all honor to the young heroes of to-day whom we are endeavoring to decorate with flowers—of oratory. [Applause.]

I feel that there is little that I can say that will add anything to what is embodied in these resolutions and what has already been said more eloquently than I could hope to say it in favor of the unanimous adoption of the resolutions; but I am reminded that to-day is Memorial Day, a day sacred to all soldiers, living and dead, of every war, and wherever they may be, or wherever they may sleep in sacred ground. I just noticed sitting in front of me a little while ago the kindly face of our much-loved Chaplain of the House, who served as a private soldier in the great Civil War from 1861 to 1865. I thought I saw, from his expression, that his mind reverted, as mine did, back to those days of the Civil War, when, in answer to the call of Father Abraham, the young men of the North rallied to the support of the flag and gladly volunteered to risk their all for the preservation of the Union under the Constitution. I know our Chaplain was thinking that this was Memorial Day, given over orginally, after the close of the Civil War, to decorating the graves of the Union soldiers who fell in defense of the flag. He was thinking of his comrades of the days gone by who had crossed over to the other shore and who had pitched their tents on the shores of that land from which none ever return.

Memorial Day was first established by proclamation of the then commander of the Grand Army of the Republic in 1868, the gallant soldier and statesman, John A. Logan, who called upon his comrades to assemble that year and each succeeding year for the purpose of decorating with the choicest flowers of springtime the graves of those who had given up their lives that the Republic might live.

It is now more than 50 years since the close of that great war that established for all time the doctrine that the United States is a Nation, one and indivisible, and able to maintain itself as a great independent Nation among the nations of the earth under the Constitution established by the forefathers. While I fully agree to the well-deserved thanks of the Congress and the people to the young heroes of the recent war, and while I agree that nothing we can say or do is too good for them, yet I would not forget, and we must not forget, what we owe to the old heroes of the Civil War, who are facing to-day the sunset of life, but who in the years agone, before most of the Members of this House were born, carried the flag of this country to victory on many a hard-fought battle ground and saved and perpetuated this American Union. What does Decoration Day mean to us?

WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO YOU?

What does it mean, this marching past
Of a few old men who are bent and grave?
You have heard of the host that was proud and vast
And you see the banners that brightly wave;
You have heard men glibly extol the brave
Who endeared the Gray and honored the Blue;
You have heard of the cause that was lost and won,
But what is the lesson you teach your son,
And what is the meaning of this to you?

What does it mean, this trudging by
Of a few old men who will cease ere long
To march to the graves where their comrades lie
Or to hear the cheers of the careless throng?
But what is the lesson your son has learned,
And what is the meaning of this to you?

They offered all that the brave may give,
Where the selfish prey and the timid pause;
Dearer to them than the right to live
Was the right to die in their country's cause!
The crowd is granting them its applause,
Thinking that thus they receive their due;
They have given much and have not complained,
But what is the lesson your son has gained,
And what is the meaning to you?

What is the meaning to us of this Memorial Day that is being celebrated to-day in every city, town, and hamlet over the length and breadth of the land, and wherever the soldiers of the Republic may lie, sleeping their last long sleep, either in the soil of the land for which they died, or across the sea where they fought and died in the cause of humanity; for more than 50,000 of our brave young men, the flower of the land, are sleeping to-day beneath the sod of a foreign land, where they made the supreme sacrifice? The meaning to me is just this, that, in the language of Abraham Lincoln, "government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth." [Applause.] And, Mr. Speaker, I would add to that, for the purpose of making it more explicit so far as we in this country are concerned, so that it would read: Government of the people of the United States, government for the people of the United States, and government by the people of the United States, shall not perish from the earth. [Applause.]

This is our country, established upon the doctrine that the people themselves are sovereign and have the absolute and undisputed right to dictate the form of their own government and to maintain the same without foreign interference, holding friendly relations with the peoples of all the earth, but entering into no entangling alliances with foreign powers, whose governments and interests are not the same as ours. I have no Utopian dreams of a great international government that shall control and dictate the affairs of this American Republic. I would not, if I could have my way, give my consent under any circumstances whatever to delegating to a coterie of self-elected men sitting around a table in some gilded palace across the Atlantic any single sovereign right that belongs exclusively to the people of the United States. The independence of this country was achieved by our forefathers through years of sacrifice and war. It was maintained at the cost of the blood and treasure of our people in the Civil War. I would not yield that independence, no matter what it might cost to maintain it in the future. I am an American first and all the time, and I believe in the American people and in their right to self-government without the aid or consent of any other nation on earth; and I believe that the will and the wishes of the American people should in the future, as in the past, control the destinies of this Nation.

Fifty-four years ago this month, after the close of the great Civil War, this city witnessed the greatest parade that has ever passed down historic Pennsylvania Avenue, when our victorious soldiers of the Armies of the Tennessee and of Georgia, 200,000 strong, marched down the Avenue in the great review before President Johnson and Gen. Grant and other famous men of the Nation. The victory had been won; the Union had been maintained; rebellion had been crushed; but in the flush of victory there was grief profound that so many of the comrades of the marchers had made the supreme sacrifice and yielded up their lives on the battle fields of the South and that the great emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, had passed over to the other shore only a little while before that historic and victorious parade. On that occasion a great banner was hung across the front of this Capitol Building, and on it was this inscription:

The only national debt we can never pay is the debt we owe the victorious Union soldiers.

To-day I repeat that the only national debt we can never pay is the debt we owe to the gallant soldiers, sailors, and marines of past wars, as well as to those of the recent World War, the young heroes who have added new luster to the American flag, and who on foreign soil have carried that flag to victory and gloriously upheld American ideals. I most sincerely hope that there may never be another World War or another occasion when the young men of this land may be called upon to offer up their lives in the cause of humanity or in defense of our liberties and our institutions. We must not forget that we have certain duties to perform here at home, and one of these duties that devolves upon us, the representatives of the American people, is to see now and for all time to come that no man who risked his life and his all for the cause of his country shall ever suffer want. [Applause.] In the words of Abraham Lincoln, we should keep constantly in mind our duty "to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan." We can not pay this debt to the heroes of this war or of any war all at once; it will extend, of necessity, through years of time, and so long as the last one of the country's defenders remains alive. But it is a duty that we should ever have in mind, and we should give particular thought and care now, not alone to our returning heroes of the late war, but also to the veterans of the Spanish War and their widows and orphans, and to the old heroes of the Civil War in their declining years, and to the widows of those who have passed away. This is a sacred duty devolving upon Congress, and I believe that it will be faithfully met.

We are glad to honor the young men who are now returning from across the sea to reenter the ordinary civil pursuits which they left when they answered their country's call. Out in my own State of Illinois this has been a memorable week, for the Prairie Division has just returned, covered with honor and glory from its service in France, and the people are extending to them a heartfelt and cordial welcome. They have served their country with honor and distinction, and the people of that State welcome them home with open arms, tinged, however, with sadness for some who bear the scars and wounds of battle and for others who went away in the flush and strength of manhood but who will return no more.

Another event of note occurred in my own home town this week, when the surviving members of the old Fifteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry held their annual reunion. These reunions have been held every year on the date when that regiment was mustered into the service, May 24. A few years ago there were usually several hundred survivors of that regiment at their annual reunion. This week there were only 21 of all that number alive and able to be present. And so everywhere the ranks of that grand army of the Union are being depleted year by year, and it will be but a few years before the last one will have fought his last battle and gone to join his comrades on the golden shores of the New Jerusalem. Their places will be filled by the survivors of the late war, who, following the example of their sires, will no doubt by their future course win in civil life as they have in their country's service the plaudits and approval of all, and I trust that they will see to it that the liberty and independence of this great country shall be perpetuated and continue forever and forever.

I wish here to express more specifically than do the pending resolutions my own appreciation—and I know every Member of this House will feel the same way—of the splendid cooperation of the women of America in their voluntary service in promoting the comfort and well-being of our soldiers, sailors, and marines during the late war; to the Red Cross nurses and workers, to all those who gave their time and their services, freely and patriotically, they are deserving of all praise. The good they accomplished was beyond price, and they, one and all, who so served, justly deserve the special thanks of the Nation.

And now in closing I wish to say one word more for the old veterans of the Civil War and for the widows of those who have fought the last battle and passed over to the great beyond. They are all, or very nearly all, past the allotted age of man. Many of them are dependent upon the pensions granted by a grateful Government for the services rendered in the country's time of need. In many cases the pensions now granted are not sufficient to furnish them with the ordinary necessities of life. This country is great and rich and powerful. It should do full justice to these old men and women. Their numbers are growing less every day that passes. I favor, and I hope Congress will favor, a minimum pension of $50 per month to every surviving veteran of that war, and of $30 per month to every widow of a Civil War veteran. That would about close the chapter as to Civil War pensions, and I hope this Congress will take such action.

But my time has expired, and I think perhaps I have suggested quite enough for the time being, and will only say in closing that to-day we have for our heroic soldiers, sailors, and marines of all wars but one sentiment:

Cheers for the living,
Tears for the dead!

[Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCKEOWN].

Mr. MCKEOWN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, a nation without its heroes or a nation without traditions will be a nation without history and without ideals. It is as a dream when we think back but a few months ago, after the declaration of war, when the Congress was called upon to pass the selective-draft law, when, after the great drawing had taken place here in Washington, we saw America's young manhood answering the call of their country. They went with the determination to accomplish the purpose for which they had been selected. They went without fear of the results. I stood and watched them as they gathered at the stations. There were

heart-rending scenes. I saw the wife cling to the parting husband. I saw little children kissing the father good-by. I saw them as they loaded onto the train and I saw it as it sped away from the station. I saw the waving of hands, and in many instances it was a fond farewell; it was the last wave of the hand. We heard them in this Capital as they came trooping through, with the enthusiasm of youth. We heard them yelling their hurrahs as they went through this city by the thousands, trainload after trainload. Members of this House heard them through the midnight hours, in the morning's dawn, as they were rushing to the seaboard to take passage across the sea. We saw them at the ports of embarkation as they marched down and went aboard the transports, and to thousands of them it was a strange experience. Coming from the far interior of this great Republic, it was the first time many of them had ever looked upon the briny waters of the Atlantic Ocean. It was a new experience to them as they went aboard ship for the first time, and I imagine there were heart throbs experienced as they looked out upon the ocean, as they passed out of the harbor, and looked perhaps for the last time upon the Statue of Liberty in the harbor of New York. The hearts of the American fathers and mothers went with them through their perilous journey, and watched as the days went by to see if they had arrived safely across, and the anxious fathers and mothers of the country waited for the card which came back to say that they had landed safely in France.

To-day the mothers and fathers of the boys who sleep in France have a peculiar lonely feeling. Theirs is that feeling that can be only felt by the father and mother who have given up their offspring forever. This morning's sun shed its beams upon 60,000 lonely homes in America and thousands upon thousands of our Allies. There never was in the minds of the American people any doubt as to the outcome of the conflict. There was never any doubt as to what was to be the final outcome of this war. It did not make Americans tremble to see the reports of the onward advance of the Huns. America had fought before under great disadvantages and had fought under great trials and difficulties, but never since this Republic has been founded has it been the lot of these God-fearing people to go down into defeat. It has been given to us to hear above the battle roar the scream of the American eagle proclaiming victory.

No poor word of mine uttered here can do any good to the soldiers who have "gone west." No poor words of mine in eulogy can do the living soldier any good. The only way for American Congressmen to show their real true appreciation of the American soldier who has won this war is to walk up like men and vote for legislation that will do them substantial good. We have had enough of words already. [Applause.] The fathers and mothers of these soldiers made great sacrifices, and as was said by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], we must look to the kind of men their fathers were to know the kind of men and soldiers they are. One of the things that has touched me deeply since this war has closed has been the fact that two sons of two distinguished Americans met in St. Louis to organize a great legion—the son of that illustrious man, Theodore Roosevelt, one of America's greatest citizens, and the son of our beloved minority leader, ex-Speaker CHAMP CLARK. These two men have joined together to uplift the American soldier and to bring his cause to the attention of the American people. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some little rivalry or envy now since the war is over as to who played the most important part. Time will efface all of that. At present in the Army there is rivalry as to who should have this position or that position, and there are bitter feelings here and yonder in individual cases, but time will efface it all, for the time will come in this country when the proudest boast of its citizenship will be uttered in the words "My father was a member of the A. E. F."

It will be the proud boast of the young men of America in the the future. Gentlemen, let me say that no monument that can be carved by the sculptor of Parian marble, no image that can be wrought by the cunning hand of genius, will be sufficient to record and perpetuate the memory of these men. They do not need it. They have already erected in the hearts of the American people—not alone America, but in the hearts of all well and right thinking people in the world—a monument to their bravery, to their dauntless courage, to their self-sacrifice, that will live on and on and will live when time shall be no more and their long sleep is ended when the trump shall call us to the judgment bar. [Applause.]

In the great drama of the war the illustrious sons of Oklahoma played their parts with such marked courage and bravery as to not only reflect great credit upon the new Commonwealth but won the admiration of the brave men of the world.

The greater portion of the Oklahoma troops were in the Thirty-sixth and Ninetieth Divisions. Both divisions saw heavy fighting, and both suffered many casualties.

These divisions are returning to America, and the anxious fathers and mothers of Oklahoma and Texas are counting the hours until their returning sons will cross their thresholds and be at home again. The parents and loved ones of those who were left sleeping in the soil of France are bravely choking their sobs of anguish and checking their tears of sorrow.

To these latter our hearts go out in this hour of their bereavement, but in it all and through it all we can see a brighter side. I can hear the persuasive voice of Henry Clay saying:

> They were fighting a great moral battle for the benefit not only of their country but of all mankind. The eyes of the whole world were fixed upon them.

And the overpowering eloquence of Daniel Webster declaring:

> They consecrated their work to the spirit of national independence, and that they wished that the light of peace might rest upon it forever. They went, as Americans, to mark a spot which must forever be dear to them and their posterity.

In my dreams I can see them dressed in glorious garments, wearing garlands on their brows. I can see them listening to the songs of the birds amid beautiful trees. I can see them lying down on beds of roses listening to the music of falling waters, and in the harmony of human voices I hear these words, "Blessed are they who die for their country."

Mr. Speaker, among the 70 men who were awarded the congressional honors out of the 2,000,000 American soldiers in France, 3 of these were awarded to Oklahoma men.

They were Samuel M. Sampler, of Mangum, Okla.; Lieut. George P. Hays, of Okarche, Okla.; and Corpl. Harold L. Turner, of Seminole, Okla. It is with great pride that I mention the name of Corpl. Turner, because he is one of Seminole County's boys who fought along with her other sons in Company F, of the One hundred and forty-second Infantry. Many of his companions lie buried near St. Ettienne, alongside the heroic sons of Lincoln County. It is there that the gallant Harrison and brave Matheny fell leading their men to victory in the face of tremendous odds.

Their mute and silent resting places are marked by little wooden crosses, typifying that Christian civilization for the preservation of which they died.

In the words of Annette Kohn, let me conclude:

"In Flanders fields, where poppies blow,"
In France, where beauteous roses grow,
There let them rest—forever sleep—
While we eternal vigil keep
With our hearts' love, with our souls' prayer,
For all our fallen "over there."
The morning sun will guild with light,
The stars keep holy watch at night,
The winter spread soft pall of snow,
The summer flowers about them grow,
The birds sing their sweet springtime call—
God's love and mercy guard them all.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, throughout the length and breadth of this land to-day everywhere—

We will scatter flowers of kind remembrance
Over the graves of our heroic dead,
And burnish bright on memory's tablet
The cause for which their blood was shed.

This beautiful memorial observance was initiated at the close of the late Civil War for the purpose of decorating the graves and revering the memory of those who fell in that conflict and has grown in popularity with the passing years and has been extended in scope until all those who have fallen or died in all the wars in which our country has participated are likewise honored and revered upon this sacred day. Throughout this eastern country, in hamlet and in city cemeteries as well, wherever rests the remains of a Revolutionary soldier or a soldier of the War of 1812, notwithstanding the fact that all of their comrades and relatives, too, have passed beyond, some one places a laurel wreath in token of a loving memory. Likewise in far-away Mexico, where our blood was shed for the benefit of a greater America and the extension of our civilization upon this continent, there, too, is reverence paid by some gentle and loving hand. Likewise to those who fell in the Civil War, whether they sleep amid the northern pines or rest beneath the greensward of the southern valley, some loving hand pays a tribute there this day. And so with those who fell in the War with Spain and in our various Indian wars. Now a new and greater significance is added to this sacred day, but what a mockery it will be in the years to come unless some affirmative action is taken by this Congress to see to it that those who rest in the far-away land of France are brought back for their final rest here at home. One of the sacred promises which was made by this Government, that was made upon this floor and upon the floor of the other body, was that when this war was over and when this world strife should cease that the remains of those boys who fell in action should be brought back to their

several homes. I know it has been stated by many that this should not be done; that it will be a gruesome and unpleasant task; but even if this be true, it should not prevent our fulfillment of promise and duty.

Many will agree with Theodore Roosevelt and his good wife when they said, "Let the tree remain where it falls"; but there are thousands and thousands of mothers in this country who can not subscribe to such a sentiment as that, and our promise so sacredly made then should be as sacredly carried out now. [Applause.] By reason of a law enacted by France years and years ago it is absolutely impossible to take and exhume a body of any of our soldiers who were buried in France and bring them out of that country, and unless that law is changed those boys who are buried on French soil will have to remain over there. Diligent endeavor has been made by those in authority in our Government to see if some modification or repeal of this unreasonable law may be had, but up to this time the French authorities have remained like adamant and refused absolutely to change it by either repeal or modification. I can not believe that that country, for which this country gave so much, will much longer persist in the observance of this law. I appeal to the mothers of France, I appeal to the fathers of France, I appeal to all those in authority there to remember that upon this side of the sea there are hearts that are aching like those that are aching upon that side. To-day throughout that country those who are living can go to the little green spots that sepulcher their loved ones and in a measure appease their anguish. The fathers and mothers in America who so freely gave their sons are entitled to have that same holy privilege, and I think there is nothing that we can do that would add more to our respect for the living and the dead than to pledge ourselves to-day to the fathers and mothers of this country that we will see to it that their boys are brought back, and, if necessary, that some affirmative action is taken by the Congress of the United States to direct the attention of France to the duty that she owes, not only to herself but to this country and the world, to remove the obstacle that now stands in the way. I was coming up the Avenue the other day and I met a funeral cortege. I supposed from the appearance of the troop of Cavalry that was with it and from the coffin draped with the Stars and Stripes that they were carrying with military honors some soldier boy of ours to his last resting place. I soon discovered, however, that it was a soldier son of Italy killed in an accident in Ohio. His remains rested at Arlington until the war was over and opportunity could be afforded to have his remains taken back to the land that gave him birth. They should be just as respectful of our desires and our rights over there and see to it that the remains of the boys who did so much for them and the world are brought back to this country of ours, so that when these observances occur in the years to come that those who gave them may go to their several resting places and pay the homage that their glorious deeds and sacrifice has entitled each and all of them to receive. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in previous years this day was not very generally observed in the South. In the Southern States another day is set apart for memorial exercises, when the loyal women of the South decorate the graves of the heroes of the Confederacy and decorate also the graves of those Union soldiers whose bodies were not removed from the South to national cemeteries. On the day I left my home in Aiken, S. C., I noticed in the Baptist churchyard the graves of Union soldiers covered with flowers, placed there on the day previous by the Daughters of the Confederacy. And, my friends, I am told by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, Judge TOWNER, that it was such action on the part of the women of the South a few years after the war that gave to Gen. Logan the inspiration to initiate the movement to have this day, May 30, set apart as the Memorial Day for the Nation. But while there has heretofore been no general observance of this day in the South, I know that this year it has a new significance for the people of that section, for during the past year the sons of the South in common with the sons of the North have paid the supreme sacrifice in the service of the United States Government. To-day the thoughts of the American people are across the sea at the cemeteries of Romagne, Thiacourt, and Le Cartelet, where sleep the sons of America who died that we might live, and the hearts of the American people are with those on this side of the sea who grieve for loved ones who will never return.

Out of this cruel war this good will come, that this Nation will be united as never before, united not only by constitutional provisions, but united by the tie that binds—by the blood of our boys shed in a common cause. Evidence of this reunited spirit I have seen in the county where I reside, whose people have followed the fortunes of the Pennsylvania troops trained in the adjacent city of Augusta, Ga., at Camp Hancock, with an interest second only to the interest evinced in the troops of our own State, and at Spartanburg, S. C., where the people have ever shown an affectionate interest in the welfare of the New York division, which was trained at Camp Wadsworth, near Spartanburg.

To-day the people of the South join the people of all other sections in paying tribute to the American soldier, wherever he hails from, the living and the dead. But, my friends, while paying tribute to the American soldier it is only natural that reference has been made by Members to the achievements of the soldiers from their respective States.

On this day our thoughts naturally revert to home, to those people whose lives form so intimate a part of our own lives and who to-day either rejoice at the safe return of some loved one or grieve that he will never return. To-day the Eighty-first Division, composed of South Carolinians, is on the sea. I share the joy of those who anticipate an early reunion with loved ones serving in that division, and my heart goes out in sympathy to those who know that though their sons left home with that division they will not return, that their bodies rest in the cemetery at Romagne, in the Argonne Forest, where this division in the closing days of the war won imperishable glory for itself and for American arms.

The sons of South Carolina went with another division, the Thirtieth, composed of National Guard troops of Tennessee, North Carolina, and South Carolina, and as long as bravery and gallantry excite the admiration of men and women, so long will song and story tell of the achievements of that division. In the fortunes of war to this division was assigned the duty of attacking the Hindenburg line in the early fall of 1918. Brigaded with the veteran troops of Australia they went into that most sanguinary conflict with an enthusiasm and courage that won the admiration and the plaudits of the English Army. With machine gun and cannon in front of them, with death-dealing aircraft above them, and exploding mines beneath them, into battle they went. And the spirit of Lee hovered over them and the life of Jackson inspired them as they threw themselves into the conflict and smashed for the first time the presumably impregnable Hindenburg line.

Mr. Speaker, I recently wrote to the War Department and asked for a list of the soldiers to whom there had been awarded the congressional medal of honor. This is the highest honor that can be bestowed upon an American soldier. I hold that list in my hand and it shows that while we had in France at the time of the signing of the armistice 2,000,000 men, only 70 were awarded the congressional medal of honor. This list gives not only the name but the organization and home address of our heroes, and I know that my colleagues will pardon my expression of joy when I state that it shows that out of the 70 medals awarded the American Army 6 were awarded to sons of South Carolina, who served in the One hundred and eighteenth Infantry, Thirtieth Division, a greater number than was awarded to any other regiment in the service of the Government. [Applause.]

The names of those six men I shall read to the House:

James C. Dozier, first lieutenant, Company G, One hundred and eighteenth Infantry; home address, 524 Asnafrel Street, Rock Hill, S. C.

Richmond H. Hilton, sergeant, Company M, One hundred and eighteenth Infantry; home address, Westville, S. C.

Gary Evans Foster, sergeant, Company F, One hundred and eighteenth Infantry; home address, Inman, S. C.

John C. Villapigue, corporal, Company M, One hundred and eighteenth Infantry; home address, 1517 Lyttleton Street, Camden, S. C.

James D. Heriot (deceased), corporal, Company I, One hundred and eighteenth Infantry; home address, R. F. D. 1, Providence, S. C.

Thomas Lee Hall, sergeant, Company G, One hundred and eighteenth Infantry; home address, R. F. D. 4, Fort Mill, S. C.

My friends, I do not recite these facts to disparage the achievements of other divisions or organizations of the Army. There is glory enough for all, and the success of any unit of the Army is the success of the American people. But I recite these facts that they may be recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that the House and the country may know that these sons of South Carolina, carrying into battle that flag against which their fathers fought half a century ago, by their sacrifice demonstrated their devotion to this reunited country, and by their gallantry and bravery won the undying admiration of the people of South Carolina and, I hope, of the people of America. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SWEET].

Mr. SWEET. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, without disparagement to the soldiers of other countries, I do not believe that I am going too far when I say that the war just closed has demonstrated that the American soldier is without a peer in the annals of warfare.

When the *Lusitania* was sunk and American lives were lost the question naturally arose, Will the people of this country resent with force this unwarranted attack upon innocent babes, defenseless women, and noncombatant men of neutral nations? When American rights were being violated and disregarded by a ruthless submarine warfare; when the institutions of our time and the civilization of our age were confronted by an armed monster whose armies were endeavoring to overrun all Europe and subjugate its people; when terrorism seemed to grip the souls of the strongest men; when the American Congress on April 6, 1917, declared war against the Imperial German Government the question trembled on the lips of every lover of democracy and liberty, Will the great Republic defend itself? Will it stand true to its traditions and protect the rights of its citizens on land and sea? Can the people of a republic habituated to the avocations of peace and the teachings of Christianity be aroused from a lethargy of profound indifference to take part in a war 3,000 miles away and build a fighting machine that would be the equal of or superior to the greatest fighting machine the world has ever seen? In short, can a government of the people, by the people, and for the people meet this the supremest test of the ages? What is the answer?

Uncle Sam, like a mighty giant, awoke as from a troubled dream, rubbed his drowsy eyes for a moment, straightened to full height, and girded his loins for the contest, while the fires of righteous indignation raged within his bosom and shook convulsively his majestic frame. Sublime manifestations of an unconquered and unconquerable spirit! Indifference vanished, debating ceased, unity of thought and purpose became the watchword of the hour. The time for action was at hand.

The people of the United States—the children of liberty, the disciples of Washington and Lincoln—marshaled their hosts and resources. When the Nation demanded soldiers we behold them coming from every Middlesex village and farm; from the workshop, the counter, and the bar; from the hovel on the hillside and the mansion on the square; from the cotton fields of the South, the great prairies of the West, and from New England's historic hills. We behold them as they cross 3,000 miles of sea infested with submarines. We behold them upon the gory fields of that great war. We are with them at Chateau-Thierry, Vaux, Belleau Wood, St. Mihiel, and the Argonne Forest. "We are with them in the trenches running red with blood, in the whirlwind of the charge, where men become iron with nerves of steel." We will never know what they suffered and endured; we will never fully realize the privations that they underwent and the perils that they encountered until victory came.

We committed the flag of the Republic to their care and keeping, on foreign soil, and all that it represents—the flag that had never known defeat. They brought it back to us in honor, without a stain upon its folds, and in a blaze of glory. [Applause.] They demonstrated that a free people can and will defend themselves when the principles of their institutions are jeopardized and the rights of the citizens are unjustly assailed. They settled the greatest question of all time in favor of the stability and perpetuity of free institutions. It is now an established fact that a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal can and will maintain itself against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

When the war began the American soldier was an unknown quantity in Europe. When the war was over an admiring world paid homage to his daring, his perseverance, his initiative, and his courage. Before the war they said he would not fight. After the war they said there was nothing he could not fight. They said we could not transport an army across 3,000 miles of sea. We did. They said we could not feed 1,000,000 men in Europe. We fed 2,000,000 men in Europe, and a part of the time the armies of those associated with us. They said our soldiers could not stand up against the trained soldiers of Germany. We answered that challenge by annihilating the Prussian Guards, the flower of the German Army. [Applause.]

When we entered the war the monarchies of Germany and Austria-Hungary were in the ascendancy. When the war closed the thrones of Europe were tottering to their fall and their rulers were fugitives from justice, fleeing in disguise and disgrace from the wrath and scorn of their own subjects and the hate and execration of an infuriated and outraged world.

Instead of monarchies we behold the formation of republics. Instead of the downtrodden and oppressed we behold faces beaming with the hope of better days to come.

Instead of militarism we behold men returning to the avocations of peace. We behold the spirit of freedom, with its gentle and impartial hand, marking out the nations of the world.

We behold the principles of government for which Washington and Lincoln contended triumphant among the sons of men. [Applause.]

The American soldier! He has honored us; may we honor him. We must never forget those who fought in this Great War.

> The tumult and the shouting dies—
> The captains and the kings depart—
> Still stands thine ancient sacrifice,
> An humble and a contrite heart.
> Lord God of Hosts be with us yet,
> Lest we forget—lest we forget.

[Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I intended to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], but it seems he is not here. I suppose he is coming later. I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, as I listen to the splendid addresses here to-day, exceptionally eloquent and patriotic, there recurs in my mind the immortal address of our martyred President, Abraham Lincoln, on the battle field of Gettysburg:

> The world will little know, nor long remember, what we say here.

But as long as the human race endures upon this planet humanity will gratefully remember what our American boys did during this war. [Applause.]

This is the greatest Memorial Day in all the history of our country, and it is exceptionally fitting for the Congress of the United States to hold this memorial service on this Memorial Day. Personally, I have felt for many months that we were a little derelict in not holding these exercises sooner. I introduced a resolution last September (H. Con. Res. 52) providing for a memorial session of this kind by both the Senate and House; but there seemed to be no suitable opportunity to consider it during that session or during the short session last winter.

You may all know that the English Government for hundreds of years has at the close of every war held a memorial session of the British Parliament. During this war they decided that owing to the sublime courage of her sons, the frightful casualties, and the barbarous nature of the enemies' atrocities it was appropriate to hold memorial services earlier and not wait for the close of the war. So, on the 29th of October, 1917, the British Parliament held a memorial session to express the Empire's gratitude and commemorate the distinguished services and heroism of the British Army and Navy.

The little party of 10 Congressmen, of which I was one, who were the first to visit the western front, in October and November, 1917, were honored by being given reserved seats on the floor of Parliament to listen to those memorial exercises, and we heard that marvelously eloquent memorial address of Premier David Lloyd-George, which will go down in history as one of the greatest addresses ever delivered in the world. It was in that speech that he paid that magnificent tribute to the aviators as "the cavalry of the clouds." I have here a copy of the Parliamentary Debates of the House of Commons of that date, which is similar to our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and, strange to say, that address might fittingly be slightly paraphrased and delivered in our exercises here to-day. He referred to and compared this war with the various other wars of the world. He referred to our own Civil War. He complimented the campaigns of Stonewall Jackson and other officers and campaigns of our Civil War, and then showed how really insignificant, relatively speaking, all the wars in history had been, both in numbers engaged, character of warfare, and results, as compared with this war and the fiendish barbarity that our boys and those of our Allies have had to endure; and, as he said then, it seems that when we consider the kind of hardships and the terrific conditions which our men had to face it is almost unbelievable that so few of the survivors became insane. To see, or even read about, what our boys have gone through, days and nights in mud and water, engulfing quagmires and morasses, under a constant hailstorm of terrific machine-gun fire and ceaseless thunderbolts from powerful artillery, it is a marvel that the delicate and sensitive mechanism of the human nerve and mind could endure them without derangement.

But, my colleagues, it is not by words only that we should display our appreciation of our sons at this time and in this Congress; it is the deeds that will hereafter count. We will in the future be judged by what we do, not by what we say. I sincerely hope this Congress and the membership of this House

will have patriotism enough and will be nonpartisan enough, be big enough Americans, to rise to the occasion and demonstrate to the world that we are worthy to represent such splendid young men as the millions we put into this war; that we are worthy to represent the greatest Nation on the face of the earth; that in this legislative restoration, readjustment, and reconstruction period we will measure up to the traditions of our splendid country; and that the boys may always have the feeling that we at home were worthy of the sacrifices which they made. That is what will count in the future. It is what we in Congress do during the next year or two in showing our appreciation, our ability, our patriotism, our courage, and our determination to measure up to what we ought to be and do that will count. The glorious dead of our country's wars sleep with their duty done; ours lie yet before us.

I earnestly hope that this Congress will not attempt to traffic in the blood of these boys by trying to make partisan capital out of them. That is the only danger I see on the horizon. I do hope that we will legislate as a great American patriotic legislative body should.

There is one disquieting thought that comes to my mind—I do not know whether it occurs to others or not—but when I think of the period which President Lincoln went through during our Civil War and reflect upon the way he was misrepresented and mistreated and the contemptuous disrespect that was accorded to him during that time and realize the honor that has been paid to him by the entire civilized world ever since, with all due respect, I can not help feeling mindful of a not very dissimilar condition existing in some places at the present time. And when I see in the leading morning daily paper of this city—the Washington Post—this morning the President's splendid message cabled by him yesterday from Paris to the American people published in small type in the central part of an inside page, with an insignificant heading and mixed among unimportant articles, I can not help feeling that possibly history may repeat itself and that hereafter the President of the United States may be accorded a great deal more consideration, distinction, and honor by the world than he is now being accorded by some people and some partisan papers in the superb and heroic work that he is doing for our Republic, for the human race, and for human liberty on this earth.

I have always had a supreme contempt for narrow, vindictive, and disloyal partisanship, and I am going to here venture the prophecy that no man will make a creditable historic name for himself by traducing the splendid efforts or the name of the first citizen of the civilized world to-day.

As no one else has referred to it, I am going to read to the House and into the RECORD the President's brief cable message to the American people, as follows:

My fellow countrymen, Memorial Day this year wears an added significance, and I wish, if only by a message, to take part with you in its observation and in expressing the sentiments which it inevitably suggests. In observing the day we commemorate not only the reunion of our own country but also the liberation of the world from one of the most serious dangers to which free government and the free life of men were ever exposed.

We have buried the gallant and now immortal men who died in this great war of liberation with a new sense of consecration. Our thoughts and purposes now are consecrated to the maintenance of the liberty of the world and of the union of its people in a single comradeship of liberty and of right. It was for this that our men conscientiously offered their lives. They came to the field of battle with the high spirit and pure heart of crusaders. We must never forget the duty that their sacrifice has laid upon us of fulfilling their hopes and their purposes to the utmost. This, it seems to me, is the impressive lesson and inspiring mandate of the day.

WOODROW WILSON.

[Applause.]

And I trust the speech which the President is delivering to-day at the graves of our fallen heroes in France will also be inserted in the RECORD to-morrow. No human eloquence can ever do justice to their fame or describe the debt which humanity owes to the more than 50,000 of our bravest and best that are to-day sleeping under the soil of France.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I may again refer to President Lincoln's Gettysburg address, and say that it is for us, inspired by the illustrious example of our heroic boys, to carry on the noble work that they began and show ourselves worthy of the confidence that they and our Nation have imposed in us. [Applause.]

We Members of the United States Congress have reposed in us a sacred trust, a trust for our heroes that are living and for those who have made the supreme sacrifice; a trust for our country and for human liberty; a trust for all humanity and for all time. Upon us has descended an unparalleled and unmatched opportunity. We are temporarily to a certain extent the legatees of the world and the executors of Providence. It is my earnest prayer that the Members of the Sixty-sixth Congress will honor themselves and our country by loyally working together for the freedom and happiness of the human race and the permanent peace of the world—the ideals for which our sons and comrades fell. [Applause.]

Inasmuch as reference has been made here to the services of a number of individual States, permit me say that the State of Colorado, which I have for many years had the honor to represent in part, contains less than 1 per cent of the population of the United States, yet out of the first 40 congressional medals that were awarded for heroic services during this war our young State received 5—12½ per cent. [Applause.] So that on behalf of our Colorado boys I am supremely proud to say that the Centennial State will in all future history be accorded a proud place for the loyal service her sons have rendered to our country during this World War. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, we honor ourselves to-day by honoring the memory of our fallen soldiers, sailors, and marines. It is very fitting, indeed, that we pause in the midst of our regular work to engage in exercises of this character. I congratulate the majority leader upon the resolution presented, and I assure him that it will be to me a very great pleasure to vote for its adoption.

As a few of us mingle here to-day in these exercises no doubt our minds go back to our homes, as we think of our neighbors and friends engaged in similar exercises paying their tributes of respect to the men and the women—the women, mark you, as well as the men—for the glorious victory that has been won for the civilization of the world. I recognize our fallen heroes as my personal benefactors. I recognize them as the benefactors of my country and of modern civilization. In this great war we have come in contact with boys and girls, men and women throughout the Nation, whose hearts have been turned with earnestness and devotion to the accomplishment of a great task. Note, if you please, the marvelous transformation of the thoughts and feelings of the American people in regard to the war. For nearly three years that war was a foreign question. Many of our people were proally and some were pro-German. They debated it among themselves as a purely foreign question; but when the time came for our country to take its place in the great contest the American people with rare exceptions turned away from the thought that life's greatest achievement was to keep out of the war, and directed their attention to the winning of the war for the American flag and the civilization of the world. [Applause.]

Let your thoughts, if you please, drop into the lives of the boys and the girls as well as the men and the women of the Nation. When the call came for American soldiers and sailors and marines to enter the contest, our young men faced a serious duty. Almost intuitively they seemed to catch the measure of their responsibility. That vision gave them a broader view of life. They saw the world in a new light. They realized that the interests of their own Nation and possibly the nations of the world rested upon them, and that their deeds would determine for all time the question of intellectual, civil, and religious freedom. As the boys went to the war and to the front, and as the call of the Government went out to the people of the country for war workers in the departments in Washington, thousands and thousands of American girls came hither promptly and eagerly to help in that work.

It was not the amount of their annual compensation that prompted in most instances. Those girls felt that their country had made a call to them, as it had made to their brothers, their relatives, and their sweethearts, and they said, "We will volunteer for the war to help carry on the work at home." As I have met them in large numbers here in Washington and elsewhere in the States, I have found the expression in their words and in their countenances and deeds that they realize that by helping in this war work they were coming just that much nearer to the boys. That sentiment on the part of self-sacrificing boys and girls alike helped the American Government to round out this great contest with unparalleled victory for liberty throughout the world.

But what principle was involved here? What measure of power did they have at command? Whence did they receive it? The underlying principle in it all for our Government and the governments of the world goes back to the teachings of George Washington and Alexander Hamilton, national sovereignty for the American Union. When this doctrine was challenged by hostile guns in the sixties Abraham Lincoln and the boys in blue carried it to victory, and to-day by virtue of that triumph we have 48 States, more than 100,000,000 of people, and almost countless billions of wealth behind the Government of the United States that enabled us to win this victory, destroy monarchy, and preserve representative government throughout the world. Whenever President Wilson wields the power of

the American Government in guiding the Army and Navy and that great civic force in the lines of diplomacy he is wielding a power transmitted to him by Abraham Lincoln and the boys in blue; and, thank God, we have one country, one Union, one Constitution, and one flag waving over all. [Applause.]

In all this broad field of activity and thought I hope we can see the uniforms of the men of the Revolutionary period, of the period of the Civil War, and the uniforms of the men of this great war drawing the hearts of the American people together, so that the Southland and the Northland, the Eastland and the Westland make an American land, "one and inseparable" forever; and to that high achievement we dedicate our thoughts, our deeds, and our lives, to do justice to the men whose uniform graces our gathering to-day, and to whom this and subsequent Congresses shall carry in faithful devotion those recognitions that their brilliant service merits and our duty demands. [Applause.]

Our country must be thoroughly Americanized. But what transforming and unifying power can possibly bring all of these divergent opinions, characters, customs, religions, and politics into a unity of purpose and action to build one nation out of the nations of the world? Mrs. Andrews and I observed an incident in Boston in 1908 that answered this question in part. One Sunday afternoon we attended an open-air concert on the Boston Common. Some twelve or fifteen thousand people were present. About three-fourths of them seemed to have been born under foreign flags. Whole families were there together, happy, cheerful, and well dressed. They enjoyed the program and cheered heartily at times. Just as they were dispersing the band began unexpectedly to play the Star-Spangled Banner. Instantly hats were removed and the whole audience stood like an army at attention until the music ceased. Then they cheered and cheered to the echo. The newcomers seemed to be the most enthusiastic. Why? Why? Why? Because they had a keen realization of the splendid opportunities they have here as compared with the meager earnings in their native countries. They know what this flag means for them and their children. That spirit made the colonists one and enabled them to build one nation out of the nations of the world.

This is not only the unifying power, but it is also the saving power of the American Republic. It goes a long distance in the solution of the vexed question of immigration and also in the thorough Americanization of the citizenship of our country. Thus it is not necessary to teach the doctrine of hate on the part of any man toward the land of his birth or the flag under which he was born. Do you recall the old homestead on which you played with your brothers and sisters in the days of your childhood? Do you remember about wading the brook yonder, and does your body now feel the thrill from the water? Did you gather flowers and bring them to mother and receive the priceless benediction of her smiles? Did you go out into the woods and sit under the trees and listen to the songs of the birds? Forget the old homestead? No, no, no! Never, never, never!

> How dear to this heart are the scenes of my childhood,
> When fond recollection presents them to view—
> The orchard, the meadow, the deep-tangled wildwood,
> And every lov'd spot which my infancy knew.

But regardless of the land of our birth, we must insist most emphatically upon the doctrine of unwavering loyalty on the part of every American citizen to the Government and flag of the United States of America.

My country, our country, the country of all the world, and as the struggling millions of the earth see our flag how can they refrain from saying with us:

> My country, 'tis of thee,
> Sweet land of liberty,
> Of thee I sing:
> Land where my fathers died,
> Land of the pilgrims' pride,
> From every mountain side
> Let freedom ring—

Now, henceforth, and forever. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I heartily favor this resolution and commend the Congress for considering it on Memorial Day. I am sure that every Member will be glad to give it his support.

After the adjournment of Congress last March, in company with other Members of Congress, I went to Europe. I had voted for the resolution declaring that a state of war existed with Germany and all the laws and appropriations necessary to carry it on, and to that extent I felt my responsibility.

Everybody now recognizes the fact that war with Germany was unavoidable. After the sinking of the *Lusitania*, on May 7, 1915, upon which there were 115 American citizens who went to a watery grave, we tried to adjust our differences through diplomatic channels. Germany reluctantly agreed to observe the rules of international law. She discontinued the killing of our citizens in her submarine warfare until January 31, 1917, when we were notified that the next day it would be renewed. Ship after ship to the number of 1,276 merchant vessels were sunk, of which 425 were under neutral flags. Fifteen of them were flying the flag of the United States, and a total of 226 American lives were sacrificed. Not only were our international rights violated on the sea, but intrigues were sought to be entered into with Mexico and Japan, to embroil us in wars with our sister Republic to the south and our ally in the Orient. Germany promised as a reward a part of the States of Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona. In addition innumerable acts of sabotage were committed, in which bridges, machinery, and manufacturing plants were destroyed throughout the United States. Many millions of dollars were expended in this country in propaganda work, through the press, public speakers, and secret agents, in an effort to create sentiment favorable to Germany and to prevent our Nation entering the war. There was no other course for a self-respecting nation to pursue, except to pass the resolution approved April 6, 1917.

The Germans had been preparing for war for 25 years and thought they were destined to rule the world. Hence the opening of the war had been prearranged. The German Emperor was conveniently away from his country sailing around Norway. The Russian ambassador was temporarily absent from Vienna, and President Poincaire was away from France. They were unaware of the treachery being practiced. The time was opportune for Germany to strike. Germany did not believe that England would enter the war, or that if she did that she would enter it in time to save France. Germany expected to overrun France and conquer that nation within 30 days. With her navy increased by adding the French battleships and Russian fighting ships, she expected to successfully match England in a second war. With that concluded, her third war was to be with the United States, and if successful she planned to dominate the entire civilized world.

We were anxious to see what had been accomplished in France and to visualize as far as possible the expenditures of the vast sums of money appropriated by our Government. We wished to gain first-hand knowledge for ourselves, as best we could, regarding how the money was used. We wanted to assist our soldiers in every way possible in getting them speedily returned home. They felt that the object for which they had been sent across the sea had been attained, and they desired to return to their homes and civil pursuits. We impressed this as earnestly as we could upon every general we met in France and upon every American official who had anything to do with bringing the American troops back to the United States. We took the matter up with the Secretary of the Navy, who accompanied us across the Atlantic; Gen. Helmick, whom we met at Brest; Gen. Reed, at Le Mans; Gen. Harbord, at Tours; Gen. Pershing, at Chaumont; and President Wilson, in Paris. Two hundred and ninety-seven thousand soldiers were returned to the United States in April and 320,000 in May, leaving about 630,000 to be brought back, of whom it is expected 330,000 will be returned in June and the remainder in July and August.

We also wished to study the lessons of the war and the things that would be of assistance to us in the enactment of reconstruction legislation. We were particularly desirous of making inquiry as to what legislation, if any, would be necessary to dispose of the vast amount of property which we had in France; what legislation is needed to aid our soldiers to return to civil pursuits; what beneficial legislation should be enacted for the direct benefit of the soldiers; what legislation the other countries had enacted; and such other information as would be helpful in the enactment of laws for the return or control of public utilities.

Then, of course, we went to view the battle fields of Europe, hallowed by the blood of our brave boys, who died for the cause of humanity and the ideals of our country.

With these general purposes in view, we left New York and the lights of western civilization on March 15, 1919, on board the S. S. *Leviathan*, which was formerly the S. S. *Vaterland*, built by the Germans. It is the largest ship afloat, being 954 feet long, which is longer than the Capitol Building of our Nation. It had only made one round trip across the ocean and was on this side of the Atlantic when war broke out in 1914, where she was interned.

We landed at Brest on March 23, where we were met by Gen. Helmick and by Gen. Butler, in charge of Camp Pontanezen. Brest is located upon the extreme western point of France and lies south of the western coast of England. It has a harbor where the largest ships may enter, and has been utilized by us as an embarkation point. The condition of the camp had been severely criticized, but when we reached there we found it in

as good shape as the weather would permit. It rained 335 days last year at that point. At the present time all the tents are floored and ditched about. They have stoves in them and are connected one with another by board walks. It was raining when we reached there and it was raining the next day when we left. It was raining when we returned there several weeks later. It is our belief that under the splendid management of Gen. Butler this camp is in as good condition as the rainy climate will permit.

Through the courtesy of Army officials we went by automobiles over the western part of France, visiting Rennes and the replacement camp at Le Mans, where we met Gen. Reed. We went to Tours then. It is the headquarters of the service of supply and is in charge of Gen. Harbord, whom we met and with whom we discussed at length the movement of supplies and the handling of soldiers to and from the embarkation port. From there we went to Gievres, the base of supplies. It is under the control of Col. C. J. Symonds, a very efficient officer. He courteously showed us over the entire camp, an immense space built up with warehouses. We stopped for the night at Orleans, which is a beautiful city. Joan of Arc delivered it with her army on May 8, 1429, from the English. She was later tried and convicted, through treachery and jealousy, and executed by the English.

After seeing Paris for a few days we left by automobile for the American battle front, which carried us through Belleau Wood and Chateau-Thierry. We passed through Rheims, where the great cathedral was destroyed, and remained overnight at Chalons, where Attila, at the head of the Huns, was defeated in 450 A. D., resulting in the saving of Paris. Our trip then took us over the battle front known as the Argonne Forest, the most difficult battle in which our troops were engaged. We crossed Hill 304 and Dead Man's Hill, places familiar to American soldiers. We ate lunch at Verdun, on the Meuse River. This place is strongly fortified with forts on the hills, by outer walls, and by moats. It has a citadel in which ten or fifteen thousand soldiers may be housed. It is also protected by the Meuse River. Verdun was besieged by the Germans for four years, but did not fall.

We spent an afternoon upon the St. Mihiel salient, remaining overnight at the Moraign farmhouse, not far from Metz. We went through the border manufacturing city of Longwy, which the Germans entered in the early part of the war, and which was held by them when the armistice was signed. Then we went through Luxembourg, which is a beautiful country, about the size of the average county in the United States. Our journey took us through Treves (Trier), an ancient, historic, fortified city, and then through Bernkastel, on the Moselle River, where we had lunch with Gen. Martin. This is a fine section of country, largely devoted to the raising of grapes. We crossed over the divide into the Rhine Valley and entered Coblenz, which is the headquarters of the American army of occupation. Gen. Dickman was in command at that time and had 240,000 American soldiers in the occupied area. All the expense of keeping this army is being paid by Germany, including the monthly salaries of our soldiers and officers. Coblenz is on the west side of the Rhine and is strongly fortified, with a fort upon a commanding point on the east side. It is also located in the bend of the river, which is a natural defense.

We visited the city of Cologne, about 75 miles up the river, and on our way took luncheon at Bonn, which is the site of one of the great German universities. We went to this occupied section because we were anxious to see and interview as many of our troops as possible, and also to learn as much about conditions in Germany as we could. This stretch of country had not been touched by the war and, of course, was in a fine state of preservation. The farms are being cultivated, and from all outward appearances the people were well clothed and fed. Upon inquiry, however, we were told that food prices were exceptionally high, and that the poor back in the interior were in a distressful condition and unable to get fats and other nourishing foods.

On our return trip we went through Bar-le-Duc, which is a railroad center, and through which much of our supplies were shipped. At Chaumont, the headquarters of Gen. Pershing, we discussed with him at length and with members of his staff conditions in France and everything connected with the war—the various battles in which our soldiers were engaged, his difficulties, and his triumphs. He is a fearless soldier, a fine gentleman, a man of great capacity, and an excellent executive, as well as a splendid military officer. In response to our suggestions, he indicated that our soldiers would be returned to the United States as early as conditions would permit and as soon as ships could be secured.

We returned to Paris by the way of Troys, Tonnerre, and Frogny, where we saw four or five hundred Oklahoma boys belonging to the Thirty-sixth Division, who were billeted in that vicinity. They were all well cared for, well clothed, and well fed, with ruddy complexions. They appeared to be in the very best of health. We were proud of these manly men, the military representatives of the greatest and grandest Republic beneath the stars. I am glad to say to the fathers and mothers of America that we saw nothing to criticize in the conduct of any of them, and we were glad that they were from our State and Nation.

After remaining a few days in Paris, where we called upon the American ambassador and President Wilson, and spent a few days visiting the libraries, museums, Government buildings, the grave of Lafayette, and other places of public interest, including Versailles, a suburb of Paris, where the peace delegates are now in session, and where the treaty with Great Britain ending the Revolutionary War was signed, we started up to the northern front, held by the French, English, and Belgians. Our route carried us through Arras and Lens, a city of about 25,000, in which there is not a single house standing intact. We went over Vimy Ridge, upon which there is no sign of human life. The wreck and devastation is complete. For miles in that immediate vicinity we passed ruined cities and towns with not a single house standing. The entire country was covered with shell holes, and not a human being lived there. We saw only soldiers here and there guarding property.

Going north through Lille we passed east through Ath and Tournai to Brussels, in Belgium, which is a beautiful city, with approximately 800,000 people. It was occupied by the Germans in the early part of the war and was not attacked by the Belgians, because they wanted to save their capital. It was not wrecked to a very great extent. We had an audience with King Albert, who is very much beloved by the Belgian people, as is also his splendid wife. He is very intelligent and soldierly, being more than 6 feet tall. He enjoys the confidence of his people to an unlimited extent.

We spent one afternoon upon the historic battle field of Waterloo and saw where Napoleon, the idol of France, fought against the combined armies of the Old World and lost. Instead of gratifying his ambition to dominate Europe, he died in exile six years later in St. Helena.

From Brussels we went to Louvain, a university city. The university and great cathedral were destroyed here in the war. Our route took us to Charleroi, 50 or 60 miles south, where there were some great steel factories. The machinery was removed from these factories and the plants destroyed. This was purely an act of vandalism, and was committed, so it is claimed, in order that the Germans might not have Belgian competition after the war was over.

We visited Dinant, on the Moselle River. It is a small city, where the people were terrorized and abused. A number of them were lined up against a wall and shot, in order that the remainder of the population might be terrorized into submission. We were shown one wall where 116 men had been shot. Some survived, and we saw their wounds.

We went to Antwerp next. It is to be a port of embarkation for our army of occupation. This city was not hurt. We took luncheon with Cardinal Mercier, who is known as the "grand old man" of Belgium, at Malines. Though he was often threatened by the Germans, perhaps he did as much, if not more, than any other man to strengthen the people in their resistance to the foe.

We were entertained by the Belgian Parliament at Brussels and were accorded every courtesy. The people are very grateful to the United States for our substantial assistance in sending them food and clothing and for the part we took in the war.

We left Brussels, going through Ghent, where the treaty of peace between the United States and Great Britain was signed in 1814. We remained overnight at Bruges, which was the submarine base of the Germans. Following the canal to its mouth brought us to Zeebrugge, where on April 24, 1918, the British, by one of the most daring acts in all history, entered the harbor around a strongly fortified island, under artillery and machine-gun fire, and sank four cruisers with the greatest precision. This prevented the further dispatch of submarines from this port and closed the base. Of the 4,000 men who volunteered for this task, 800 were killed. The wonder is how any escaped.

We followed the coast around by the way of Ostend and crossed the Yser Canal, where the dikes were opened by the Belgians to check the advance of the Germans. Here the Belgian King, having been forced to the extreme western border of his country, issued his famous order that any Belgian soldier who retreated farther would be a traitor to his country. He maintained headquarters at Furnes, which the Belgians held,

with a narrow strip of their own country, throughout the war. To the south lays the Ypres sector, where the battle raged with great fury. It presents a picture of devastation impossible to exaggerate. All the cities and towns in it were destroyed. The trenches and wire entanglements remained intact. The hills were cleared of trees by artillery fire, and the ground is thickly covered with large shell holes.

We passed down over the fronts held by the British and French to Paris, and all over this battle area, both to the north of Paris and the east of Paris, everything of value is completely destroyed. No one can pass over this battle ground without having the greatest admiration for the bravery and bulldog tenacity of our British ally, whose troops made such enormous sacrifices of life on this bloody field. It must be remembered that they came into the war unselfishly to assist Belgium, whose neutrality England was under treaty obligations to protect. Like others, they fought for heroic ideals, that right and not might should rule for the cause of humanity and for the ideals that we all cherish. The Ypres sector, Vimy Ridge, Lens, Cambrai, and the northern front will stand as enduring monuments to their bravery and heroism.

To make a study of the peoples of western Europe, to get a glimpse of their mode of living, and to form a more correct estimate of them, we made some hurried side trips to historic Rome, Naples, Mount Vesuvius, the ruins of Pompeii, and Genoa, the home of Christopher Columbus, which is preserved in the heart of the city. We spent a day in the city of Geneva, Switzerland, renowned for its cleanliness and beauty. It is to be the seat of the league of nations in the event one is formed. We spent a week visiting England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, including London, with its innumerable places of historic interest; Oxford, the seat of the great university; Stratford-on-Avon, Shakespeare's home; Edinburgh; Glasgow; Belfast; and Dublin in our itinerary.

Each one of us was disappointed in seeing their primitive farming methods, their very general use of cattle as work animals, their antiquated farming machinery, their inadequate railroad facilities, and their insanitary surroundings. Almost everything was done with a view of protection in the event of war, and for this purpose they built splendid roads, to permit rapid communication, cities and towns on hillside and mountain peaks in order to defend them easily, and protected themselves in the lowlands by walls and moats. Even their great cathedrals were built for the purpose of protecting the inhabitants in case of attack. Their museums everywhere are full of art treasures. Most of them are statues representing great heroes, or paintings of great battles and victories won.

There are many beneficial lessons that our trip suggested, but I want to emphasize three.

The first is the splendid roads throughout western Europe, with stone bridges and culverts, some of them constructed 2,000 years ago. They are kept in fine shape and, in fact, road building is one of their principal industries.

The second is that nothing is done for temporary use in Europe. Every building is carefully erected for permanent use.

The third is that absolutely nothing is wasted, but everything is saved and preserved.

Three outstanding features of this war stagger the imagination. They are difficult to describe in language, and are therefore incapable of full appreciation.

The first is the magnitude of the task accomplished, after the declaration of war on April 6, 1917, and before the date of the armistice, November 11, 1918, in a little over 19 months. There was no Army to speak of—about 200,000 troops all told, officers and men. Legislation had to be thought out, recommended, and enacted, and money had to be appropriated to pay the expenses before an army could be raised. Clothing, munitions, and supplies of all kinds had to be made and concentrated at supply depots, so as to be available for use. Camps had to be constructed to house the men drawn from their homes. Machinery had to be made and plants enlarged to manufacture artillery and many necessary supplies. Regulations had to be formulated, promulgated, and administered for 110,000,000 people unused to military discipline in order to raise the vast army which would turn the scale in favor of the Allies. We must have transportation facilities on land and sea, to gather raw material, concentrate it at factories, provide fuel, and gather the men from every township throughout our vast country, as well as to carry to them the supplies necessary for their use and equipment. After being trained the men were transported to seaports, where we encountered a ship shortage. Ships were needed to bridge an ocean more than 3,000 miles wide. We rented, built, and commandeered every available bottom. We landed through ports in France and Great Britain 300,000 men per month with the immense stores of supplies and munitions needed by our brave men, without which they would have been helpless and useless. On November 11, 1918, we had in the Army and Navy approximately 5,000,000 under arms. More than 2,000,000 of them were on the bloody fields across the sea. Food, clothing, and all necessary munitions and supplies followed them. Docks on foreign soil had to be built, where our troops could be landed, and warehouses were constructed near the ports for the supplies. Warehouses had to be built also at concentration points in France. At Giveres we built warehouses covering 6 square miles. If placed end to end they would have formed a line 20 miles long. Everything was stored here but heavy artillery. Railroads and dirt roads had to be built, and equipment had to be added. Everything had to be enormously enlarged so that supplies and equipment as needed might be at the right place promptly, and they were there.

The second is the rapidity with which we accomplished things. When our Government recognized that a state of war existed, we pledged all the resources of this Nation to achieve a victorious result. While other nations moved with apparent deliberation, we acted promptly. We had never known defeat, and we were not going to suffer any stain on our victorious flag. [Applause.] We legislated in financial terms of billions. We concentrated men in armies of millions, and we threw both men and munitions into the battle front in such numbers and quantity as to cheer the hearts of our Allies and break the morale of the enemy. Germany figured that by the use of the submarine she would cripple England at sea, cut off supplies of food and munitions, and even if America entered the war she would have conquered Europe before we could transport our forces across in sufficient numbers to be effective.

The third is the courage and daring displayed by our soldiers on the field of battle. We are not a military Nation, but love peace. When our Government was established it was founded on certain ideals. No nation can violate our cherished rights on land or sea with impunity. Germany misinterpreted our love for peace into an abject surrender of our international rights. There is no question of the unity of our people when attacked by a foreign foe. The splendid support given our Government by all classes of citizens in every township and school district throughout the United States challenged the admiration of the world. [Applause.] The flower of our country obeyed the bugle call. Fathers and mothers, wives and sisters bade their loved ones farewell as they marched forth to duty, perhaps to death. Patriotic men and women, whether on the platform or in the pulpit or in the editorial chair, inspired our citizens upon all occasions to do their full duty and loyally and aggressively support the cause of this Nation. Bonds were purchased and money was subscribed to meet all financial requirements. Having tried to avoid war, knowing that our cause was just, cheered and sustained by the American people everywhere, our Army went into the war determined upon aggressive action and a victorious result.

When we reached France we found our Allies hard pressed by a well-trained, brutal foe bent upon overrunning and conquering Europe and the domination of the world. Our men were quickly trained in the new methods of warfare and hurriedly thrown into the battle line, first among the British and French troops, where they could be used to the best advantage and strengthen the weaker points. Appreciating the necessity of unity of action among the allied armies, Gen. Foch was agreed upon as commander of them. He is a great strategist. They were fighting on French soil. Their capital, Paris, was immediately at stake, and I think no one ever doubts the wisdom of placing this grand old warrior of France in supreme command.

Our boys had been in line in defensive trench fighting until in April when the Twenty-sixth Division went into action in the Toul sector near Seicheprey, where they thrilled our Allies by their daring, inspired confidence in them, and served notice on our enemy that we were ready to meet them on the field of battle.

The First Division attacked the German line on May 28 and captured the town of Cantigny in the Montdidier sector and held it under heavy artillery counterattacks. The enemy was again, in a great offensive, seriously threatening Paris on the Marne near Chateau-Thierry. Our troops in divisions, commanded by our own officers, were hurried to the relief of that point, so necessary to be held at all hazards. Paris was almost in sight of the enemy. Their long-range guns were dropping shells upon the terror-stricken people within her walls. Many had fled to distant cities. The fall of the French capital was imminent, and I remember with what breathless interest we watched the fighting in July, 1918, in the Chateau-Thierry sector. The French had withstood with grand heroism the terrible onslaughts of a foe superior in numbers, equipment, and prepa-

ration for four years, and must soon yield if not strengthened. Nothing can better describe the desperateness of the situation, the bravery of the French soldier and his love for the capital of his beloved country, than the inquiry of the French officer of the general commanding our American supporting divisions, if he might fall back on the American troops for support or die there.

In the Belleau Wood our soldiers attacked and counterattacked the enemy with such fierceness and daring as to capture it and the town of Vaux. For a number of days the battle raged along the entire line until the Germans were routed and driven beyond Soissons and Paris was saved. Who knows but what the civilization of a thousand years was saved. [Applause.] We wrote a new record in the military annals of our country. We captured more than 7,000 prisoners and many pieces of artillery. We did far more. We established confidence in ourselves. Our Allies recognized that we could be depended upon, and we measurably destroyed the confidence of the Germans that they could win.

I have been all over this ground hallowed by the blood of our boys who fell in defense of this country. The thick, almost impenetrable wood known as Belleau Wood was literally shot to pieces. Trees more than a foot in diameter were shot to pieces, and they appeared as if a cyclone had gone over them. In addition, the ground was pounded with shells, and great holes pock-marked the surface on every hand. No human being could survive such an artillery fire. The little town of Lucy on the hill near-by was completely destroyed. Not a single house was left standing. There was not a single person there, save a soldier or two guarding the ruins. We stopped at a little cemetery near there on top of the hill, where, with uncovered heads, we bowed in silent reverence and contemplation in honor of 78 Americans who sleep beneath the lilies of France. They died gallantly on foreign soil to uphold the emblem of their country. I thought that a grateful Nation would hold them in affectionate remembrance and generously care for any dependents left behind.

Hardly had the Chateau-Thierry German offensive been checked, and the enemy driven back to a safe distance, than our troops were withdrawn and concentrated for a drive on the St. Mihiel salient, which was planned and executed by the commander of our forces, that brave soldier and excellent officer, Gen. Pershing. This was to be the first distinct American offensive, and was to put to the test not only our readiness to fight but our ability to command and to plan. More than 600,000 troops, in addition to a few French troops, took part in this offensive. The drive was skillfully planned. Our forces were moved and placed in position with such rapidity and secrecy that the veteran German officers and soldiers were surprised when, with clocklike precision, at break of day on the morning of September 12, under an artillery barrage that consumed 1,000,000 shells, we attacked with such dash and fury that we wiped out the salient resting on the Meuse River—in fact, crossing it at one point and threatening Verdun, a strongly fortified city that the Germans had almost surrounded and besieged for four years. We captured 13,751 prisoners, 443 guns, and much material. The brilliancy of this attack and the necessity for it can be better appreciated with a knowledge of the topography of the country. It lays between the Meuse and Moselle Rivers. The drive relieved Verdun and enabled us to shell Metz and greatly interfere with the concentration of supplies there. The Oklahoma and Texas troops in the Ninetieth Division, under Gen. Hunter Liggett, took part in this drive and share the credit of the first distinctive American victory. When I visited this battle field and an officer explained the Army maneuvers, as we passed through the city of St. Mihiel and towns of Thaicourt, Vilcay, Villers, Hattonchatel, Billy, Thillot, Vigneulles, and others, and as we gazed on Mont Sec, which was pounded and cleared of all timber by artillery fire, I could better appreciate the splendid courage of America's brave sons, including those from my own State, in marching to victory through a veritable rain of shot and shell and machine-gun fire up and across the Woevre Valley to a sweeping, glorious, triumphant victory. [Applause.]

The Argonne salient was to the west and north of the Meuse and between that and the Aire River. Much of this battle area is rough and hilly; in fact, mountainous. It is covered with heavy timber and the Germans were intrenched in dugouts and strongly fortified. They thought the position impregnable. The name is given to a wide area. So important was it that the Crown Prince himself had his headquarters at Montfaucon. The attack was planned with great care and carried out with almost mathematical precision. Across hills and ravines, through thick, heavy woods, over shell-torn, spongy soil, braving every danger known to modern warfare, our gallant boys in khaki charged, capturing machine guns, heavy artillery, and about 10,000 prisoners. Roads had to be built over which to move our heavier guns, but our engineers met every emergency. Everyone who visits France and surveys this battle area, when he considers the mountainous, wooded country, the German intrenchments, and the favorable locations for their heavy artillery, stands and silently wonders how such a successful drive could be made and carried out with such precision. This drive ended the war and perhaps changed the current of history. [Applause.] The Crown Prince from a high eminence in a strongly fortified building on the point at Montfaucon, where through a periscope he viewed the location of troops and their maneuvers for miles around, saw his trusted officers and men yield one strongly fortified position after another. He witnessed Malconcourt and Batlincourt fall and retreated in safety before Montfaucon was captured. Each day, with renewed determination to quickly end the war, our divisions added new luster to our flag as the troops scaled mountain peaks, dislodged machine guns, captured prisoners, and rolled in waves down the valley upon the enemy below. This is one of the most memorable battles of all history, and the names of the towns and villages captured and occupied during this sanguinary struggle, lasting from September 26 through the entire month of October and into November, 1918, will become household words as this decisive drive is studied and successful result appreciated. [Applause.] None were too strongly fortified or manned. They all fell alike before our artillery barrage and infantry attack. Apremont, Fleville, Montfaucon, Malancourt, Brieulles, Clery, Aucheville, Villers, and Stenay among many others will remain on the pages of history.

We had to win. We could not afford to fail. An indecisive result at this time of the year, with the rainy season beginning, meant the discontinuance of offensive hostilities, digging into trenches for the winter, and giving the Germans an opportunity to reinforce their demoralized forces and to bring up reserves, munitions, and equipment. It meant a prolongation of the war into the following year and the consequent great sacrifice of human lives. This successful offensive brought the armistice of November 11, 1918, which was in effect an unconditional surrender. In this supreme struggle the brave sons of Oklahoma in the Ninetieth Division were in the thick of the battle and far to the front when the hour of 11 on the 11th day of the eleventh month tolled out a cessation of hostilities, while the Thirty-sixth Division, also an Oklahoma and Texas division, in the Champagne were in action near Suippes and Chalons, adding new laurels to our State and Nation and rapidly pursuing the retreating Huns up the Aisne. Their valor and individual acts of heroism will be recited over and over as the days lengthen into years and as long as bravery and love of country and devotion to ideals are admired by patriotic men and fair women of our beloved country. [Applause.]

As they displayed deeds of heroism on the field of battle and conducted themselves so as to add new glory to their Nation, I am sure these same qualities will follow our brave boys back into civil life as they again take up their duties of citizenship and with renewed vigor and an enlarged vision assume their places in civil life. They can be depended upon to measure up to our fondest expectations. As they bore the flag unstained to victory, they will in the future conduct themselves as becomes an American soldier. They will see that no stains besmirch their old, cherished uniform. Their opportunity is great, and that they will avail themselves of it I have not the slightest doubt. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the association of the Grand Army of the Republic was organized soon after the Civil War, and the early Memorial Days were celebrated by long lines of soldiers marching in the streets of cities, boroughs, villages, and hamlets, each post conducting exercises in commemoration of dead comrades. Not long since, I attended a reunion of the veterans residing in my county. The occasion was the assembling of very few members, as time had thinned their ranks. A resolution was adopted to disband their posts because of the few surviving veterans. For the same reason the Confederate camps also will soon be dissolved. At the time of their inceptions, the two associations were antagonistic, but since, good fellowship toward each other has developed a united interest for the growth, prosperity, and continuity of one Government, one country, and one Republic. Their descendants, but yesterday, fought side by side to preserve our rights and inherited privileges; fought for a greater America, not greater in the acquisition of territory, but a renaissance of a higher social and political standard for the peoples of the world. The War of Nations, long prophesied, has been waged and ended. New conceptions and hopes spring from the results of wars. Premature ideas of governmental policies, and a period

of unrest will shadow for a time the building up of our industries, and our commercial relations with foreign countries. The industrial period, however, must wait until the reconstruction plan is based on a true and solid foundation.

When the German Emperor challenged the American people as a Nation, he did not place his ear close enough to hear clearly the voice of the American sentiment. He had a longing to conquer the Republic over the seas. He was not big enough, his allies were not strong enough; his ambition, the dream of an insane man.

Men of the past have attempted to conquer the world and crown themselves emperors. Alexander the Great extended his power over many nations; he desired to be triumphant over all, but he could not rule the world. He died the victim of excessive indulgence. Cæsar had the same ambition for conquest, but he fell at the zenith of his power by the assassin's poniard. Napoleon, the grestest general of all history, did not reach his goal, and died in exile on the island of St. Helena. The Kaiser hoped to win where others had failed. The American troops, however, proved an impenetrable wall, the strength of which he did not know. His remaining days will be of agonizing terror and mental torture. No one man can rule the world. This must be the conclusion, if we read carefully the pages of history.

We pause to pay the highest tribute to the American soldiers and sailors to whom we owe victory and peace. Here in the halls of Congress appropriations are made to build battleships and engines of war, but it was the heroes of our Army and Navy and the fifty thousand and more, now under the sod of France who won the battles for our Republic and liberty. Never did a people make nobler sacrifices and show greater heroism than the fathers and mothers of America. [Applause.]

Congress proposed the construction of aeroplanes, but it was the American champion, who met his single adversary in the clouds 16,000 feet above the earth and conquered him, thereby winning the supremacy of the air. No war ever revealed more courageous deeds, than were performed by our soldiers and sailors. [Applause.] On the field, in the air, and under the sea they acquitted themselves with the highest honors for bravery, valor, and fortitude. They won the war for the world's progress; they won it for more perfect attainments. Civilization moves onward, extending her growth into the dark future only to enlighten it as time develops the necessity of a greater knowledge to satisfy the new thoughts and new ideas continually evolving from the intellect and the divine power of the human mind. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I shall avail myself of the privilege extended to Members to extend their remarks on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, it is my observation that the genius of America is what was evidenced in France by the American soldier in winning this war. Personally I observed and kept in touch with matters preceding the declaration of war. Then, as the matters progressed I also kept in touch with the general situation, until it finally culminated in the declaration of war by this country against the German Imperial Government, and from that on, pending and during the legislation that made it possible to accomplish what the American Army and Navy accomplished, it was my privilege as an American Representative for the State of California to participate and favor that legislation.

I observed, as far as it was in one's power, what the people were doing in this country in the way of preparing for the war and the work done in various cantonments and training camps. I observed on every side what the father and the mother and the sister and the son were doing who were not able to enter the actual service in the Army and the Navy.

I also observed the work that was being done by the Red Cross, the Young Men's Christian Association, the Knights of Columbus, the Young Women's Christian Association, the Salvation Army, the Jewish Welfare Board, and others who were assisting in this wonderful work.

I want to say now that too much credit can not be given to all those who were unable to enter the service, but who assisted in making American genius a part and the mainspring of our soldiers' and sailors' lives. Not being content with what I could see here, as soon as opportunity presented itself, in company with other Members of the House, I crossed the ocean, and for two months observed, as far as one could, the obstacles against which our soldiers fought. I observed the battle fields where our soldiers were, where the French fought, and where the English fought. I went over the German battle fields as well. We visited and had the pleasure of seeing American soldiers in the occupation of Coblentz and the territory on the Rhine. It was for the purpose of seeing our boys over there just fresh from the battle fields, for the purpose of seeing the character of the country and the kind of hardships they had to endure, the disadvantages they were up against, that we went, as well as to observe the kind of work that had been done by these organizations that I have named. Language fails when giving credit to the general of our Army, to his subordinates, and to the soldiers who participated in the conflict. We can not be too high in our praise of those who were unable to go because of circumstances, because their time had not come to be at the front, but who were engaged in preparing for those who were there, in assembling the material, providing the munitions, and seeing that the soldiers were thoroughly and well equipped, that the conditions of our soldiers were looked after and provided for; and their work has been wonderful, and credit to the highest should be extended to them.

This resolution recognizes and gives all credit, as it should—to the mother who stayed at home, to the soldier son who bared his breast to the German gun. The pen of the best writer will never be able to describe to the people at home the conditions under which our boys faced the German Army and the terrible obstacles they encountered in making the success they did. At the risk of repetition, I say that it was the American spirit, the ideal of home and country, which is instilled into every American boy from the cradle up, that made him face unflinchingly the German cannon and machine gun, the German dugouts and the pill boxes, that forced the Germans into the open and advanced until they drove them back, that won the day. It is that American spirit which caused them willingly to lay down their lives for that which they believed to be right. In any resolutions we pass we will not be able to repay those who made the supreme sacrifice. It was known that some must advance. It was necessary that those in the front line must lay down their lives, and they did it, and did it willingly; and the wonderful thing about it all is that there were so few cases, if any, of desertion. All of the soldiers whom I met regretted that they were not at the front. No one turned back. That was the disposition of them all, and it is well that we should celebrate this day not only as Memorial Day for those who have gone, but as a recognition, as far as we can make it, of those American soldiers who participated in this terrible World War. This resolution voices the sentiment of the Members of this House unanimously, and I know that it voices the sentiment of the American people. I heartily approve of and shall vote for the resolutions. At a later day I shall speak upon the war and our participation more in detail. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD].

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Speaker, memorial institutions to the thoughtful man appeal very strongly. They have their origin in the birth of a religion, in the birth of a nation, or in a crisis in either. We have as a heritage in our own civilization memorial institutions of the birth of the Christian religion, memorial institutions of our country that originated in its birth or in events that saved it in a great crisis. To-day we honor the boys who gave themselves to the saving of the civilization of the world. Too fulsome eulogy can not be paid to these men. Once in the history of the world a tragedy so great, so terrible, came upon civilization that no language is extravagant when applied to it.

With you to-day I have been thinking, not only from our entrance into the war but from 1914, when out from a clear sky, without warning, there came the thunderbolt of all Europe engaged in a mighty struggle.

We had been so long intoxicated with our own idealism that we had begun to believe that never again could there be a war on earth. We so little understood conditions in Europe that we did not know the war was inevitable. There were eddies in this country apparently running counter to it, but the gulf current of human events was bearing us on irresistibly to the maelstrom of war. You and I are too near to measure its causes or to comprehend its vastness; too near to begin to understand its final results; but we are not too near to measure the circumstances that obtained in this country in 1914; we are not too near to understand with what self-concern we thanked God that we were 3,000 miles away; that we thanked God that we were not in war and should not be—notwithstanding that Belgium was ravaged, that France was being undone, that savage modes of warfare were going on, that children in schools and hospitals were being bombed, for did not you and I assent to the proposition that we should be neutral, even in that, and we disseminated that thought to the farthest reaches of the rural population, and the men and the women of the country treasured it in their hearts as being adequate protection.

We can not deceive the soldier boys as to what ultimately thrust us into this war. We can not deceive the French, we can not deceive the English, we can not deceive the Germans

Let us not try to deceive ourselves. We were thrust into this war to defend our own sovereignty on the sea after it had not only been violated but when there was a threat of continued violation. These boys who volunteered and who were drafted had read with breathless interest all the magazines and daily papers. Carefully they had scanned and noted every kind of fighting and outrage, and the blood of the humble boy was chilled. This war had to be fought out first in the mind and heart of the American people before a single soldier was sent across the sea. I talked recently with a man returning who had been on the Verdun front and who had continued in the army of occupation. He said to me that it was not so bad over there as it was in the anticipation of what might come. This may not be quite true, but it is of the quality of mind and heart of the generous American soldier.

Those boys in the country and the boys in the towns and in the cities had been as free as air. For the first time they were subject to military discipline and felt the shock of the camp, the shock of the denial of their personal liberty, the shock of the hard discipline in the camp service, the shock of the transportation overseas. You who have been upon the sea in the darkness of the night when the waves roll, when the stars refuse to shine, can imagine what must have been in the heart and mind of those boys, to many of whom the voyage itself was dreadful; what must have been in the mind and heart when those boys knew that any time up from the subterranean caverns of the ocean a monster submarine might come. The human suffering, the agony of it all, makes it the most tragic experience of the human race. Circumstances such as these were around the boys, and yet they had been reared in an atmosphere so brave, so true, with ideals so high that this great people of ours turned from a pacific to a militant attitude. No people could have been thus turned save a self-respecting, educated, self-governing people who knew the principles of national righteousness and had them incarnated in mind and heart.

These boys are no longer boys. They have aged into men in two short years. The tragic experiences through which they have gone, whether here or abroad, whether in thought only or in both thought and deed, have put a stamp upon them that shall tell their own generation about it and transmit it to generations yet unborn. We shall have for another 50 years among us men who bear in their bodies the marks of their sacrifices for their country. It has ever been thus. For 50 years after the Revolution there were in every hamlet the heroes of Concord and Lexington, and Bunker Hill and Saratoga, and Brandywine, of Valley Forge, and Trenton, and Yorktown. This personal heritage was ours from the sea in the War of 1812, while the homes in the West learned the story of our second war for independence from those who fought at Lundys Lane and New Orleans. The Mexican War gave us another band in whose hearts the fires of patriotism burned.

There lingers yet a remnant from that host that from '61 to '65 gave all they had and offered all they hoped to be on the altar of their country. They fought to preserve the Union. We now know they fought to save civilization itself. Liberty, not only here, but everywhere, hung in the balance in the fateful years when the sad-faced Lincoln sat in the White House. The tremendous issues were clearly defined by him in that immortal address at Gettysburg. Hear him as he sets it forth in imperishable form:

> Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.
>
> Now we are engaged in a great Civil War, testing whether that Nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure.

A remnant only of the "boys in blue" remain, but they have lived long enough to see their sons shoulder to shoulder with the sons of those who wore the gray go "over the top" on the bloody fields of France. They have lived to see men honor the flag from the South and North and East and West by paying the last great price in its defense. To-day we honor the soldier that saved the Union—that liberty might not die out.

The Spanish-American veteran came strong and true to the country's call. I can make no distinction between soldiers in any of the wars. They are all the soldiers of my country. Some have suffered more, and the hearts of all, citizens and soldiers alike, go out to them in grateful recognition of the priceless value of their sacrifice. The soldiers of this Great War are home and coming home. Theirs has been a rare service. There is deep gratitude in the hearts of our people for what they have done. We welcome them to-day formally by this resolution. This is well; but the love-lit eyes of the dear ones at home is the welcome that counts most. They are tired of war. They want only to be at home now with those they love. To us who represent them is given the task of protecting in wise laws the institutions for which they fought.

We know the causes which led us into the war. We declared war because our own rights were invaded. That is clear. However, we must not think any worthy solution of the peace of the world is impossible. "Fondly do we hope, earnestly do we pray" that somehow reason and conscience and the thought of Him who holds the sparrow in the hollow of His hand may at last control this war-stricken world. This is no party question. It must not be made one. The first draft has been modified. There may be other changes. They may be necessary. Wisdom is not with anyone who blindly opposes nor who as blindly upholds any form of the league of nations that is proposed. Rather is it with those who study earnestly and honestly to know the nature of the proposed covenant and to show forth the effects that in all probability will follow if the league is adopted.

The future is doubly secure. The soldiers of the World War see with clear vision. Their love of country has become a deep and abiding passion. American to the core, they will not be willing that our heritage of more than a hundred and forty years of priceless liberty and abundant opportunity for the struggling masses of the world shall be lost to their children or children's children. Altars of patriotism will be erected in 4,000,000 homes. So clear, so definite, so marked in their thought is the condition of the people of Europe contrasted with the happiness of the people of this great Republic that these soldiers will turn with ever-increasing love and confidence to the wisdom of the fathers. They will study our confession of faith, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States as never before. The events of our history will have a deeper meaning. They understand now that things do not happen. Wisdom and strength and honesty in leadership is necessary. Wise and just principles must be incarnate in that leadership. Such leadership and such principles gave us the Republic and have thus far preserved it. Washington and Lincoln still live in the hearts of the American soldier as the fullest expression of Americanism. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA]. [Applause.]

Mr. LEA of California. Mr. Speaker, from the very beginning of the war it was recognized that there was but one termination that could be contemplated by the American people, and that was victory. It was freely recognized that whatever the price may be of victory America was going to pay that price. We have paid that price financially and in the blood of our soldiers. To-day victory is ours.

To-day all over this land the people of America will gather to express their appreciation and admiration of the soldiers who fought beneath our flag and nowhere will the patriotic voice of America be lifted in begrudging the financial cost the war has involved. We have poured out money unstintedly, greater than ever before contemplated in the financial circles of the world, and yet it is true to-day that the total expense of this war only equals the earning capacity of the American people for seven months. Even while the war was being fought the American people earned its total cost two and a half times. Here and there may be a voice of depreciation, but the 19 months during which America was at war are the greatest months in the history of this country, in the history of the world. Regardless of whatever any whining American may say, that will be the judgment of civilization, it will be the history of America. And so to-day we do not turn backward, but the inspiring call of America is, Forward face, advance to meet the problems and opportunity of to-morrow.

Now, we seek feebly to express our appreciation of this Nation, but nowhere in the world are there lips that can adequately express the gratitude of this great Nation for its soldiers living and dead.

Our soldiers are going to return to us. Most of them are going to return in good health and strength. What do we owe to them? We owe to them everlasting gratitude. Some people would treat them as if they were dependents, as if they should become wards of this country. I do not believe that should be the attitude.

The true soldier of America is not returning in health and strength as a hero seeking alms. All he asks is a fair opportunity in this best of lands to work out his own salvation. He finds abundant compensation for his services in the fact that he fought and that he played a manly part in preserving the integrity of the future of this country, the land of his home and the land of his hope. He represents the virile, self-reliant manhood of America.

The Nation will be generous in advancing their interests, but after all is said and done we have nothing better to give our returning soldiers than the Republic of their fathers, a Government of liberty, of law and order, where the rights and

liberties of minorities should be secure, where ownership of private property is respected and encouraged, where the sacredness of the old-fashioned home is still our hope and anchor, a Government of equal rights before the law and opportunity for all.

The mother of the returning soldier is fully compensated in the happy hour of his safe return. Her prayers have been answered. She is compensated for the sleepless nights, the disturbed dreams, and all the days of anxious waiting.

The war has given us back our wounded and maimed soldiers. They return to civilian life handicapped by having paid their price for victory. We have attempted to provide for them as no nation has ever provided before. We will go with them to the end of the journey. We seek to restore their health. We seek by vocational education to broaden the opportunities that yet remain to them and to equip them to fight their own battle in civilian life. More than that, we give them financial compensation to the end of the disability. When we have done all this we have not fully paid our obligation. The obligation is not paid unless the appreciation of the Nation shall go with them as long as they bear their scars and their maimed limbs. We are not worthy of them unless we appreciate them long after they shall wear those badges of their loyalty no more.

The war shall not give back our dead. Our opportunity to compensate them is past. Our Government has attempted partly to meet her obligation to them by preparing insurance for their survivors. A chaplain in the war tells me that the knowledge that a soldier had insurance, which he never doubted would be paid, has been a consoling thought to many American boys dying on the fields of France. When the end approached and the mind wandered away from the din of battle and dwelt upon the loved ones at home the thought that they would be cared for furnished a gleam of contentment in the mind of the dying soldier.

But we have not compensated him. We know no compensation for the mother that gave her son who never returned. For her the world holds no compensation. There is no reward for the vacant chair, for the lips that can no longer speak the love of a father, husband, or son, for the arm that can no longer foster or defend. Yet their loved ones are not without consolation. For 40 centuries the world has believed, and perhaps for 40 centuries will yet believe, there is no nobler death to die than upon the battle field, fighting for country.

The soldier dead of America have left to their Nation the proud heritage of a noble sacrifice. They fought in an Army that never retreated; they died in the righteous cause of their country. Their memory will live in the gratitude of their countrymen as long as Americans are worthy of that name.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL]. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I shall only take the time of the House to repeat what I said this morning at an earlier hour to the surviving soldiers of three wars of this Republic:

No generation in the history of civilization has produced greater results than the generation that preserved the Union and saved the Republic of the United States. That was an event of so great importance to all mankind that it can not be computed. Then, too, the developments and improvements that followed the war mark the greatest material and social progress in any period in human history. Our population multiplied to more than a hundred million; new inventions and discoveries were made that have created new opportunities to reward the pursuit of happiness in our own land and throughout the world. The hand sickle and the flail, the stagecoach and the freight wagon, the spinning wheel and the loom, the crane and the Dutch oven, were the simple implements used in providing the necessities of life when you old boys were young boys. These crude implements of industry have been sent to the antique shop by the reaper, the thrasher, the tractor, by the limited express and the fast freight, by the coal, gas, and electric ranges in our kitchens which take the place of the Dutch oven on the hearth.

We have shops with a million forges and factories with more than a million spindles. We have instant communication with every quarter of the globe, and fly in a few hours across continents and over seas. The span of your lives has seen this marvelous evolution in material progress. Your day and generation performed the miracle of this great change.

I congratulate you on the important fact that this development and progress were the result of individual initiative and individual industry and without the patronage of government. You enjoyed the hope of reward of individual excellence and accomplishment. You supported the Government and only asked that the Government make you secure in your life, liberty, and the pursuit of your happiness. Government bureaus did not assume to instruct you as to your going in and your coming out. Government agents did not stand over you or shadow you at every turn. Liberty of action and the hope of reward for individual effort were the inspiration of your day and generation.

I have reminded you of our country's progress and prosperity through individual accomplishment, achieved through the hope of individual reward, so I might urge you as patriots and patriarchs to warn your sons and grandsons of the danger of paternalism, socialism, Bolshevism, and all other "isms" that deny the hope of individual reward for individual effort and achievement. Evidences are multiplying in Russia and throughout the world that that government is best that only assumes to guarantee life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and leaves the rest to the aspirations, the initiative, and the industry of the individual.

You were soldiers and are the sires and grandsires of soldiers. Your blood has made glorious every field on which it has been engaged, at Fort Donaldson, at Shiloh, at Gettysburg, at San Juan, at Manila Bay, at Marilao, at St. Mihiel, Chateau-Thierry, at Argonne Forest. Truly you can exclaim, "Mine eyes have seen the glory."

All that has passed in our country's history is an inspiration and a hope for a future full of promise that all the guaranties of a great Government will be secured to the people of the Republic of the United States while they hold fast to that which is good—a government of the people, for the people, and by the people of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT].

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, I have no carefully prepared declamation in praise of our soldiers and had not intended to say anything to-day at all until I heard my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], speak of the Twenty-sixth Division and its gallant work. Then it occurred to me that some one should say a word or two, at least, with regard to the Twenty-seventh Division and perhaps the Seventy-seventh and other divisions which represented the State of New York.

First, let me say that I do not believe anybody in this House was more profoundly interested in this war than I was from the beginning. I am sure some besides myself will recall the big map we had in the Speaker's lobby there in August and September, 1914, when the Germans were speeding on toward Paris and when it seemed that nothing could stem the tide of their onrush. At length they were held at the Marne by the French and driven back to the Aisne; and we remember the anxious days when we saw the little pins on the map stand still. We thought every day for several weeks that the Germans were going to be driven back from the Aisne and out of France into their own borders. That hope in the course of the fall was shown to be false. Both sides dug in, and the line was stabilized, as they say, and the fluctuations for a long time were very slight, so that finally the map was taken down, as the War College men who came here to move the pins found there was no moving to do, and we had to study the war in some other way.

It seemed to me probable almost from the first that we would get into the war if it lasted more than a year or two, and I recall talking with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. TEMPLE, who is one of the most profound students of history in the House of Representatives, about our chances of getting into the war, along in September or October, 1914, and he agreed that if the war lasted long enough the United States was almost certain to be drawn in, just as we were drawn into the earlier world war in the days of Napoleon. I could not understand in 1915 and 1916 how anybody could claim to be keeping us out of a war which everything seemed to show we were being drawn into. If this was a war for democracy in 1917 it was equally a war for democracy in 1914, 1915, and 1916. The destruction of the *Lusitania* in May, 1915, and other outrages committed upon our people on the ocean made it perfectly clear, it seemed to me, that the nation which had started out so ruthlessly on a career of world conquest was not only willing to trample over the rights of neutrals in general, but had an absolute contempt for the people of the United States, and thought they could not fight and would not fight; that they were honeycombed with pacifism and pro-Germanism and wholly given over to pleasure seeking and money making. Finally we did get into the fight, tardily, without preparation, but in time to give them a rude awakening. We slowly got our great Nation in motion, and I believe it is true that the valor of the American spirit and the dash of our men won the war.

But, true as this is, we must not seek to detract from the credit of our allies, who had borne the brunt of war so long before we began. Our men won because they were fresh and

eager to fight. They went on the field of battle without the discouraging knowledge of the loss of brothers and cousins and dear friends, such as the English and French had had to suffer. They probably did not even realize how vital to success their presence was in the spring and summer of 1918. They had no idea of losing. They knew the great American people were behind them with tremendous resources, and when they were given a chance they went ahead. The hardest thing for them was to stand still and drill and prepare themselves in the camps. And I think that has always been so in American life.

A good deal has been said about the harshness of the court-martial system, and with truth I think, but it is not new exactly. I recall distinctly an old fellow who is still living up in my district, who fought in the Civil War, and remember asking him one day, "Charlie, what did you do in the Civil War?" He replied, "I fit and bled and died for my country in the guard-*house*." He was a good deal of a wag, a harum-scarum fellow in his younger days, and, while I know he did his share of fighting when there was fighting on hand, there was some truth in his statement about the guardhouse. An army has to have discipline. It can not have it unless the men obey orders. It is hard for American boys to learn those things. They have been accustomed to independence at home and to acting entirely on their own initiative, and that is why discipline comes hard to them. But when it comes to actual fighting, when the time comes after sufficient training when they are ordered to go forward, they show what they are made of, and then they naturally win if victory is at all possible.

I am sorry to see some evidences of what may be called propaganda against the officers of the American Army. I think it is true that the Regular Army conducted the military policy of the country in this war, and I believe it was well conducted. I believe that is one thing that was well conducted in the war and is least open to fair criticism. Mistakes were made, but not nearly so many mistakes as were made in the Civil War or any of our earlier wars. In the North we raised volunteer regiments in the Civil War. The South had a better policy than the North. Companies and regiments were organized in the North in local districts, and officers were appointed from among local men, and in many cases generals were appointed from civil life, often with very little knowledge of technical military affairs. When those regiments finally went into battle what enormous losses they had. Many of the officers of those regiments became able leaders, but it is also true that many did not. We hear much of the successes and not much of the failures.

In this war the higher officers were taken, as a rule, from the Regular Army. I know that there has been a good deal of heartburning about that, but criticism of this policy can not properly be made, it seems to me, by anybody who understands war. Generally speaking, they were doing their work well, so far as the training of the men and the larger matters of strategy and tactics were concerned. Whether these Regular officers, when they got into actual action in going over the top, were better leaders than officers chosen from the militia or from the training camps I do not know. I have heard it said that when they got in motion natural leadership rather than training came to the front. Probably that is true, but natural leadership and training were often combined. Genius is after all about three-quarters industry and training in any line of endeavor. Somebody has to do the previous studying and planning, and the success that is won by the rush of final action does not come wholly through the courage and dash of the men.

Now, I wish to say a word in regard to the Twenty-seventh Division, of New York. I went to New York to take such part as I could in the tremendous demonstration of welcome given to that division on the 25th of March. It was an inspiring sight. When the great city of New York starts out to honor its soldiers, it gives them right royal welcome. Such a tremendous outpouring of people I have never seen before, and I am sure it must have been an inspiration even to the veterans who were tired from the marching. It was my pleasure afterwards to hear Gen. O'Ryan tell about the fighting of the Twenty-seventh, and how they broke the Hindenburg line, and I have since then talked with a good many of the men from the division. Three companies of it came from my district, and they are worthy of all the honor that has been given them. The men of the Seventy-seventh also fought splendidly, and in fact we are all inclined to think the division in which our friends fought was the best division. I am sure that while we can not say too much in praise of the valor of the men in the ranks who fought in the great battles of this war, we must also give full credit to their officers; and we must consider that as a rule they did not have the same advantages for popularity as the old Civil War officers had of having come from the same localities as the men. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANKFORD].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, as surely as the works of God are eternal, and as surely as God shapes and controls the destiny of nations, so surely are the works of him who serves his country, in a great cause, everlasting. He can never die.

Our patriots of the past are not dead, although they have passed off this stage of action. They still live in the hearts of their countrymen and in the very life of the great Nation which they helped to build.

Washington still lives, wherever the air of freedom is breathed; Lincoln still lives, wherever love of country is admired; and Lee still lives, wherever chivalry, true manhood, and Christian character are respected.

The deeds of valor, of sacrifice, and of service of our noble men and women in this Great War shall last as long as the sun in yonder sky shall shine. The people of this country who have contributed in any way to winning this war can never, never die. They shall ever live in the everlasting, ever-increasing glorious achievements of the greatest Nation on earth; in a world-wide democracy; in a league of nations worked out in accordance with God's great plan, and in an everlasting peace. God made our Nation great and full of the love of freedom, and sent our armies into the conflict when they were needed to save the day for civilization and freedom. He raised up a great generation and a great people, and raised up great men to lead us in the mighty conflict, and we won. America was destined to shape the destiny of the world.

The Omnipotent has always prepared a people equal to the task to be performed, and He has always prepared a leader when He needed a leader. Just as surely as He sent Christ to die for the sins of men; just as surely as He prepared Moses to lead the Israelites out of Egypt; just as surely as He prepared Washington to free the Colonies from bondage, so surely did he prepare Woodrow Wilson to lead our Nation in these perilous times. [Applause.] To-day Woodrow Wilson, with the liberty-loving peoples of the earth gathered about him, standing on the top of the highest mountain peak of the world's history, is delivering to the nations of the world the commandments once delivered to man on Sinai, and is preaching "Peace on earth, and good will toward men." "Woodrow Wilson, with the wisdom of Soloman and the patience of Job; with the meekness of Moses and the vision of Isaiah; with the talent of David and the judgment of Paul; with the courage of Peter and the gentleness of John; with the statesmanship of Washington, the patriotism of Lincoln, and the leadership of Lee—such a man meeting such an hour could only come from the Master Mind, who always sends a Savior in the fullness of time."

A great people with great leaders constituting a great Nation has been raised up with a great destiny. Their duty has been performed. Their glory is immortal. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GALLAGHER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, it was not my intention when I came into the House to-day to speak to the pending resolution, and I would not now but for my desire to call attention to one or two facts that seem to have been overlooked in the very beautiful tributes that we have listened to to-day to the armed forces of the United States, and to call attention to the unjust and unfair statement made regarding our alien population.

We all glory in the growth and in the mighty power of this Republic. It is a great country, as the world has discovered. It has been made great and it has progressed because we have drawn upon the best blood of the peoples of the world, and the development of the country, the ingenuity of our people, and the way we do things is the cause of wonder everywhere. We are naturally proud of the achievements of our Army abroad. They rendered a service to our country not only on the field of battle, but one that will no doubt hereafter make our flag respected wherever it proudly floats. We glory in men who sacrificed their lives in the mighty struggle for justice and for right. As the President said, "The purposes of the United States in this war are known to the whole world—to every people to whom the truth has been permitted to come." We did not enter this war for any selfish purpose of our own, but to "bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free." All praise to the New World Army; they fought bravely against poisoned gas and in the trenches, and

they won, although not given much credit abroad; and what they want as they return is an opportunity that helps a man to be a man. [Applause.]

But there is also praise and glory due to those soldiers who were compelled to remain here, where they rendered valuable and loyal service. It was not alone the fact that we were winning battles in France that brought about the armistice so soon, but it was because of the preparation that we were making in this country to win the war, that the enemy knew about, that hastened the Central Powers to ask for peace. The work of all kinds that was done in this country, the privations endured by the people everywhere to back up the efforts of our Army abroad, and the courageous and splendid work of the Navy are among the reasons why we achieved the success we did upon the blood-stained fields of France.

We should remember and not overlook the fact in speaking of our growth, advancement, and power that the people who came from other shores anxious for liberty and freedom, and who made their homes here, helped us to develop this country and make it what it is. They are also entitled to some of the credit for the progress we have made. But the course we have pursued for upward of a hundred years of welcoming immigration to the United States some are now attempting to change, and they would shut the door against the people who want to come here and share in our prosperity. I am against any such legislation. I can remember when it was the policy of this Government to welcome the oppressed of every land to our shores.

In the days when I went to school we used to sing in the morning, at the opening of the exercises:

America, sweet country dear, for every race a home;
We love the land of liberty and all who hither come.

But that is not to be the policy from now on if some people have their way, nor will such a song be popular. It was stated here this afternoon—and I was somewhat surprised at the assertion—that 10,000,000 aliens in this country refused to fight during this war. I do not know where the gentleman who made the unjust statement got his figures, but I do know something of the alien population of this country; he evidently does not. The section of the country from which the gentleman who made that assertion comes has very few aliens in it, and few aliens ever cared to make their home in that neighborhood.

I represent a district made up largely of foreigners and the children of foreigners, with very few Americans in it. Does anybody believe that we did not furnish our quota for the Army? Does anybody believe that they did not willingly volunteer for the Army and Navy in that district without waiting to be drafted? Hundreds who were entitled to exemption waived their rights and went in under the draft. They showed their courage and they showed their Americanism, and they went to the front like any other soldier of the Republic. Aliens by the thousands in this country were anxious to enlist, but were deprived of an opportunity because they were subjects of countries with which we were at war. Not only in this war, but in every war we have ever had, the foreign-born residents of America have taken a part. Why, in the Civil War my oldest brother at 16 years of age was in the Army of the Potomac for nearly four years. Regiments of Irish soldiers were in the Civil War, as were those of other nationalities, and in every other war we have ever had, and we find monuments in this city to Lafayette, Kosciusko, Pulaski, Von Steuben, Barry, and Sheridan; and reading history you can find Irish names as plentiful among the Revolutionary heroes as you can find them upon the membership roll of this House to-day. They fought in that glorious struggle for liberty, believing that this country would remain what it has always been, the hope of the oppressed everywhere. Foreign names! Look at the casualty lists sent over from France, as published in the daily papers; foreign names one after another. But aliens by the thousands are now waiting for an opportunity to leave the country because of certain restrictive legislation and because they believe in personal liberty. It is unfair to stand up here and say, without the facts, that 10,000,000 aliens refused to enter the Army of the United States. The Council of National Defense, the State councils, and the draft boards, the women who knitted and those who sewed, those who nursed the sick and wounded and cared for our troops in the trenches and on the battle fields, all contributed to our success, as did the labor forces of the country, and are all entitled to share in the glory achieved, and there is glory enough for all. We fought a great fight because we fought for the things we believe to be right, and our flag was an inspiration on the battle line to the worn and struggling armies of our Allies and urged them on with renewed courage to strike the blow that brought victory to our cause.

Let me finish with a verse of a poem by D. F. McCarthy in his great tribute to our glorious flag:

Here's our love to you, flag of the free,
And flag of the tried and true.
Here's our love to your streaming stripes
And your stars in a field of blue;
Here's our love to your silken folds
Wherever they wave on high,
For you are the flag of a land
For which it were sweet for a man to die.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, much has been said, much will be said, in praise of the valorous deeds of the American soldiers in the Great War which was recently brought to a victorious and righteous conclusion. However, too much can not be said in their praise. Their heroism, their self-sacrifice, their patriotism, will live in song and story and history forever. These young heroes will forever be enshrined in the hearts of their countrymen. Their deeds of valor and heroism will forever inspire the youth of the land. So far as language is concerned we can but enlarge upon the beautifully worded resolution offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. However, I trust that this Congress will speedily enact legislation which will recognize and reward the heroism and sacrifices of these soldiers in a substantial and beneficial way.

I wish to lay a garland of pure white lilies at the feet of the mothers and wives and sisters and daughters of the heroes of this war, who, inspired by patriotism and love, devotedly toiled and suffered and prayed for their country and their loved ones, and many of whom are now wearing, or are entitled to wear, the golden star. And we should not forget those hundreds of thousands of soldiers who were held in the various camps in this country, who were subjected to the hard, tedious, monotonous grind of military training, but who, much to their regret and disappointment, were denied the privilege of engaging in a spectacular manner in this Great War and deprived of an opportunity to inscribe their names upon the scroll of fame. They should be remembered. They are entitled to their share of praise, and I say this in all sincerity, notwithstanding the fact that I have a son, even now but 18 years of age, who recently returned from overseas after having rendered active service on the Metz and Argonne-Meuse fronts.

However, it is inevitable that those who crossed the seas, those who were offered and who seized the opportunity of doing their part in that larger way, will be more acclaimed than those who were not so fortunate.

No army ever went to battle with a higher, a more unselfish, and more patriotic purpose than did the American soldiers—not for self-aggrandizement, not for territory, but in behalf not only of our own country but of the downtrodden people of all the world. It was exceedingly meet that the greatest Republic in all the tide of time should enlist in this war for democracy and liberty, and I think that no more beautiful sentiment was expressed during the war than that by Gen. Pershing, who, reverently standing with bowed head at the tomb of Lafayette, said, "Lafayette, we are here." And we were there, and we continued to go in increasing numbers, and with renewed enthusiasm as time went on. We did not arrive an hour too soon, but we did arrive in time, turned the tide of battle, and materially helped to win the great victory. I shall not take time to recount specifically any of the deeds of valor and of courage displayed by the American soldiers, except to state that it was a source of pride to me the other day that the entire membership of this House rose en masse and greeted a returned soldier who resides in my own State, and who is generally acclaimed as the greatest individual hero of the World War, Sergt. Alvin C. York. [Applause.] I was proud of him and his superb courage and marvelous achievements. However, there are innumerable other heroes from my State and from every State in the American Union. There is glory enough for them all, both officers and men, as well as for the countless hosts who remained at home and toiled to the best of their ability in various spheres and capacities. In fact, with few exceptions, the American people almost man to man and woman to woman enlisted wholeheartedly in the great war against despotism and militarism.

I wish to state, in conclusion, that these World War veterans are returning to our shores with broadened vision, with quickened step, with heightened impulse, with increased patriotism—better citizens, truer Americans than ever—and these returning heroes will in the future direct the energies, control the

policies, and shape the destinies of this great Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, as there are no other gentlemen who desire to speak, I offer the amendment which I called to the attention of the House at the beginning of these exercises, and ask that it be now read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 13, after the word "served," insert "on the selective-service boards and," and at the end of line 13 insert the word "patriotic," so that it will read:

"That the thanks of Congress are hereby extended to those who served on the selective-service boards and in the various auxiliary forces, whose humane and benevolent work at home and on the field of battle contributed so greatly to the comfort and support of our valiant warriors."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is definitely and clearly to recognize the services of the selective-service boards, sometimes known as draft boards.

Mr. WELLING. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. WELLING. The inclusion of the selective-service boards is, of course, very proper, but they neither assisted materially in the "comfort" or the "support" of our soldiers, referred to in line 1, page 2. It seems to me, in order to complete the thought that the gentleman has in mind, the word "organization" ought to be inserted before the word "comfort," in line 1, page 2, so that it would read:

That the thanks of Congress are hereby extended to those who served on the selective-service boards and in the various auxiliary forces, whose patriotic, humane, and benevolent work at home and on the field of battle contributed so greatly to the organization, comfort, and support of our valiant warriors.

Because these selective-service boards were engaged chiefly, it seems to me, in the organization of those forces.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield, would not the word "mobilization" be better than "organization"?

Mr. WELLING. I have no desire, Mr. Speaker, to encumber the resolution——

Mr. MONDELL. I fully realize that, and I thank the gentleman for the suggestion. I was just thinking for a moment and running it over in my mind. We went very thoroughly and very carefully into this, and I will admit that the amendment that I offered, which it was necessary to offer because of my good-natured agreement, to the change of a single word, involves possibly a little further change——

Mr. WELLING. The word "organization" seems to me best suited to complete the thought.

Mr. MONDELL. I think possibly the word "organization," of the two that have been suggested, is, perhaps, the better, and I have no objection to that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WELLING to the amendment offered by Mr. MONDELL: On page 2, line 1, before the word "comfort," insert the word "organization."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent for the modification of the amendment?

Mr. MONDELL. I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the amendment as modified.

The question was taken, and the amendment as modified was adopted.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution as amended.

The question was taken, and the resolution as amended was unanimously agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Saturday, May 31, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the acting president of the Civil Service Commission, requesting permission to destroy certain useless papers in the files of the commission (H. Doc. No. 66), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FREAR: A bill (H. R. 4061) to provide departmental budget and tax revenue estimates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4062) to appropriate $500,000 to aid the Andrew Jackson Memorial Association in the erection of a monument at Nashville, Tenn., to commemorate the life, character, and services of Andrew Jackson; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4063) to amend section 162 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4064) to provide for the reduction of mileage to actual transportation expenses of Representatives and Senators; to the Committee on Mileage.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4065) to locate, map, and mark field of battle fought near Nashville, Tenn., December 15 and 16, 1864; to construct driveways, etc., and make an appropriation for same; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4066) to establish a fish hatchery and biological station in the sixth congressional district of the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4067) to relieve Congress from the adjudication of private claims against the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4068) to authorize the appointment of Philippine constabulary and Philippine scout officers to the grades of captain and first and second lieutenants in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 4069) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Las Animas, Bent County, in the State of Colorado, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4070) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Pueblo, Pueblo County, in the State of Colorado, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4071) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Saguache, Saguache County, in the State of Colorado, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4072) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Trinidad, Las Animas County, in the State of Colorado, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4073) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Eads, Kiowa County, in the State of Colorado, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4074) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Springfield, Baca County, in the State of Colorado, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4075) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Rocky Ford, Otero County, in the State of Colorado, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4076) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Golden, Jefferson County, in the State of Colorado, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4077) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Florence, Fremont County, in the State of Colorado, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4078) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lamar, Prowers County, in the State of Colorado, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4079) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Walsemburg, Huerfano County, in the State of Colorado, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 4080) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Polk, State of Arkansas, to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the city of Mena, one German cannon or fieldpiece with carriage and suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4081) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Miller, State of Arkansas, to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the city of Texarkana, one German cannon or fieldpiece with carriage and suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4082) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the southern district of the county of Logan, State of Arkansas, to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the city of Booneville, one German cannon or fieldpiece with carriage and suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4083) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Crawford, State of Arkansas, to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the city of Van Buren, one German cannon or fieldpiece with carriage and suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4084) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Howard, State of Arkansas, to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the city of Nashville, one German cannon or fieldpiece with carriage and suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4085) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the northern district of the county of Logan, State of Arkansas, to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the city of Paris, one German cannon or fieldpiece with carriage and suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4086) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Scott, State of Arkansas, to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the city of Waldron, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage and suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4087) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Little River, State of Arkansas, to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the city of Ashdown, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage and suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4088) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Montgomery, State of Arkansas, to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the town of Mount Ida, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage and suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4089) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Fort Smith district of the county of Sebastian, State of Arkansas, to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the city of Fort Smith, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage and suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4090) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Greenwood district of the county of Sebastian, State of Arkansas, to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the town of Greenwood, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage and suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4091) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Pike, State of Arkansas, to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the town of Murfreesboro, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage and suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4092) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Sevier, State of Arkansas, to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the city of De Queen, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage and suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 4093) to amend an act approved March 26, 1908, entitled "An act to provide for the repayment of certain commissions, excess payments, and purchase moneys paid under the public-land laws"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 4094) to provide employment and rural homes for those who have served with the military and naval forces through the reclamation of lands to be known as the "national soldier farm act"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HARRISON: A bill (H. R. 4095) to authorize the Secretary of War to provide military instruction in the academies, colleges, and public high schools, furnish military equipment to same, and to detail officers as military instructors therein; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 4096) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant the use of land and camp equipment to the United States Training Corps for Women and to detail Army officers for service at recreational camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 4097) granting an honorable discharge to certain enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4098) prescribing the rates of pay of the Navy and Coast Guard enlisted personnel; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4099) providing for the granting of honorable discharge to certain members of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: A bill (H. R. 4100) to amend paragraph 220, Schedule G, of the tariff act of October 3, 1913; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4101) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Pomona, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4102) to provide for the erection of a public building at Long Beach, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 4103) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Newcastle, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4104) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Staunton, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4105) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Palmyra, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4106) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Buchanan, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4107) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Gen. George Rogers Clark; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4108) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Staunton, Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4109) for the control and regulation of the water of Niagara River above the Falls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4110) for the control and regulation of the use of boundary waters of the United States for power purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 4111) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Russellville, Ark., two captured German cannons or fieldpieces, with carriages, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4112) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Clarksville, Ark., two captured German cannons or fieldpieces, with carriages, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 4113) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Alexandria, La., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4114) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to cities and towns in Louisiana German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 4115) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lima, County of Allen, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4116) to donate two captured cannons or fieldpieces to the city of Wapakoneta, Auglaize County, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4117) to donate one captured cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Tippecanoe, Miami County, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4118) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Anna, Shelby County, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4119) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Bradford, Miami County, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4120) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the village of Yorkshire, Darke County, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4121) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the memorial commission of Fort Amanda, Allen County, Ohio, four German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 4122) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a new post-office building at

Andover, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 4123) to protect citizens of the United States against lynching in default of protection by the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 4124) to establish marketing departments in agricultural colleges in the several States of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4125) appropriating $350,000 for the construction of dredge boats for dredging on the Arkansas River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4126) appropriating $350,000 for the construction of dredge boats for dredging on the Arkansas River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4127) to provide for the improvement of navigation on the Arkansas River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4128) providing for a survey of Arkansas River, Ark., with a view to making same navigable; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4129) for the erection of a public building at Conway, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4130) for the erection of a public building at Morrillton, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4131) for the erection of a public building at Conway, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4132) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Little Rock, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4133) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Morrillton, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4134) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Little Rock, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FREAR: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 83) to provide a joint budget committee composed of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 84) to provide for the payment of travel pay upon discharge to men of the Regular Army enlisted prior to April 2, 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 85) relating to the induction of registrants who applied and who were accepted for induction and assigned to educational institutions for special and technical training under the provisions of the act approved August 31, 1918, but whose induction, without fault of their own, was not completed; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PARK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 86) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan tents and other material to the Albany Chamber of Commerce, of Albany, Ga., and the South Georgia Association of the Woodmen of the World, for the annual log rolling and encampment of the Georgia Woodmen of the World, to be held in Albany, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MASON: Resolution (H. Res. 86) to investigate payment of interest and principal on Russian bonds; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: Resolution (H. Res. 87) to allow the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department to appoint a clerk to said committee; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. IRELAND: Resolution (H. Res. 88) authorizing the Doorkeeper to appoint an additional page; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Resolution (H. Res. 89) requesting the Secretary of Agriculture to report to the House the buildings occupied by the Department of Agriculture, the amount of floor space, the number of employees in each, and other information; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. IRELAND: Resolution (H. Res. 90) authorizing the payment of charwomen necessarily employed under direction of the Superintendent of the Capitol Building; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 4135) granting an increase of pension to George W. West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 4136) granting an increase of pension to George M. Jacobs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4137) to compensate the Nashville Trust Co., of Nashville, Tenn., trustee under the will of E. W. Cole, deceased, for damages to a building situated on the corner of Union Street and Fourth Avenue north, in Nashville, Tenn., and known as the Cole Building, as the result of a blast in improving the channel of the Cumberland River by a United States Government boat on Monday, August 13, 1912; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4138) for the relief of Kinney, McLaughlin & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4139) granting a pension to Sarah E. Brady, widow of Nathaniel E. Brady; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4140) granting a pension to Elsa Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4141) granting a pension to Harry Wynn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4142) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Robert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4143) granting an increase of pension to Louis Sickenberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4144) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Jane Lush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4145) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Sidney E. Collins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 4146) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint William H. Armstrong a captain in the Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 4147) granting a pension to Luther M. Southhall; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4148) granting an increase of pension to Braden E. Fox; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4149) granting a pension to Harriet E. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. IRELAND: A bill (H. R. 4150) for the relief of Charles S. Fries; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 4151) for the relief of John P. Willard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4152) for the relief of J. C. Hendricks, administrator of the estate of Samuel Houston, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4153) for the relief of Marion H. Henderson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4154) for the relief of James A. Frey; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4155) for the relief of the heirs of N. N. Barmore, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4156) for the relief of John Davis; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4157) for the relief of Elizabeth Granger and Mary Granger, daughters of Dan B. Granger, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4158) for the relief of the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of Arkansas; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4159) for the relief of the legal representatives of Wiley J. Davis, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4160) for the relief of Leander Mason and others, heirs of Thomas M. Mason, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4161) for the relief of W. M. Middleton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4162) for the relief of Finis M. Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4163) for the relief of John Davis; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4164) for the relief of John W. Fein; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4165) for the relief of Edgar Shinn; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4166) for the relief of James Shook; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4167) for the relief of Gillum Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4168) for the relief of Patrick O'Kane; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4169) for the relief of Mrs. Herbert Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4170) for the relief of William D. Kirkland; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4171) for the relief of J. C. Hill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4172) for the relief of H. L. McFarlin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4173) for the relief of the estate of William A. Crawford and the heirs of Henry H. Beavers; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4174) for the relief of the estate of Jeremiah Cockrell, late of White Oak, Fairfield County, S. C.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4175) for the relief of the heirs of Lovick Lambeth, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4176) for the relief of the heirs of Jacob Pennington; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4177) for the relief of the heirs of George W. Sleeker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4178) for the relief of the estate of George Byerly, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4179) for the relief of the heirs of Augusta W. Diehl, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4180) for the relief of the heirs of Simon Kirkpatrick; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4181) for the relief of the heirs of Peter Goodman; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4182) for the relief of Stephen W. Bates; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4183) for the relief of Eli G. Collier; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4184) for the relief of C. V. Hinkle; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4185) for the relief of James A. Frey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4186) for the relief of R. W. Harris; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4187) for the relief of Marion H. Henderson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4188) for the relief of George W. Beavers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4189) granting an increase of pension to William Douglass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4190) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Lee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4191) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson D. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4192) granting an increase of pension to George W. Plank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4193) granting an increase of pension to George W. Burton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4194) granting an increase of pension to William H. Simmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4195) granting an increase of pension to William Douglass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4196) granting an increase of pension to James R. Power; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4197) granting an increase of pension to Alvin G. Woodworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4198) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4199) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ballou; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4200) granting a pension to Edward Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4201) granting a pension to William A. Pollard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4202) granting a pension to Frank Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4203) granting a pension to Rebecca E. Skaggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4204) granting a pension to Edward Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4205) granting a pension to Frank W. Godsey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4206) granting a pension to Sam Ragsdale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4207) granting a pension to Kate Chance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4208) granting a pension to George W. Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4209) granting a pension to George W. Johnston; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4210) granting a pension to Mrs. A. M. Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESHER: A bill (H. R. 4211) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Isaac Rake; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 4212) granting a pension to Mary M. Canton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: A bill (H. R. 4213) granting an increase of pension to Matthew M. Eshelman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4214) granting a pension to Rita Shafges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4215) granting a pension to Harriet J. Houghtaling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4216) granting a pension to Marion W. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4217) to reimburse Jason J. Green; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RHODES: A bill (H. R. 4218) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Lotz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4219) granting an increase of pension to William B. Thurman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 4220) for the relief of Frank Barber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 4221) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Gifford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 4222) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Shell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4223) granting an increase of pension to Uriah J. Favorite; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 4224) granting a pension to Mary Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4225) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte C. Brandau; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petitions of the Welsh Presbyterian Synod of Northeast Pennsylvania; convention of District Superintendents of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Columbus, Ohio, southern Indiana, and Kentucky; and sundry residents of Hasbrouck Heights, N. J., earnestly protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of the Shoe Retailers' Association of San Francisco, earnestly requesting Congress to repeal tax on shoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against luxury tax on soda, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of Jordan Marsh Co., Boston, Mass., opposing repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also (by request), petition of over 2,000 Armenians of Detroit citizenry urging American mandatory over united independent Armenia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens of Minnesota, protesting against luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of mass meeting of Jewish citizens of Niagara Falls, N. Y., protesting against outrages in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNING: Memorial adopted by membership of Wiley Methodist Episcopal Church, Camden, N. J., protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of membership of Broadway Methodist Episcopal Church, Salem, N. J., protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of residents of Camden County, N. J., protesting against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CURRY of California: Resolutions of Sacramento (Calif.) Boat Club, protesting against tax on small motor, sail, and row boats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of special post-office clerks at Providence, R. I., relative to salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: Petition of 85 citizens of the city of Indianapolis, Ind., urging the enactment of legislation providing for the permanent Government ownership of all railways, telegraph, and telephone facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Rev. Augustus S. Buchanan, pastor of the Home Presbyterian Church, and 66 other citizens of the city of Indianapolis, Ind., in remonstrance against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Henry Dilger and 65 other citizens of the city of Indianapolis, Ind., urging upon Congress the enactment of legislation providing for the national ownership and Government operation of all railroads within the United States and its possessions necessary for the furnishing of transportation to the people of the United States, including all lands, terminals, and equipment required or desirable for successful operation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, Monument Division, No. 598, praying for the enactment of legislation restricting immigration into the United States from foreign countries; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of J. D. Williams (Inc.), Brooklyn, and Max Green & Co., manufacturing furriers, opposing tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Association of Manufacturers, with reference to the United States Employment Service, opposing appropriation for Department of Labor Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of R. E. Swett, Richmond Hill; P. Martin, Brooklyn; A. E. Payson, New York; C. S. Hammond & Co., New York; the White Co., Cleveland, Ohio; W. Bianchi & Co.; H. C. Stieglitz, Brooklyn; Carter, Macy & Co. (Inc.); Globe & Rutgers Fire Insurance Co.; Freck, Loeser & Co., Brooklyn; Grevatt Bros. (Inc.); members of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., Brooklyn; H. R. Lathrop & Co. (Inc.); Standard Mail Order Co.; the Baker & Taylor Co.; M. J. Whittall; M. B. Snevily, president Oil Seeds Co.; Thomas P. Graham; F. G. Robertson; Fred W. Cohen; Metal & Thermit Corporation; George W. Baker; E. W. Durkee; Fred Fear & Co.; Campbell, Metzger & Jacobson; Columbia Graphophone Co.; and P. W. Lambert & Co., all of New York State; H. Jacquin & Co., A. V. Wahlberg, S. Williams, M. Phillips, M. McClure, E. Leap, Daniel Currie, A. Van Kilch, P. J. Dinan, Edward M. Hanley, V. W. Knutsen, Leo D. Fox, J. Megroz, Mack Wolf, Elbert Butts, J. A. Guillaume, H. T. Kramer, Philippe Lambert, G. Megroz, and Leo C. Lucke, all of New York, protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: Petition of Chamber of Commerce and citizens of Long Beach, Calif., against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Southern California Wholesale Grocers' Association and 40 manufacturers of southern California, against restriction of power of Interstate Commerce Commission relating to long and short haul rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of New Century Club, of Pasadena; First Friends Church, of Long Beach; Bible Institute of Christian Workers, Los Angeles; Memorial Baptist Sunday School, South Pasadena; State convention of California Women's Christian Temperance Union in session at Santa Ana; Methodist Congregation Sunday School and Epworth League, of La Verne; Lake Avenue Congregational Church and Sunday School, Pasadena; Covina Methodist Church, Covina; Interchurch Committee, La Verne; Long Beach Quoit Club and Ladies' Good Luck Club, Long Beach, all of California, against repeal of war prohibition; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Placer-Nevada Counties' Christian Endeavor Union, urging the adoption of the league of nations plan, submitted by Una G. Price, president, Grass Valley, Calif.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of board of trustees of the city of Glendale, Calif., urging the enactment of proper legislation reverting to private ownership the telephone lines and systems which were taken over by the Government during the war; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of United States Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, against the repeal of the daylight-saving system; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Protestant Ministers' Association of San Francisco, Calif., against the lifting of the ban on beer and wine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Bonham & Gillette, Red Bluff, Calif., asking the removal of the excise tax on automobiles, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition or memorial of Methodist Episcopal Church of Dunsmuir, Calif., against the lifting of the ban on beer and wine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of certain citizens of Gazelle, Calif., protesting against the lifting of the ban on beer and wine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, telegram by Eugene S. Elkus, president; G. W. Brainard, secretary, Board of Trade, San Francisco, Calif., relative to the effort being made to deprive the Interstate Commerce Commission of its present power to authorize departures from long and short haul clause; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Pacific coast section of National Electric Light Association, protesting against the establishment of a standard of ethics by the Bureau of Standards, by H. F. Jackson, president, Sierra & San Francisco Power Co., San Francisco, Calif; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of St. Helena Chamber of Commerce, urging the repeal of the war-time prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of J. C. Hunter et al., of Bismarck, Mo., protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWEET: Petition of citizens of Wright County, Iowa, relative to the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Resolutions adopted by the faculty council of University of North Dakota; Forestry State Normal School, Bottineau; faculty of State Normal School, Valley City; and the Study Club of Fargo, N. Dak., favoring a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Commercial Club of Bottineau, N. Dak., favoring bill 15400 for the creation of a Department of Education; to the Committee on Education.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *May 31, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee our Father in Heaven for the splendid demonstrations on the floor of this House yesterday and throughout the length and breadth of our land in memory of the American soldier, living and dead, who fought for his country and for humanity in all the wars of the past.

Teach us, we pray Thee, the value of patriotism, not only in war but in peace, that right and truth and justice may live and make the world pure and strong and a safe place for the home, industry, and our religious convictions. To the glory and honor of Thy holy name, in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. DUPRÉ, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Widow Emma Golden (H. R. 12263, 2d sess., 65th Cong.), no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, I ask unanimous consent for permission to that committee to sit during the sessions of Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, asks unanimous consent that that committee have permission to sit during the sessions of Congress. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

LATE REPRESENTATIVE JOHN L. BURNETT.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a brief resolution of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on the death of its late chairman, the Hon. JOHN L. BURNETT, who was also a Member of this Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a brief resolution of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on the death of the Hon. JOHN L. BURNETT, late chairman of that committee. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The following is the resolution referred to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House of Representatives of the United States of America has learned with deep regret of the death of Hon. JOHN L. BURNETT, late chairman of this committee.

Appreciating his sterling worth and honoring him for his loyal and whole-hearted service to the people of the United States, the members of this committee desire to extend to his widow and his family their sincere expressions of sympathy: It is therefore

Ordered, That the clerk be directed to enter a copy of these resolutions on the committee minutes, to present a copy to the House of Representatives for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and to transmit copies to Mrs. John L. Burnett and Mr. P. W. Burnett, of Gadsden, Ala.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 1200) making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, and for other purposes, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

PRESIDENT WILSON'S MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Memorial Day speech made by the President of the United States in France yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the speech delivered yesterday by the President of the United States. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

B. F. ESTOPINAL.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask for consideration of the privileged resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois, from the Committee on Accounts, offers a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 56.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the House to B. F. Estopinal, clerk to the late Hon. Albert Estopinal, a Representative in Congress from Louisiana at the time of his death, April 28, 1919, the sum of $166.66, being an amount equal to one month's salary of a clerk of a Representative in Congress.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILEAGE, STATIONERY, ETC.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 1200 and ask for the immediate consideration of the same.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman state the character of the bill for the information of the House?

Mr. GOOD. The Senate has passed the bill with regard to mileage and stationery allowance, and with provision for the pages, as reported by the House, with two amendments. That bill as it passed the House made the mileage that had been appropriated for in the legislative bill for the regular session of Congress available for this special session of Congress. The Senate adopted the suggestion that was made on the floor of the House by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], and struck out that provision, and made a direct appropriation for the mileage of this session, thereby obviating the necessity of making a new appropriation for the same purpose for the next regular session. They have also added the stationery allowance for Senators and the regular allowance for pages and other employees in the Senate. If this consent is given, I expect to move to concur in the Senate amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, asks unanimous consent that there be taken from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 1200, with Senate amendments thereto, and that the same be immediately considered. Is there objection?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is that the bill that has just been messaged over?

Mr. GOOD. It is.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (H. R. 1200) making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, and for other purposes.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

REREFERENCE OF A BILL.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have a bill transferred from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to the Committee on Military Affairs. It is a bill, Mr. Speaker, that has only one purpose, and that is to increase the pay of officers in the Army. The reference was clearly a mistake, and it should go to the Military Committee.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I could not hear the gentleman.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I will say to my colleague from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] that I ask unanimous consent to have rereferred a bill that was introduced by me for increasing the pay of officers in the Army. It was referred incorrectly to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I ask that it go to the Committee on Military Affairs, which has sole jurisdiction of the subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. GARNER. Has the gentleman consulted the chairman of each one of these committees?

Mr. DYER. I have consulted the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and he, of course, says it should go to the Committee on Military Affairs. The same bill was presented in the House in the last Congress and went to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GARNER. That meets with the approval of each one of these committees?

Mr. DYER. Oh, yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I will say that it should have gone to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I gave notice the other day that it seemed to me that it would be conducive to the orderly dispatch of business if gentlemen in position of some responsibility on this side, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], responsible on his side, were informed in advance in regard to these requests. I think that was a reasonable suggestion, and I believe that it is a suggestion that should be followed for the protection of the House. If this matter were tremendously important, I would not object; but in view of the statement I made the other day, I feel that at this time I must object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming objects.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, if it were a matter of any great importance, I would have consulted the distinguished leader of the House; but it is a very simple matter, involving nothing except that a little bill, which has nothing on earth to do with the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, but is a purely military matter, should go to the Committee on Military Affairs. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] moves that the bill be rereferred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that motion is not in order at this time. Other business has intervened, and the gentleman has not stated that he has authority from his committee for making the motion.

Mr. DYER. That is not necessary.

The SPEAKER. The motion of the gentleman from Missouri was in order, of course, immediately after the approval of the Journal; but other business has intervened, and an appropriation bill has been taken up, and the Chair thinks that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Obviously there is not.

CALL OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Andrews, Md.	Browning	Campbell, Kans.	Cole
Babka	Brumbaugh	Carew	Cooper
Bacharach	Burdick	Casey	Copley
Benson	Burke	Chindblom	Costello
Bowers	Butler	Cleary	Crowther
Brooks, Pa.	Caldwell	Coady	Cullen

Curry, Cal.	Howard	McPherson	Sabath
Dale	Huddleston	MacGregor	Sanford
Davey	Hulings	Maher	Saunders, Va.
Dempsey	Humphreys	Mann	Schall
Dewalt	Husted	Mead	Scully
Donovan	Hutchinson	Michener	Sherwood
Dooling	James	Mooney	Shreve
Doremus	Johnston, N. Y.	Morin	Siegel
Doughton	Jones, Pa.	Murphy	Slemp
Eagan	Kearns	Neely	Small
Edmonds	Kelley, Mich.	Newton, Minn.	Smith, N. Y.
Ellsworth	Kelly, Pa.	Newton, Mo.	Snyder
Emerson	Kennedy, R. I.	O'Connell	Steele
Fisher	Kettner	Olney	Steenerson
Fitzgerald	Kleczka	Osborne	Stephens, Miss.
Flood	Kreider	Padgett	Stevenson
Focht	LaGuardia	Paige	Sullivan
Fuller, Mass.	Larsen	Pell	Temple
Gallivan	Lee, Ga.	Peters	Thompson, Ohio
Ganly	Lesher	Phelan	Tilson
Garland	Linthicum	Porter	Upshaw
Glynn	Little	Pou	Vare
Goldfogle	Lonergan	Quin	Venable
Goodwin, Ark.	Luce	Radcliffe	Voigt
Graham, Pa.	Lufkin	Ragsdale	Ward
Greene, Mass.	Luhring	Rainey, J. W.	Watson, Pa.
Griest	McClintic	Ramsey	Welty
Griffin	McFadden	Reed, W. Va.	Wilson, Pa.
Hamill	McGlennon	Riordan	Winslow
Hicks	McKiniry	Robinson, N. C.	Zihlman
Hill	McKinley	Rowan	
Holland	McLane	Rowe	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and seventy-eight Members have responded to their names. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming moves that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

REPEAL OF LUXURY TAXES.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Committee on Ways and Means has a very urgent measure that it is desirous of bringing up in the House immediately. In view of that fact I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2021) to repeal section 904 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, may we have it reported?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont asks that the bill be reported. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2021) to repeal section 904 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 904 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919, be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That is sufficient. It is notification that this bill relates to the luxury tax?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. SNELL rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. SNELL. To ask a question of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan how long the consideration of this bill will take, and whether it is the intention to proceed with the Agricultural appropriation bill when this bill is finished this afternoon?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know what the procedure will be after the passage of this bill, but I think it will take but a very short time to pass this bill.

Mr. CANNON. I do not think anybody can prophesy about that until we find out what it is.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2021.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] will take the chair. [Applause.]

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2021) to repeal section 904 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919, with Mr. WALSH in the chair.

Mr. WALSH took the chair amid general applause.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the consideration of H. R. 2021, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the report read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks that the report be read. The Clerk will read it.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Ways and Means, to whom was referred H. R. 2021, to repeal section 904 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919, having had the same under consideration, report it back to the House without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

On February 28, 1919, the Committee on Ways and Means favorably reported a resolution to repeal section 904 of the revenue act approved February 24, 1919, and the following is quoted from the report submitted by Mr. KITCHIN at that time:

"The purpose of section 904 was to encourage thrift and economy and to prevent extravagance, as well as to provide revenue. It was understood that these consumption taxes were levied as war taxes only. This was a proper tax in time of war, but your committee believes that in time of peace it can not justify the placing of the burden (1) on the retailers of the country of keeping the necessary additional accounting system to collect the tax from the taxable sales in order to properly return the tax collected to the Government; or (2) such a heavy tax upon the consumer.

"Your committee is unanimous in recommending the passage of this resolution.

"Section 904 of the revenue act of 1918 reads as follows:

"'SEC. 904. (a) That on and after May 1, 1919, there shall be levied, assessed, collected, and paid a tax equivalent to 10 per cent of so much of the amount paid for any of the following articles as is in excess of the price hereinafter specified as to each such article, when such article is sold by or for a dealer or his estate on or after such date for consumption or use—

"'(1) Carpets and rugs, including fiber, except imported and American rugs made principally of wool, on the amount in excess of $5 per square yard;

"'(2) Picture frames, on the amount in excess of $10 each;

"'(3) Trunks, on the amount in excess of $50 each;

"'(4) Valises, traveling bags, suit cases, hatboxes used by travelers, and fitted toilet cases, on the amount in excess of $25 each;

"'(5) Purses, pocketbooks, shopping and hand bags, on the amount in excess of $7.50 each;

"'(6) Portable lighting fixtures, including lamps of all kinds and lamp shades, on the amount in excess of $25 each;

"'(7) Umbrellas, parasols, and sun shades, on the amount in excess of $4 each;

"'(8) Fans, on the amount in excess of $1 each;

"'(9) House or smoking coats or jackets, and bath or lounging robes, on the amount in excess of $7.50 each;

"'(10) Men's waistcoats, sold separately from suits, on the amount in excess of $5 each;

"'(11) Women's and misses' hats, bonnets, and hoods, on the amount in excess of $15 each;

"'(12) Men's and boys' hats, on the amount in excess of $5 each;

"'(13) Men's and boys' caps, on the amount in excess of $2 each;

"'(14) Men's, women's, misses', and boys' boots, shoes, pumps, and slippers, not including shoes or appliances made to order for any person having a crippled or deformed foot or ankle, on the amount in excess of $10 per pair;

"'(15) Men's and boys' neckties and neckwear, on the amount in excess of $2 each;

"'(16) Men's and boys' silk stockings or hose, on the amount in excess of $1 per pair;

"'(17) Women's and misses' silk stockings or hose, on the amount in excess of $2 per pair;

"'(18) Men's shirts, on the amount in excess of $3 each;

"'(19) Men's, women's, misses', and boys' pajamas, nightgowns, and underwear, on the amount in excess of $5 each; and

"'(20) Kimonos, petticoats, and waists, on the amount in excess of $15 each.

"'(b) The tax imposed by this section shall not apply (1) to any article enumerated in paragraphs (2) to (8), both inclusive, of subdivision (a), if such article is made of, or ornamented, mounted, or fitted with, precious metals or imitations thereof or ivory, or (2) to any article made of fur on the hide or pelt or of which any such fur is the component material of chief value, or to (3) any article enumerated in subdivision (17) or (18) of section 900.

"'(c) The taxes imposed by this section shall be paid by the purchaser to the vendor at the time of the sale and shall be collected, returned, and paid to the United States by such vendor in the same manner as provided in section 502.'"

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, this matter of the repeal of section 904 of the new revenue act was considered by the conference committee at the time the revenue bill was before that committee last winter. The conference committee had no jurisdiction over this section to strike it out, both Houses having agreed to it; but by unanimous vote of the members of the conference committee it was agreed that a special bill would be introduced looking to the repeal of this particular section. Bills were introduced in the House for the repeal of this section of the law at the last session of Congress, but owing to the lateness in the session they failed to pass. The Committee on Ways and Means therefore at a meeting last week took up the consideration of the repeal of several of the sections of the new revenue law which relates to consumption or so-called luxury taxes. The consideration of the matter of the repeal of other sections or parts of sections of the bill was deferred, awaiting further information from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the Secretary of the Treasury. Therefore the committee, by unanimous vote, all members being present, ordered a favorable report of this bill for the repeal of section 904.

Mr. CANDLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. CANDLER. This is the same identical bill that was passed by the House just before the adjournment of the last session of Congress, but failed to pass in the Senate?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes. This bill, if enacted into law, will repeal, according to estimates made by the Treasury Department, an amount of revenue estimated to be $85,000,000. My candid opinion is that the tax provided for in section 904 would yield more than $100,000,000. I think it will go above the estimate.

A bill has been introduced also—introduced by myself—looking to the repeal of section 630 of the new revenue law, which relates to the tax on soft drinks and ice cream. According to the estimates, if that section of the law is repealed, it will repeal $21,000,000 of taxes in addition to those accounted for by this section.

Many requests have come from every quarter requesting the repeal of other sections of the so-called luxury or consumption taxes. Among others is a request from the dealers of the country for the repeal on the tax on automobiles. If that provision of the law is repealed, it will cancel some $90,000,000 or $100,000,000 more of those taxes.

The total amount of taxes that will be collected during the coming fiscal year, as estimated by the Treasury Department under the so-called luxury or consumption taxes, is in round numbers $350,000,000. Therefore this bill, as I have said, will repeal from $85,000,000 to $100,000,000 of those taxes.

I do not know that I care to make any further statement unless some gentleman wishes some information, which I will be glad to give if possible.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The estimate made at the last session of Congress certainly was that the automobile tax would raise $125,000,000.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; but that estimate is reduced by the Treasury Department now to $90,000,000.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That has been reduced, has it?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes. But I will say to the gentleman that it is my opinion that it will yield far more than $90,000,000, because at the time those estimates were made there were not as many automobiles being made as are now being made. I made an inquiry recently of several of the principal automobile dealers about the delivery of a car, some of the kind in quite common use, and I found that it is almost impossible now to get the delivery of an automobile short of two or three months, if it were ordered now. There is a very great demand in the country for automobiles. The factories are running full blast, as fully as they can find labor anyway, and therefore I believe the amount of the tax to be collected by the Government on automobiles, if this provision of the law is not repealed, will far exceed $100,000,000 this coming year.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to inquire whether or not this bill will repeal the so-called luxury tax on jewelry?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; jewelry is not included in this section of the law.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I have received a great many letters from merchants asking for the repeal of this tax. I see that it is paid wholly by the consumer, but I do not recall receiving a letter from a consumer asking that this tax be repealed. I should like to inquire whether consumers are asking for the repeal of this tax.

Mr. FORDNEY. The information that has come to me comes largely from dealers, although I have had many requests from consumers.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The statement that the gentleman has made would indicate that the automobile business has not suffered very severely by reason of this tax.

Mr. FORDNEY. No. I saw a bill for the sale of an automobile the other day to the purchaser, and it was made out giving the price of the automobile and some extras, for extra tires, that in addition thereto the Government tax, stating the exact amount, and then giving the total to be paid by the purchaser of the automobile. Therefore I believe that in all cases the tax is added to the price which the purchaser or consumer pays, and the purchaser or consumer pays it.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. Did the committee consider the question of fixing a specific date ahead upon which this law should take effect?

Mr. FORDNEY. No.

Mr. GARRETT. I have seen the statement—I do not know how accurate it is—that unless something of that sort be done a considerable expense and a great deal of annoyance will be caused to the Government on account of having to return taxes that will be collected between the date of the passage of this act and the time of notifying them to stop taxing.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will say that I had some talk with Government officials about that. It was their opinion, and it is my opinion, that if the bill takes effect immediately on its passage every merchant in the country will report the amount of taxes collected from the date that the law took effect and the date of its repeal, and therefore there will be no burden on the Government to separate the taxes from the nontaxing period.

Mr. GARRETT. The point I understood that was made was that there would be a great many who would not have notice of the passage of the act and would continue to collect the tax, and hence it would be necessary for the Government to return all that might be collected after the signing of the act.

Mr. FORDNEY. It might be well to fix a special date; but I hardly think so. I think the Government would give notice through the press, so that everybody collecting the tax would know immediately. If the bill passes the House, as I believe it will, and then immediately is passed by the Senate without amendment, it will be notice to the country that the signing of the bill by the President, wherever he may be found, will be the date of the cancellation of these taxes.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Certainly.

Mr. PLATT. Does the gentleman think it good policy at this time to repeal a tax which is going to yield $100,000,000, and a luxury tax at that?

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me say to the gentleman, in answer to his question, I have been and am now opposed to putting upon the people a consumption tax. I have opposed it and did when the committee was preparing these hearings on the bill. I do not believe in consumption taxes so long as we can raise the necessary money to meet the running expenses of the Government in some other way less burdensome to the people. The consumption tax in every instance must and will be paid by the consumer. Now, there is a possibility of raising the necessary funds to carry on the running expenses of the Government by collecting money in some other way that would be less burdensome on the poor people.

Mr. PLATT. The gentleman will not contend that this is burdensome on the poor people.

Mr. FORDNEY. It is very burdensome on the poor people, because boots and shoes are worn by the poor as well as the rich, and the price that the poor man pays for a pair of shoes to-day is far in excess of the limitation set out in the law. Not only that, but in many other articles of wearing apparel. Prices are high to-day, whatever the cause may be. Conditions all over the world are abnormal as to the cost of living and everything that pertains to food and clothing. There are many articles covered by this section of the law used by the poor people. I believe the tax would be less burdensome to the people of this country if imposed on people that have large incomes instead of upon those whose incomes are meager.

Mr. PLATT. Does the gentleman mean to say that the poor man pays more than $10 for a pair of shoes?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do.

Mr. PLATT. I do not pay that.

Mr. FORDNEY. I am a poor man, and I pay more than $10 for shoes.

Mr. PLATT. It is not necessary; the gentleman can get the shoes cheaper if he wants to.

Mr. FORDNEY. If I wanted to buy a pair of stogies I probably could buy them for less than $10, but such a pair as the gentleman wears and I wear costs more than that.

Mr. PLATT. I get a pair for $7.

Mr. FORDNEY. I pay more than $10 for shoes.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Is it not a fact that practically all sections of the country are in favor of the repeal of this law?

Mr. FORDNEY. I speak for myself; I have received but a single letter asking the Ways and Means Committee not to repeal this section of the law.

Mr. DYER. The committee was unanimously in favor of the repeal of the section?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Has the gentleman's committee given consideration to the repealing of the taxes on other matters?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; the committee did take up and discuss the repeal of other sections of the law, but deferred action, wait-

ing to receive information from the Treasury Department, as requested by them.

Now, let me say further to the gentleman. I want to say to the gentleman that in reporting this section of the law and as to these taxes imposed by the various sections of the law this must be borne in mind: No matter who is responsible for it, what the cause or occasion may be, this situation faces the Congress of the United States. The expenses of the Government for the coming fiscal year are going to be in excess of the revenue collected by the Government somewhere from one to two billion dollars.

The question is, Where are we going to get that money? The duty devolves upon Congress to raise that money to meet the expenditures already contracted for and expenditures that can not be relieved before the end of the next fiscal year. The Army and the Navy are still costing us a large sum of money. I do not see any good reason why our soldiers who are in this country should not be more promptly discharged. Every man now held by the Government in the Army and the Navy in this country in excess of the ordinary size of the Army and the Navy in normal times is a burden upon the taxpayer, and a great burden. The taxes are millions of dollars per day, caused by the slowness of the Army and Navy Departments in discharging men from the service who ought to be discharged. That is my opinion, at least. I may be wrong about that; but those expenses are going on from day to day, and they are enormous, and where in the world we are going to get from six to eight billion dollars of taxes this coming year is a quandary. It is a matter of very serious consideration for the Congress of the United States, and in repealing any of the existing laws we must bear in mind the question of where we are going to get the money in lieu of those taxes that we are repealing.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. A pair of shoes that costs $10 does not pay any tax.

Mr. FORDNEY. Up to $10; no.

Mr. CANNON. If they cost $12, there will be a 10 per cent tax?

Mr. FORDNEY. Twenty cents on a $12 shoe.

Mr. CANNON. If a woman's dress costs $200—and it is my experience that that is not a high price for a woman who goes in fashionable society—she has to pay how much tax?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know; my wife has not had a new dress since the Democratic Party came into power. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Most of us do know.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois yield for just a moment for an explanation?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would like to call to the attention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], in answer to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], the fact that women's dresses are not in this bill at all. Women's dresses are not taxed; neither is men's clothing. Those two things were taken out by amendment in the Senate one midnight when everybody appeared to be asleep. So they go scot free. They are not in this repealer at all, because, owing to the parliamentary status due to the fact that women's clothing and men's clothing were taken out, the bill was in such shape in conference that it had to be reported out in that way or else the whole bill would have been defeated.

Mr. CANNON. Let us take trunks, for instance. A trunk costing up to $50 does not pay any tax. I see that is especially mentioned here in this bill.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. If the trunk cost $60, the purchaser would have to pay how much?

Mr. FORDNEY. Ten per cent on all prices paid above $50.

Mr. CANNON. How many men in the House have constituents who buy trunks costing over $50?

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. We all have them.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, yes; the gentleman is from Chicago; but how many of his constituents, how many of his laboring men? How many of the farmers of the country buy such trunks? How many of the people who are producing things?

Mr. FORDNEY. All wardrobe trunks pay a higher price than that.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, yes; that is where you travel with a wardrobe trunk, and have your silk dresses and your spike-tail coats hung up on hooks.

Mr. FORDNEY. I may say to the gentleman that I do not own a wardrobe trunk, but I thought perhaps he does.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no; I do not; I am one of the poor fellows.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no!

Mr. CANNON. Oh, well, the gentleman says "Oh, no!"——

Mr. FORDNEY. I am joking.

Mr. CANNON. So am I. [Laughter.] But seriously I do not believe that 5 per cent of the people of the United States pay one single cent on these articles mentioned. [Applause.] I want five minutes after a while in the consideration of this bill.

Mr. JEFFERIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. JEFFERIS. I would like to inquire where they expect to raise this revenue amounting to $100,000,000 if not raised on these articles in the manner provided.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know just from what source it will come, except it will come from the people in some manner. Taxes must be raised; the money must be collected somewhere from the people. I would say, however, that we must not be frightened over the amount of taxes that we are paying because of this Great War. Let me say to the gentleman that I picked up a Chicago Tribune the other day, and to my great surprise I saw that the English budget, which is the English Government's expenditures for this fiscal year, which begins the 1st day of April and ends on the 31st day of March—their taxes will amount to $7,500,000,000.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Taxes or appropriations?

Mr. FORDNEY. Taxes. Their budget represents the amount of money they must pay this year, collected in taxes, not from the sale of bonds. It must be remembered that the population of Great Britain—that is, England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales—is about 45,000,000, while we have a population of more than 100,000,000. Their public debt is almost identical with our public debt. When our Government has disposed of the Government bonds and certificates of indebtedness already authorized, together with those that have been disposed of, our public debt will amount to $37,500,000,000 and is almost identical with that of Great Britain. Great Britain holds obligations of her Allies in an amount equal in round numbers to that held by our Government from our Allies, namely, $9,000,000,000. So that England's public debt and budget are identical with that of ours this coming fiscal year, with less than one-half of the population that we have to pay the bill. Therefore, her taxes must be double the tax imposed upon our people now.

Mr. JEFFERIS. Can the gentleman give any information as to the percentage of the people of the United States who are paying any portion of this so-called luxury tax on these different articles?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I could not, because, in the first place, the Treasury Department did not have that number; that is where that information must come from, for the reason that these luxury taxes are not yet far enough advanced. They were only put into effect on the 1st day of May, if I am correct, and it is now too early for the Government to find out how much these taxes are going to be and who pays it and what class of people pay it, so I have not that information.

Mr. JEFFERIS. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will.

Mr. JEFFERIS. Did the gentleman's committee have any information as to the cost of collecting this tax?

Mr. FORDNEY. No, sir; we have not. We have no information from the Treasury Department as to the amount.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The gentleman has given the population of the United Kingdom. I would like to inquire whether or not the English budget is not spread over Australia, Canada, South Africa——

Mr. FORDNEY. No, sir; it is not; it applies only to Great Britain. Canada has an independent government of its own, as has also the Union of South Africa.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will.

Mr. BEGG. Does the gentleman have any data showing how much will be saved in the collection of this tax and in seeing that the law is administered if it is repealed?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; that would be coupled with the question asked by the gentleman from Nebraska as to how much it would cost to collect it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield first to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON].

Mr. DENISON. I understood the gentleman from Michigan to state awhile ago that the public debt of the United States was $37,000,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. FORDNEY. The amount of the outstanding obligations of the Government, together with the authorizations, is $37,500,000,000.

Mr. DENISON. And in that connection Mr. KITCHIN, the former chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, stated at the last session that when all the war debts were paid the public debt of the United States, exclusive of what we had loaned other Governments, would be $20,000,000,000.

Mr. FORDNEY. Well, it must be understood—perhaps I should have gone further and stated that at the present time we hold in round numbers, it is a little above or below, $9,000,000,000 of the obligations of our Allies in this war, which are to be deducted from those figures which I have just given.

Mr. DENISON. According to the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] in the House here in answer to an interrogatory I put to him, he stated that the total indebtedness of the United States Government after we had paid all the debts of this war, including the amount of foreign bonds we held, would be about $29,000,000,000.

Mr. FORDNEY. That is, exclusive of the obligations held by this Government, it is $29,000,000,000. Now, let me say to the gentleman in the payment of our obligations for the next 12 months, beginning the 1st of July, the interest on our public debt is going to be somewhere between $1,000,000,000 and a billion and a quarter dollars. That is the interest upon our public debt. So far the interest from the obligation of the Allies that our Government holds has been promptly paid by the Governments borrowing that money, but it must be borne in mind that so far we have loaned them the money to pay, but that will be changed; we can not keep that up forever, and we expect in the future that they furnish the money to pay both interest and principal.

Mr. DENISON. And I think they should. Now, will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. DENISON. I was somewhat impressed by the question put by the gentleman from Nebraska as to where we will get the $100,000,000 we are losing in repealing this section, and I want to ask the chairman if he can tell the House what part of this $100,000,000 of revenue will be realized under subsection 20 of section 904, which puts a tax on kimonos, petticoats, and waists, on the amount in excess of $15 each?

Mr. FORDNEY. I might be more familiar with it than the gentleman from Illinois, because he is a bachelor, but I must confess I am not thoroughly posted as to just how much we would get from the sale of kimonos. There are no figures on the subject. The gentleman ought to be better posted.

Mr. DENISON. Did the gentleman's committee consider how much of this $100,000,000 revenue which would be lost would be lost by that particular item of the bill?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; there is no way of giving the information correctly, and I will say seriously, because these taxes have only been in effect a few days and the Government has no real statistics other than the estimates made at the time the bill was drawn last year, and where that information was obtained I do not know, but a Mr. McCoy, of the Treasury Department, who furnished these statistics and estimates on all former revenue bills which have been enacted since this war, is the gentleman who furnished those statistics and it was found that he was conservatively correct in all his estimates. I have stated, and I believe now, that his estimates are conservative, because under the act of 1917 for last year and under the act of 1916 it was estimated we would raise about $3,600,000,000 of internal-revenue taxes from the provisions of the law. More money than that sum had been raised and when the Commissioner of Internal Revenue came before the committee, together with the Secretary of the Treasury, both stated that if we would give the Commissioner of Internal Revenue a sum of money, of about $7,000,000, to pay expert accountants to review the tax returns that had come in they would collect—and that estimate was taken from those reports that had already been reviewed up to that time—they would collect another billion dollars, and therefore that law would yield more than $5,000,000,000 on an estimate of $3,600,000,000.

Therefore, it would seem that the estimates provided in the same way by the same gentleman, as set out in this law, are conservative and below the amount that will be collected.

Mr. DENISON. I was going to state, Mr. Chairman, that I am in sympathy with the repeal of most of the items of this section, but it does seem to me that a tax on kimonos and petticoats and waists in excess of $15 is so clearly a luxury tax, if I understand what those mean——

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman does not claim that a petticoat is a luxury?

Mr. DENISON. I do not know much about those items, but I think that is a luxury.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I merely wanted to say that while it is utterly impossible to give any figures as to how much the collection of these taxes is going to cost, my information is that it was necessary to organize a bureau in the department for the sole purpose of collecting this tax, and it is thought it would be extremely expensive to collect it. My guess is—and, of course, it is a guess—that our net loss of revenue from the repeal of section 904 would not cost anything like $8,000,000.

Mr. FORDNEY. I think the gentleman is correct in that statement, although it is absolutely impossible to know at this time just how much money it is going to cost the Government to collect those taxes. But it is estimated, as the gentleman says, that it will cost a large sum of money.

Mr. TINCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will.

Mr. TINCHER. Have the committee under consideration any proposition for the repeal of section 907 of the revenue act?

Mr. FORDNEY. May I ask the gentleman what that section covers? I have not the bill before me.

Mr. TINCHER. It covers tooth paste, liniment, and everything that has to be handled in the ordinary drug stores.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not believe there was any specific bill introduced and sent to the committee for the repeal of that section of the law, but the whole proposition of the consumption and luxury tax was discussed by the committee briefly and brushed aside for further information, with the exception of this section which we are now offering to repeal.

Mr. TINCHER. Will there be in the hearings of the Treasury Department an endeavor to find out whether you can save a good part of this by repealing section 907, thus releasing from the Treasury of the United States a number of accountants that it will take to collect under 907?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know how much that will amount to.

Mr. HOCH. Is the proposition for the repeal of this particular section based upon the injustice of this tax or primarily on the difficulty and impracticability of collecting the tax?

Mr. FORDNEY. There are several reasons. First of all, when this bill passed the House providing for the so-called consumption and luxury taxes it was at that time thought advisable and necessary to collect by the provisions of this bill $8,000,000,000. But the gentleman will remember that between the time this bill passed the House and the time it was taken up for consideration in the Senate the armistice was signed and the Secretary of the Treasury went before the Committee on Finance of the Senate and recommended a reduction of from $8,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000 for the taxable year of 1918 and a reduction to $4,000,000,000 for this year. Therefore it was thought not necessary to carry all those provisions; that we would not need the amount of money that bill would raise. But it now transpires we are going to need a great deal more money than it was thought six or eight months ago we would need this coming fiscal year.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I understood from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] that there was no tax upon tailor-made clothes. I would like to know if the revenue bill provides for any tax?

Mr. FORDNEY. Answering the gentleman, it is my recollection, without going back and reading the specific provision in the law, that there is a tax, no matter where those clothes are made. If the value of those goods are above a certain sum, there will be a tax.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman pardon me again?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I make the assertion, and I am quite sure the gentleman will verify it when he stops to think, that men's and boys' clothing and women's dresses were in the original law, as reported to the House and passed by the House, but were stricken out in the Senate, and they are not in this bill or in this repealer. I understand that there is absolutely no tax whatever upon men's clothing and boys' clothing or women's dresses.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is as I understood the gentleman when he mentioned the subject.

Mr. FORDNEY. Possibly the gentleman is right.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. I simply desire to state to the gentleman that I believe there are members of the committee who would never vote for the repeal of this law if it is to be grounded upon the fact that these items affect the poor people. It must be

grounded upon the fact that it is impossible or very difficult to make the collection, because we can not go before the country, in my judgment, and justify exempting shoes of $10, valises of $25, and trunks of $50. It was based prior to this time, and this time also, I take it, on the difficulty of making the collection, not only on the part of the retailer in keeping the account, but on the part of the Treasury Department. So if it is to be based, as has been suggested here, on the statement that it is going to help the poor man, I do not think we can go before the country on that issue at all, and I do not believe the chairman wishes to be so understood.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. To suggest to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] that in making that statement he is reflecting upon the intelligence of another body, one of whose Members at a late hour in the evening made one of the greatest speeches ever made in favor of this bill, in favor of the poor women who wore calico dresses, and the poor workmen who would have to pay $25 for a suit of clothes, and succeeded in that argument in knocking out the taxes that had gotten in this bill against women's dresses and Parisian gowns, and things of that sort, and against tailor-made clothes of gentlemen who can afford to go out to evening parties.

I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin will look up the RECORD and examine the speeches that were made by an eloquent gentleman in the other body, when appealing at 12 o'clock midnight to those who were in the galleries, who asked that justice be done to those unfortunate poor who would have to buy dresses for women and clothing for men.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. FREAR. I have never found it necessary to be governed by the judgment of those in the other body in my reasoning, nor have I found it necessary or advisable even to be governed in my judgment by those in this body on a question of public economy.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I hope the gentleman will always form opinions of his own on these matters.

Mr. FREAR. I am trying to do so now. I believe that there are many Members of this House who are acting upon this question of repealing these features of the bill solely because of the difficulty in making collections both on the part of the retailer and on the part of the Treasury Department, and they can not justify it because it is going to be a relief to the poor people, judging from these items. All that we have to do is to read them to make sure of that.

Mr. FORDNEY. I received a letter this morning from a man appealing to me to bring about the repeal of these so-called consumption taxes on the ground that he is receiving to-day from the Government—he is a Government employee—$65 a month, and he states that it affects the value of about everything that comes into his house, and on a salary of $65 a month this law is collecting from him a tax that he feels unable to pay.

Now, you can spread this tax over the poor or the rich as you may, but there are many items in this bill that are used by all the common people of the country on which the tax is being repealed.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. Reverting to the source of revenue, what proportion of the revenue will be raised by the war excess-profits tax? It is from $2,000,000,000 to $3,000,000,000, is it not?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; something over $3,000,000,000 now.

Mr. FESS. I would like to have the gentleman's judgment as to whether that source will be very much after the war is over?

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, I would say to the gentleman this—and I am glad he brought up that question, because it permits me to make a brief statement on the provisions of this law, which in my opinion ought to be changed; I do not know whether this would be a popular move or not, but I do know that it would be a very beneficial move to the labor of this country and to the capital of the country if the present excess-profit tax imposed upon the corporations should be transferred to the stockholders instead of the corporations. If the gentleman will permit me, a corporation is only the trustee of property belonging to the stockholder. It owns nothing. The stockholder owns all that property. The corporation is only acting for the stockholder. I do know this, that there are industries to-day, corporations that after they have earned a sufficient or reasonable income upon their capital invested are loath to go any further in making any large profits, because of being brought out of the lower paragraph of the income-tax law or the excess-profit tax law. The taxes upon further profits are very heavy, and that corporation, after it has earned a reasonable income upon the capital invested, does not care to break its neck, so to speak, in making more money and paying out $4 out of $5 to the Government on all money earned above a certain sum. That was the case with the taxes for the year 1918, now reduced. I believe that if that excess-profit tax should be removed or transferred, as I have said, from the corporation to the stockholders, the corporation would be given a free hand to run at its fullest capacity, producing more cheaply than under any other circumstances, and when the money is once paid to the stockholder, the Government should collect from the stockholder a sum equivalent to that which would be collected from the corporation.

I am not advocating less taxes on the stockholder or the corporation, because I know that we must collect a large sum of money there, but what I want is the privilege extended to the corporation to run the whole year round at its fullest capacity and to make all the money it can, and by so doing give full scope to its productive ability. But when that money is once earned, it should go to the stockholders; and if not distributed to the stockholders during the taxable year, then some equitable plan should be adopted to tax that money in the hands of the corporation as if it had been distributed to the stockholders, but giving the corporation a freer hand for the greater expansion of business.

Now, another thing: In the law there is provided a certain income from the sale of real estate and other property. The Treasury Department, through the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, has adopted a plan of collecting income taxes. It is a regulation, not a law, in my opinion, and it is this: If a party were selling some real estate to-day under the usual terms of deferred payments, say, one-fourth down on the purchase of the property or the signing of the contract and the balance in one, two, or three years—which is very common in the sale of real estate—if notes are given, the Treasury Department treats that as a completed or closed contract, and the parties selling the property must pay a tax on not only the cash received but the full value on the sale. Now, on the other hand, if notes are not given and the amount that would be provided for in the notes is provided for in the contract to be paid in one, two, or three years, the Treasury Department does not consider that a completed contract or completed sale and only considers as income the amount of cash received, and the deferred payments then are considered income in the year in which it is paid.

Now, that is a ruling of the Treasury Department through the commissioner's office, and it is wrong. I know of many instances where contracts have been made for the sale of property and notes given for deferred payments that never will be paid. I know a specific instance; I have one myself, in a sale which I made in 1912. I did not report income because the cash payment was very small. I took notes for long-time payments, payable every 90 days. In the meantime a storm came along and blew down much of the timber covered by that contract. The corporation to whom I sold is financially irresponsible except for the security of the property which I sold, and now to-day I must lose a large sum of money on that contract upon which I am called upon to pay a tax, and I never did and never will get that money.

You will pardon me for referring to a personal matter, but I know of other such instances. A note should not be considered income until the money is received for that note. Neither should a stock dividend be considered as income until the money has been received for that stock, and since this law has been enacted the Federal court in the district court for the southern district of the State of New York has held that the stock dividend is not income until it has been converted into money.

I believe that is a just and equitable decision of the court; but the Federal Government has appealed that case, and it will go finally to the Supreme Court of the United States if it is not there now. These things are rulings on the law, not provisions of the law, and I believe there are many other provisions of the law that work an injustice upon the people of the country.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. My concern in the reduction of this amount of $100,000,000 is with reference to the future, because if the excess-profit tax continues, as I presume it will, whether rightly or not, after the war is over I can not see that there will be such a great amount collected under that tax. It seems to me that that was very largely penal, and when people talked about profiteering in the war the answer was, "Let the profit be made, and the Government will take it in the form of a tax." That will not go on

after the war, and if the receipts from the excess-profit tax are materially reduced what are we going to look to as a source of revenue?

Mr. FORDNEY. I believe it will be businesslike to do two things: First, to prune most industriously everyone of the appropriations for the maintenance of this Government. [Applause.] We ought to curtail wherever we can without crippling the Government. Secondly, then we must look around for the necessary money to meet our ordinary expenses. The obligation is upon the Government, and the people are the Government, and therefore we must raise the money in some way. We must raise it in the most equitable and just manner.

Let me correct a statement that I made just a minute ago. When I stated that a stock dividend was not income, I did not mean that. I had reference to the note or obligation in a contract for the sale of real estate. The law did provide that a stock dividend should be considered income.

Mr. FESS. I understand the gentleman has no trepidation about our ability to pay the expenses incurred for the war without injury to the public?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I have no fear whatever about our ability to pay our debts. I have not the exact figures before me, but I have them in mind, and they are very nearly correct. It is stated that the public debt of Great Britain to-day is, in round numbers, $800 per capita, and that the per capita debt of France is $900 for every man, woman, and child in France, and the public debt of Germany to-day is equal to 50 per cent of the total value of all property in Germany. That does not include the obligations that would be placed upon Germany by the Allies now considering that matter at Paris.

Mr. CARTER. How much is the public debt of the United States?

Mr. FORDNEY. The estimate is that the wealth of the United States is $300,000,000,000, and exclusive of the obligations of our allies that we hold the per capita debt of the United States to-day is only $300, one-third that of France, about one-half that of Great Britain, and far below that of Germany, because Germany's wealth before the war was only $80,000,000,000 as against $300,000,000,000 for the people of the United States.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman permit a further interruption?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I had felt that these luxury taxes were conducive to saving as against extravagance. I was rather inclined to oppose the repeal for that reason. I also thought, in reading it over pretty carefully, that a man of my standing could get through without paying any luxury tax at all. I do not see any article in here that would hit me, and I think I would represent the average fellow. I thought the tax was in the interest of frugality as against extravagance at a time when we are trying to save money, and we need all the revenue we can get. I was questioning the wisdom of the repeal, although there is a tremendous clamor for it.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman was present, as I was, in this Hall two weeks ago last Saturday night, when the Republican Party in conference, or in caucus, as you may call it, passed a resolution recommending the repeal of the so-called consumption taxes. This is one of the sections. The Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee have joined with the Republican Members of the House in a unanimous report for the repeal of section 904, and this is a partial compliance with the resolutions passed by the Republican Party two weeks ago. Therefore, whether or not there are some people who would pay the tax who could well afford to pay it, who are caught under section 904, I do not want to argue that; but this action is in line with the resolutions passed by our party in conference two weeks ago, it is in line with the agreement of the conferees in the last session of Congress, and the bill for the repeal was passed in the House without a dissenting vote at that time, but failed to pass in the Senate because of the lateness in the session.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will ask for 20 minutes more time, solely for the purpose of answering questions, if anyone wishes to ask me any. I do not think I will use all that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that his time be extended 20 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. As one member of the committee on Ways and Means I wish to add one word to what the gentleman from Michigan has said, with which I am in entire accord. It is true, as the gentleman stated, that the committee unanimously agreed to report this bill. Perhaps the members were influenced by a different reason, but I think there were few and possibly no members of the committee who objected to this tax in the abstract. The objection to the tax arose from the manner in which it worked out, more than from the nature of the tax itself; from the expense of collecting it and from the fact that it was generally believed that some persons succeeded in evading it, and because in many cases the cost of keeping track of it on the part of the merchant was more than the tax amounted to.

Then, there was another thing that influenced some—especially myself—and that is that over in the other body, spoken of by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, they proceeded for some reason, thought good by themselves, to take out the tax on men's and women's clothing, which made the whole section look unfair and unjustifiable in comparison. Influenced by these matters, it became not, as the gentleman from Michigan said, a party matter at all, because at the last session a bill was passed for its repeal, went through the House without opposition, and was presented by the Democratic floor leader, and both Democrats and Republicans voted for it. That was another reason that influenced members of the committee—that there was an implied pledge or understanding that these taxes would be repealed at this session. So I think, as a whole, it is not the nature of the taxes themselves that influenced the committee so much as these other matters.

Mr. FORDNEY. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. I do not think this matter ought to be determined on what was done heretofore or upon the fact as to whether Democrats or Republicans voted for it. What is its purpose by taking taxes off of those who will not feel them and placing them on those who are not able to pay them? I do not understand that a suit of clothes is not necessary in and of itself, but the price of it ceases to be a necessity whenever you put it beyond that which is necessary to pay for the purpose for which we wear clothes—to keep us warm and comfortable. I understand that on a suit of clothes costing over $50 the excess over $50 is taxed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Let me say again to the gentleman that men's clothing is not taxed at all. If any dealer in this city or elsewhere taxes a gentleman who comes in and buys a suit of clothes he is liable to go to jail for one year and pay a fine of $1,000 for misrepresentation of the facts.

Mr. SIMS. I do not care whether it is a suit of clothes or a trunk costing $50.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Let me say again that when the bill came into the House from the Ways and Means Committee it carried two provisions—that men's clothing in excess of $50 per suit should pay a tax, that women's clothing in excess of $50 for a dress should pay a tax. If a woman wanted to buy a dress and pay $49.99 for it, she paid no tax. If she wanted to buy a $5,000 dress, she would be taxed on everything above $50. If a workingman or a rich man paid $49.95 for his suit of clothes, he paid no tax under our bill. If he bought a suit costing $150 or $200 from a fancy tailor, he paid a tax on all in excess of $50.

When that bill got to the other side, to the unmentionable body, a Member of that other body, in an outburst of eloquence that swept those in the gallery off their feet and almost brought tears into their eyes, pleaded in behalf of the poor workingman who would be taxed by this bill, having in mind the workingman who would pay over $50 for a suit and the good, dear lady who takes $5,000 of American money, goes to Paris, and buys a Parisian gown, and insisted that there should be no tax on women's dresses. We provided that she could buy a dress without paying a tax if she did not pay more than $50. We thought that we took care of the poor in this bill.

Mr. SIMS. The luxury part is not in the amount paid, as fixed by the Ways and Means Committee, but in the amount over what is considered to be necessary for the necessary uses of a garment. The gentleman from Pennsylvania does not think that a $5,000 gown is necessary for any lady, does he?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Well, there are some ladies down in Tennessee——

Mr. FORDNEY. The more handsome the lady, the more handsome she makes the gown look.

Mr. SIMS. The more handsome the lady, the less she needs a gown costing over $50. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Now, let me say to the gentleman, to recompense the Government for taxes lost by the repeal of section 904, since the war several great industries have sprung up in this country that could not survive against the strong and unfair

competition that we had prior to war conditions. One is potash. If you gentlemen of the House wish very valuable data on that subject, you will read the annual report of the Alien Property Custodian, the Hon. A. Mitchell Palmer, now Attorney General. In his annual report, beginning on page 25, he there describes the unfair and ruinous competition in the chemical industry in this country carried on by the Germans prior to the war. He explains it there more fully than I have time to explain it now. He showed in one particular instance where there were five industries established in this country in the chemical industry; they ran along, but afterwards competition became so keen that the price of the article produced was cut down so low that three out of the five were obliged to suspend operations.

When the war came on the two that had survived, it transpires, were branches of a parent company in Germany. Since that time the Government has taken them over under the enemy alien property act.

Since the war broke out people have invested in this country some $50,000,000 in the production of potash.

Mr. SIMS. What has that to do with women's underclothes?

Mr. FORDNEY. It has a lot to do.

Mr. SIMS. I do not see how that comes in.

Mr. FORDNEY. How could you raise cotton without potash, and women's underclothes are made of cotton.

Mr. SIMS. Not those that cost more than $50.

Mr. FORDNEY. Now, that is the reason why Republicans and Democrats should read this statement of Mr. Palmer.

Mr. SIMS. Of course the Republicans are not in favor of taxing luxuries. We all know that, but this is one time we believe they would stand for the Democratic policy of putting heavy taxes on luxuries and light ones on necessaries.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, $50,000,000 has been invested in that industry, and the Geological Survey reports that in a certain lake in California there is raw material in sight to supply our wants at the present consumption for the next 80 years, and another lake in Nebraska quite equal to that of California. Potash is produced in 12 States in the Union from various sources. That industry will be put out of business unless we give them some protection, and the Ways and Means Committee will in a few days report what we might call a separate or shotgun bill for the purpose of protecting that industry.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] has introduced a bill to protect the dyestuffs industry, one of the most important in the land. We have all the raw material necessary to make all of the dyestuffs for the whole world. All that is necessary is for our Government to protect that industry in this country against the cheaper made article and the ruinous competition from Germany that existed before the war and will exist again the minute this war is over.

Another is laboratory glass, and I could go on and detail several of them. We will present to the House separate bills for the protection and relief of those industries, and we are going to ask our good Democratic friends to help us protect them from ruination, from competition from Germany the minute the peace treaty is signed, and I know you will do it.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] said that, of course, the Republicans are in favor of the repeal of luxury taxes. I just want to quote from the President's message to the end that the Democrats may see there are some Democratic reasons for the repeal.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes. If the gentleman can find anything really condensed in that message he will do more than I can.

Mr. REED of New York. In that message the President said:

> Many of the minor taxes provided for in the revenue legislation of 1917 and 1918, though no doubt made necessary by the pressing necessities of the war time, can hardly find sufficient justification under the easier circumstances of peace, and can now happily be got rid of. Among these, I hope you will agree, are the excises upon various manufacturers and the taxes upon retail sales. They are unequal in the incidence on different industries and on different individuals. Their collection is difficult and expensive. Those which are levied upon articles sold at retail are largely evaded by the readjustment of retail prices.

Mr. SIMS. Oh, that all applies to soda water and things like that.

Mr. FORDNEY. I have in my possession 42 propositions on which the President has taken 89 positions. That makes three more. [Laughter.] He might change his mind again before he gets over here.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. It has been stated by members of the committee on the floor that one of the motives actuating the committee in seeking a repeal of this section is the fact that another body has taken the tax off men's clothing in excess of $50, and also women's clothing. Is there any other reason why we should repeal this tax, and because another body takes out two things that should be taxed, is there any reason why we should retaliate and take out all of the rest?

Mr. FORDNEY. That is not the reason.

Mr. REAVIS. What is the real reason?

Mr. FORDNEY. The real reason is that it is a consumption tax, and because of the items contained in that section 904 being composed of articles of common use by all of the people. It was thought advisable, by both Democrats and Republicans, to strike it out, and here we are.

Mr. REAVIS. The statement is made in the report that the reason is the difficulty of collecting the tax and the burden that is imposed upon the retailer. What information has the committee on that point?

Mr. FORDNEY. We have no reliable information, because the law has been in effect only a short time, and there is no reliable information obtainable, except the general information that we know that it is going to be very expensive to collect this tax.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. I want to take the gentleman out of this political turmoil and ask him a question about that thing he was discussing when first interrupted. As I understood the gentleman's policy, it is that the excess-profits tax should not be assessable until after distribution of dividends?

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, no.

Mr. CARTER. Let us have the gentleman's position on that.

Mr. FORDNEY. My idea—and I do not know whether this be agreeable, for it is only a personal idea; I do not know what my party or the gentleman's party might think of it—is that it would be a great benefit to the industries of the country to permit them to run full blast, if we would put the tax upon the individual stockholder and not the corporation. If the corporation fails to distribute the money, it should be taxed as if it were distributed. I am not trying to get away from any of the taxes at all.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. As I understand the chairman of the committee, you expect to lose by the repeal of this section $100,000,000 of taxes, and you know of no place now from which you can get that amount?

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, yes; we do.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. What is the method, then?

Mr. FORDNEY. By an import duty, and we propose to bring in a bill of that kind as soon as we can. It will take several months to prepare it, but we are going to bring it in.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Will that bill bring in a sufficient amount of revenue to cover the deficit which the gentleman has stated here will exist?

Mr. FORDNEY. We have no bill prepared. We have not had time. The gentleman will remember last year it took the Committee on Ways and Means 20 weeks to prepare the present so-called new revenue bill.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Has there ever been a tariff bill prepared that would bring in that amount of revenue on imports——

Mr. FORDNEY. One hundred million dollars?

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. No; the amount that the gentleman stated would be a deficit. I think the gentleman stated $6,000,000,000.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, no; but I will say this, however, that if the rates of duty had been in effect last year which are provided for in the Payne tariff law, which had the lowest ad valorem rates that we had had for half a century down to 1913, on the amount of goods imported last year we would have collected more than a billion dollars of import duties. We collected $170,000,000. Our import duties to-day are lower than those of China, lower than any country in the world that has any tariff law.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Have not the requests which have come for the repeal of this section come largely from the large department stores, and not from the small merchants?

Mr. FORDNEY. I could not say that was just correct; they came from many sources.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Was it the unanimous report of the committee—both Democrats and Republicans alike—that this section of the bill should be repealed?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir; both at this session of Congress and at the last session.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Then, this does not savor of anything like a party division, so to speak?

Mr. FORDNEY. No.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Was it the unanimous opinion of the committee that one of the principal reasons for this repeal was the excessive cost for the benefits derived under the bill?

Mr. FORDNEY. This is one of the consumption-tax provisions of the law; and I believe that nearly every man on the committee was opposed to consumption taxes then and is now. This section being one of the most obnoxious, they thought it ought to be repealed.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Will the chairman be kind enough to state——

Mr. FORDNEY. One of the most burdensome, I will say.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Whether or not it was considered and whether that was one of the reasons why this section was recommended for repeal—the excessive cost of collection?

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, that was part of it; but this is a consumption tax, my friend, and that is one of the reasons.

Mr. LONGWORTH and Mr. LAGUARDIA rose.

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I thank the gentleman, but I think I will take the floor myself later.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is this repeal proposed as a beneficial measure? Are people unduly taxed now, or what is the purpose of it?

Mr. FORDNEY. To relieve the taxpayer from paying taxes, the consumers of the country who purchase these articles.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then why do the committee stop on one section, 904——

Mr. FORDNEY. This is the largest luxury-tax or consumption-tax provision of the law; all of them amount to $350,000,000. Now, this repeals about $100,000,000 of that, so it is the largest item in the law.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How much would the repeal on ice-cream soda amount to?

Mr. FORDNEY. Twenty-one million dollars on soft drinks and ice cream combined; $12,000,000 on soft drinks and $9,000,000 on ice cream.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman knows we had a tax on soft drinks in the previous bill. The ice-cream soda tax was put on this alone. Is not that correct?

Mr. FORDNEY. I introduced a bill, my friend—it was not in the 1917 law—for the repeal of section 630, which is the soft-drink and ice-cream provision of the law.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Has that bill been reported?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for one hour.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee in reporting a bill which was unanimously reported by the Democratic and Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee last session and unanimously passed by a Democratic House, both Republicans and Democrats voting for it. I was amused a moment ago when in answer to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] the gentleman from Michigan reminded him of the fact that all Republicans in the last Congress just before we adjourned and all Democrats voted for this identical bill which the gentleman from Michigan, as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, has reported out, and wondered why now the gentleman from Ohio and other gentlemen on that side, who then voted for it, should question the righteousness of this bill or intimate that they were not going to vote for it. He could not understand it. Well, the gentleman from Michigan need not wonder. The explanation is easy. The Republicans of the House simply had more confidence in the Democratic Ways and Means Committee of the last Congress than they have in the present Republican Ways and Means Committee. [Laughter.] When the Democrats reported out, with the approval of every Republican member of the committee, this identical bill, every Republican and every Democrat in the House on February 28, just before Congress adjourned, including the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] and others who now question its wisdom, voted for it. It passed the House unanimously and was only defeated in the Senate by the filibuster of three Republican Senators. It is therefore natural that the present distinguished chairman of the committee should express surprise that gentlemen on the Republican side question very much the justice and wisdom of this bill reported out by him. Why, fellow Republicans, this bill is all right. [Laughter.] You said it was all right the last session, just a few months ago. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] says he thinks he is going to vote against this bill. Why, the gentleman stood right within 5 feet of the then chairman of the committee while it was being thoroughly explained, and voted for it. Now, I would like to know why this change unless I have given the exact explanation and reason for it. It is just simply a question of lack of confidence on their part in the Republican Ways and Means Committee; that is all. [Laughter.]

Gentlemen, let us get the facts concerning this bill and its history. From the foundation of this Government until last year, when the Ways and Means Committee, both Republicans and Democrats together, was writing the biggest revenue measure that was ever presented to any legislative body on earth or any people were ever called on to pay, no such a tax as is involved in this bill was ever inserted in any revenue bill. Such a tax is a revenue innovation. Some call it a luxury tax. It should be called a price-luxury tax. The articles taxed are necessities. They only become a luxury according to the statute when the price of them exceeds a certain arbitrarily fixed price. The Ways and Means Committee put that tax provision in the original revenue bill at the earnest recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury and the administration, not so much to get revenue with which to prosecute the war, although we needed every cent we could get then, but for the purpose of encouraging thrift and economy among the people during the war—to discourage extravagance. The Secretary recommended a rate of 20 per cent instead of 10 per cent.

This provision, whose repeal by the pending bill is asked, passed the House together with what was then paragraph 1 of the section. That included clothing, suits of clothes, overcoats, coat suits, cloaks, dresses, underwear, and so forth. It passed the House unanimously during the war, as its repeal passed unanimously after the war was ended.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Would it interrupt the gentleman if I should read one sentence from the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. KITCHIN. No. I will be glad if the gentleman will read it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It says:

> This tax is recommended not only to raise additional revenue but for the equally important purpose of discouraging waste and consumption and unnecessary production.

The necessity has now been entirely removed.

Mr. KITCHIN. As I say, we passed this bill during the war. Before it got out of the Senate Finance Committee the war ended. The armistice was signed. Then, with the sanction of the Ways and Means Committee, Republicans and Democrats, I notified the Finance Committee of the Senate, Senator SIMMONS, Senator LODGE, and others, that it would be satisfactory to our committee if they would strike out all this section 904. It was intended to exist for and during the war. Everything taxed in that section is a necessity of life and not originally a luxury. The bill fixed an arbitrary price above which that necessity should become a luxury and be subject to a tax and below which that same article should remain a necessity.

The Senate Finance Committee, after maturely considering it and its whole history, Republicans and Democrats, unanimously struck it out of the bill which they reported to the Senate. The Senate on the last day of the consideration of the bill restored the whole provision, including the tax on clothing, suits, overcoats, cloaks, dresses, and so forth. Before the vote was taken on the entire bill, in the hurry and flurry of that day's discussion, the paragraph containing the taxing of such wearing apparel articles was stricken out, but the provision taxing the articles now included in section 904, which this bill proposes to repeal, was left in. Though fine, high-priced clothes, suits, overcoats, cloaks, dresses, some reaching into hundreds of dollars each, was made exempt from the tax, a tax of 10 per cent on shoes, hats, caps, hosiery, and many other such articles of necessity was levied. The conference committee met the bill just in that shape.

The House conferees would have been willing to have stricken the entire section out for certain reasons I will give you. They knew there was a discrimination in favor of one class of wearing apparel and necessities against another. They felt that if one was taxed, the other should be; if one was exempt, the other should be. The conferees on the part of the House and Senate had no jurisdiction to strike out the entire section 904, as it appears in the law. Why? Because there was no disagreement between the House and the Senate with respect to the tax on articles covered by section 904. Both bodies passed the bill

with such a tax in it. For the benefit of the new Members I will say that conferees have jurisdiction only on matters of disagreement between the two Houses.

The only way to harmonize the tax was to put back the tax on clothes, overcoats, dresses, and so forth. The Senate conferees would never agree to that. The conferees felt that the entire section should go out of the bill; but, as I said, they had no jurisdiction or authority to strike out the tax now in section 904, as both Houses had passed such a tax. So it became law. The conferees were all agreed that the only way we could harmonize it, and the only fair and just thing under the circumstances, taking into account the history of these so-called luxury taxes and the discrimination contained in the section, was to introduce and pass a bill, immediately after the revenue bill was signed by the President, to repeal section 904.

A statement as to this agreement and understanding of the conferees was made in the House and Senate. It went out through the country and everybody understood it. Not one objection to its repeal was heard from any source. It seemed that the whole people, when the matter and the facts connected with it were fresh in their minds, approved the proposed repeal. Accordingly, immediately after the revenue bill was signed by the President the Ways and Means Committee met and unanimously reported out a bill for the repeal of section 904, a bill identical in all respects, word for word, with the pending bill. On February 28, 1919, after explanation to a full House, the repeal bill, just like this one, was unanimously passed by the House. It went to the Senate. The Finance Committee of the Senate unanimously favored the repeal, but on account of the filibuster in the Senate was unable to reach a vote on it in the Senate.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the conferees had not come to that arrangement and understanding, is it not a fact that, owing to the parliamentary situation that then prevailed at the close of the session of Congress, this revenue bill would possibly have been thrown back on the Senate for further discussion, and probably would have failed, and the Government could not have secured the money nor could the machinery have been put in motion to collect these war taxes at this time? That is the fact, is it not, and that is one of the reasons why this understanding was reached?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Now, let us see whether this is a wise and just tax now that the war is over. It is easy for one of a demagogic trend of mind to picture an opposing demagogue on the stump in his district arousing the prejudices of the people, especially the prejudices of the poorer people, against one who voted for the repeal of any kind of a tax supposed to be aimed at the "rich folks." In fear and trembling he imagines how his demagogic opponent will make the welkin ring by holding him up as an enemy of the "poor folks" because he voted to take the tax off silk petticoats, silk stockings, fine bonnets, $5.10 hats, $3.05 shirts, and $2.07 caps. He underrates the intelligence and sense of fairness of the people. No man, rich or poor, intelligent or ignorant, can see any good reason why a Member of Congress should be willing to let a $100 suit of clothes, a $200 overcoat, a $500 cloak, or a $1,000 Parisian gown go absolutely tax free while perfectly willing to put a 10 per cent tax on a hat costing over $5 or a cap costing over $2 or a shirt costing over $3, or on many other articles of necessity. Suppose I make clothing. My friend over there from New Hampshire [Mr. BURROUGHS] makes shoes. I have a clothing industry. He has a shoe industry. Shoes are just as much of a necessity to the people of the country as clothing. Both are absolute necessities.

Is it right to say to the gentleman from New Hampshire, "We are going to handicap your industry by putting a 10 per cent tax on your products when it reaches the consumer, while we propose to let KITCHIN's products go free of any tax," though both industries are similarly situated, having same capital, and producing articles of living necessity? I could give illustration after illustration of the discriminations of this tax as it now exists in section 904.

Until the revenue bill of last Congress neither party, from the foundation of the Government, ever incorporated in a revenue bill or ever suggested, even during the Civil War, that this kind of a tax should be levied, making a necessity of life a luxury if sold over a certain arbitrarily fixed price. The Government of France levied such a tax during the war. I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] if the Government of Great Britain finally adopted such a tax? I know it was being discussed in Parliament at one time.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. The French Government was the only Government that finally enacted this law. The revenue was somewhat disappointing on account of the difficulty of collecting, and the dissatisfaction was very great. After several months of consideration of a bill of that kind the British Parliament abandoned the matter, so I am informed.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is my understanding.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] a moment ago made a very important suggestion regarding the repeal of this tax. He said one of the important reasons why we repealed the section last session and propose to repeal it now is on account of the difficulties of its administration and collection. This is true. While the Secretary of the Treasury, last Congress, when the war was on, strongly recommended such a tax in the interest of frugality and economy as well as revenue, those in the department who had to do with the administration of the revenue laws pointed out very clearly the many difficulties which would be incurred in the administration of such a tax provision and of the many commissions of frauds it involved. This is different from any other section of the bill. It will be almost impossible for the Government in its administration to safeguard itself and protect the honest dealer against a competing dishonest dealer.

There are only three kinds of retail taxes—that is, taxes collected from the consumers when the articles are sold—contained in the revenue act. These are the so-called patent or proprietary medicine tax, the soft-drink tax, and the tax in section 904, now under consideration. The patent-medicine tax is only 1 cent on every 25 cents or fraction thereof. The soft-drink tax is 1 cent on each 10 cents or fraction thereof. There are 20 people engaged in the sale of the articles in section 904 to 1 engaged in the sale of patent medicines or soft drinks, and the sales of articles under this section will amount to hundreds of millions of dollars more than either of the other two classes.

The Government can not protect itself or the honest dealer by issuing of stamps or tickets to be delivered canceled to the purchaser at the time of sale as it can do in case of sale of patent medicines or soft drinks. In both of such cases the unit of each sale is so small that the use of stamps or check tickets is practicable, but it is impractical in case of sales under section 904. How can we keep up with the accounts and keep track of the more than one million dealers in articles coming under this section and see whether every month, when they make returns of the sales and the tax, they have or have not pocketed Government money or evaded the tax? How can one tell whether or not they have noted and returned each taxable sale? And then if we lose all of the taxes on pills and tablets and other patent medicines and half of the taxes on soft drinks we will lose very little as compared with the amount that we would lose under this section unless it was possible for the Government to effectively administer the provisions and collect substantially all the tax. And this the Bureau of Internal Revenue fears can not satisfactorily be done.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; and the gentleman will notice also that in the same store there will be a dozen different articles, each paying a different rate, upon which a different amount must be paid and a different return made.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; that is true, which shows how very difficult and costly will be the administration of the provision.

The price of soft drinks, including ice cream, will either be 5 cents, 10 cents, 15 cents, 20 cents, or 25 cents a drink and the tax on each unit of sale or article will never, except in rarest cases, exceed 3 cents, and on pills or tablets and patent medicine the tax on any one sale will not in one case out of a hundred amount to over 4 cents. So the tax in each sale will be a small amount. In such cases the Government can easily protect itself by stamps or tickets to be canceled when the article is sold and the cost of collecting is small. It will get the tax in advance, and the tax being small, the dealer will be able to purchase such stamps or tickets and hold them for sales. But in sales of articles in section 904, how can the Government reasonably protect itself? How can it calculate whether the tax is going to be $1, $5, $10, or $20 on each unit of sale? Sale of stamps or tickets in this case would be impracticable and would involve too much outlay on the part of the dealer. It seems there is no reasonable way in which the Government is going to protect itself or the honest dealer against the rival dishonest dealer in the enforcement of this provision. The Bureau of Internal Revenue agrees with your committee in this matter and recommends the repeal of this section.

Mr. BAER. I was thinking that the same rule might apply to notes in banks. They do not know what size notes you are going to give, but if you fix up a note they put on any amount of stamps. I think the same rule would apply to this.

Mr. KITCHIN. No; the gentleman can understand the difference between the illustration I gave and the case that he gives. In the first place there are just so many banks in the United States. They are infinitesimally few as compared with the number of dealers coming under section 904. They are in certain places. The Government knows every one. The banks keep accurate account of each note taken. They are always of record. Of course, the farmers' friend from North Dakota did not know that. [Laughter.] They do not do it in a haphazard way. Then, there is a Government inspector, called bank examiner, who goes around four or five times a year and examines these notes, the amount of each of them, the makers, and so forth. Then the bank officers have to swear four or five times a year as to the amount of notes they hold. The Government can find out exactly, to a cent, the amount of notes outstanding at any one time in any bank. Both the bank examiner and the agent of the Bureau of Internal Revenue can at any time inspect the notes and see whether the proper amount of stamps has been attached to them. And then, too, the bank would refuse to take one's note unless properly stamped. I have dwelt on this for the benefit and information of the farmers' friend from North Dakota.

The Government, in a practical way, uses the stamp method, as in case of notes, as a protection of the revenue or as a protection to the honest dealer. It might cost the Government almost as much as it gets out of the tax to properly administer the law so as to be fair to the retailer and fair to the Government itself. If the Government can not collect substantially every dollar of tax that is due from a dishonest dealer, then it is going to be a great hardship on the honest dealer who turns in every dollar he receives and collects from his customers every dollar of tax due. It will work in favor of the dishonest competitor who pockets the tax collected or, to undersell his honest competitor, fails to charge to the purchaser the tax.

These are some of the considerations that led the committee to believe, on the whole, that this tax in its present shape and at the present time is an unwise tax and that it ought to be repealed. Some gentleman says, "Where can you get it from?" In the first place, let me tell you that, while technically the Treasury Department made estimates of the amount that they would collect from this source, yet practically it never considered it a part of the revenue bill, for the reason that the Treasury Department knew of the understanding of the House and Senate conferees with respect to this section; it knew that, in pursuance of that agreement, immediately after the President signed the revenue act, the Ways and Means Committee reported unanimously a bill to repeal section 904, and the House unanimously passed it, and the Senate Finance Committee, composed of Republicans and Democrats, unanimously approved the repeal. It therefore presumed that section 904 was going to be repealed. The estimates of revenue from this section is a pure guess. It may be $85,000,000. It may be more. It may not be half that amount.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Does the gentleman from North Carolina know of any authority under existing law whereby the Treasury Department or the Internal Revenue Department can require a storekeeper to keep his accounts in a certain way, so as to record each sale, and whereby the inspector or the revenue collector can tell the amount of any particular sale?

Mr. KITCHIN. I know of no law requiring that.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I do not understand that by this act you can compel a man to keep any record of his sales, and therefore you can not tell whether he has robbed the Government or whether he has not.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The Government might require him to keep his books in a certain way.

Mr. KITCHIN. I doubt whether it would require him to keep a record of every sale, regardless of whether it was a taxable sale or not, but the Government can require him, under its regulations, to keep an itemized account of every one of the sales on which this 10-per cent so-called luxury tax applies; but unless it could make him keep a record also of the sale of articles whose price was under the luxury price there would be no way to check him up. If he was required to keep a record of every such sale, it would be an undue and most expensive hardship.

Gentlemen, let me say that there should be no demagoguery in this thing. In some parts of the country they may think a man who buys a shirt that costs more than two or three dollars is indulging in a luxury. The poorest outdoor laborer in the cold regions of our country can not buy a shirt for less than $5. They must have woolen shirts. Instead of $3, such a shirt, which three-fourths of the outdoor laboring people in the North and Northwest must have during the winter months, can not be bought for less than $4 or $5, and when you put a tax on all over $3 you are taxing the laboring man of the North and Northwest 10 per cent on every dollar he pays above $3.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is there any reason for taking off this tax that would not equally apply to taking off the tax on ice cream?

Mr. KITCHIN. Why, certainly. Ice cream, whether the same quantity in one place costs 10 cents and in another 40 cents, is not an article of necessity but purely a luxury. Every article in this section is a necessity for the poor and rich alike, whether it costs $1 or $10. The soft-drink and ice-cream tax is very small per unit of sale. The Government can, as I have tried to show, easily administer the tax provision as to them, and safeguard in the most practical way the collection of the tax, and at the same time protect the honest dealer, while it can not satisfactorily do so in case of the tax under consideration, as those charged with the administration of the law have pointed out.

We should remember, too, that articles which are absolute necessaries of life by this arbitrary scale of price fall into the luxury class in these abnormal times, while in normal times they would fall much below the luxury price fixed by this section.

A hat that you could buy for $3 three or four years ago, in normal times, now costs $6. A hat that you could buy for $5 three or four years ago you can not buy now for less than $10. A pair of shoes that cost $5 before the war you now have to pay $10 or $12 for. Such hats and shoes are not a luxury, but they become so according to the arbitrary price standard fixed by the section, because of the present abnormally high cost of such articles.

An article of higher cost may be a necessity to one person as much as one of lower cost may be to another. Take a suit of clothes. Here is a man, a splendid gentleman, just as good and as much of a gentleman as anyone, who, in normal times, wears a suit of clothes costing from $15 to $25. He deems that sufficient for him, according to his business associations and surroundings, and he is content. Here is another man no better, but with different business associations and surroundings, who pays $50 or $60 for a suit. That is just as much a necessity for him as the suit costing $15 to $25 is to the other man.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman does not seriously mean to say that ice cream is not a necessity, taking into consideration the climate and conditions and the needs of children?

Mr. KITCHIN. Why does not the gentleman come right out and say that when prohibition goes into effect in New York, ice cream, as well as soft drinks, will become a necessity. Is that what the gentleman means? [Laughter.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Not exactly; I am very serious in this.

Under the conditions and the surroundings we have in New York City, I say ice cream is a necessity for the proper care and nourishment of children.

Mr. KITCHIN. If the gentleman wants me to express an opinion, although I am not an expert——

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman is an expert on raising children. [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. I am not a physician, and do not know much about the Public Health Service, but I would say that if the children can not afford to pay the small tax on ice cream, I would suggest that if they would take a glass of pure milk, costing a good deal less, put in a little ice, it would be much more refreshing and more wholesome, and in every way serve their health much better than ice cream, the make-up of which is, in many cases, very doubtful.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. REAVIS. The gentleman stated that a $20 suit purchased by one individual was no more of a necessity or less a luxury than a $50 suit purchased by another individual.

Mr. KITCHIN. Both are necessities to each individual; I did not say luxuries.

Mr. REAVIS. Is not the presumption justifiable that the man who buys a $50 suit can better afford to pay the tax than the man who buys a $20 suit?

Mr. KITCHIN. I think there is no doubt about that. I suppose a man who is worth a million dollars is better able to pay a tax of $200 on a $60 suit of clothes than a poor man to pay any tax upon his, but the financial ability to pay taxes is not the real basis of the tax under consideration. If it was we would provide that the man who paid $60 for a suit of clothes

and was worth a million dollars should pay, say, $100 tax, and the man worth $500,000 should pay $50, and a man worth $100,000 should pay $10, and so on. The income tax, with its high gradations, catches the man of financial ability.

Mr. REAVIS. Was not the committee, in the first instance, actuated by the knowledge that if a man insisted on paying $25 for a grip, or $10 for a pair of shoes, he ought to be compelled to pay a tax because of his ability to pay the tax on the article above that price? Was it not founded on his ability to pay?

Mr. KITCHIN. Of course, that entered somewhat into it, but one of the principal ideas was to discourage men who were not so able financially from being extravagant in their purchases. If, however, they, rich or poor, insisted on such purchases they would pay the tax. One of the main purposes of the section was to promote economy and frugality among the people during the war.

Mr. REAVIS. You relieved them from the tax?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. This bill repeals such a tax, for the reasons I have given.

Mr. REAVIS. Does not the same motive that inspired the committee to put the tax on these things, miscalled luxuries, still prevail?

Mr. KITCHIN. I do not think to anything like the same degree.

Mr. REAVIS. It differs only in degree?

Mr. KITCHIN. I believe I can make the matter very plain, so that the gentleman will not be willing to carry out to its legitimate conclusions his own theory. We all admit that these are necessities.

Mr. REAVIS. The article itself.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. Now, a house to shelter a man's wife and children is a necessity. There is no man in the United States who can not take $5,000 and build a house sufficiently good to protect his wife and children, to let them live comfortably, shelter them from the storms, the wind, and the sunshine. The house may not be as fine as some others, but it will provide that sort of protection. That is a necessity. Take the man who has the $5,000 house and the man who has a $20,000 house or a $50,000 house. Would the gentleman be in favor of fixing an arbitrary price and saying that every man who buys or builds a house to shelter himself, his wife, and children at a cost or price over $5,000, or even $10,000, should pay 10 per cent upon the excess?

Mr. REAVIS. If the gentleman is asking me the question, I would not, because temperamentally I am opposed to a consumption tax, but I have listened carefully to the gentleman and to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] for some reason why this should be now repealed. The only reason yet given is that the committee agree upon it. That is not persuasive with me. Another reason is that you are discriminating against the shoe man in favor of the clothing man. That discrimination against the shoe man can be secured by putting the clothing man in instead of relieving the shoe man.

Mr. KITCHIN. How about the collection of it, the extreme difficulty, which the department points out, of its administration, and the ease with which a dishonest competitor can take advantage of an honest competitor?

Mr. REAVIS. Oh, that prevails with every consumption tax in the bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. Was the gentleman here when I explained the difference between a consumption tax on soft drinks, patent medicines, and so forth, in which cases the Government could protect itself by a stamp or ticket in advance, and the difficulty of collecting a tax of this kind and guarding the Government and an *honest* dealer against a dishonest dealer?

Mr. REAVIS. I heard the gentleman's explanation, and, with all due regard for the gentleman, I do not accept it.

Mr. BAER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KITCHIN. I want to say to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] that I regard him as one of the most brilliant, most able men in this House, one whose mind can comprehend any proposition as quickly as anyone; and after Mr. FORDNEY's full explanation, clear as a bell, and after my full explanation, as clear as two bells [laughter], how in the world his mind to-day fails to grasp the sound reasons for the repeal I can not understand, unless he got no sleep last night. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Let me see if the gentleman and I are not in agreement upon the real bedrock proposition involved here. I conversed with the gentleman from North Carolina at great length about it when it was first suggested. The prime object of this tax was not to raise revenue, but it was to discourage the sale of high-priced articles—not only discourage the sale, but the production of them. So that it would leave the manufacturers who were producing high-priced clothes an opportunity to go to the production of lower-priced necessaries; so that this tax was a tax to penalize not only the sale but the production of the articles described. The gentleman from North Carolina and I agreed that it was an unprecedented tax, a tax which so far as we knew was never in existence in any country, except in France as a war tax, but was justifiable because we were at war. We wanted to stop people from even producing such articles as I described in this section, and was only justifiable in that way as a war tax. Now that the armistice has been signed, we not only do not want to discourage production but we want to encourage it. That is the reason why this law should be repealed.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman has clearly stated many of the reasons why the tax was put in the bill and why it should now be repealed. If gentlemen will think a moment they will realize that other articles could be included in a tax of this kind almost without end and the same reasons as gentlemen give for opposing this repeal could be applied to justify the tax on them. Take chairs, for instance. A man can sit on a chair that cost $2 or $3 just as well as he can in a chair that cost $50. Take davenports, beds, furniture of all kinds, blankets, and hundreds of other things. You can go into every class of articles, though necessaries, and put them into this class of so-called luxuries by fixing an arbitrary price above which they should become luxuries and be subject to a tax.

Let me bring to your attention another consideration. This section, if unrepealed, will unjustly cause the retail merchants of this country to lose millions and millions of dollars. This did not become a law until February 24. When the revenue act, which included this section, became a law, under the circumstances I have explained the dealers and the people generally understood that this section would be repealed. When the act was passed the merchants had on hand many millions of dollars of stock bought long before such a tax was suggested, much less enacted, and with no idea that the price to their customers would be increased by such a tax. The purchase of these millions of goods was made on the basis of a certain profit, that they could dispose of them to customers at a certain price. After they got these goods on the shelves this section was enacted. This would of necessity compel them to charge a higher price to the customer or consumer, who by the provision is to pay directly the tax.

You will see at once that millions of dollars of these goods would never be bought. A person would go to buy a bonnet or hat or stockings or shoes, and so forth, and after the price was stated the merchant would have to say, "In addition to the price you have to pay 10 per cent tax" on such and such excess. In many cases the reply would be, "I will not buy if I have to pay the tax," or the customer would ask for the article below the luxury price and not subject to the tax. There is no doubt that millions of dollars' worth of goods would be left on hand, a loss of millions to the dealers, who purchased or contracted to purchase long before they knew of such a tax. Many women, perhaps, through the influence of "frugality" societies, would refrain from buying articles in the so-called luxury class for fear of being regarded as extravagant or as belonging to the luxury class. Retailers, as we know, must contract six or seven months in advance of the season for which they buy. Before this law was ever put upon the statute books millions and millions of dollars were contracted for to sell at a certain price retail. In these contracts the tax was not considered, as there was no law providing for such a tax, and if contracted since the revenue act was passed, or after the conferees had agreed on it, the dealers had every reason to believe this tax would be repealed. As I said, necessarily many millions of goods will be left on hand by reason of the tax if it is not repealed, to the great loss of the innocent retailers. If such a tax was put on the manufacturer of the articles and applied to articles hereafter manufactured, then the manufacturer and the retailer could protect themselves from loss of the goods already manufactured or purchased.

It is possible that the Government may have to resort in the future to a tax somewhat similar to this, but it should be levied in a way to safeguard the Government in the revenue and protect the honest dealer against a competing dishonest dealer.

Mr. BURROUGHS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. BURROUGHS. I was very much interested in what the gentleman was saying, but I labor under a good deal of the same apprehension or misapprehension which the gentleman from Nebraska has expressed.

What troubles me about this thing is, while the taxes on these particular articles expressed in this bill are repealed, that the tax should be left on things which seem to be equally

deserving of repeal. Take, for instance, the matter of fur coats. I come from a northern climate, where a fur coat is a necessity.

Mr. KITCHIN. Is the fur coat troubling the gentleman? It has troubled me. As the gentleman says, in his northern climate and in the Northwest fur coats are a necessity for rich and poor alike. The tax on them should be repealed. It was practically understood at the last session, when the repeal of this section was passed by the House, that the Senate would amend the repealing bill by including the tax on articles made of fur and that the House would concur. This will probably be the course pursued at this session if this bill passes the House. It so happens that the tax on fur coats and other articles of fur is in another section with articles of several different classes. Properly it should have been in the section under consideration. The committee thought it best to confine the repeal to section 904. The Senate, no doubt, will amend by adding fur coats and other articles of fur worn by the people, and the House, or its conferees, will agree to it, as was the understanding last session.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Was that understood?

Mr. KITCHIN. That was the tentative understanding of the members of the Ways and Means Committee and Finance Committee.

Mr. BURROUGHS. I was in favor of the repeal of these——

Mr. KITCHIN. The other articles taxed in the act are real luxuries, regardless of the price. Take the question of smoking. It makes no difference whether a cigarette costs a quarter of a cent or 5 cents each, it is a luxury. It makes no difference whether a cigar costs 5 cents, 10 cents, or a dollar, it is a luxury. It makes no difference whatever whether it costs 10 or 25 cents or a dollar a pound, candy, for instance, is purely a luxury. So are practically all the other articles taxed in the bill. I ask pardon for consuming so much time. I had no idea of taking over 5 or 10 minutes.

In conclusion, permit me to give you gentlemen over to my left some advice——

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Do not interrupt me while I am starting out in my advice to you gentlemen. I noticed the other day when the Committee on Agriculture had up its appropriation bill in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union that on several propositions, which the Committee on Agriculture, after thorough study and investigation into all details, had recommended and reported, and which the Committee on Agriculture, Republicans and Democrats, of the last Congress had, after mature consideration, reported favorably, the Republican Members present, except the members of the Committee on Agriculture itself, led by the honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], voted almost to a man to strike out. After my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and the other gentlemen here who voted with him had made up the majority membership of the Committee on Agriculture, composed of as intelligent, able, and patriotic Republicans as can be found, and had them nominated and elected by the House as worthy of our and the country's trust and confidence, we had the spectacle on this floor of the gentleman from Pennsylvania combining together practically every Republican present in an effort to vote to discredit this committee of their own creation and repudiate its first official effort and act. Fortunately for the committee and the agricultural interests of the country there were enough Democrats here to vote with the committee to save in its substantial entirety the bill.

Mr. BAER. I would like to ask the gentleman if that was not a Democratic bill, and that this Republican committee did not have any hearings on it at all?

Mr. KITCHIN. Here are the facts: The committee last Congress had extensive hearings, all published. At the hearings and in the consideration of the bill in the committee were the present chairman and many other Republican members of present committee. The bill, just like the pending bill, was reported favorably by the unanimous vote of Democrats and Republicans after the fullest consideration. The pending bill, being the identical bill which was reported and passed last session, was, after full consideration by the present committee, Republicans and Democrats, at this session again reported favorably by a unanimous vote. Mr. LEVER, a Democrat, was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture last Congress, and a majority of the committee were Democrats. Mr. HAUGEN, a Republican, is the chairman of the committee this Congress, and a majority of the committee are Republicans. All, Democrats and Republicans, in both Congresses reported the bill by unanimous vote. By your votes you attempted to repudiate the Republicans on the committee last session and the Republicans on it this session. I saw that effort made five times. I saw the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], who had more power in creating this committee than any other man, five times ask the Republicans of the House to discredit and repudiate this committee of his own creation, and five times did I see practically every Republican present stand up and respond to his demand. This does not look good. Mr. MOORE and the Republicans who followed him should kick these gentlemen off the committee and put others in their places, if they are either in patriotism, in integrity, or in ability unworthy. I am glad to say that the House is in entire disagreement with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and the Republicans who followed him with respect to the membership of this committee.

Now comes the Ways and Means Committee this morning and reports a bill, a Ways and Means Committee the majority membership of which was created by the Republican caucus, and under the influence of the bad example set by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania and his followers in respect to the Agricultural bill many Republicans indicate and assert that they intend to repudiate the first official effort and act of their own Ways and Means Committee. They propose to discredit, as far as possible, the Republican membership of that committee. All right, go ahead. I remind you again that you yourselves voted for and the House unanimously voted for this very bill a few months ago. Now, then, shall we understand that you confess that you have made a mistake in electing the Republican membership of the Ways and Means Committee, and that really the Democrats of the last session, when you voted for the bill, had a better committee, a committee more worthy of your trust and confidence? Do you want to stand here at this session and repudiate your own committee while you indorsed our Democratic committee? [Laughter.]

I think Mr. FORDNEY'S committee is right in reporting this bill out favorably, and I hope every Republican and Democrat will vote for it. [Applause.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. Seven minutes.

Mr. KITCHIN. I offer to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman want to pursue the line of argument now?

Mr. KITCHIN. I have finished my argument.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from North Carolina and to the committee that I do not propose to talk upon this immediate matter. I intended to talk upon a feature of the revenue bill, and it might be more desirable to the committee to have this, which is right in line upon this section, concluded before I say what little I have to say. I am perfectly ready to go ahead now if it is desired.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is recognized.

Mr. LONGWORTH. May I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, before he begins, if he will be willing to yield to me 10 minutes of his time in order to avoid asking recognition in my own behalf?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And I think the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] also would like a little time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. With pleasure. I hope the gentleman will interrupt me if I overstep the time, so that I can keep the promise. I will gladly yield.

Mr. Chairman, having sat side by side with the gentleman from North Carolina for many moons, I have every faith in his patriotism, but on public occasions, when there is an opportunity for brilliant oratory, I am impelled to say that his partisanship sometimes overtops his patriotism. Here to-day is a proposition which, as I view it, is nonpartisan. I would not inject partisanship into it, but I find, owing to the speeches that have been made upon the other side and the suggestions that have come from the gentleman from North Carolina, it is necessary to cover the situation, even though one or two partisan references may be made.

If the gentleman will recall the elections recently held, by which a Democratic Congress was turned out and a Republican Congress was put in, after the President of the United States had made an earnest appeal to the people to elect a Democratic Congress, since he had not faith in a Republican Congress, he will probably find a reason for the expressions that come up from the new Members on the Republican side. These gentlemen have been sent here because of a lack of faith in the administration and in the Democratic leadership here. I do not wonder that new Members on the Republican side ask questions about these bills. They have seen enough in the last few days

to lead them to believe that the Democrats while in power were capable of putting over a good many things that were in the interest of the Democratic Party, more so perhaps than they were in the interest of the country.

I have a distinct recollection with reference to the Agricultural bill. When it came up here under Democratic auspices from year to year it was raised in the aggregate of appropriations from time to time until it provided ultimately for upward of 18,000 employees, mostly Democratic officeholders, who were sent broadcast over the country to talk to the farmers, and who occasionally did what a Congressman used to do in the old days when he was a candidate, left just "a few kind words for the administration" before he departed from the mission on which he had been sent. It is mighty helpful if 18,000 representatives of the Department of Agriculture, coming from the colleges and theoretical institutions, going broadcast among the farmers in all the States, and particularly in the Middle West, after teaching a few lessons on making cottage cheese and the preparation of apple butter, should say, "Don't you think President Wilson is right on the league of nations?" or "Don't you think our splendid President should be backed up by your votes?"

I do not wonder, if men have been put into the Department of Agriculture or any other department for this purpose, that Members of Congress, coming here for the first time and observing that a Democratic hold-over bill is being expedited in its passage through the House, not because the Republicans had any particular choice in the matter but because it had to be passed speedily to save the face of the Democratic administration, I do not wonder that some of them have been asking, "Why were not hearings had upon the subject?" And I do not wonder that they failed to know that this bill had had hearings up to the tune of 1,000 or 1,200 pages at the last session of Congress under a Democratic administration. They were not aware how the bill had been turned over to us. This bill, as we all know, must be passed before the 30th day of June next or the functions of the Department of Agriculture will cease and whatever benefit the farmers get from it will not operate, unless a Republican Congress passes a resolution, in accordance with Democratic practice, extending the appropriations of the preceding year—a war year, by the way—into peace times.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to my friend from Iowa, the new chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, who is proceeding under great difficulties in the conduct of a Democratic bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. Not at all. May I ask the gentleman if the bill under consideration at the present time has any resemblance to a Democratic bill such as that which was passed in the last Congress?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes. It has a close resemblance to the bill passed through the House when the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] was chairman of the committee and when the Democratic Party was in complete control of the House and of the committee and when he had the approval of a majority of the House.

Mr. HAUGEN. In what respect has there been a change since the last Democratic Congress?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I see no substantial changes.

Mr. HAUGEN. How is it a Democratic bill?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am referring to the Agricultural bill now. It is a Democratic bill, passed under Democratic auspices in the last Congress, and is re-presented because there has been no real opportunity to prepare a proper bill since the Democrats passed it, and we are in a situation where, if the bill does not pass speedily, the functions of the Department of Agriculture will cease. So that it is a matter of prime necessity to get the bill through.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. LEVER. I do not recall that the gentleman from Pennsylvania offered any amendment to the bill as it passed the House at the last session, except that he offered a provision for the extermination and eradication of mosquitoes. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is usually accurate, but in this instance he falls short of the mark, because while that was a standing motion for three or four sessions of Congress previously, and while it met with a heartless rebuff from the gentleman from South Carolina always and ever, although his section of the country is sometimes as afflicted by the pest as any other section of which I spoke, yet that question did not arise at the last session of Congress and no such amendment was offered by me.

Now, I want the new Members to observe that the present agricultural bill contains no provision for the extermination or eradication of the mosquito, which the gentleman from South Carolina seems to have preferred to preserve rather than exterminate. I hope, however, that under a Republican administration we may be able to put the mosquito out of business, even in the gentleman's territory. [Laughter.] So that, to resume, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] was answered to a certain extent by the action of the people of the United States when they went to the polls last November and practically said, "Get out, ye Democratic Congress; we want Republicans on guard." Hence, we are here, picking a few flaws in the kind of legislation that was thrust upon us when we were in the minority and when the steam roller was pushed over us from the White House, all the way down the line.

Who was it—who was it that induced Republicans to support the war revenue bill? Did I vote for the great tax bill in committee or upon this floor because I wanted to tax the people? No. And yet I voted for that bill.

Why did I vote for that bill, even for this so-called luxury provision? I voted for it because under the administration of the President, the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, the country was brought to such a financial pass that it was absolutely necessary almost to tax the shirts on the backs of working men in order to raise the revenue necessary to permit the President to run the Government, and those taxes included the $100,000,000 we voted to him, much of which he has been spending during his sojourn on the other side of the water.

How much money did he want? Well, gentlemen, up to the beginning of this present fiscal year, which ends June 30 next, we had appropriated and spent, including loans to our Allies, $12,000,000,000—$12 per minute for every minute that has elapsed from the time Jesus Christ was born down to the present moment. That is what we spent up to the end of June, 1918. Then stepped into the Congress of the United States, before he undertook his voluntary mission abroad, the President of the United States, and mounting that rostrum yonder, said that the necessities of the Government were great, that vast sums of money would be needed, and that taxes would have to be levied upon the people, but that the people would not complain. Oh, go and get the address of the President, the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, and read there his words to the effect that the people would gladly—I think I am using the exact word—the people would "gladly" bear the burden of the taxes that we should levy upon them, and that it was our duty to do so.

Previously he had suggested that we should go so far as to levy taxes upon stationary engines, upon gasoline and oil; but political conditions that are ever present in the mind of the distinguished and eloquent gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] prevailed in the Committee on Ways and Means, and when it came to taxing the oil—kerosene—that went into the farmer's lamp, "No, no"; the committee could not see it as the President saw it, and the suggestion of the President was heard no more. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania voted for the appropriation?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Which appropriation?

Mr. GARNER. The appropriations that we made in the war.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. And all the taxes, too?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. All the taxes imposed during the war.

Mr. GARNER. I think the gentleman admits that he voted for all the appropriations and all the taxes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; I have already said so. I would not have done it except under the compulsion of war and the direction of the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, who said that unless we levied these taxes, which he said the people would be glad to pay, failure in the war stared us in the face.

Mr. GARNER. Probably the President would not have suggested the appropriations or the taxes either if it had not been for the war.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to ask the gentleman from Texas if it is not true that, when the President was escorted in here, and from his high place yonder made his address to Congress, he said that for the fiscal year 1919, now about to close, he would need $24,000,000,000? Am I right? Is that what the President said?

Mr. GARNER. Yes; and did not the gentleman from Pennsylvania vote for every appropriation necessary to make up the $24,000,000,000?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes. I am coming to that. I am not denying anything with respect to that.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman seems to be criticizing the President of the United States because the appropriations were necessary and the taxes were necessary, and he excuses himself for voting for them on the ground that it was a necessity.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will wait a minute—though I did not intend to go into all the details this afternoon—I intended to suggest that although I had confidence in the President of the United States and voted all the money he asked, I have not had complete confidence in the manner in which it has all been spent, and I am inclined to think there has been a great extravagance, which I have not approved. There were cantonments, some of them in the gentleman's own State. There were large Army contracts. There was waste in aviation—$640,000,000 gone up in one lump-sum appropriation for the construction of airplanes. There were 1,500 or 2,000 young American aviators waiting in France for American aeroplanes in which to attack the enemy, but not a single combat plane was produced for the $640,000,000. That money was spent, and there was no satisfactory return for it. And even though the President was forced to investigate it and did appoint an investigator and finally appointed the distinguished ex-justice of the Supreme Court, Mr. Hughes, who found that certain people ought to be court-martialed, yet those gentlemen are still walking abroad, applauded by their superiors in the War Department, are guests at banquets where songs are sung in their honor, the chief of them being whitewashed by the Secretary of War, who tells the public that aeroplanes tingle from the ends of their fingers. Yet our appropriation of $640,000,000 went glimmering, and we never had a single combat plane in France, where for a time approximately 2,000 young Americans, trained for the purpose and waiting to serve, never had the honor of fighting in an American machine. Those are some of the reasons why I think it is fair to criticize the appropriations which, because of our confidence in the President of the United States, we voted for, though we taxed the people heavily to do it.

Mr. MADDEN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that $640,000,000 had been expended for aeroplanes?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Six hundred and forty million dollars in one lump-sum appropriation, and not a question asked, because the President said that amount was needed. We were told we must keep our mouths shut in Congress, though we were taxing the people almost to an industrial death, because if we asked how this money was going to be spent we might be "giving information and comfort to the enemy."

Mr. MADDEN. In order that the gentleman may get the correct figures into the RECORD, I should like to say that the total amount of money expended for aeroplane activities was a little over $1,800,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Why, of course, after they wasted the $640,000,000 they came in and asked for $800,000,000 more, and we were still told, "Ask me no questions. Give us the money." And the administration appointed men to high places to see that the money was honestly expended. If the gentleman from Illinois is correct, the extravagance has gone way beyond $640,000,000—the expenditures up into the billions. That is the reason I say to my friend from Texas, who is always able in defending the Democratic Party and the administration, that we have a right to criticize the manner in which the administration has conducted itself, though we are respectful to the Commander in Chief.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman knew that $640,000,000 had been spent without a single combat plane being constructed, and still voted for additional appropriations for the Aviation Service, did he not?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Still having confidence in the President of the United States and reluctantly reposing some confidence in those whom he appointed to administer the funds.

Mr. BAER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BAER. I think it would be well for you to explain the amendment that you had to these appropriation bills, which would have provided for a committee to supervise the expenditures.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I had not intended to say anything about that, because it might be charged that that was partisan, and yet I think it was not. Two amendments were offered to those revenue bills, by way of motions to recommit, asking for the appointment of a committee on expenditures to cooperate with the Commander in Chief—to cooperate, not to interfere—with the President of the United States and the heads of departments, in seeing that these moneys were properly and efficiently spent; and those amendments were defeated, because word came from the White House—the President then being an inmate of the White House [laughter]—because word came from the White House that to impose such a restriction upon the revenue bill would so embarrass and tie the hands of the President as to make him practically ridiculous before the nations of the world. Yet no less a man than Abraham Lincoln, whose memory is still dear to some of us, though sometimes there is danger of an eclipse—in the time of Abraham Lincoln Congress passed a resolution providing for the appointment of such a committee, and it visited the White House occasionally, which, I regret to say, our leading Democrats did not often do while the European war was on. [Laughter.] And they cooperated with the President, the immortal Lincoln, and from him they received much more encouragement, I am sure, than even my distinguished and eloquent friend from Texas [Mr. EAGLE], who now rises to put a question to me, ever received from the hands of the President whom he has loyally supported.

Mr. BLANTON. There are 18 gentlemen from the State of Texas. Which one does the gentleman mean?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The distinguished gentleman from Texas to whom I have just referred. I said in the days of Lincoln Congressmen visited the President, and were received sometimes for purposes of consultation. I yield now to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EAGLE. If my good friend from Pennsylvania wants to have a row with me, whether I want it or not, I should like to say that I think fully as many members of the Democratic Party during the Civil War visited the White House when dear old Uncle Abraham was there as did the Republicans during the war that tested the life of the Nation when Woodrow was up there.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Texas may have a more intimate knowledge of the events of 1861 to 1864 than I, but I am sure from everything I have read that President Lincoln welcomed Members of Congress and was extremely patient with them. And while he might have differed with some of them—the leader of the party, Thad Stevens, was that kind of a man who would force himself into the presidential office, whether invited or not—the immortal Lincoln conferred with the people's representatives even as our President, abroad now, confers with Clemenceau and Lloyd-George, the representatatives of their Governments, about matters here, there, and elsewhere.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman now yield to the more obscure gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman from Texas who began the controversy has not concluded; but having been compelled to rule favorably to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] the other day I yield again.

Mr. BLANTON. I think my good friend from Philadelphia, in which the most of this money was spent, ought to tell us how many prominent Republicans had anything to do with the expenditure of the money which he claims to have been wasted.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I can not count them on the fingers of my two hands.

Mr. BLANTON. And in whom the President had confidence then, but I can not say that he has now.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want the gentleman to get this all in—whatever the gentleman knows about Philadelphia Republicans who have been unfair to the President of the United States should be put in the RECORD.

Mr. BLANTON. I did not mean Pennsylvania, but all over the country.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has heard of the cantonments in Texas, of which there has been much complaint, and of expensive Army camps which should be investigated.

Mr. BLANTON. I think there ought to be an investigation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman confirms my statement that they should be investigated. There should be an investigation of cantonments in Texas, of course; and I am willing that the investigation should be extended to Pennsylvania, New York, or any other State. If there has been corruption, if there has been crookedness, if there has been profiteering, if there has been deviltry in Texas, the State from which the gentleman [Mr. BLANTON] comes, or any State, the Democratic Party is as much interested in it as the Republican Party. When it comes to the ordinary morals taught in the Sunday schools the gentlemen on the Democratic side are as well brought up as Republicans; they want no corruption or profiteering or crookedness under the guise of patriotism. I have sat by the side of the gentleman from North Carolina for some time; he does not swear; he does not drink; he has no bad habits except to smoke lamp lighters, which he manufactures himself.

[Laughter.] I have every confidence that he would be as delighted to have the matter of waste and extravagance investigated in Texas as in Illinois or New Jersey or elsewhere. I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. EAGLE. I had not asked to interrupt the gentleman, but I hope when he gets the investigation he will be very thorough with it, and he will find me voting with him to see if anything wrong was done at the Hog Island shipyard.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I know the gentleman from Texas well enough to know that Hog Island is in his mind, and I hope when the committee comes to examine it closely neither he nor it will have fault to find with that great work of construction. If anything wrong has been done, I will stand with him for the punishment of the culprits who profiteered on the Government or who used the guise of patriotism to make money while our boys were fighting and dying abroad. I would be in favor of punishing them in the great States of New York and Pennsylvania as I would if it occurred in any other State.

Mr. EAGLE. None of the things that I have observed during the war gave me more profound satisfaction than the trip I made up the Delaware and witnessed at Hog Island the marvelous energy, concentrated intelligence, and wonderful achievements of American organization, American labor, in that matchless work, contributing so largely to win the war. I hope when the investigation shall be made, if ever it is made, on the published charges that wrongs were done in connection with that business, that it may turn out that nothing wrong was done in connection with the Hog Island shipyard.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I can not let this opportunity go by without saying that I have always found the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EAGLE] fair and statesmanlike in matters of this kind. His tribute to Hog Island is more eloquent than I could possibly make it, and I think is justified by the facts. At least I hope so.

If we proceed in this spirit, Democrats and Republicans alike, we may catch the crook, if there is one. We may punish him, and for the sake of American honor may purge ourselves of some of the charges that have been bruited about in the newspapers and elsewhere.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. And for these reasons the gentleman has given he thinks this bill ought to pass. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; I think the bill ought to pass, and I am rather pleased that the gentleman has suggested that I come to a speedy conclusion; but before doing so, since the Texan controversy has been so elucidating, I shall speak of another matter. I think I should say to my friends on both sides, and particularly to our new Members of Congress, that they must be on guard against propaganda. If there is one place on earth where the propagandist gets in his work it is in the Congress of the United States, and if there is one man above another to whom the propagandist will go and upon whom he will work his wiles, it is a new Member of Congress.

Just a word to our new brethren. If there is an old pension bill that is a stench to high heaven, that has been floating around the Capitol for 50 years, it is likely to bob up when some new Member of Congress arrives. It is not that the old soldier is being wronged, but it is that somebody who has had that old bill in tow thinks that because the new Member has been saying he is a friend of the old soldier he can unload that bill on him.

In tax matters it is very much the same way. When we are raising money—and I thank God that we never had to raise any by direct taxation during my experience here under a Republican administration—the same condition of affairs results. Professing patriotism, talking loudly about what they have been doing for the country, about their love for the flag and all that, interested parties will come before the constituted committee of Congress and say, "Yes; you have got to raise this money, but do not put it on that; that hits me. Do not put it on this; that touches my profits." When you come to take taxes down, as in this case, you will find the fellow next door coming in with his appeal, saying, "Take mine down, too; the war is over, why tax me?" One reason I am not quite in accord with the partisan suggestions of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] when he indicates that we have followed blindly in these two or three bills the action of the Democrats in supporting them is that propaganda has been getting in its work. My experience of more than six years under a Democratic administration here has shown that one of the highest propagandists this country has ever known is the gentleman who guides the destiny of this Nation. He starts things. People then say the President said this or the President said that, and they are influenced by what they read of his sayings, but sometimes, having started something, the President finds that the masses of people are against what he starts and then sometimes comes another address, indicating another change, because, with ear to the ground, our distinguished Commander in Chief has heard what the people have been saying. We have something like that before us now in this tax-repeal agitation.

Why are you hearing from your constituents all over the land about this revenue bill? Who is it who started the flood of telegrams that have been coming upon you during the last two or three weeks? Who is it that started the writing of letters from taxpayers in your district urging you to take the tax off this and the tax off that? Strangely enough it is chiefly the same high official of this Nation, who, according to the admission of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], insisted that the necessities of war required $24,000,000,000 up to the end of June next, including $8,000,000,000 of taxes. It was he who demanded that we levy these taxes on the people. It was his Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo, who came before the Committee on Ways and Means, and in a long and learned address to the committee stated that he and the President agreed that it would be absolutely necessary to raise $8,000,000,000 of these twenty-four billions by a direct levy upon the people.

Gentlemen on the other side would endeavor to place the responsibility for these bills upon the Republican Party. I indicated the other day that this whole business had been dumped upon those who were coming into power. I repeat that the Democrats and the administration have endeavored and are endeavoring to unload the greatest burden of all history upon the Republican Party, which has come into power in this House in recent months. It was not of our choosing. To be sure, we voted when the President asked for money to give him money. We differed as to these bills and questioned them as they went in. There were many things in them to which we did not agree, but there stood the mandate of the man whom the people had chosen President of the United States, and there was his Secretary of the Treasury in daily contact with the Committee on Ways and Means, demanding that we hasten the passage of the bill that would carry $8,000,000,000 against the people in order that twenty-four billions might be in hand before the end of June next.

When we followed instructions the people began to complain and those in power responsible for the estimates began to renege. There is no use mincing words about this. When the House bill got to the Senate, those in control at the Treasury began to yield. As to the luxury tax, they said, "Take that down." The Secretary, before the Finance Committee of the Senate, instead of standing up for the $8,000,000,000 by taxes, began to talk about borrowing the money from the people, although we had been borrowing to the limit. Then they cut that bill down so that it would appear that they were not taxing the people $8,000,000,000, as the President and his Secretary of the Treasury had indicated and directed. They cut it down by $2,000,000,000, making it possible under that bill to collect only six billions for the current year and $4,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1920. The people had not taken kindly to the President's appeal for the election of Democrats because he could not trust Republicans. Yes, although they had appropriated the money as originally estimated, they reduced the 1919 taxes to $6,000,000,000 and the 1920 to $4,000,000,000. Oh, yes, the Democrats were constructive. They believed their President was constructive when he incurred the expenses and he was still constructive when he reduced the taxes. You can be against a ship subsidy and have no American merchant marine, but you can be constructive if you are willing to take the money for ships directly from the pockets of the people.

Republicans generally avoided that kind of constructive legislation. The President was against a good many other Republican propositions—against a tariff upon imports, for instance—he was not in favor of levying a tax upon the foreigner who sends goods into the United States to compete with us. Rather should we tax our people on what they produced to raise money for the war. It is easy to do big and daring things if you can tax the people to get the money to do it. Yes; you can be constructive with the money wrung from the people by taxation, but the Republican Party never indulged much in that kind of construction.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will.

Mr. PLATT. Do I understand the purport of the gentleman's argument is that this bill is one unloaded on the Republicans by the Democrats?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; it was unloaded on us, but there was nothing else for the Democrats to do. They had reached the limit. The President said we would have to have

$24,000,000,000 in 1919. The Secretary of the Treasury said we must have $8,000,000,000 of taxes, and the Ways and Means Committee, under the direction of the gentleman from North Carolina, with Republican support, yes, went forward in good faith to raise that $8,000,000,000. Then they did not face the people with such a heavy tax burden, and it was cut over in the Senate to six, and then it was cut to four. As I told you a day or two ago, my friends on the Republican side, we have got to meet $10,000,000,000 appropriations next year, and if we have only $4,000,000,000 in sight under the tax bill the Democrats left on our hands, and $1,000,000,000 miscellaneous, we may have to make up a deficiency of anywhere from $5,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000. That is our responsibility, and it was dumped on us while the people were led to believe the tax burden was to be steadily lowered.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT. I understood the gentleman to say, in answer to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT], that this particular bill was one of the bills dumped upon his party by the Democrats. I should like to ask the gentleman how that happened. We assumed the responsibility of passing it through the House. It only failed in the Senate by a filibuster of three Republican Senators.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am glad the gentleman raised that question of a filibuster. I have heard it used here several times. It must be a rich morsel in the mouths of our friends upon the other side. It does not seem to worry even our new Members on this side; but if there was a filibuster over there, or if there were long speeches over there, it might have been intended to prevent the President of the United States from getting another $5,000,000 to spend "over there" without taking us into his confidence. [Applause on the Republican side.] It might have been to save billions of dollars in certain large appropriation bills that this Congress intends to cut down, and which I may say the administration of the Republican Party will report minus certain very large and very attractive and very juicy appropriations and lump-sum appropriations for stocking-up purposes which the Senate did not want to pass.

Mr. GARRETT. Then the gentleman indorses the course pursued over there?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I say, if it was to save enormous sums of money, I do not blame a few Senators for making a few speeches. If the President had not been so late in coming home to help the Congress of the United States do the business that he was elected to perform, and if he had not been so infernally anxious to get back again, we would not have been in the perplexing situation we are to-day. It was the President of the United States who controlled that whole situation. He could have called this Congress in session March 5 and have remained here until the appropriation bills were passed; but instead of that he preferred to go over there and make speeches challenging the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GARRETT. My friend, then, indorses the course which was pursued?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Oh, not necessarily. I say I am glad they made a few speeches over there, because they brought out very interesting facts that the people wanted to know.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We learned only yesterday that out of $100,000,000 which we gave the President of the United States, he had allowed the Czecho-Slovac nation $5,000,000, and if it had not been for some little inkling from the other side, not in a covenant openly arrived at, that he gave up $5,000,000, we would never have known anything about it. I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he, during his long and very useful career in this House, has been called in conference by the President of the United States more than half a dozen times since that gentleman has occupied the White House?

Mr. GARRETT. Well, I do not know that I remember the times. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Well, I will say that the President would be a wiser man to-day if he had called into consultation occasionally the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee. [Applause.] I am not flattering the gentleman from Tennessee when I make that statement.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman is very kind. But pursuing the line of thought of a moment ago, let me say to the gentleman if at the proper time it be desired to discuss what the President of the United States has done with the funds which were given to him by the Congress without any strings attached to them, of course we should be ready to discuss that. Mr. McKinley was given $50,000,000. There was never a suggestion of making an inquiry as to what he had done with that fund. Why? Because at the time it was given to him it was stated that no investigation and no question would ever be made of it. Do I understand that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, by the suggestion as to investigating the President's fund, means to impugn the integrity of his use of that fund?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will say to the gentleman that I have heard of $100,000 given to Mr. Baruch to be spent for purposes not clearly explained. There has been a suggestion that many governments have been generous and kind to the President of the United States, and that it is the custom of potentates when they travel abroad or visit another's country to leave some token of their regard. Congress might not approve the expenditure of money in this way if called upon to do so specifically.

I question whether the people of the United States know all these things. I question whether even the newspapers have commented upon the simple statement made in the old Congress by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], that the President granted out of the $100,000,000 fund $5,000,000 for the incorporation of a company in the State of Connecticut to do business in Russia. We can not understand why one Vance McCormick, Democratic national chairman at that time, should be connected with that enterprise. We do not know much about it, but we should know. It seems to me that the people generally would be better satisfied if the President, in whom we have shown confidence during the war, should tell the Congress of the United States something about these things. I do not want to embarrass him while he is over there. But I wish he was home. I believe it would be better for the people of the United States if he were back here now. When we are trying to get information about money we authorize him to spend, you can not blame us if because he remains away we ask that Congress be permitted to perform the business the Constitution requires of it.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say as to the disposition of the $50,000,000 placed in the hands of President McKinley that it was distributed among the heads of the various departments in this Government, and the record is there to show what became of it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman, after he was in Congress before, and before he arrived this time, having been an auditor, knows whereof he speaks and does honor to the name of a great man. This country reveres the name of William McKinley. There was never a breath of suspicion against any expenditure made by him. But the trouble with the President is that from the beginning of his career in Washington, though in the first utterance he made to the public he said that his doors were to be open, they have been closed to Congress and to his own party. Even his leaders have not consulted him. He has done the most daring thing in the history of the world, leaving the Congress, leaving the people, and leaving the country for an indefinite period, attending as much to the business of the people of the world as he does to that of the United States, and at the cost of the United States. If our cost, according to the statement of the gentleman from Michigan who spoke here this morning, is true, is to be as great as that of England, we may well inquire about our trade routes. We talk about shipping and trade, but where is it? We have heard that at least one of our great Allies has not given up a single trade route nor lost one ounce of its foreign business since this war began. What about ours? Ours, it seems, is but to yield and to pay. We are to go on doling out millions, to be raised by taxation and to be taken from the people by loans, to do what? To encourage our love of humanity? To prove that the black man and the white man and the yellow man and the brown man can sleep in the same bed? That sounds like buncombe of the first class. The millennium is not here.

The nations supposed to be at peace on the other side are still struggling with each other. Judging from our mails each day, the battles of Europe seem to be transferred to the United States. We are expected to take up their quarrels here. We turn down little bridge bills on account of economy, a river here and a canal there, because you say it costs money, and yet we vote billions upon billions to lend to people on the other side to rebuild their roads, to build their bridges, and you appealing to Congress for yours. The President says our humanitarian effort is to go on until the last drop of American blood is shed and until the last dollar is spent. I do not believe in his time or in yours or mine we are going to see the realization of any such dream.

In my judgment, gentlemen, we are dealing with practical questions, and it is almost time, whether some folks like it or

not, that this Congress show its mettle and stand by its prerogatives.

You say we swallowed your Agricultural bill. We have not yet. We may have to swallow it. The President, having failed to call Congress in session until we were driven into a corner where we could not help ourselves, has put the majority to a great disadvantage. He still lingers on the other side, and it will take the ship so many days to go and so many days to return bearing the bill as we shall pass it in order to obtain his signature. He has got us handicapped going and he has us handicapped coming. We have got to get the bill to him, and he will have to get it back before the 30th of June. And I suspect some of the wise gentlemen on the other side knew full well the difficulty that the Republicans would be under in endeavoring to razee the bills they dumped on them and concerning which they endeavor to lay the blame upon the gentlemen over there who talk a little longer when they get the floor than we do at this end of the Capitol.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. LEVER. I think this is a very interesting performance, in view of the fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is complaining that we have not time in which to consider these bills. And yet the RECORD ought to show that he has spent nearly an hour in consideration of a bill and has not discussed the bill two minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. How much more time have I, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to assure my friend from South Carolina that I am as anxious to get back to the consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill as he is, and probably a little more, but of course we like a full attendance when we take up the consideration of the Agricultural bill, in order that we can point out the varied Democratic imperfections in that measure. [Laughter.]

The President put up this $24,000,000,000 demand to us in the House. We had a joint session of both branches of Congress here, and he told us what he needed. Before the Committee on Ways and Means we were told that $8,000,000,000 must be raised by taxes. I will not go over that story again. But step by step they began to fall back. There was too much complaint arising from the people, and evidently the Democratic leaders thought among themselves, "We will wait until the Republicans get in and unload it on them."

Now it is done. Our distinguished citizen on "the other side" says he does not keep in very close touch with this side. But he knows pretty well how to start a propaganda. I am going to read a message that the President did not deliver here owing to the fact that by reason of a prior engagement he was detained in Paris. In his message—and this is the first message of the kind the President ever sent to the Congress of the United States, the May 20 message, sent here by cable, and I think it must have been a very expensive message, although the wires temporarily are Government controlled—and I wish the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] would give ear——

Mr. KITCHIN. Two——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Two ears——

I hesitate—

Says the President—

to venture any opinion or press any recommendation with regard to domestic legislation while absent from the United States and out of daily contact with intimate sources of information and counsel.

In other words, he means to say: I have been unable to see my friend from Texas, Mr. GARNER, or my good friend from North Carolina, Mr. KITCHIN—I have been unable to mingle with the other leading gentlemen on the other side of the House, who could have given me valuable information—and being here alone, with nobody but Col. House to consult me—

I hesitate to express any opinion or press any recommendation with regard to domestic legislation while absent from the United States.

[Laughter and applause.]

Now, the President was modest about that, and we must give him credit for his modesty.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; and I should have said that he would have been wiser to have called in also the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY], but he says here that he had no chance to discuss questions with his intimate sources of information. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Is the gentleman discussing the bill before the House or is he taking a ramble and a crack at all creation? The latter, I presume. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; I am dealing with the bill right now. The President, you understand, put the whole responsibility upon Congress. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], and other faithful Members on the Democratic side called in their friends and said, "This must be done or we lose the war." Things like oil, which Democratic farmers use, were prudently omitted. I am not going into those matters very minutely. But after it was all done here comes the President—that is, by cable—after an absence of nearly six months, after he has imposed this great obligation upon us, after Republican and Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means alike, in good faith, had attempted to raise the money required; after the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. OLDFIELD], and other members of that committee had stood right up to the rack and forced taxes right back upon their constituents, believing they were performing a patriotic duty—along comes the President's cabled message——

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. How does the gentleman account for the fact that we were able to induce the gentleman himself, notwithstanding all his astuteness, and his colleagues on the Republican side of the Committee on Ways and Means, to join in all these measures?

Mr MOORE of Pennsylvania. I had faith in the President of the United States and I believed that he needed the money that he asked for, and that it would be honestly expended.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman admits that he did all these things that he has been complaining about for the last hour because he had confidence in the President.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I had faith in the President and voted him the money.

Mr. GARNER. I understand the sum and substance of the gentleman's excuse which he gives is that he had confidence in the President.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would not have voted for any of these bills if I had not had an abiding faith in the President of the United States.

Mr. MADDEN. Faith is a matter that begins where reason ends. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I was greatly disappointed in the position he took with regard to the Panama Canal tolls. But that was before the war. The President said he wanted the money to win the war, and on that statement, as in the case of my friend from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] and my friend from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] and my friend from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], I voted for those measures.

But after we had put this thing over, after the Democratic Senate had tried to save the face of the Democratic Party by making changes in the bill so that the people would not rise in rebellion, the President's latest message—his cabled message—arrived, and what did he say?

Many of the minor taxes provided for in the revenue legislation of 1917 and 1918, though no doubt made necessary by the pressing necessities of the war time, can hardly find sufficient justification under the easier circumstances of peace, and can now happily be got rid of. Among these, I hope you will agree, are the excises upon various manufacturers and the taxes upon retail sales.

Here was a new expression of the President, for whom we undertook to raise the $8,000,000,000 in taxes. Had he changed his mind about that $24,000,000,000? We had certainly spent it, or most of it. Why should it not be paid? Certainly the taxpayers who read that cheerful message would look to Congress for relief. The President did not say that the expenses are still on. He did not say that we do not have still to make enormous appropriations. He simply said, in effect: "Boys, I told you to put these taxes on; but seeing that the people do not want them, I advise you to take them off."

And so there comes a flood of telegrams from every corner of the United States saying, "The President says taxes are too high. The President says take the taxes off." My friends, that is an evidence of the manner in which a presidential mind that does not keep in close touch with the Democratic leaders can yet sense the popular will, even though far removed from home.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman admits that he followed the President when the President advised us to put these taxes on.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I followed the President when the President made his war demands.

Mr. LEVER. And when the President advises us to take these taxes off he follows him again, which ought to be conclu-

sive that the President is right usually—that the gentleman still has faith in him.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It ought to be known in South Carolina that the President forced us to impose these taxes. And now the President wants us to take them off, though the obligations still remain.

Now, getting down to this luxury tax, so called [laughter], the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] with regard to the parliamentary situation is exactly correct. The country was given the promise at the close of the last session, through both Houses, that this so-called luxury tax—which is paragraph 904, and which should be very carefully read, so as not to confuse it with other paragraphs of the bill—should be repealed. Good faith demands it. There is no other way, from my point of view. The conferees in the last session got into a tangle because of a situation that arose in the Senate, and they agreed to report back to their Houses, and both Houses practically agreed that that section, section 904, should come out.

The country was so advised and the people have been expecting it. Why? Not so much because of the administrative expense down here, but because of the damnable annoyance to every small dealer throughout the length and breadth of this land. I called up the Treasury Department a little while ago to find out just what the trouble was about this luxury tax, and it was explained that a small shopkeeper, a country grocer who is charged with the collection of this tax, is obliged to keep extra clerks and extra books and go to a great deal of trouble to figure out the tax on certain lines of sales, amounting to so much. It is such an unreliable tax as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] referred to. You can not put stamps on it. You can not keep a check on it. It depends very largely upon the integrity of the dealer, and sometimes there is a gross imposition on the purchaser. It is a confusing and perplexing tax, that ought to be repealed. You may say that ice cream ought to go in; but bear in mind one thing, that presents a serious question for legislators. We have passed a prohibitory law. We have denied to ourselves the right to collect $1,000,000,000 in taxes that we formerly derived from the sale of liquors. That is gone, and in consequence of its going ice cream and soft drinks have a rushing trade. Though we put the profit in their hands, we are asked to relieve them of taxes. Gentlemen ought to think twice, whether this is a matter of a little child eating an ice-cream cone on the sidewalk, as some gentlemen seem to think it is, or whether it is a matter of helping the profiteer. Have you bought any candy lately? Have you bought any ice cream lately? Have you bought any of those things that sometimes you can do without? If you have, you have observed that the price is almost twice as high as it was before. You have been told time and again that the war has practically closed; yet these gentlemen say the poor little child is paying this tax, and they want to be relieved of it, after the business has been put in their hands, by the legislation which took liquor out of the purview of taxation. There we have a loss of $1,000,000,000, and no place to raise the money. We can not raise it out of the churches. We have got to have some substance out of which to raise the nearly $10,000,000,000 that must be raised for administrative purposes next year.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. REAVIS. The gentleman spoke of the intolerable irritation caused to small shopkeepers in the collection of this tax. I asked the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] if that has furnished one of the reasons for the repeal of this section. He said that the tax had been in force such a short time that they had no information on it. What is the gentleman's information?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. My information is that certain small shopkeepers had to have new clerks, new books of accounts, and must do extra figuring to find out whether the amounts sold are taxable. We knew that this tax was going to be a nuisance when we put it on, but we put it on only because we were told that the French were obliged to adopt it and that the British Parliament was contemplating it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I shall only occupy the attention of the House a few minutes and then yield to my friend and colleague on the committee, Mr. LONGWORTH. What I intend to say will relate to the bill solely, for I do not care to discuss any other matters at this time, and I hope to give some reasons for the passage of the bill in a few minutes.

In the first place, I want to say that I have sat under the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] as chairman of the committee for a good many years. He was very informing to-day, and gave excellent reasons for the support of this bill. He was also entertaining, as he often is, and one of the best things about his wit is that it never leaves any sting. While I was in accord with him in the most he had to say, I can not follow him entirely. He made a statement that he thought the Republicans on this side showed less confidence in the new committee than they did in the Democratic committee when it originated and reported the bill which was passed at the last session.

Unfortunately the gentleman got the matter turned right around. This bill was originally a Democratic bill and was passed by a Democratic House. The Republicans also, every one of them, voted for it, so far as they expressed themselves at all. But while the Members of the old Congress who voted for it may have some difficulty in explaining why they changed their vote at this time, I am not at all surprised that the new Members view the bill somewhat with suspicion, knowing its Democratic origin, and the fact that many mistakes and blunders were foisted upon us by the last administration.

Let us consider this bill and see why these taxes ought to be repealed. They have been called "luxury taxes." In fact, the articles taxed are necessities, and if there is any luxury about them it is in their cost above a specified sum.

Let me call attention to the fact that this particular section which is repealed by this bill is the only one in which a certain kind of accounts is to be kept, an account in which the merchant may have a dozen different kinds of articles, upon each of which is a different rate, and perhaps different classes of a particular article upon which there may be a different rate.

So notwithstanding it has been said that there is no difficulty in keeping accounts with reference to this tax, it has been found to be an extremely onerous burden.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. The bill imposes a 10 per cent rate on everything; what is the difficulty?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman misunderstood me. A dealer has to make a computation on every article. The tax is different on each article because the price is different, and a separate computation has to be made on each one. He can not make it in the way that he can in other sections of the revenue law—by simply lumping his sales.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is the nub of the whole thing. Take a lady's purse, with the tax on a price above $7.50. She pays 10 per cent on all that it costs above $7.50.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Suppose the price is $8.25. The purchaser pays a tax of 10 per cent on $1.25. If the customer has it charged she must pay cash for the 10 per cent on the $1.25. That is the way it runs out.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is correct. It is impossible to make a charge account of the tax. It must be paid in cash. This makes it difficult to carry on a credit business in these articles. That is the way it works out. On caps the tax is an uncertain amount, depending on the price, on hats it varies according to the price, on shoes above such a price the tax is a different amount, and so on it goes all down along the line. The merchant has to make a calculation on every single article and upon different classes of the same article. The result has been that the merchant has frequently been obliged to have another clerk and must charge the expense to his customers by adding it to the articles pro rata. Gentlemen think it is easy to impose taxes so it will be fair, but this is a kind of tax that can not be imposed so that it will be fair. There is always difficulty in imposing a tax equitably, and there is more difficulty in a tax of this kind. There are all sorts of luxuries that are not taxed at all in this section. There is just as much reason why they should be taxed as the ones enumerated in this section. There are some articles we know ought to be taxed, if these are to be taxed. Such are women's dresses priced above a certain amount and men's clothing costing a certain amount. Yet a woman may pay $5,000 for a dress or a man $200 for a suit of clothes without paying any tax at all. Some gentlemen say that that does not make any difference to them, they care nothing about that, but the Committee on Ways and Means was more or less influenced by the inequities in this schedule after it came back to us from the Senate. I did not vote for this tax when it was first presented with the same theory that was advanced by the Secretary of the Treasury in support of it, viz, that it was going to keep down the purchase of luxuries. I did not believe it would, and I do not believe it has to any great extent, although it probably has interfered with some sales.

I voted for it at that time because we were in the throes of war and it was absolutely necessary that we should have all

the money which could be raised, either from taxes or bonds or in any other way; and, as far as I could see at that time, if we kept on with the war expenditures at the rate they were being created by the administration for another year we would be absolutely bankrupt, in spite of anything we could do. That is the reason I voted for it in the first instance.

Then this bill went over to the other body, which they say we can not mention here. In the course of its travels it came back very sadly butchered up, with very important parts of it left out. Members said that they would not vote for the bill in that form, but the answer was made to them at that time that they should not pay any attention to this; that we were going to repeal the luxury taxes; and so the word went out to the whole country, the pledge of the whole Congress at that time, that these luxury taxes named in this section were going to be repealed. In pursuance of that announcement, which everybody understood and upon which a large number of Members based their votes at that time, this bill, in practically the same form in which it is now——

Mr. LONGWORTH. In exactly the same form.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. My friend from Ohio corrects me—in exactly the same form—was brought before this House at the last session and, without one solitary dissenting voice, everybody said these taxes should be taken out under the circumstances. They were not fairly apportioned; they were not in the form they ought to have been levied; they did not equalize burdens among the people or among business men. I could stand here, if I had the time, and show you the faults and difficulties inherent in the tax which made us extremely reluctant to pass it originally. I think there was not a member of the committee that was satisfied with it when it was introduced, and we were still less satisfied with it when it came back from the Senate as a part of the revenue bill; but we had to pass the bill before March 4 or the consequences would be very serious.

Then the repealing measure came up here, and under these circumstances this House unanimously passed this same bill, and now again the matter comes before the House, and Members say, "Why should people spend their money in that kind of way? Why should anyone buy things he does not need?" Are we going to tax everyone in this country who purchases things he does not need and might get along without? If we are, we will have to go into a very wide circle and take in ten times as many articles and matters as we have considered in this section, which we now seek to repeal. The fact of the matter is that this whole section was illogical from the beginning, It was not necessary in time of peace, and its only justification could be that it was passed in time of war, in time of stress, in time of peril, when we had to have the money. Now, in pursuance of the pledge heretofore given, we have brought in this bill for repeal, and we think it ought to pass.

I know we need the money, but we ought to collect it in a way that would be more equitable than the provisions of this section which is sought to repeal; but some will say, "Why not amend the section?" I will tell you why. Because there are not three gentlemen in the House that could agree as to just what articles are luxuries and at just what point these necessities which are included in this section became luxuries by reason of the price fixed upon them. There is not a gentleman present who is not the possessor of some article which is not a necessity and yet is not taxed; yet this section which we now propose to repeal contains nothing but necessities, and in many cases necessities, pure and simple, are taxed. As the gentleman from Washington well says, "Why should the loggers and lumberjacks of my State, who are compelled to wear flannel shirts, pay a tax on that article, which is an absolute necessity to them?" Why should a man whose work compels him to wear a pair of high boots pay a tax on those boots because they cost over $10? A hat costing more than $5 at present is a luxury under the law, but a matter of economy if the wearer has it cleaned and uses it other seasons. While I never had a pair of $10 shoes in my life, many gentlemen claim to me that it pays in the long run to buy the more expensive article in this line.

I think there is no question but that, as prices now run, if one has the money—which I have not—to buy a carpet above the price specified in this list, it will last enough longer to make an economy, instead of a luxury; but be that as it may, why should carpets, which are used most largely by people of moderate means, be taxed, while imported rugs, which I have seen sold in this city at prices running up into the thousands of dollars, be entirely free from the tax? As to an umbrella, how are you going to get a good one for less than $4? I do not buy any that costs that much, because I lose them, and a $2 one is just as good to lose as a $4 one. Why should a smoking jacket or lounging robe be taxed? It saves the use of another coat and is very much more comfortable. This particular tax is a tax on the privilege of making oneself comfortable. To be sure, we could go in our shirt sleeves; but some of us last winter could not get our apartments well enough heated for that purpose. I will admit that any man who wears silk hose ought to be taxed, but can we not allow the ladies the privilege of wearing silk hose without paying the tax? Under the law that now stands, they will have to pay or go without. There is one redeeming feature: They will have to pay in advance for them, and can not get the amount charged to their husbands, under this law. A valise or suitcase that costs in excess of $25 looks pretty high until you visit some of these places where they carry a really good article, and, in accordance with the spirit of the times, have doubled or tripled the prewar prices. I never had such an article myself, but if I wanted to get one that would last, I would have to pay it. Of course, fans ought to be taxed. I suppose the gentlemen will claim that there ought to be a tax on the privilege of keeping cool, unless you are willing to carry a palm leaf. I never had such articles as pajamas, so I am quite willing that people that do wear such articles should be taxed, and I know all my farmer friends will join with me in this, but those who wear them insist there is no more reason for them to be taxed than a nightshirt.

The fact is that when we go over this schedule we find that it is full of inequalities, which, in some instances, verge on absurdities.

It is claimed that this schedule will produce ninety to one hundred million dollars' revenue. I have never believed it would produce one-half that amount, and if there is as much difficulty in collecting it as the Bureau of Internal Revenue claims, the net receipts from it will be almost nothing. I shall have to say, however, that there is no way of determining just how much additional expense is caused to the department by reason of these provisions, as those who have to enforce it are also used in enforcing other provisions. It can, however, be seen at a glance that there is no way of simplifying this tax.

We can not provide that it shall be paid by means of stamps or through tickets or by a tax on gross sales, nor is it practical to put it upon the manufacturer. Consequently the process of keeping a record of the amount due by the party who sells the articles, and the work of the Treasury Department in seeing that he does keep a proper record and make a proper return becomes very burdensome to both.

Then the tax discriminates between different kinds of business. The man who has a hat and cap store is at a loss to understand why his business should be taxed, when next to him is a high-class grocery store, containing all kinds of luxuries, and catering to those to whom expenses are no object, with no element of necessity connected with it, and yet no tax is paid. He feels that he is treated unjustly when a dealer in women's dresses returns no tax. If luxuries are to be taxed, he wonders why, if necessities become luxuries by reason of the price, that there is no tax upon houses that cost around a million dollars—and we have plenty of them in New York and Washington. Naturally he thinks it would be better to put a tax on a man that keeps extensive grounds for his own recreation, as this seems to him to be purely a luxury. In fact, as he looks about him he observes that there is no tax where money is wasted most, and that the tax is only imposed on these articles which are in themselves necessities, with every person differing as to the point where they cease to be necessities and become luxuries.

These reasons are presented as forming good grounds for the repeal of this luxury tax; but this bill, in fact, is not a Ways and Means Committee bill. It is the bill of the conference of the Republican Members of the House, which directed the Ways and Means Committee to introduce it. The committee does not, therefore, feel that the principal responsibility of this bill rests upon it, nor, if the bill is voted down, will it feel that one of its own measures has been defeated. On the contrary, its conclusion will be that the Republican Members have either become stampeded by the cry that this is a Democratic bill or there is so little unity among the Republicans that they are unable to take a definite position and adhere to it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this debate has taken a very wide range. We have discussed the President of the United States, and we have discussed potash and lumber and various other matters. I want, as the saying is, to get down to brass tacks, and to show, if I can, that every man here, on whichever side of the aisle he happens to sit, is amply justified in voting for this bill. Perhaps I can best illustrate the reason why it was originally adopted by reading from the recommendation sent by the Treasury Department to the Committee on Ways and Means with reference to the imposition of all these luxury taxes, and to show that this, in the opinion of the Treasury

Department and of the Committee on Ways and Means, is a tax which stands absolutely by itself, both as to method and as to substance. Having given reasons and suggestions for putting taxes on certain luxuries, this report goes on as follows:

It is believed, however, that the rates here suggested could be imposed without seriously injuring the producer or so reducing consumption as to impair the revenue. The rates, in short, are not beyond the maximum point of yield.

That covers every possible form of luxury tax except the taxes provided by section 904, which taxes stand by themselves, as will be illustrated by the next paragraph, which I shall read to you:

The retail sales tax, however—

This tax—

raises a different set of considerations. That tax is recommended not only to raise additional revenue but for the equally important purpose of discouraging wasteful consumption and unnecessary production.

Mark that particularly. The object of this tax never was so much to raise revenue, although it was expected to raise a substantial amount, as to prevent wasteful expenditure and production of these articles, which, after reaching a certain price, are not necessaries at all.

For instance, it was undesirable in time of war for women to be buying expensive dresses; it was undesirable for men to be buying expensive suits of clothes or shoes or what not, because by the unnecessary expenditure they thereby deprived themselves of a certain power to buy freely of Liberty bonds and otherwise contribute to the war cost. What was the other reason? To prevent unnecessary production; to prevent people from manufacturing at all these articles which were not real necessities. Take, for example, this beautiful suit of clothes which I have on to-day. I do not remember how much I paid for it. It was bought a long time ago—long before the war. I am not so much up to fashion as the gentleman who has just addressed us. As I recollect, it cost me about $65. Now, what is the use, in time of war, in expending as much as $65 on a suit of clothes? Moreover, why should men engaged in the manufacturing of expensive clothes and other similar luxuries produce articles of that sort when their productive capacity could be better employed in producing articles of absolute necessity for war purposes? So it was deemed at that time advisable to prevent, or at least discourage, the production of such things as these and other high-priced articles which were not necessary. This was a war tax—a war tax pure and simple. It was imposed largely to prevent not only wasteful expenditure but the production of such articles as were not necessary for war purposes. But to-day, gentlemen, that necessity has absolutely ceased. It is a wise thing to encourage production to-day of all sorts of articles, whether necessities or not. It gives people employment. It is a wise thing, also, to encourage expenditure, so as to diffuse money among the people of the United States. I will proceed a little further with this reading:

It would be superfluous, at this stage of the war, to dwell upon the fact that waste and extravagance are akin to treason.

This was to prevent waste and extravagance in time of war. To-day the necessity for that has ceased.

We pay lip homage to this truth, but we neglect its practice. We are not cutting our personal budgets sufficiently to make the excess of national production over national consumption equal to the needs of the Government. The retail sales tax distinctively labels the taxed article as luxurious and serves notice that the Government's ban is upon it.

In other words, the Government was trying to put a ban upon the purchase and the production of the articles described in section 904.

The really needy consumer—

Mark this—

The really needy consumer is amply protected by exempting from the tax those classes of articles which the poor actually buy or need to buy. Other articles must be taxed vigorously if the tax is not to be interpreted as legitimatizing extravagance.

In other words, I do not for a moment rest the necessity for the repeal of this section on the proposition that it will benefit the poor taxpayer. I have no means of knowing how many persons, what percentage of our population, is taxed under this section at all. I imagine it is insignificant; that it is an insignificant percentage.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the gentleman will permit, I think the gentleman is a little in error in his language. For instance, in the Pacific Northwest, where our great logging industry goes on, every logger pays more than $10 for his boots.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I assume that is true of a good many cases, that the poor man pays the tax under this section, but I do not rest my contention on that proposition. I rest it mainly on two grounds: First, that the expense and the trouble of collecting it is almost infinite. They have had to organize a new bureau in the Internal Revenue Department whose only function is to administer the taxes under this section. I do not for a moment agree with the chairman of this committee in his estimate that the net return from this section will amount to anything like $85,000,000 or $100,000,000. I think that when the expenses of this have been paid it will be found that a comparatively small net revenue will come to this Government from this tax.

Mr. JEFFERIS. I would like to inquire if the gentleman can give any information as to the number of employees the Revenue Department has found it necessary to employ to look after this tax and the cost thereof?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I can not give the gentleman that information. I do not know accurately. I do know that they have had to form a bureau for the purpose. Of course, it has been very difficult to say how many men will be necessary, because the tax has only been in operation for about a month. I think it went into effect, as I recall, on the 1st of May, less than a month ago, so it is entirely impossible to judge, but I have been informed at the departments and by revenue officials that they are only beginning to realize the enormous number of employees that it will be necessary to have all over the country even to pretend to stop the evasion of this law. Now, I think, this argument can be legitimately made in the interest of the poor taxpayer. I have no doubt the fact would develop if this law was enforced some considerable time, in view of the fact every retailer of this country will have to add to his cost of selling both by the additional accounting in the case of these particular goods and by the employment of a number of additional clerks to make these returns, that he will take it out of the customer on other articles.

He will take it out on articles of absolute necessity, and will be forced to do it in order to pay the additional cost of keeping proper books and employing additional clerks.

Mr. HAUGEN. I understand the gentleman to say that the tax on the better-quality and higher-priced articles—for instance, shoes—was intended as a ban upon production of a better quality of shoes, for instance?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Is the country now to understand that the 2-cent tax on a 15-cent plate of ice cream is a ban upon ice cream?

Mr. LONGWORTH. No. At the very outset of my remarks I said this section 904 was intended to be an entirely different proposition than any other tax; was intended as a ban, whereas the tax on ice cream and soda water was intended to be only such as the traffic would bear.

Mr. HAUGEN. Where is the distinction? One is a revenue and the other is a ban?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Did the gentleman catch my reading of the Treasury recommendation?

Mr. HAUGEN. No; I did not.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I commend it to the attention of the gentleman, because it is the very foundation of this whole argument. Let me say this, that the purpose of the tax referred to by the gentleman is only to get revenue, while this is mainly for the purpose of discouraging the sale and production of the article.

Mr. HAUGEN. As an illustration, one who buys a pair of silk stockings at $3 pays a 10-cent tax, and the school children buying five plates of ice cream pay 10 cents. The revenue is the same and the tax is the same.

Mr. LONGWORTH. But the object of putting the tax on was entirely different.

Mr. HAUGEN. But the intention was the same.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The intention of putting the tax on ice cream and other drinks was to get revenue only, and so the tax was placed low enough that it would not discourage the business. I introduced a bill on the first day of the session, and so far as I know, no one else has, to repeal section 630, which is the tax on ice cream and soda water. [Applause.] I intend to press that bill for early passage, and I believe the Ways and Means Committee will take that bill up, together with other consumption taxes, and we will bring in a comprehensive bill before long and repeal these unjust consumption taxes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman inform the House why this great Committee on Ways and Means should report a Democratic bill word for word instead of the bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will say to the gentleman that I do not call this a Democratic bill. I supported it as a war measure. I saw no politics in it then, and I do not see any now.

Mr. HAUGEN. It was brought in by a Democratic Congress.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It was brought in by a Democratic Congress, and I voted for it, as did the gentleman. Let me repeat

that it was the exact bill that was passed unanimously by this Congress in the closing days of the session.

Mr. REAVIS. Let me say to the gentleman that we have an agricultural bill before the House that is infected with the same virus.

Mr. HAUGEN. I beg the gentleman's pardon. As to the bill referred to the gentleman is mistaken. The bill went to the Senate, and the bill reported by the Agricultural Committee cut $5,000,000 out of it. That is the difference. Here you have the bill word for word.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. In connection with what the gentleman said in reference to the effect of these taxes on the poor man, does not the gentleman recognize where we levy taxes of this kind on a large number of articles that inevitably, while it is called a tax on luxuries that we have been reaching for in this particular case, we reach absolute necessities?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Absolutely. The name "luxury tax" in this section is a misnomer. Every article described is a necessity needed in the daily life of the people, and they are only regarded as luxuries after they get beyond a certain price. This tax has never existed in this country in time of peace and never ought to, for it is a tax to prevent production, and to-day we ought to encourage production and give employment to the people of this country.

Mr. REAVIS. If this section was a penalty rather than a revenue measure, why was it not made prohibitive?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Well, that question arose in other instances. The gentleman will recall that an amendment was offered by myself in committee, and the committee adopted it, to put a prohibitive tax on platinum.

There is another and almost similar instance in principle. We should have a prohibitive tax on platinum used in jewelry in time of war. But the moment the armistice was signed the necessity for that tax ceased, just as it has in this case.

Now, in regard to this bill, gentlemen, there seems to be some little misunderstanding. This exact bill was reported unanimously from the Committee on Ways and Means, and I do not care whether you want to call it a Democratic bill or a Republican bill. The Committee on Ways and Means had no politics in the last session of Congress, and it ought not to have politics on such matters as this now. [Applause.] The bill was reported and passed after a few minutes of debate without a word of protest. It went over to the Senate, and the only reason why it did not pass the Senate was the fact that they undertook over there to load it up with amendments.

They put on an amendment taking off the tax on furs, and they even went to the extent of putting on an amendment to that bill, which was in the form of a resolution, conveying felicitations to the President of the United States and hoping for his safe return to this country—hardly a germane amendment to such a measure as this. But another reason, in my judgment, emphasizing the necessity of passing this bill now is that it was mutilated in the Senate in cutting out men's and women's clothing. There is no justification for taxing a man on a $10 pair of shoes and not taxing him on a $50 suit of clothes. That is another reason why we should repeal the whole business.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I yield, of course, to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORDNEY. In answering the question asked by a gentleman as to whether or not this is a Democratic bill, I want to say that I introduced this bill, and I copied word for word the bill introduced at the last session by the gentleman from Ohio and one introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]. Now, if it is a Democratic bill, it was a Democratic bill when introduced then by Republican Members. Word for word, this is a copy of the bill introduced by those gentlemen.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I recall the fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I introduced those bills exactly at 12 o'clock on the opening day.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And is it not a matter of good faith, considering the action of both Houses and the notice given to the public and the general understanding?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Entirely so, I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. Would the gentleman say there was no longer any reason for the practice of thrift among the American people?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I would not say there is no reason for the practice of reasonable thrift. I certainly do not believe it is wise now to limit the production of any article in this country, because the production of a valuable suit of clothes or a pair or boots encourages American labor, and I want to see American labor encouraged.

Mr. PLATT. The tax was increased from 10 to 20 per cent, was it not?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not know whether 10 per cent would discourage it to any great extent or 20 per cent, but——

Mr. PLATT. Nearly all the complaints, as I understand, come from wholesalers and manufacturers, and not from consumers.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think it is certain that the repeal of this tax will be of direct benefit to the poor people of this country, not directly, because they are not subject to the tax, but, as I have explained before, because inevitably they will have to pay higher prices for other articles in order that retailers may be able to pay the additional expense that the payment of this tax will cause them. I think there is no question about that. So that from that standpoint; from the standpoint just stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]; from the standpoint of view that this is not a proper tax in time of peace, because we ought not in time of peace to attempt to limit either large expenditures or production; from the standpoint, too, that it was the unanimous act of this House before and would now be the law except for the fact that the Senate undertook to add certain amendments to it, this bill ought to pass unanimously. I hope that amendments will not be offered, but that it will be permitted to pass at once, and every man here, on either side of this House, can amply justify his vote upon it.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Is it the proposition of the committee, of which the gentleman is a member, to give consideration to the other luxury taxes?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Unquestionably. As the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] said this morning, a number of these bills have been introduced, and they have been referred to the Treasury Department for report.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I am interested to know why this particular bill was made a special order. Does it not leave a wrong impression on the country to make this bill a special order in preference to the others?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I tried to show precisely the contrary of what the gentleman suggests. In the first place, it is a system of taxation entirely by itself. In the second place, it was admitted by this House unanimously that such taxes as this, which are unexampled in our history, which have no example anywhere except in France as a pure war tax, ought not to continue for a moment when this country was not actually in war. The opinion of the House on the subject was unanimous, and I really am surprised that so much question has been made about it to-day.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I yield.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Will Members be able to say to their constituents that the members of the Ways and Means Committee will take up soon the question of repealing these other luxury taxes, or will it take a long time?

Mr. FORDNEY rose.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan to answer that question.

Mr. FORDNEY. I stated this morning, and I will restate now for the benefit of those who were not present, that there are bills and requests before the Ways and Means Committee to repeal the automobile tax, the tax upon furs, the tax upon jewelry, and the tax upon soft drinks and ice cream, candy, and various articles that are covered by other sections of the law. The committee wish and intend to take up the consideration of those requests at as early a date as possible. We were requested, however, not to act upon those matters until we received some further information from the Secretary of the Treasury and from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and for that reason passed those other matters over until some other time, when the committee can meet and consider them.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Does the gentleman think it will take a long time to do that?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I do not think it will take a long time.

Mr. SIMS. Why not wait and put them all together. This can be recommitted to the committee.

Mr. FORDNEY. That is the gentleman's view; but the repeal of this section 904 will repeal a tax of $100,000,000 in a total of $350,000,000 consumption taxes, and it is a pretty good step forward toward doing the thing that our party two weeks ago in conference agreed to do and directed this committee to set to work to do. We have done this work as quickly as possible, and will get to the others as quickly as we get the necessary information.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman has expressed a hope that no one will introduce an amendment. Inasmuch as I have an

amendment in my hand, I want to know why a proposition to repeal section 630 along with 904 would embarrass or hamper the passage of this bill, inasmuch as everybody who has spoken to-day on this bill seems to be in accord that section 630 ought to be repealed and will be repealed.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will give the gentleman the positive assurance, so far as I am concerned, having originally introduced that bill, that I will press it for passage, but I do not think it ought to be tacked onto this bill, even if it could be done in a parliamentary way, which I am convinced it can not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Since the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] has pressed the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] to make this statement, the gentleman from Ohio might fairly ask the gentleman from New York what he proposes as a substitute for the $21,000,000 that would be taken away from the revenue of the country?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. We might repeal war-time prohibition for one thing.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Having lost a billion dollars in taxes by prohibition, I will ask the gentleman where we can make up that billion dollars?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Do not let us make it up by imposing a tax on the innocent little children down in the tenements who want to eat ice cream in the summer.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would the gentleman put it on the dealer in soda water, who has the cream of the business, now that the liquor dealers have been put out of business?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not care where you put it as long as the burden does not fall on the innocent little children who need to eat ice cream as a necessity in hot weather.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is the gentleman thinking about the little children or is he thinking about the dealers who are going to double the price for selling it to the little children?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not know about that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman know that ice cream costs more now than formerly, and a great deal more of it is sold now than formerly?

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Can the gentleman give the House any information as to the present condition of the Treasury, the number of outstanding bonds, and so forth?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I can not offhand. I have not seen a recent statement, particularly as to the outstanding Treasury certificates. I am prepared to admit, though, if I get the import of the gentleman's question, that it is not such as would justify the destruction of present sources of revenue except after thorough investigation and deliberation. I will say this to the gentleman from New York, that I should feel it my duty on this occasion to make a point of order against his amendment, even though I am as anxious to have it eventually passed as he. I think a number of these consumption taxes should be either repealed or amended. I will give the gentleman another instance where the tax falls heavily on the small boy—10 per cent tax on sporting goods. To my mind it is utterly indefensible that baseball bats, baseball gloves, and things of that sort should be taxed 10 per cent which has to be paid by the American boys, while American ladies who buy expensive jewelry only pay 5 per cent. All these questions are to be taken up and given careful attention by the Ways and Means Committee. But you must always keep in mind that no matter how wise it may be to abolish eventually consumption taxes, in view of the present condition of the revenues we have to go fairly slow and know just where we are going.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. Everyone must admire due caution and look to the Treasury, but here is one single item where we take eighty-five to one hundred millions off the taxes of those who can pay it and let the buyers and consumers who pay other consumption taxes wait while the committee deliberates. Why should they not all go together? Why not refer the bill back to the committee and let the committee bring in a bill dealing with all of them?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Let me ask the gentleman from Tennessee to remember that he voted to make this the only tax to be repealed in the closing days of last session.

Mr. SIMS. I do not think the gentleman knows how I voted on it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman did not vote against it.

Mr. SIMS. I never heard of it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman is so attentive to matters of legislation that I am grieved and surprised to know that such a piece of important legislation could be passed in the last session without the distinguished chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee knowing about it.

Mr. SIMS. I was giving attention to another and more important piece of legislation.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If any other gentleman had intimated or insinuated that the gentleman had allowed anything to get by him, I would have repelled the charge with indignation. [Laughter.]

Mr. HULL of Tennessee was recognized.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield long enough for me to make an inquiry of the gentleman in charge of this bill?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Does the committee intend to take up any other bill to-day?

Mr. FORDNEY. I want to finish this bill. I do not think that there will be any other bill taken up to-night.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that we have pending before the House legislation of greater importance than that under consideration to come on immediately after its passage. I yielded to the gentleman from Michigan with the understanding that this bill would most likely be passed in at least two hours. The gentleman said he would take 15 minutes in discussing the bill. It is now nearly 5 o'clock and five hours have been consumed in general debate.

We have the Agricultural bill pending of more than 90 pages, carrying about $32,000,000, which will have to be passed or the Republicans will have to stand guilty of that for which we have charged the Democrats in the past—incompetency. [Applause.] If we are going to transact business and demonstrate our competency, let us do it. We have been here for five hours, and, so far as I have observed, not more than 10 minutes has been devoted to the discussion of the merits of the bill. We have a bill carrying $32,000,000 for the benefit of 6,000,000 farmers and 6,000,000 laborers tilling the soil and a hundred million consumers of this country, with a shortage of food production and a great necessity for this legislation. Are we going to fritter away the time reducing the tax on silk stockings and cutting down the revenue that gives us $100,000,000 and putting nothing in the place of it? Gentlemen, I suggest an agreement as to the closing of general debate so that this matter may be closed to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I will yield the gentleman from Michigan a minute.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to delay any other legislation. I am ready and willing to vote on this bill now, and I stated so when I first spoke. I only occupied four or five minutes in explaining the bill, and from that time on I was answering questions. As to what legislation may follow after we pass this bill I do not know, but I am anxious to close debate now.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I will yield a minute to the gentleman.

Mr. LEVER. I desire to call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], who has spent three days fighting the Agricultural appropriation bill, took a whole hour, and it looked to me almost as if it was a deliberate filibuster against the Agricultural appropriation bill. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield me a minute?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the rather gratuitous statement suddenly injected by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] should be answered to this extent, that the speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], while it may have lasted an hour, was due to the fact that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] had assailed the gentleman from Pennsylvania and others for at least one hour previously.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I agree entirely with the very pointed remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN], and I must say that I was in the act of making a similar statement when the gentleman from Iowa arose and made it much more forcibly than I could have done. I think it unfortunate that with the innumerable problems confronting the House and Congress which we have at this time a certain limited number of gentlemen persist in their efforts constantly to play politics. I was both sorry and disappointed to hear my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]. I admire him very much personally. He is affable, genial, and exceedingly versatile. He is just as versatile when speaking in the field of fact as in the field of fancy or in the field of fiction. It depends altogether upon the direction in which my distinguished friend

gets headed as to what he may discuss during the hour when he happens to have the floor. The highest compliment, however, speaking in entire frankness, that I can truthfully pay to his remarks delivered a few moments ago is to say that he made a very poor speech.

We have pending here some extremely difficult problems vitally affecting the welfare of every class of citizenship, according to whether they are revenue problems or strictly financial problems of legislation relating to our educational and industrial or other conditions. Yet with these great questions pressing hourly upon us, questions involving not only our reconstruction situation but questions which ramify into world conditions, we find gentlemen whom the country sometimes mistakes for real leaders unconcernedly rising in their places and diverting the entire time and attention of the House with long-winded political harangues, speeches utterly filled with sophistry and buncombe, statements not seriously intended to be accepted as accurate. [Applause on Democratic side.] I hope that until Congress works out and solves at least a few of these great legislative problems which are confronting us some of our friends may be able to content themselves by suppressing this political claptrap to which we have been exposed in a measure from time to time.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Not just now. I want to discuss this tax question if I can get to it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Exactly, and that is what I was going to ask the gentleman to do.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I came in here to-day expecting, as did some other gentlemen, that we would hear some very interesting discussions of the principles of taxation as they relate to this problem, and I wish to say that during the past two years I have never thought of politics while we Democratic and Republican colleagues have been working together on the Ways and Means Committee, each member having equal voice and equal rights to offer amendments, to discuss questions, to vote on them, and never was I in any separate conference with the Democrats as to any policies of the committee. Every act of that committee was decided on in full committee and, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] truthfully said, everything coming out of that committee relating to taxes was the joint product alike of the Democratic and Republican membership upon it. I must say that I get a little weary when some gentlemen persist in interrupting the real business of the House by attempting to play what some people would say was cheap politics—raising the question of politics in every conceivable little way—was this a Democratic bill, was it introduced by a Republican or a Democrat? My God! We have more problems to solve than our entire joint wisdom can possibly solve, and I say it is discouraging, when many of us on both sides have been earnestly striving jointly to work out some of these problems, to be constantly interrupted by gentlemen whose chief mission seems to be to play politics. In my opinion, unless some of that is supressed during the next 18 months, the country will not be subjected to any greater menace from the I. W. W. and the anarchists than it will from these professional politicians. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

So far as the conduct of the war was concerned, every loyal citizen of this country was equally patriotic and to the fullest measure performed his part.

But I do not think it is fair for some gentlemen to insist that they shall have a little more than their share of credit for the commendable things which were done in the prosecution of the war and shirk entirely their part of the responsibility for the little things that did not happen to go exactly right. Now, if gentlemen insist on a full share of such credit they must be frank enough and manly enough to admit, as it was admitted during the deliberations of this House since April, 1917, their proportionate share of responsibility for legislation which might have in some respects proven irritating to this or that individual over the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] When the time comes, so far as the Democratic Party is concerned, it was right and sound and wise in so many big things for which it was responsible it can well afford to admit any little mistakes that may have been made here and there by individuals in the course of the prosecution of the war; but in any event, so far as I am concerned and so far as I know, the disposition of Democrats is to welcome the closest scrutiny, notwithstanding the expressed intention of selecting a lot of partisan investigating committees to cover their work all over with partisanship, which announced intention has been written up by the newspapers for months——

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the subject under consideration?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. General debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not interrupt the gentleman by a parliamentary inquiry unless he yields.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I was about to say, so far as the Democratic Party is concerned, it will welcome the closest scrutiny of every act connected with its part of the conduct of the war. It will freely give credit to any and every citizen for what he did, but I warn my friends who have politics alone on their mind in connection with these investigations that they are very liable to overplay that policy before they have proceeded far. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Mr. Chairman, this Nation will be ready at the conclusion of the war to compare points with every other Government engaged in the World War with respect to the conduct of those nations in the prosecution of the war. This Nation stands head and shoulders above any other nation, Allies or enemy, with respect to the soundness of the financing of the war, with respect to the soundness of the tax levy, with respect to the time and manner of raising the armies and the navies, with respect to the rapidity with which our armies and our munitions and our supplies were rushed to the front lines in Europe, with respect to the losses, and with respect to the glory in proportion to the part we took and the time and expense incurred. [Applause.] These facts will come out; they will reveal what I say more clearly to the average citizen as we get further away from the war.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I regret I was diverted to this extent by this injection of politics, and I want to say in connection with this revenue measure now pending that, so far as I am concerned, I have never felt any politics and have never acted any politics when in conference with my colleagues on the committee in working and framing internal-tax statutes. There is no politics, essentially no politics, in our internal-tax laws. We have our well-defined differences as to customhouse legislation, but if my colleagues will permit, I as one Member am ready and shall be glad to continue during the next two years that close and nonpolitical cooperation in the working out of our problems related to internal taxation. Now, my genial friend from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], when asked by some new Member whether we could raise at the customhouse a sufficient amount of money to make up whatever deficiency might arise from the repeal of this statute referred to in the pending bill, and the repeal of such other tax provisions as might be effected later and keeping in mind, too, the estimated receipts and expenditures for next year, he hesitated very much in making what I considered a definite answer. I wish to express as my individual opinion that the sooner this House acts upon the view that the customhouse does not afford a boundless and practically untapped field of revenue to be drawn on without limit whenever we need it—the sooner, I say, the House realizes that fact and takes up the study of the far broader field of internal taxation to which we inevitably must look for the chief portion of our revenue in the future, the better it will be for the House and for the country. Every sane and intelligent person must know that only some hundreds of millions can be gotten from the customhouse at the most, and such person knows equally well that we must raise, for a few years at least, a minimum of $3,000,000,000 and upward.

Now, on this resolution now pending. I think that during the war the Committee on Ways and Means carefully followed all the investigations it could make as to the most desirable methods of taxation that might be adopted in this country even for temporary war purposes. In so doing it carefully followed the fiscal policies of each of the other important commercial countries at war, England, France, Canada, Australia, Italy, and even the enemy countries, although no lesson of value was to be learned from the latter. We found many kinds of taxes that were being utilized. Many of them were not intended as permanent peace taxes, because they were either unsound in theory or utterly unfeasible in their administration.

Some gentleman has referred to his antipathy to a consumption tax. I am frank to say that from my individual viewpoint the best test of a tax in this country—in other words, the nearest approximation to justice in taxation—is ability to pay. No tax absolutely approximates exactness in its application or in the justness of its operations, but ability to pay more nearly approximates that, in my opinion, than any other test that can be applied.

Now, while European countries were searching in every place for new revenue, for new taxes, we found none of them had adopted this so-called luxury-tax provision except France. France adopted it for the equally twofold purpose of raising revenue and discouraging useless or extravagant individual expenditures. They estimated the tax yield at $120,000,000 for the first year. They thought it was feasible of administration. They have been very much disappointed in each respect. The theory of the tax is sound. Since the war began I have been

advocating the working out of a schedule of luxury taxes that could be retained as a permanent peace tax until our war expenditures, or at least the chief portion of our war debt, shall be paid. So, I repeat, the theory of this tax is absolutely sound. England in her stress for revenue undertook to model after the French "luxury" tax. The House of Commons appointed a very able commission to investigate, hold hearings, confer with business people, and draft a bill. That commission worked for many weeks. They called in the manufacturers, the wholesalers, the retailers. They called in the heads of each industry affected, and that was most of them. They had accountants, expert statisticians, experienced administrative officers from the internal-revenue department. They found this proposed schedule was absolutely filled with perplexities, many of them unforeseen, with the result that almost as fast as they could iron out one they would come in contact with two or three more. I mean in relation to putting the law into practical and efficient operation and making it apply to the intricate business conditions of the country.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman had something considerable to do with the framing of this particular tax, and did he and the subcommittee engaged upon it not find just this same difficulty in getting it so worked out fairly that it would operate without undue perplexity and without imposing too large burdens in various directions?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. There is on file, I think, in our committee room now, a report of that subcommittee supporting the theory of this tax, the soundness of it, and calling attention to the many difficulties involved in working out the administrative side and in making a practical application of it to our great variety of complicated business conditions in this country. And we further stated that if it was expected to secure a feasible measure on this subject, perhaps many weeks' time would be required or, at least, should be used, in working out this schedule. That time was not permitted under the circumstances and in the hurry. It came to the House in the defective form that it was found in the bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman has referred to the administrative side of the question. In what respect does it differ from the collection of the 2 cents on the plate of ice cream?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I am coming to that right now.

Mr. HAUGEN. Is not the expense just as great in collecting 2 cents on ice cream as a dollar on something else?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I am coming to the administrative features now. I may say that the leader in the House of Commons week after week arose and answered inquiries by stating that he still intended to put through and in operation what was technically called a luxury schedule, but after working on it for months in the manner I have stated they found the difficulty of administration was so complicated that they decided that they would simply increase some of the income-tax rates and get far more revenue with measurably less expense and complaint than they would by undertaking to adopt and administer this new schedule.

Now, it is very easy to lay a tax on the manufacture of these articles, or on the wholesaler or on the retailer himself, but this, mind you, was intended to be a tax on the expenditure of individuals. It was not a tax on the manufacture of them or on the distribution by the jobber or on the sale by the retailer. It was intended to pass beyond each and all of them and fasten itself on the purchaser, while the Treasury regulations would compel the retailer to collect this tax and turn it over to the Government.

If it were only possible to levy the tax before it got to this advanced stage, the administration of it would be very different, and so would the tax. But here are between 40 and 50 classes of articles; there are estimated to be some 2,000,000 persons, firms, and corporations in the United States engaged in the business of retailing more or less of these articles. Most of those persons—all of them, in fact—would have in some stages of the year some of these articles. Their clerks, their salesmen, would be required to know the law, and the rates applicable to each of these articles when it passed a given price.

Now, as to the practical difficulty of that, of course, in the larger stores one or more clerks who are experts in this law, and with no other assignment, would be required to devote their entire time to looking after this tax proposition. Of course, the merchants realize that it would cost them many millions to employ clerical assistance for no other purpose than to run down as many of these sales as they are able while they were being made every minute throughout the day, and they would rather pay almost twice this amount, perhaps, in the form of some other tax, and the point I make and the suggestion I make is that, in view of the utter lack of time to practically work out this schedule before it came into the House in the bill last year, and in view of its considerable emasculation by the Senate, without in any sense abandoning my original views as to the soundness of this class of taxation, the committee should undertake to re-form, rewrite, or overhaul this provision and find, if possible, some other form—and I still think it possible—far more convenient and less expensive by which this class of expenditures can be reached for a substantial tax. I repeat, my suggestion is that, instead of abandoning this matter entirely and dismissing this tax and dismissing the revenue as well, we should undertake by some tax method equally sound as this in theory and far more feasible of administration, to find a suitable amount of revenue until the chief portions of our war expenditures have been taken care of.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to consume more than a few minutes. I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS] and reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] desires some time.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; I believe the gentleman from Illinois desires to speak, and I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky he be given some time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have the floor.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield to me for a brief statement? I want to ascertain if we can come to an agreement as to the end of general debate.

Mr. CANNON. I will wait. That will do just as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I have been out of commission for quite a time, and am still to a great extent out of commission, yet I feel impelled, since so many gentlemen have preceded me in favor of this bill, to submit a few remarks in opposition to its passage. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] is an able man, and, by the way, I can truthfully say that I believe all the members of the Ways and Means Committee are able men and gentlemen and absolutely honest in their convictions. I believe the committee in asking for the repeal of this section of the revenue law is doing that which it believes is proper and for the best interests of the country, regardless of political conditions. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] gave this bill a new name. He has rechristened it. Heretofore this tax has been known as a luxury tax. That name, I presume for the purposes of the repeal, would not sound well to the country, so he renames it a consumption tax. The idea seems to be to lead the country to believe that the committee is not asking the repeal of a tax on luxuries, but is demanding the repeal of a tax on the consumer. All taxes, by whatever name they may be called, are consumption taxes. I challenge the committee to name any kind of tax that is not a tax on the consumer. The committee can not do so, and it is useless to attempt to defend the repeal of a tax on luxuries by calling it a tax on consumption. All taxes, it makes no difference by what name they may be called, are in the final analysis taxes on the consumer and consumption taxes.

Section 904 of the revenue act of 1918, proposed to be repealed, is as follows:

SEC. 904. (a) That on and after May 1, 1919, there shall be levied, assessed, collected, and paid a tax equivalent to 10 per cent of so much of the amount paid for any of the following articles as is in excess of the price hereinafter specified as to each such article, when such article is sold by or for a dealer or his estate on or after such date for consumption or use—

(1) Carpets and rugs, including fiber, except imported and American rugs made principally of wool, on the amount in excess of $5 per square yard;

(2) Picture frames, on the amount in excess of $10 each;

(3) Trunks, on the amount in excess of $50 each;

(4) Valises, traveling bags, suit cases, hatboxes used by travelers, and fitted toilet cases, on the amount in excess of $25 each;

(5) Purses, pocketbooks, shopping and hand bags, on the amount in excess of $7.50 each;

(6) Portable lighting fixtures, including lamps of all kinds and lamp shades, on the amount in excess of $25 each;

(7) Umbrellas, parasols, and sun shades, on the amount in excess of $4 each;

(8) Fans, on the amount in excess of $1 each;

(9) House or smoking coats or jackets, and bath or lounging robes, on the amount in excess of $7.50 each;

(10) Men's waistcoats, sold separately from suits, on the amount in excess of $5 each;

(11) Women's and misses' hats, bonnets, and hoods, on the amount in excess of $15 each;

(12) Men's and boys' hats, on the amount in excess of $5 each;

(13) Men's and boys' caps, on the amount in excess of $2 each;

(14) Men's, women's, misses', and boys' boots, shoes, pumps, and slippers, not including shoes or appliances made to order for any per-

son having a crippled or deformed foot or ankle, on the amount in excess of $10 per pair;
(15) Men's and boys' neckties and neckwear, on the amount in excess of $2 each;
(16) Men's and boys' silk stockings or hose, on the amount in excess of $1 per pair;
(17) Women's and misses' silk stockings or hose, on the amount in excess of $2 per pair;
(18) Men's shirts, on the amount in excess of $3 each;
(19) Men's, women's, misses', and boys' pajamas, nightgowns, and underwear, on the amount in excess of $5 each; and
(20) Kimonos, petticoats, and waists, on the amount in excess of $15 each.

The Ways and Means Committee, a Damon and Pythias committee so far as this bill is concerned, in its report asking that this law be repealed uses the following language:

The purpose of section 904—

The section the committee asks to be repealed—

was to encourage thrift and economy and to prevent extravagance as well as to provide revenue.

Therefore, according to the statement of the committee, it proposes to repeal a law whose main purpose is to encourage thrift and economy, to prevent extravagance, and provide revenue.

If the law is repealed, therefore, the converse of this proposition will become true, and we will have a law that will discourage thrift and economy, will encourage extravagance, and reduce the revenue. There is no escape from the cold logic of this proposition.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] admits if this law is repealed the Treasury will lose $100,000,000 in revenue, but proposes to let these luxuries go untaxed and raise the revenue lost by the repeal of this section of the revenue law by means of an import tax; that is, by a tariff law, which is peculiarly a consumption tax and bears heaviest on the poorer classes. In a word, he proposes by this bill to relieve the rich, those who are able to buy, of this tax on luxuries and supply the deficiency of $100,000,000 by laying the burden on the poor by means of tariff taxes.

I wondered while the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] was asserting the deficit of $100,000,000 of revenue that will result from the repeal of this section will be supplied by increased tariff taxes what had become of my distinguished friend, Mr. KITCHIN, of North Carolina, a gentleman for whom I have the highest regard. I wondered if that knightly warrior, who for so many years has so gallantly stood a faithful sentinel, gun in hand, on the watchtower of low tariff, had at last lowered the flag of the people and surrendered before the assaults of the legions of high protection.

I invite gentlemen to read the section of the law to be repealed, and then I ask them how they expect to go among their constituents and justify themselves before the tribunal of justice and fair taxation for a vote to repeal this law.

This bill provides among other things that the charming, fantastic, beautiful, and scantily clad sweet young creatures who daily promenade F Street in this city, and like thoroughfares in other cities, and whom all the younger Members of this House love, and all the older Members, such as Uncle JOE CANNON and myself, admire, shall pay a tax of 10 per cent on the excess of all over $10 on a pair of shoes and a like tax on the excess of all over $15 on silk skirts. Why should they not pay this tax on such luxuries? No man has, and no man can present, a valid reason why they should not pay the tax. All of us like to look at beautiful shoes and silken hose and hear the music of the swish and rustle of silken skirts, but that is not a valid reason why such luxuries should not bear their part of the burden of taxation to pay the cost of the recent horrible, disastrous war. [Applause.]

My good friend Mr. KITCHIN, of North Carolina, wants this law repealed so the workingmen of this country will be enabled to buy shoes that cost over $10, and trunks that cost over $50, and carpets that cost over $5 per square yard, and suitcases that cost over $25, and pocketbooks that cost over $7.50 without paying a tax on the excess over those prices. Workingmen, as a rule, do not pay such prices for such articles. In the first place, they do not have the money to waste in that manner, and if they did they prefer to put it in homes rather than use it in wasteful extravagance. Where one workingman will pay $10 for a pair of shoes a thousand will pay a less price, and so with all the other articles enumerated in this section.

I never paid $10 for a pair of shoes in my life, and when I pay more I ought to pay a tax, and am willing to pay it. Nine dollars is the most I ever paid for a pair of shoes, and that was $4 too much. [Laughter.]

If a man pays over $50 for a trunk, he ought to pay a tax, and a big one at that. Most people in this country when they travel can carry their personal belongings in a cheaper trunk than a $50 trunk, and many of them in a suitcase or an old-fashioned carpetbag. Those who dance should be made to pay the fiddler, and those who insist on paying extravagant prices for articles of luxury ought to be compelled to pay the taxes. I have no trouble in carrying my personal effects in a cheaper trunk or a carpetbag. [Laughter.] I do not need a $50 trunk to carry my things around in.

People who buy articles at extravagant prices have, or ought to have, the money to pay for them. The trouble in this country is there are too many patriots, so-called, of the wrong kind. They are heartily in favor of taxation to pay the cost of war, but are in favor of some one else paying the taxes. They want some one else to do the fighting, while they do the hurrahing. I notice that the excess over $7.50 on smoking jackets is taxed 10 per cent. A man who will wear a smoking jacket should pay a big tax on the entire cost. A smoking jacket is merely a fad and not a comfort or necessity. I have never yet heard of a man wearing a chewing jacket, and fully as many men chew as smoke. A smoking jacket is a useless thing anyway, though I presume some men imagine they look quite handsome and cute and distinguished in one of about the stripes, checks, and colors of a shirt that a colored dude would wear to a Negro picnic in Georgia. A man with a smoking jacket on usually goes into what he calls a den and lights a 5-cent cigar, for which maybe he paid 50 cents and thought he was getting a great bargain because he paid a high price. He puffs away and believes he is getting a fine smoke, but he is not, because he does not know what a good smoke is.

If a man wants a good, comfortable, soul-satisfying smoke he should get a Kentucky or Missouri corncob pipe and some natural-leaf hillside tobacco and go out into the country to a log farmhouse and sit in the front yard under an old oak tree, in his shirt sleeves, with his shirt unfastened in front and his suspenders down, close by an old well of cool water with a sweep and an old, moss-covered bucket. There he can get the right kind of smoke, such as the denizens of crowded, profiteering cities never dreamed of in their philosophy, while with half-closed eyes he watches the curling, fragrant smoke drift away and mingle with the lazy, fleeting clouds while he dreams of home and heaven. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, if I understood the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] correctly, he stated one reason for the repeal of this tax is that it is so much trouble to collect. All taxes are troublesome and costly to collect, and if that is a valid reason why this tax on luxuries should be repealed, the same reason applies with equal force to all taxes and no taxes whatever should be levied and collected. I have never observed that many persons are anxious to pay taxes. He gives as another reason why this law should be repealed that some dealers are dishonest and make false reports, and therefore because the dishonest escape by perjury the honest also should not pay the tax. This statement is a thinly veiled and glittering sophistry. It is just as reasonable, just as logical, to say that if two persons are arrested for the same kind of crime and both are equally guilty and a jury acquits one the other should be discharged without trial because the one equally guilty had escaped punishment.

This Congress should pass laws to compel those who have plenty of money and are able to pay extravagant prices for luxuries to bear their part of the burden of taxation the war has entailed. I never paid more than $2.50 for a shirt in my life, and that price shirt is good enough for any man.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I yield five minutes to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. I am much obliged to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL].

Mr. Chairman, it is all moonshine about workingmen buying $10 shoes and $3 shirts. Some may occasionally pay such prices for a Sunday shirt or shoes, but it is not a habit with them to pay such prices. Those and higher prices are prices the rich—people with money—pay, and I am in favor of making the people able and willing to pay extravagant prices pay their toll of taxes.

If this bill is passed by and by it will be like the daylight-saving bill. That bill passed by a large majority, but it seems

difficult to find a Member of this House now who will admit he voted for it.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen who voted to repeal this luxury tax will make trouble for themselves at home. Their constituency will not approve of it and some of you when some bright man gets after you in your district about this bill, will think the day of political judgment has come. And it will, too, and you will be weighed in the balance and found wanting. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. BAER. If this provision is left in the law does the gentleman believe that 98 per cent of the people in this country will ever pay the tax on any of these things?

Mr. THOMAS. I think so. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] made the statement on the floor of this House a few minutes since that through this provision of the revenue law sought to be repealed $100,000,000 in taxes would be lost. If this law, which levies only a tax of 10 per cent on the excess above the prices named in the law, produces a revenue of $100,000,000 there must of necessity have been many millions of dollars' worth purchased at excess prices above the provisions of the law and it is fair to presume that such purchases were made by the rich, by people with money to pay extragavant prices, which must have embraced more than 2 per cent of the population. If only 2 per cent of the population as the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BAER] seems to believe will ever pay any of this tax then the other 98 per cent will escape the tax and that will be because the 98 per cent will not purchase the articles at prices for more than enumerated in section 904, and the burden will fall on the 2 per cent who are able to pay extravagant prices for luxuries.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] have mentioned somewhat of politics in discussing this bill. I am not generally greatly interested in politics unless there is a real political subject under discussion or I am engaged in a campaign and then I try to hold up my end of the log. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] severely censures the President because he believes that $24,000,000,000 were appropriated on his advice. Mr. MOORE must have thought the advice good, as he voted for most, if not all, of these appropriations. However, the gentleman almost immediately back tracked and censured the President for not now being in Washington to give him and other Members of Congress more good advice about how to vote on other appropriations and other matters of vital interest to the country. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is "a gentleman of anagosity and general understanding throughout the neighborhood," but it seems to me his logic does not "coreander" on this proposition. [Applause and laughter.]

The President has had many and grievous burdens to bear and has without doubt acted as he believes for the best interests of the Republic regardless of political considerations, and he should at least be given credit for a conscientious discharge of public duty. Even if mistakes have been made, this administration will go down as one of the greatest in human history.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] deprecates, properly, the induction of politics into bills such as the one now under consideration, and some other gentlemen have, if I mistake not, spoken of politicians in this House. Why, gentlemen, there are no politicians in this House. All the Members are statesmen. That proposition is easy of demonstration. A statesman is a man who holds an office, and a politician is merely a fellow who is trying his best to obtain an office, and if he fails to obtain office and become a statesman he then becomes a disappointed political reformer, finds everything wrong, and endeavors with his voice to overturn all existing orders of things, and in fact seeks to turn the material and moral universe upside down. I am like Uncle JOE CANNON; I do not have an abiding faith in political reformers. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against this bill. It seeks to repeal a luxury tax, pure and simple. I shall demand the yeas and nays, so the House may be put on record, and gentlemen who desire to dodge the issue had best be looking around for pairs. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, the war, which I hope has ended, was the most criminal and gigantic in all recorded human history and the most destructive of human life and property. The sons of this Republic performed a valorous part in that momentous conflict. In a single year we spent $19,000,000,000 to equip armies to carry the starry flag beyond the seas. Nineteen billion dollars is an amount whose magnitude the minds of men are helpless to grasp. A billion dollars in $1 bills laid end to end and side by side, 60 feet wide, would girdle the earth, 25,000 miles around. Bonds have been issued and enormous taxes have been levied. The people have bought the bonds and paid the taxes without complaint, except from the criminal profiteers. The public debt is now $47,000,000,000, and taxes will have to be levied on all kinds of property to pay even the interest on this enormous sum, and it would be folly, to say the least, to repeal a law taxing luxuries and lose $100,000,000 in revenues with this condition of the public debt, and more money yet to be appropriated to pay the expenses of the war.

I have gladly and cheerfully supported all measures that I believed necessary to carry the war to a successful termination and all measures necessary for the maintenance and comfort of our soldiers in the field.

America sent her sons across a wide waste of wild waters to fight for alien people, and they bravely and heroically maintained the valor of the great Republic. When the last of them shall have returned to home and friends, which I hope will be in the near future, my vote shall be only for appropriations, unless in case of some dire necessity, which stop at the water's edge. A jug of mescal and a barrel of beans will start a revolution in Mexico at any time, and there are people in Europe who will never stop fighting as long as we feed them.

Some of the people our soldier boys fought for seem disinclined to give them any credit for winning the war. That is criminal ingratitude. It is said that Thermopylæ had its messenger of defeat but that the Alamo had none. The American private soldier, the loved doughboy, had no messenger of defeat, because he was never defeated and is undefeatable.

The words of his fate came hissing
From the pit of the war each day;
Killed or wounded or missing—
Plain private—what more to say?

Our soldier boys never turned their backs to the foe, but died upon the field of honor amid the joys of conquest and smiled in death. The red trenches and tented fields of France—Chateau-Thierry, Belleau Wood, St. Mihiel, and the Argonne—will forever stand before America's vision imperishable monuments of lofty patriotism and martial courage. The lone vigil is ended, the tumult has ceased, and thousands of our soldiers and marines are sleeping "the sleep that knows no waking." The death toll is staid, the draping of the willow hangs above them, and the "grass green from the soil of carnage" waves over their graves, but their valor and loyalty and devotion to duty will be enshrined forever in the hearts of their countrymen. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I shall not detain the committee very long. We are going to need more money than we will be able to get for the coming fiscal year without borrowing heavily.

I am not going to criticize as to the expenditures. We are all responsible for them. We all voted for the declaration of war. We all were for it, and we would be for it again if any nation in the world blew up our ships on the world's highway. That is what put us into the war. We did not go into the war for the purpose of protecting democracy in the Balkan States or on the Congo or anywhere else on earth outside of the United States. We kept out of the war under the leadership of our President, and we only went into the war to achieve victory when we were driven in. Our policy, as amended by our President, was that the world was to have peace without victory.

You may say that is criticizing and I will drop it right there. When Germany blew up our ships on the world's highway both sides of this House closed up like a vise and war was declared.

Now we have got to pay the piper. Our Allies whom we have financed will not pay during this or the coming generation the money they owe us. If they pay us the interest we will be wonderfully fortunate. Russia will probably never pay. Roumania had something, and so did other countries. I am not criticizing the advances at all, but I just want to say that you must look at the things we are asked to do. Take the wounded soldiers with a leg off, with an arm off, and the proposition for educational vocation. That is all right, I am glad of it, but there are many that you can not restore, and when you do restore them you have to pay them more than $7.50 a month if they have one leg off. We have got to have at this session of Congress enormous pension legislation. We have paid a $220,000,000 pension bill for soldiers before this war, and the pensions will not decrease. I do not know how much it is to be, but I believe that when the pension legislation that ought to be enacted, and will be enacted, in addition to the legislation already enacted, all put together, will be not less than $500,000,000 to $700,000,000 a year.

Then here comes the Secretary of the Interior with another alleged compensation scheme, which, if it is entered upon, will cost within the next 20 years $5,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000.

This bill picks out that one paragraph of the revenue law and seeks to repeal it, thereby taking off annually $100,000,000 in taxes. Then there is the other paragraph that we all want to take off, the tax upon soda water and ice cream that the children have to pay, 1 cent for every drink. I think that ought to go off, although I am not so clear about this tax being repealed. [Applause.] Let me ask you gentlemen a question. Do you get any letters from the automobile people and all the people who are paying taxes? I get them by the hundred. Although they do not say so in so many words, yet the tenor of their complaint is, let the boil go upon somebody else's nose. When the question is asked, Who's nose? the reply is made, Oh, let these plutocrats who made money from excess profits pay the tax. Why, good heavens, we have been taking a very large share of those earnings. The war is not over, and the expense of the war between this and the conclusion of the treaty of peace and its ratification ought to be less and less day by day and month by month, and if you are going to depend upon the excess profits and war profits you are not going to have so much, for you will collect less and less by the hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars this year under this bill and next year and next year. I am perfectly willing to take from him who hath and put it in the National Treasury. Many mickles make a muckle, and it is up to us, either by indirect taxation or direct taxation—call it consumption tax, or a tariff tax on imports, or as you choose—it is up to us to get the money. We have to have it.

Do you know what I would do if I had the power? I would not pass this bill repealing this particular clause at this time. [Applause.] Some gentleman says that we are committed to it. Not at all. I am not bound to do it, and you are not bound to it. It is a mere question of what is the best thing to do. Why would I not do it? I do not want to send a bill across to the Senate with this clause only repealed. I would like to have something put into its place when it is repealed that will make up the hundred million dollars we lose, if you can find anything to put in its place. When we come to the soda water on which the children have to pay a cent on every drink they buy, you will find that it is a very expensive tax to collect. The chairman of the Ways and Means tells us that that clause brings in $20,000,000. I do not know that I shall do it, but I have been thinking that I would move to substitute that clause for repeal instead of this clause which this bill repeals, although the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] thinks such an amendment would not be in order. I do not know whether the Senate would pass either or both of them, but we will have to run up against probably two or three revenue bills. Both sides of the House have got to cooperate in raising the money. The war was not merely a protection to us in this country, but it involved us in an expense that is as high as the skies. That is a question for both sides of the House, for we will require all of the money that we can collect at the customhouse, whether it is four or five hundred millions of dollars. I fancy it would be a difficult thing to pass a revenue bill whereby we could collect at the customhouses more than five or six hundred millions of dollars in taxes. I have not given this close attention, but I am just roughly guessing at it.

If the amendment that I speak of should be ruled out of order; that is, to strike out the section this bill provides for and to insert in its place the soda-water section, well and good, but that is the way I should like to see it passed. If that is not out of order, then I should be glad to have somebody else or if somebody else does not offer the amendment I shall to the pending bill to take in section 630. [Applause.]

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I desire now to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I will say to my colleague that it was not my purpose really to actually discuss this bill. I did seek time earlier in the day, but I did not know that it was to take up so much time, with the idea of presenting another section of the revenue act; but in view of the fact that I do not desire to discuss this and it is so late in the day, I shall not ask for time.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. How is the time of this debate controlled?

The CHAIRMAN. There was no agreement as to time or as to who should control the time, but gentlemen having been recognized for an hour, not having consumed the hour have reserved the balance of their time.

Mr. RUCKER. I should like to have two or three minutes to pay my respects to this bill.

Mr. FORDNEY. Everybody is anxious to go home, and what I wanted to do was to close this debate as quickly as we can and then move that the committee rise.

Mr. CANNON. If we adjourn now, the bill will be subject to amendment under the five-minute rule after general debate ceases.

Mr. FORDNEY. Can not we come to some agreement when general debate shall close?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

Mr. SIMS. Mr Chairman, I want to talk to my friends on the Republican side of the House, not that the others do not need it, but the Republicans have the power.

Now, what was the first thing in the way of taxation or in reduction of taxation that you gentlemen who have the power do as soon as you are called here in extra session? It is to relieve the rich people of this country from the existing tax burden of $85,000,000 to $100,000,000 per annum without placing the loss anywhere else, so far as this bill goes, but with the promise to hunt around and put it somewhere else some time or other in the remote future. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], intimated in his reply to my inquiries that he would put it on potash and dyestuffs by increase of tariff duties.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. No; I have only five minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman voted for that in the last session.

Mr. SIMS. I say I did not, and I will show it by the RECORD.

Mr. FORDNEY. I did not intimate that.

Mr. SIMS. You referred to that when I asked you. You spoke of potash and dyestuffs. That was a very poor reply. The facts are that if you vote for this bill you will vote to take taxes off of those who are abundantly able to pay them and not hurt them at all. If you do not do anything else you will reduce the ability of the Government to pay its bills.

The Ways and Means Committee has been increased to 25. Increase it more, put it up to 30, and let those 5 extra members become a subcommittee to find somewhere to raise the amount of this loss before you take it off of anybody. When you go home you will have to answer why you began your work in the extra session of this Congress by removing the taxes from those who can pay and by so doing increase the taxes on those who are unable to pay.

I will ask my friend the gentleman from Michigan, whose anecdotes and stories have entertained me for 20 years, to be bold enough to withdraw the bill and recommit it to the Committee on Ways and Means and let it prepare another bill taking the taxes off of, at least, some of the poor people who will have to pay and put other taxes on such things as the rich will have to pay exclusively. Because when people are able to buy those things that these taxes will reach they will not be poor or distressed or needy. Now, put the burden where it belongs. No matter who voted for this bill or did not, or what caucus agreed to the bill or what caucus did not. Put some relief of the poor in to sweeten it and to make it more tolerable for those who may vote for the bill. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] says, every time you get a glass of soda water you pay 1 cent for the privilege of paying for the soda water. Why not put this tax somewhere else now instead of leaving it to promises as to what the Ways and Means Committee will do hereafter? If you do not do better hereafter than you are doing now, you ought to resign from the committee.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Practically all of these obnoxious taxes to which the gentleman refers were put in the bill on the recommendation of the Treasury Department under the administration of President Wilson.

Mr. SIMS. Why do you not put in something regardless now?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am willing to follow the President in war, but I think I will break away a little on matters of taxation.

Mr. SIMS. Is this your first breakaway? [Laughter.] The gentleman is breaking away in a style not to be admired by taking burdens from the wealthy, who will not be deprived of anything they will need, and putting the burdens on those who will have to do without something they do need in order to pay it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman please, the President in his message to Congress recommended this be repealed. I read it into the RECORD.

Mr. SIMS. Then you should hasten to hold meetings of the committee and cut it out.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I wanted to keep the gentleman and the President in line.

Mr. SIMS. You are trying to get away from the merits of this legislation, or rather its lack of merits.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALSH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2021) to repeal section 904 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919, and had come to no resolution thereon.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that just as soon as possible—Monday morning, if it can be done—I would like to take up the bill.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, June 2, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting draft of joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to permit Señor Julio Mira y Bolivar, a citizen of Cuba, to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point (S. Doc. No. 16); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting copy of a resolution adopted by the National Assembly of Panama, asking the Senate of the United States not to change the name of the canal from Panama to Roosevelt (H. Doc. No. 67); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 4227) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Peabody Memorial Library, in the town of Jonesport, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 4228) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Peterboro, N. H., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD: A bill (H. R. 4229) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Gonzales, Tex., two pieces of artillery of large caliber captured or obtained from the enemy during or at the close of the war with Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLASSON: A bill (H. R. 4230) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Oconto Falls, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOODALL: A bill (H. R. 4231) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Gorham, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 4232) for the erection of an addition to and completion of the public building in the city of El Paso, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4233) donating a captured cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Dyer, Ind.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JEFFERIS: A bill (H. R. 4234) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Fort Calhoun, Nebr., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage and ammunition for same; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 4235) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 4236) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Fort Meigs, Wood County, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 4237) providing for an increase of salary for the United States attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 4238) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fort Madison, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4239) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mount Pleasant, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4240) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Keokuk, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4241) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Burlington, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4242) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Columbus Junction, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4243) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Keosauqua, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4244) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wapello, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4245) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Washington, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4246) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Grandview, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4247) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Fairfield, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4248) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Donnellson, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 4249) for the acquisition of a site and erection of a building at Jefferson, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4250) for the acquisition of a site and erection of a building at Algona, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITHWICK: A bill (H. R. 4251) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the Florida State College for Women, at Tallahassee, Fla., two German cannons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4252) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon each to the cities of Tallahassee, Quincy, Crawfordsville, Bristol, Apalachicola, Blountstown, Milton, Marianna, Bonifay, Vernon, Panama City, De Funiak Springs, Crestview, and Pensacola, all in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 4253) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Idaho Springs, Clear Creek County, in the State of Colorado, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4254) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of La Junta, in the State of Colorado, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4255) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chenoa, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4256) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Roanoke, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4257) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Eureka, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4258) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Normal, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4259) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Le Roy, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4260) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Mount Pulaski, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4261) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Forrest, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4262) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Chatsworth, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4263) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Piper City, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4264) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Atlanta, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4265) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Paxton, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4266) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Washburn, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4267) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fairbury, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4268) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Gibson City, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4269) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lexington, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIDDICK: A bill (H. R. 4270) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to some counties of the State of Montana German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4271) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Valley, State of Montana, one German cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4272) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Dawson, Mont., one German cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4273) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Cascade, Mont., one German cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4274) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Phillips, Mont., one German cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4275) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Park, Mont., one German cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4276) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Yellowstone, Mont., one German cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4277) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Fergus, Mont., one German cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4278) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Hill, Mont., one German cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4279) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Custer, Mont., one German cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 4280) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Seward, in the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4281) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Geneva, in the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4282) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at David City, in the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 4283) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Prestonsburg, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4284) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Whitesburg, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4285) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hazard, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4286) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Pikeville, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4287) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Inez, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4288) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of McKee, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4289) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Booneville, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4290) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Paintsville, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4291) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hindman, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 4292) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of O'Neill, Nebr., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4293) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Fort McPherson Cemetery, McPherson County, Nebr., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4294) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Scottsbluff, Nebr., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4295) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Callaway, Nebr., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4296) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Broken Bow, Nebr., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4297) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Gering, Nebr., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 4298) granting additional compensation, according to length of service, to the officers and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4299) to require the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain data to the adjutants general of the several States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4300) to revive the right of action under the act of March 12, 1863 (12 Stat. L., 820); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4301) to relieve Congress from the adjudication of private claims against the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4302) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and an act in amendment thereto approved October 6, 1917; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4303) to increase the rate of pension allowed to Army nurses; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 4304) providing for the investigation of certain lands in the State of Washington with a view to their reclamation; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 4305) to provide for the establishment of a national employment system and for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such system and to regulate the expenditures of moneys that shall be appropriated for such purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 4306) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Walters, State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 4307) to authorize the Supreme Court to prescribe forms and rules, and generally to regulate pleading, procedure, and practice on the common-law side of the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 4308) to donate one cannon to the city of Columbus, Nebr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4309) to donate one cannon to the city of Fremont, Nebr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4310) to donate one cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Norfolk, Nebr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 4311) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Caribou National Forest; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4312) for the completion of the Fort Hall irrigation project in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4313) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage and shells, to the city of Aledo, Ill.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PLATT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 87) authorizing national banks to subscribe to the united war work campaign; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MASON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 88) to repeal sections 800 and 906 of the war-revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 89) extending for a total period of one year the grace period for the payment of premiums on military and naval insurance policies in the case of any honorably discharged officer or member of the enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 90) authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to provide for the restoration and completion of the historical frieze in the Rotunda of the Capitol; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BLANTON: Resolution (H. Res. 91) providing for an audit of the accounts of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CRAGO: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, favoring the establishment of a system of national highways; to the Committee on Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 4314) granting a pension to Malinda A. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 4315) granting an increase of pension to David Allcut; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4316) granting a pension to Nancy Cochran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4317) granting a pension to Julia Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4318) granting a pension to Mary J. Titus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4319) granting a pension to Zelpha I. Eaton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4320) granting a pension to Laura A. Ooley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4321) granting a pension to Maria A. Struman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4322) granting a pension to Eva L. Little; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4323) granting a pension to Alice Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4324) granting a pension to Nancy Bastin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4325) granting a pension to Edgar P. Killion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4326) granting a pension to John Queen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4327) granting a pension to Fred Hauk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4328) granting a pension to Seth Cornelius; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4329) granting a pension to G. C. Crawshaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4330) granting a pension to Samuel Ash; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4331) granting a pension to William Alligee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4332) granting a pension to John I. Amy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4333) granting an increase of pension to Simon F. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4334) granting an increase of pension to William T. Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4335) granting an increase of pension to George W. Lampkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4336) granting an increase of pension to William R. Roark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4337) granting a pension to Adeline Bomgardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4338) granting an increase of pension to Burnetta Dayton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4339) granting an increase of pension to Eliza C. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4340) granting an increase of pension to Capt. James W. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4341) granting an increase of pension to John H. Back; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4342) granting an increase of pension to Leander Sawyers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4343) granting an increase of pension to James M. Snoddy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4344) granting an increase of pension to John H. Rusie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4345) granting an increase of pension to James A. Padgett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4346) granting an increase of pension to B. L. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4347) granting an increase of pension to William Norman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4348) granting an increase of pension to Obadiah McGuire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4349) granting an increase of pension to James M. Kirk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4350) granting an increase of pension to E. L. Gilley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4351) granting an increase of pension to William Schooley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4352) granting an increase of pension to Marion Southern; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4353) granting an increase of pension to Asa Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4354) granting an increase of pension to Mathias Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4355) granting an increase of pension to Francis H. Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4356) granting an increase of pension to Israel Wilkie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLASSON: A bill (H. R. 4357) granting a pension to Amanda Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 4358) for the relief of Gust Mihleder, formerly a second lieutenant of Infantry, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4359) granting an increase of pension to George W. Beck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4360) granting a pension to Harry W. Conn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 4361) granting a pension to Charles Brubaker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 4362) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Ashton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRIE of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 4363) granting a pension to Martha Thornton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4364) granting an honorable discharge to Robert Henry McNeal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 4365) granting an increase of pension to Levi W. Easton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 4366) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George H. Webb, alias George Hinman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 4367) authorizing the President to award a medal of honor to Maj. B. F. D. Fitch for conspicuous bravery rendered on the man-of-war *Varuna* on April 24, 1862; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4368) granting a pension to Henry Fields; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4369) granting a pension to Lee Begley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4370) for the relief of James Clay Colson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4371) to correct the military record of Sylvester B. Miller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4372) to correct the military record of William Andover; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PARRISH: A bill (H. R. 4373) granting a pension to Robert O. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RIDDICK: A bill (H. R. 4374) granting to the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Bowdoin, Mont., for the benefit of the Methodist Episcopal Church, at Bowdoin, Mont., lots 12 and 13, in block 21, town site of Bowdoin, State of Montana; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 4375) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Carr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 4376) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Woolaston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 4377) to correct the military record of Jesse L. Meeks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Dr. Hyman Cohen and friends of Jewish people, Chicago, Ill., relating to persecutions and massacres of Jews in European countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Hudson County, N. J., against any repeal or weakening of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition of citizens of Jewish faith in the city of Kankakee, Ill., to stop outraging and massacre of Jewish people in European countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Danville, Ill., and citizens of Ridge Farm, Vermilion County, Ill., against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of Edward Flash, jr., president of New York Produce Exchange, and Alfred E. Marling, president of Chamber of Commerce, New York, protesting against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of Missouri House of Representatives, relating to laws for National Army and National Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Nelson Cunliff, commissioner of parks and recreation, St. Louis, Mo., against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of St. Louis Label Works, asking that zone rates be retained as they stand; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of John Schmall, director department of public welfare, St. Louis, relating to the disposition of beer, wine, and whiskies stored in warehouses; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of Bauer Importing Co., Liquor Dealers' Benevolent Association, and William A. Bruckheiser, urging repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of St. Louis Screw Co., Pilley Packing & Flue Brush Manufacturing Co., Standard Heel & Counter Co., Rawlings Manufacturing Co., Whitelaw Bros. Chemical Co., all of St. Louis, Mo., against repeal of zone advances on advertising pages of periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of C. E. Berg, St. Louis, Mo., asking removal of war tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hess & Culbertson Jewelry Co., St. Louis, Mo., asking repeal of tax on jewelry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Evens & Howard Fire Brick Co., Curtis Manufacturing Co., and Bemis Bros. Bag Co., all of St. Louis, Mo., against Department of Labor Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of St. Louis jewelers and State retail jewelers, with national jewelers, urging repeal of tax on jewelry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Equal Suffrage League of St. Louis, Mo., expressing appreciation of vote in favor of the Susan B. Anthony amendment May 21, 1919; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of Fred Warner; A. E. Van Tyne; St. Louis Tennis Association; W. H. Stevens, president of Agricultural Insurance Co.; A. H. Wilkes, superintendent of Metropolitan Life; Charles A. Shafer, superintendent of Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.; Louis Gollin; James Byrne; S. Peterfreund; J. S. Carr, cashier of Chippewa Bank, of St. Louis, against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Franklin Motor Car Co., of Chicago, opposing repeal of the postal zone law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of T. J. Nertvey, of Ottawa, Ill., asking postponement of date at which sales of alcoholic liquors now on hand shall be prohibited; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Mr. L. Waldo Smith and 720 others protesting against the 10 per cent tax levied on sporting goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition of J. D. Piggott, Warsaw, Ill., and C. A. Wegehenke, Hamilton, Ill., for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition and memorial of the Christian, Methodist Episcopal, and Union churches, the three Protestant churches of the city of La Harpe, Ill., and on behalf of a majority of the citizens of said city of La Harpe, Ill., requesting the rejection of the President's recommendation to exclude wine and beer from the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Lawrence V. Smith and 18 other residents and citizens of Alexis, Ill., and Norwood, Ill., protesting against a modification of the war-time prohibiton act to permit the manufacture and sale of beer and wine, as recommended by the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of sundry citizens of Little York, Ill., protesting against the modification of the war-time prohibition act to permit the manufacture and sale of beer and wine, as recommended by the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of Edward M. Van Cleve, principal of New York Institute for Education of the Blind, relating to H. R. 16016; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Fenton, Mich., protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of First Methodist Church, of Oxford, Mich., protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Methodist Episcopal churches of Lansing, Mich., protesting against removal of ban on sale of beer and wine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KIESS: Petition from Messiah Lutheran Church, of South Williamsport, Pa., urging constitutional amendment against polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition from citizens of Coudersport, Pa., praying for the repeal of the so-called luxury tax on automobiles and their accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition from Newberry Methodist Episcopal Church, of Newberry Station; Mulberry Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Williamsport; East Main Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Lock Haven; other citizens of Williamsport; Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, of Lock Haven; and Renovo District, Clinton County, Sabbath School Association, Renovo, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition from citizens of Potter County, Pa., protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition from citizens of Williamsport, Pa., protesting against any repeal of the war-time prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Charles Wade; P. D. Ruark; Edward Hooper; H. T. Jacobs; Robert H. Anderson; John W. Tracy; N. B. Reeside; Richard Harvey; Harriet Hinkley; Walter Harvey; R. C. Schaeffter, superintendent Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.; George W. Bahlke; Richard T. Barden, president Baltimore Association Credit Men; Edward W. Bartol, superintendent Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.; Albert G. Schumacher; Mary K. Hinkley; Charles F. Reimer; J. K. Voshell; J. Engel & Co.; J. Appleton Wilson; Arthur E. Hungerford; Rev. Frank Hays Staples, vicar St. Paul's Guild House; J. J. Prissman; George C. Howell; A. H. Homberg; H. D. Walsh; 176 persons of Baltimore, Md., protesting against the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Alice J. Reilley and the H. M. Rowe Co., Baltimore, Md., against daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Maryland Car Wheel Works, Baltimore, asking for appropriations for railroad equipments; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petitions of Glison's Garage, Cumberland, Md., and Blair Motor Car Co., Baltimore, Md., against tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: Petition of sundry citizens of Saline County, Nebr., for repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of Mr. Charles H. Brown and other residents of the village of Jordan, N. Y., protesting against the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of Summerfield Methodist Episcopal Church, of Bridgeport, Conn., opposing repeal of war-time prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of the Herron Hill United Presbyterian Church, of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging the retention of war-time prohibition on beer and light wines; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Kaye & Ienstein (Inc.), furriers, of New York, against 10 per cent tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William Bartheman, jeweler, of New York, protesting against sections 900 to 907 of revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAIGE: Petitions of Associated Industries of Massachusetts, Frederic C. Hood, president, and from Clinton Chamber of Commerce; C. A. Juckett, Fitchburg; Otter River Board Co.; C. A. Hubbell, president T. R. Almond Machine Co., Gardner; John A. Dunn Chair Co., Gardner; John C. Stevens, Clinton, and Edward E. Ousey, Gardner, superintendents of Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.; M. P. Chace, Webster; Webster Chamber of Commerce; Isaac Jackson, Princeton; Fitchburg Mutual Fire Insurance Co., by L. R. Welch, president, and all employees, all in the State of Massachusetts, protesting against repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of W. S. Hatch and 80 citizens of Belfast and Waldo, in State of Maine, requesting repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of E. P. Taylor and 13 other citizens of Burnham, Me., and Ernest E. Bowen and 10 other citizens of Waldo County, Me., for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of members of Methodist Episcopal Church, of Ellsworth, Me., protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES: Petition of Ed Anthony and others, of Fredericktown, Mo., favoring retention of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Samuel McConnell, James S. Neuman, and M. B. Snevily, protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 59 citizens of New York, favoring daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Southern Association of College Women, held at Columbus, Miss., urging the establishment of a permanent school board service division; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. ROUSE: Telegram from Newport Civic and Industrial Association, Newport, Ky., protesting against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Newport Civic and Industrial Association, Newport, Ky., favoring daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, telegram from E. T. Gale, Covington, Ky., against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of the executive committee of the Monroe County (N. Y.) Farm Bureau, representing 2,000 farmers of Monroe County, urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHALL: Petition of William E. Dunn and others, of Minneapolis, Minn., providing for the Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of employees of the International Heater Co., of Utica, N. Y., against the repeal of the daylight-saving act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VAILE: Petition by representatives of the colleges and universities of Colorado and others, asking that provision be made for the continuance of the Women's Division of the United States Employment Service and submitting a review of the work of that office; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. WASON: Memorial of Berlin Chamber of Commerce, William E. Mathews, managing secretary, urging the retention of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: Petition containing 607 names of residents of Porter County, Ind., asking that laws be enacted to enforce war-time and national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *June 2, 1919.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we worship Thee. Thou art the author of our liberty. Thy name alone guarantees the perpetuation of our free institutions. Thy thought revealed to us through Thy Word is the guide to the future prosperity and happiness of this great people. We pray Thee to give us hearts responsive to the divine will to work out God's plan for this people, that this Nation may be in God's hands as an evangel of brotherhood and justice and peace among the nations of the earth. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

THE PANAMA CANAL (H. DOC. NO. 67).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, at the request of the chargé d'affaires ad interim of the Republic of Panama, a copy of a note from the Panaman chargé d'affaires, together with a resolution (No. 25) passed by the National Assembly of Panama on February 27 last, asking the Senate of the United States not to change the name of the canal from Panama to Roosevelt, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 21).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, submitting supplemental estimates of appropriations in the sum of $16,800 required by the Navy Department for additional employees, fiscal year 1920, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3478. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution tendering the thanks of Congress to those who served, or gave others to the service of, the country in the Great War.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1200) making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 1200) making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, and for other purposes, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT IN FRANCE (S. DOC. NO. 20).

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, out of order I ask unanimous consent that the address of the President at Suresnes Cemetery, in France, on Memorial Day be printed in the RECORD and also as a public document.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection at all to its being printed either as a public document or in the RECORD, and I would like to have the Senator suggest one or the other.

Mr. PITTMAN. I should like to have it printed in the RECORD for the purpose of preserving it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PITTMAN. I would also like to ask separately that it be printed as a public document.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that there is virtually an agreement between the two Houses that such printing shall be in one form or the other. If it is printed in the RECORD, it can be sent out exactly the same as if printed as a public document, and there is only that much more expense attached to it when printed in both forms. I dislike to object to the request, but I ask the Senator if he will not consent to simply allow it to be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. PITTMAN. I realize that the agreement or understanding with regard to having matter printed either as a public document or in the RECORD is a very good plan, but it seems to me that this should be made an exception.

Mr. SMOOT. It is the address of the President of the United States, and I shall not object; but really I think it is wrong.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I want to know before we proceed very much further on this question of distributing literature upon the league of nations what the rule is going to be. If there is going to be a print of this material both in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and as a Senate document, I have no objection to it at all. I do not want to make any exception, but I want to know that that rule is going to be permitted to stand with reference to other addresses, because while this is the address of the President of the United States the subject is one upon which there is a very wide difference of views. It is the subject in which I am interested and not individuals. I object for the reason that I want to have the question settled here and now. I am not objecting to the printing, but I am giving notice that I shall insist that it shall be regarded as a precedent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is a matter the Chair can not settle.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I have already given notice that I intend to object to the publication of speeches as public documents without their reference to the Committee on Printing. But I realize, Mr. President, that the address of the President of the United States may be some exception, as being of more general interest to the people, and I did not feel it to be my duty to object to the printing of the address as a public document. I also understand that the remarks of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] apply to Members of this body. The general publication of matter relating to the league of nations or anything else offered here on the floor and emanating from others than the President of the United States or Members of this body will meet my objection if I am on the floor.

Mr. BORAH. I have no objection at all to the address being printed as a Senate document or in the RECORD, but I want it distinctly understood that it establishes the precedent and it will not be proper for anyone to object hereafter to printing in the same way any other important speech upon the same subject.

Mr. PITTMAN rose.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, with the indulgence of the Senator from Nevada, I wish to express the hope that the Senator from Idaho will not attach any condition whatever to the printing of the President's speech in whatever form it is requested. It is true that the rule ought to be so understood that both sides of this question shall have equal access to the public RECORD and the Public Printing Office. All should be shut out or all should be admitted that is worthy of a place. But I think when you come to an address of the President, in view of his position we ought not to place any limitation at all. I think we had better let the address be printed in both forms. It will not cost very much. If this practice is always indulged with reference to the President, it will not cost a great deal of money. I hope the Senator will withdraw any objection whatever.

Mr. BORAH. I have only stated, what I do not propose to withdraw, and that is that if this custom is established it must apply to everyone who wishes to have a document of importance upon this important subject published. I have no desire to discriminate against the President, but I do not intend that there shall be any discrimination against the league of nations, for I intend that literature upon both sides shall have equal opportunity whether it comes from the President of the United States or anyone else.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not imagine that the Senator from Idaho can call upon the Chair to rule upon a precedent that the Chair does not make.

Mr. BORAH. I have not asked the Chair to rule. I have simply said——

The VICE PRESIDENT. I know; but you are stating a proposition here that you say you are going to make a precedent. The Chair says that unless the precedent is made either by the Chair or by the vote of the Senate it is not a precedent. The mere objection of the Senator from Idaho does not constitute a precedent.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Idaho will permit me, it seems to me to be only a question of fairness to have the President's address printed as a public document. There will be a limited number printed for general distribution, whether it is printed as a public document or in the RECORD. I do not think there ought to be any general understanding about the matter. This comes from the President. Some addresses in opposition to the league have been brought in here and ordered printed as public documents at the request of Senators. Some of these addresses we would like to have as public documents, because we do not desire to carry the RECORD around with us. I think the address of the President ought to be printed as a public document. Senators would like to have it in that form to keep in their desks and put among their papers. If other addresses come in which Senators want to have printed as public documents, consent will be given, but to agree now to print everything as a public document that is brought in here, it seems to me, is exacting too much. It is for the convenience of Senators to have such addresses in the form of a public document.

Mr. BORAH. I am not asking the Senate to make any promises. I am making my statement for the RECORD, and I propose, if I can, to see that this is a precedent and is adhered to as a precedent hereafter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair only interfered for the purpose of making the position of the Chair clear, namely, that the Chair can not enforce this as a precedent. It will have to be enforced by the Senate if it is enforced at all.

The President's address is as follows:

[From the Washington Daily Post, May 31, 1919.]

LEAGUE OF NATIONS A COVENANT THAT MILLIONS WHO DIED IN WAR SHALL NOT HAVE DIED IN VAIN, PRESIDENT DECLARES IN HIS TRIBUTE TO THE FALLEN—WARNS THOSE WHO ARE SEEKING A RETURN TO AN OLDER ORDER THAT THEY CAN NOT SUCCEED BECAUSE "THE PEOPLE ARE IN THE SADDLE"—LOOKS FORWARD TO TIME WHEN PRESENT OPPONENTS OF LEAGUE WILL BE AS ASHAMED AS THEY WHO REGRETTED UNION OF STATES AFTER CIVIL WAR ARE NOW—FEELS HIS PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY.

PRESIDENT WILSON'S WARNING.

"I look for the time when every man who now puts his counsel against the united service of mankind under the league of nations will be just as ashamed of it as he is now who regretted the union of the States.

"You are aware, as I am aware, that the airs of an older day are beginning to stir again; that the standards of an old order are trying to assert themselves again. There is here and there an attempt to insert into the counsel of statesmen the old reckoning of selfishness and bargaining, and national advantage, which were the roots of this war, and any man who counsels these things advocates a renewal of the sacrifice which these men have made; for if this is not the final battle for right there will be another that will be final. Let these gentlemen who suppose that it is possible for them to accomplish this return to an order of which we are ashamed and that we are ready to forget realize they can not accomplish it. The peoples of the world are awake, and the peoples of the world are in the saddle.

* * * * * * *

"I was told that there would be opposition, and I found union of action. I found the statesmen with whom I was about to deal united in the idea that we must have a league of nations; that we could not merely make a peace settlement, and then leave it to make itself effectual; but that we must conceive some common organization by which we should give our common faith that this peace would be maintained, and the conclusions at which we had arrived should be made as secure as the united counsels of all the great nations that fought against Germany could make them. We have listened to the challenge, and that is the proof that there shall never be a war like this again."—From President Wilson's Memorial Day address in France.

—

The text of President Wilson's Memorial Day address yesterday at Suresnes Cemetery, near Paris, follows:

"Mr. Ambassador, ladies and gentlemen, fellow countrymen, no one with a heart in his breast, no American, no lover of humanity, can stand in the presence of these graves without the most profound emotion. These men who lie here are men of unique breed. Their like has not been seen since the far days of crusades. Never before have men crossed the seas to a foreign land to fight for a cause of humanity which they did not pretend was particularly their own, but knew was the cause of humanity and of mankind. And when they came they found comrades for their courage and their devotion. They found armies of liberty already in the field—men who, though they had gone through three years of fiery trial, seemed only to be just discovering, not for a moment losing, the high temper of the great affair, men seasoned in the bloody service of liberty. Joining hands with these, the men of America gave that greatest of all gifts—the gift of life and the gift of spirit.

THEIR COURAGE AND ARDOR.

"It will always be a treasured memory on the part of those who knew and loved these men that the testimony of everybody who saw them in the field of action was their unflinching courage, their ardor to the point of audacity, their full con-

sciousness of the high cause they had come to serve, and their constant vision of the issue. It is delightful to learn from those who saw these men fight and saw them waiting in the trenches for the summons to the fight that they had a thought of the spirit as well as a physical might, and those of us who know and love America know that they were discovering to the whole world the true spirit and devotion to their motherland. It was America who came in the person of these men and who will forever be grateful that she was so represented.

SLEEPING WITH KINDRED SPIRITS.

"And it is the more delightful to entertain these thoughts because we know that these men, though buried in a foreign land, are not buried in an alien soil. They are at home, sleeping with the spirits of those who thought the same thoughts and entertained the same aspirations. The noble women of Suresnes have given evidence of the loving sense with which they received these dead as their own, for they have cared for their graves, they have made it their interest, their loving interest, to see that there was no hour of neglect, and that constantly through all the months that have gone by the mothers at home should know that there were mothers here who remembered and honored their dead.

"You have just heard in the beautiful letter from M. Clemenceau what I believe to be the real message of France to us on a day like this, a message of genuine comradeship, a message of genuine sympathy, and I have no doubt that if our British comrades were here they would speak in the same spirit and in the same language. For the beauty of this war is that it has brought a new partnership and a new comradeship and a new understanding into the field of the effort of the Nation.

LESSON TAUGHT BY THE DEAD.

"But it would be no profit to us to eulogize these illustrious dead if we did not take to heart the lesson which they have taught us. They are dead; they have done their utmost to show their devotion to a great cause, and they have left us to see to it that that cause shall not be betrayed, whether in war or peace. It is our privilege and our high duty to consecrate ourselves afresh on a day like this to the objects for which they fought. It is not necessary that I should rehearse to you what these objects were. These men did not come across the sea merely to defeat Germany and her associated powers in the war. They came to defeat forever the things for which the Central Powers stood, the sort of power they meant to assert in the world, the arrogant, selfish domination which they meant to establish, and they came, moreover, to see to it that there should never be a war like this again. It is for us, particularly for us who are civilized, to use our proper weapons of counsel and agreement to see to it that there never is such a war again. The nation that should now fling out of this common concord of counsel would betray the human race.

"So it is our duty to take and maintain the safeguards which will see to it that the mothers of America and the mothers of France and England and Italy and Belgium and all other suffering nations should never be called upon for this sacrifice again. This can be done. It must be done, and it will be done. The things that these men left us, though they did not in their counsels conceive it, is the great instrument which we have just erected in the league of nations. The league of nations is the covenant of governments that these men shall not have died in vain. I like to think that the dust of those sons of America who were privileged to be buried in their mother country will mingle with the dust of the men who fought for the preservation of the Union, and that, as those men gave their lives in order that America might be united, these men have given their lives in order that the world might be united. Those men gave their lives in order to secure the freedom of mankind, and I look forward to an age when it will be just as impossible to regret the results of their labor as it is now impossible to regret the result of the labor of those men who fought for the union of the States. I look for the time when every man who now puts his counsel against the united service of mankind under the league of nations will be just as ashamed of it as he is who regretted the union of the States.

OLD STANDARDS SURGING FORTH.

"You are aware, as I am aware, that the airs of an older day are beginning to stir again, that the standards of an old order are trying to assert themselves again. There is here and there an attempt to insert into the counsel of statesmen the old reckoning of selfishness and bargaining, and national advantage, which were the roots of this war, and any man who counsels these things advocates a renewal of the sacrifice which these men have made; for if this is not the final battle for right there will be another that will be final. Let these gentlemen who suppose that it is possible for them to accomplish this return to an order of which we are ashamed and that we are ready to forget, realize they can not accomplish it. The peoples of the world are awake and the peoples of the world are in the saddle. Private counsels of statesmen can not now and can not hereafter determine the destinies of nations. If we are not the servants of the opinion of mankind, we are of all men the littlest, the most contemptible, the least gifted with vision. If we do not know courage, we can not accomplish our purpose, and this age is an age which looks forward, not backward; which rejects the standard of national selfishness that once governed the counsels of nations and demands that they shall give way to a new order of things in which only the questions will be, 'Is it right?' 'Is it just?' 'Is it in the interest of mankind?'

STATESMEN UNITED FOR LEAGUE.

"This is a challenge that no previous generation ever dared to give ear to. So many things have happened so fast in the last four years that I do not think many of us realize what it is that has happened. Think how impossible it would have been to get a body of responsible statesmen seriously to entertain the idea of the organization of a league of nations four years ago! And think of the change that has taken place! I was told before I came to France that there would be confusion of counsels about this thing, and I found unity of counsel. I was told that there would be opposition, and I found union of action. I found the statesmen with whom I was about to deal united in the idea that we must have a league of nations; that we could not merely make a peace settlement and then leave it to make itself effectual, but that we must conceive some common organization by which we should give our common faith that this peace would be maintained and the conclusions at which we had arrived should be made as secure as the united counsels of all the great nations that fought against Germany could make them. We have listened to the challenge and that is the proof that there shall never be a war like this again.

"Ladies and gentlemen, we all believe, I hope, that the spirits of these men are not buried with their bones. Their spirits live. I hope—I believe—that their spirits are present with us at this hour. I hope that I feel the compulsion of their presence. I hope that I realize the significance of their presence. Think, soldiers, of those comrades of yours who are gone. If they were here, what would they say? They would not remember what you are talking about to-day. They would remember America which they left with their high hope and purpose. They would remember the terrible field of battle. They would remember what they constantly recalled in times of danger, what they had come for, and how worth while it was to give their lives for it. And they would say, 'Forget all the little circumstances of the day. Be ashamed of the jealousies that divide you. We command you in the name of those who, like ourselves, have died to bring the counsels of men together, and we remind you what America said she was born for. She was born, she said, to show mankind the way to liberty. She was born to make this great gift a common gift. She was born to show men the way of experience by which they might realize this gift and maintain it, and we abjure you in the name of all the great traditions of America to make yourselves soldiers now once for all in this common cause, where we need wear no uniform except the uniform of the heart, clothing ourselves with the principles of right, and saying to men everywhere, "You are our brothers and we invite you into the comradeship of liberty and of peace."' Let us go away hearing these unspoken mandates of our dead comrades.

HIS PERSONAL CONSECRATION.

"If I may speak a personal word, I beg you to realize the compulsion that I myself feel that I am under. By the Constitution of our great country I was the Commander in Chief of these men. I advised the Congress to declare that a state of war existed. I sent these lads over here to die. Shall I—can I—ever speak a word of counsel which is inconsistent with the assurances I gave them when they came over? It is inconceivable. There is something better, if possible, that a man can give than his life, and that is his living spirit to a service that is not easy, to resist counsels that are hard to resist, to stand against purposes that are difficult to stand against, and to say, 'Here I stand, consecrated in spirit of the men who were once my comrades, and who are now gone, and who left me under eternal bonds of fidelity.'"

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a telegram embodying a resolution adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of Washington, D. C., relative to massacres in Poland, Rumania, and elsewhere, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WARREN. I have a brief telegram, signed by two distinguished citizens of my State, who have large interests in Mexico. One is an ex-governor of Wyoming and the other a capitalist, of the same State. I ask that the Secretary may read it. It is only a matter of three or four lines.

There being no objection, the Secretary read as follows:

CASPER, WYO., *May 30, 1919.*

Hon. FRANCIS E. WARREN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Have urgent messages from our representatives in Mexico to request your influence to stop movement of Mexican troops over American soil, as many Americans held by Villa would be in danger.

B. B. BROOKS.
C. B. RICHARDSON.

Mr. WARREN presented petitions of the Jugo-Slav Republican Alliance No. 79, of Rock Springs; of the Slavonic Workingmen's Benefit Union, of Diamondville; and of Bratska Ljubezen No. 134, of Superior, all in the State of Wyoming, praying for the independence of the Jugo-Slavs and for justice and fair dealing in connection with peace deliberations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GRONNA. It is not my purpose to burden the RECORD unduly with resolutions, but I have received a great many resolutions from the organization known as the Knights of Columbus. I present only two. I ask that one of them be read, and that both be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, the first one being read, and the second was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At a meeting of the Knights of Columbus of Williston Council, No. 1798, the following resolutions were passed:

"Whereas President Wilson has stated, 'No peace can last or ought to last which does not recognize and accept the principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that national aspirations must be respected. Peoples can now be dominated and governed only by their own consent. Self-determination is not a mere farce': Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That in keeping with these words of truth we hold that the right of Ireland to self-determination can not be denied. And be it further

"*Resolved*, That President Wilson be asked to use his great influence at the peace conference to the end that the people of Ireland be permitted to determine for themselves the form of government under which they wish to live. And further

"*Resolved*, That Williston Council, No. 1798, of the Knights of Columbus respectfully petitions the Members of Congress from North Dakota to bring these resolutions to the attention of the Congress of the United States of America, to the end that such action be taken."

Dated at Williston, N. Dak.

Rev. E. P. O'NEILL,
Chairman.
THOMAS B. HOGAN,
THOMAS M. COONEY,
Committee.

Resolutions adopted by Grand Forks Council, No. 1260, Knights of Columbus, Grand Forks, N. Dak., in the matter of Irish representation at the peace conference.

Whereas the Irish nation is one of the oldest organized nations; and
Whereas the English nation has subjugated the Irish nation by force of arms and without color of right or provocation; and
Whereas the wrongs and cruelties perpetrated by the German nation upon the helpless people of Belgium pales in insignificance before those perpetrated by the English nation upon the people of Ireland; and
Whereas the Irish nation has never recognized the right of the English nation to rule over her destinies; and
Whereas the lapse of time can never ripen a crime into a claim of right, and especially as in this case where the wrongs and cruelties are being continued at the present time; and
Whereas the will of the majority of all the people of any nation should be the supreme law of that nation; and
Whereas a larger proportion of the Irish people are standing to-day for Irish independence than have ever stood in any nation for any cause at any time; and
Whereas the men of Irish birth and Irish descent have given the full measure of their devotion to every land in the recent battle for the rights of humanity, and have been conspicuous in their defense of the rights of America not only in this World War but in all her wars; and
Whereas the Chief Executive of our Nation has declared for the rights of small nations in the matter of self-determination; and
Whereas there is no longer need for the claim that the subjugation of Ireland is necessary for the security of England; and
Whereas its boundaries are well defined and not in conflict with those of any other nation; and
Whereas the Irish nation has selected three delegates to the world's peace conference in Paris; and
Whereas martial law is the order of England in Ireland at the present time; and
Whereas the delegates selected by the Irish people are confined in English prisons without trial: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Knights of Columbus, 500 in number, of the city of Grand Forks, N. Dak., and Grand Forks, Minn., That we petition the Congress of the United States of America to use its influence to have the principles of democracy and self-determination applied not only to Belgium, Poland, and other small nations which are being considered, but also to Ireland; and be it further

Resolved, That we petition Congress to use its influence with the English Government to either release its Irish political prisoners or bring them to a speedy and just trial, that the world may judge her by her acts; and be it further

Resolved, That we petition President Wilson, that he use his best influence in having the principles of self-determination, which he so strongly advocates in behalf of other nations applied to Ireland, and that representatives of the Irish nation may be heard in the present peace conference.

Respectfully submitted.

HOWARD J. MANLEY,
Grand Knight.

Mr. GRONNA. I submit sundry resolutions with reference to war-time prohibition. I ask that one of them may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and one was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOTT, N. DAK., *May 25, 1919.*

Hon. A. J. GRONNA,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was presented and read at the regular session of the Chilton Methodist Episcopal Sunday School May 25, 1919, and was adopted by a unanimous vote of all present. The resolution is sent to you as a protest in the matter mentioned, and we request that you, as our representative, do all in your power to keep the war-time prohibitory law in full effect.

Respectfully,

F. W. GRESS, *Pastor.*

We, the members and officers of Chilton Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, make our most vigorous protest against the repealing of the war-time prohibitory law relative to the sale of intoxicating drinks. We urgently plead with you to do all in your power, as our representative, to prevent the repeal of said law, to the contrary notwithstanding our honorable President, Woodrow Wilson, requesting repeal of same.

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM L. ZIEGAHM, *Superintendent.*
GLADYS STONE, *Secretary.*

Mr. GRONNA presented a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Minot, N. Dak., relative to the unification of the freight and passenger service of the Soo Line and Great Northern Railway at that city, and favoring the discontinuation of such service, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Chilton Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, of Mott, N. Dak., and a memorial of the Methodist Episcopal Sunday School of Mott, N. Dak., remonstrating against the repeal of national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KENYON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Fort Madison, Iowa, praying that Congress intervene to prevent the massacre of Jews in Poland and Roumania, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PHELAN presented a resolution adopted by the Imperial County Farm Bureau, of El Centro, Calif., favoring the plan of the Secretary of the Interior for the reclamation of lands and the settlement thereon of discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. McLEAN presented memorials of the congregation of the Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, of Bridgeport; of the Grace Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, of Bridgeport; and of sundry citizens of Norwalk, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the repeal of national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Naugatuck Valley Association of Churches and Ministers, of Middlebury, Conn., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Local Branch, Connecticut State Board of Agriculture, of Woodstock, Conn., praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Board of Trade, Chamber of Commerce, and Manufacturers' Association, all of Derby, in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SHERMAN presented memorials of sundry citizens of Reno, Pocahontas, and Vandalia, all in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against the modification of war-time prohibition permitting the manufacture and sale of wine and beer, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE.

Mr. SHERMAN. I present a circular letter of May 10, 1919, on the letterhead of the League to Enforce Peace, Illinois Branch. I wish to have it printed at length. I call attention particularly to the effort of this branch of the league to procure Memorial Day speeches, asking that the Grand Army Post pass resolutions for the league of nations and advise their representatives of their action. I have received various resolutions, but not a single resolution from any Grand Army Post in my State in response to this circular letter, which I think is a prostitution of Memorial Day to improper purposes.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE,
CHICAGO, ILL., *May 10, 1919.*

COMMANDER GRAND ARMY POST.

DEAR COMPATRIOT: Knowing that your organization is among those that have permanent and personal interest in preserving peace, we are writing to urge you to give the projected league of nations your careful study and your valuable support.

In particular, you may soon be desirous to procure for Memorial Day a speaker who will be worthy of the occasion. Would you like to have us help you? You can do added patriotic service, we feel sure, if you secure one who will give a rousing, educational speech on the league of nations. We have more to commemorate this year than ever before; the graves of our heroes are not all in Illinois. Can there be any doubt that we are committed to some form of internationalism? And internationalism organized under a league of nations to aid in preserving peace is, in a sense, the cause for which our sons and brothers have died.

The memorial of May 30 could be nothing more fitting than a discussion of the new world order, purchased with so much suffering. If you can not secure a league of nations oration for the day, will you not at least pass resolutions similar in thought and purpose to the form inclosed? We shall be very much interested to hear from you and to help you with speakers or literature on the league, or in any other way possible. We have eloquent, forceful speakers who will come for their necessary traveling expenses.

We shall be pleased to have your personal opinion by filling out the inclosed card and returning the same to us. Let us hear from you by early mail.

Holding ourselves in readiness to assist you in any way possible, we are, very truly, yours,

THOMAS F. HOLGATE,
Chairman,
By J. E. BANGS,
Executive Secretary.

DEVELOPMENT OF WATER POWER.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, about a week ago I called attention to the bill (S. 220) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable water," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce, introduced by myself, which had been referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce instead of, as I thought, to a joint committee of the Committee on Public Lands and the Committee on Commerce. The Senate ordered the withdrawal of the bill from the Committee on Interstate Commerce and that it be referred to the joint committee suggested. A motion to reconsider that order was entered. I ask that that motion be taken up for action now.

Mr. SMOOT. I really did not hear what the Senator said, there was so much confusion in the Chamber.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I asked for the consideration of the motion to reconsider the order by which the bill introduced by myself, relating to power sites on the public domain and dams in navigable streams, was referred to a committee to be composed of members of the Committee on Public Lands and the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SMOOT. I remember the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] entered the order on May 23. Would not the Senator just as leave let it go over until the Senator from Massachusetts can be in the Chamber? He is out of the Chamber now on very important business. He may be back this afternoon, and he may not.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. He will be here this evening.

Mr. SMOOT. He will be back this evening, I am informed.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have waited patiently for a week for the consideration of the matter.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator from Massachusetts will be here at the next session of the Senate, which I understand will be to-morrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Let me ask what is being considered by the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. I asked the Senator from Montana to defer the motion until the Senator from Massachusetts can be here.

Mr. McCORMICK. The colloquy is not audible on this side.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. In view of the absence of the Senator from Massachusetts, I will accede to the request of the Senator from Utah and let the motion go over, but I give notice that I shall ask for its consideration to-morrow morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just at this point the Chair would like the attention of the Committee on Rules with reference to this very subject.

The other day the Chair ruled that a motion to discharge a committee was in order at the time of calling for reports of committees, but in accordance with the precedents of the Senate was not debatable until the hour of 1 o'clock. The ruling of the Chair, without any rule or without any precedent, was based on the theory that the object of reports of committees is to get a bill to the calendar, and that the object of a motion to discharge a committee is also to get a bill to the calendar, and therefore it was in order at that time to move to discharge a committee. But it will be seen that it leads to confusion, and the Chair respectfully requests of the Committee on Rules that there be an amendment to this effect, that at that time a motion to discharge a committee may be made if it is not to be debated, but if it is to be debated it goes to the period of time when resolutions coming over from a preceding day are in order, when it will be clearly debatable.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, I offer some material on the subject of the league of nations and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing for consideration and publication as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The matter will be referred to the Committee on Printing for action.

RATIFICATION OF TREATIES.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I ask to have referred to the Committee on Printing a compilation relating to foreign practices in the ratification of treaties, and also extracts from the Executive Journal of the Senate with reference to proceedings in the case of amended and rejected treaties by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The matter will be referred to the Committee on Printing for consideration.

SITES FOR MILITARY HOSPITALS (S. DOC. NO. 22).

Mr. REED. Mr. President, at the last session of Congress there was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds a resolution relating to an investigation of and the selection of sites for military hospitals. The subcomittee having the matter in charge prepared a report, which in the closing hours of the session was submitted to the committee, the committee adopting the report of the subcommittee. That report did not get before the Senate at the last session. I desire now to present it, in order that it may be printed for such use as the Senate may desire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 1252) for the appointment of William R. Leonard as captain in the United States Army; and

A bill (S. 1253) donating captured cannon, cannon balls, war relics, etc., to certain cities in Texas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1254) to amend section 4414, Revised Statutes of the United States, to classify and provide salaries for clerks in the Steamboat-Inspection Service; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1255) authorizing the Texas Co. to bring suit against the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 1257) to amend an act approved June 22, 1910, entitled "An act to provide for agricultural entries on coal lands"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1258) to prohibit experiments upon living dogs in the District of Columbia or in any of the Territorial or insular possessions of the United States, and providing a penalty for the violation thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NUGENT:

A bill (S. 1259) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Nez Perce National Forest; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1260) for the relief of Elijah Stroud;

A bill (S. 1261) donating captured cannon to the city of Rathdrum, Idaho;

A bill (S. 1262) donating captured German cannon to the board of county commissioners, Twin Falls County, Idaho;

A bill (S. 1263) donating captured German cannon to the University of Idaho; and

A bill (S. 1264) for the relief of Washington Kellogg; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1265) granting a pension to Thebold W. Gehrmann;

A bill (S. 1266) granting a pension to Aaron L. Kelly; and

A bill (S. 1267) granting an increase of pension to David Ham; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 1268) authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to deliver to each of the several county seats and incorporated towns in the State of Georgia captured German cannon,

cannon balls or shells, and gun carriages, condemned United States cannon, cannon balls and shells, or gun carriages; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 1269) to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, and sodium on the public domain; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1270) granting an increase of pension to Jasper M. Sweeney (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1271) granting a pension to Felix Clark (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1272) granting an increase of pension to George Moir; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 1273) to prohibit intoxicating liquors and prostitution within the Canal Zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

A bill (S. 1274) making it unnecessary to secure permits from the United States Shipping Board for the construction of ships in American shipyards for foreign account; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1275) awarding a medal of honor to George Murphy, late private, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1276) granting permission to Capt. Dorr F. Tozier to accept a gift from the King of Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 1277) for the relief of the heirs of Ko-mo-dal-kiah, Moses agreement allottee No. 33; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 1278) for the relief of Fanny A. Crocker; and

A bill (S. 1279) for the relief of the heirs of Ari Cantrell; to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

A bill (S. 1280) for the relief of J. G. Seupelt;

A bill (S. 1281) authorizing the issuance of patent to the heirs of James Longmire;

A bill (S. 1282) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent for certain land to Estella McReynolds;

A bill (S. 1283) for the relief of George L. Neff; and

A bill (S. 1284) for the relief of Henry States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1285) for the relief of Ira M. Krutz;

A bill (S. 1286) for the relief of the Pacific Creosoting Co.;

A bill (S. 1287) for the relief of the M. A. Phelps Lumber Co.;

A bill (S. 1288) for the relief of W. H. Presleigh;

A bill (S. 1289) for the relief of Simon M. Preston;

A bill (S. 1290) for the relief of Matilda Elizabeth West;

A bill (S. 1291) for the relief of Mary Wait;

A bill (S. 1292) for the relief of Caroline M. Killough;

A bill (S. 1293) for the relief of the estate of Frederick Heisinger;

A bill (S. 1294) for the relief of Nellie Harrington;

A bill (S. 1295) for the relief of William H. Hare;

A bill (S. 1296) for the relief of the heirs of L. A. Davis;

A bill (S. 1297) for the relief of the heirs of Joshua Curtis, deceased; and

A bill (S. 1298) for the relief of the Alaska Steamship Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 1299) to confer on the Court of Claims jurisdiction to determine the respective rights of and differences between the Fort Berthold Indians and the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 1300) to authorize the sale of certain lands at or near Minidoka, Idaho, for railroad purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 1301) to establish the international exposition of the United States of America; to the Committee on Industrial Expositions.

A bill (S. 1302) for the relief of John H. Rheinlander; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 1303) donating captured cannons and unloaded projectiles to the city of Blue Rapids, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PHIPPS:

A bill (S. 1304) authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to deliver to each of the several county seats in the State of Colorado captured German cannon, cannon balls or shells, and gun carriages, condemned United States cannon, cannon balls and shells, or gun carriages; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1305) to provide for the erection of a public building at Monte Vista, Colo.; and

A bill (S. 1306) to provide for the erection of a public building at Delta, Delta County, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1307) granting to the State of Colorado public lands to aid in the construction and maintenance of public roads; to promote the study of forestry; to promote the study and development of horticulture; and to promote vocational education in the State of Colorado; and

A bill (S. 1308) limiting the creation or extension of forest reserves in Colorado; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. NEWBERRY (for Mr. TOWNSEND):

A bill (S. 1309) to establish a national highway system; to create a Federal highway commission; to encourage efficient and economical highway transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1310) providing one German cannon or fieldpiece for the village of Concord, Mich.;

A bill (S. 1311) providing one German cannon or fieldpiece for the town of Allen, Mich.; and

A bill (S. 1312) providing two German cannon or fieldpieces for the town of Trenton, Mich.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 1313) for the relief of Francis Nicholson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 1314) to donate a gun or howitzer to W. I. Brown Post, No. 31, Grand Army of the Republic, of Penacock, N. H.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 1315) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Gorham, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1316) granting a pension to Lizzie E. Hinds (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 1317) to establish a national park, to be known as the Mississippi Valley National Park, near Prairie du Chien, Wis., and McGregor, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD (for Mr. BANKHEAD):

A bill (S. 1318) to create a Federal power commission and to define its powers and duties, to provide for the development of water power, for the use of lands of the United States in relation thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 1319) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Marcellus M. Crocker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KELLOGG:

A bill (S. 1320) to donate war trophies to the city of Mankato, in the State of Minnesota;

A bill (S. 1321) to donate war trophies to the city of Glencoe, in the State of Minnesota;

A bill (S. 1322) to donate war trophies to the city of Little Falls, in the State of Minnesota;

A bill (S. 1323) to donate war trophies to the city of Fairmont, in the State of Minnesota; and

A bill (S. 1324) to donate war trophies to the city of Le Sueur, in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) authorizing national banks to subscribe to the united war work campaign; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE-COMMERCE ACT.

Mr. POMERENE. I introduce a bill to further amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The bill (S. 1256) to further amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. POMERENE. I have a very brief memorandum explaining the provisions of the bill. It is only a matter of about two or three pages, and I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD. I think it will be of assistance to Senators who are interested in the subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM.

The commission's current print of the act to regulate commerce as amended, revised to June 1, 1918, contains paragraphs placed in section 1, presumably for convenience, which were not enacted as amendments to that act and form no part of section 1. These are:

(1) The first whole paragraph on page 8, which is part of section 38 of "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1917 (39 Stat., 964); and

(2) The first whole paragraph on page 14, which is the text of "An act to define the rights and privileges of the trustees of municipally owned interstate railways and construing the act to regulate commerce with reference thereto," approved February 17, 1917 (39 Stat., 922).

The print also contains paragraphs inserted in their present places in section 1 which were enacted as additions to that section without indication of where they were to be placed. These are:

(3) The five complete paragraphs on page 9 and the first two paragraphs on page 10, constituting the Esch car service act, so called, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' as amended in respect of car service, and for other purposes," approved May 29, 1917 (40 Stat., 101); and

(4) The remaining matter on page 10, all on page 11, and the first seven lines on page 12, constituting the priority act, so called, temporary in its nature and entitled "An act to amend the act to regulate commerce as amended, and for other purposes," approved August 10, 1917 (40 Stat., 272).

Both of these latter acts provide that section 1 of the act to regulate commerce, etc., be further amended "by adding thereto the following"; and in the absence of other provisions as to place the amendments thus made might successively be appended to the text of section 1 as it existed at the time of amendment.

Section 1 of the accompanying text ignores the placing, in fact, made in the commission print and proposes amendment of the first three paragraphs of the existing section 1 of the act to regulate commerce, meaning thereby:

(a) The paragraph on page 7 and ending with line 5, page 8, of the current print.

(b) The paragraph beginning on line 18, page 8, and ending with line 2, page 9, thus omitting that listed above under (1).

(c) The paragraph beginning on line 8 and ending on line 23, page 12, thus omitting those listed above under (3) and (4). Section 2 of the accompanying text proposes amendment of the paragraphs of the Esch car service act listed above under (3). This text retains the term "car service" used in the existing act, but enlarges its meaning.

In the attached text carats (/) indicate the omission of matter contained in the existing act, and interrupted underlining indicates the suggested new matter, except in the case of the proposed section 20 (a), the substance of which has not been enacted by Congress. The text is, in the main, that of the proposed section 20 (a) in the Rayburn bill which passed the House in 1914.

EQUAL SUFFRAGE.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I introduce a joint resolution, and ask that it may be read. I will say that the resolution was reported favorably by the Judiciary Committee at the last session, but it was not reached on the calendar for consideration. I therefore reintroduce it, and should like to have it read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 41), proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That Article V of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows, to wit:

"ARTICLE V.

"The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this Constitution when ratified within six years from the date of their proposal by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, or by the electors in three-fourths thereof, as the mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress: *Provided*, That no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, if the Senate will pardon me for a minute, I want to state that the resolution just read proposes to change the present constitutional provision in two respects only. It fixes a limit of six years within which a proposed amendment to the Constitution must be acted upon by the States in order to be valid, and it provides that in addition to the methods provided by the Constitution at present—to wit, the submission to legislatures or to conventions—if Congress desires to do so, it may submit the amendment to the electors of the States themselves.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I am a member of the Judiciary Committee, and was a member of the subcommittee which considered and favorably reported this proposed constitutional amendment during the Sixty-fifth Congress.

In my judgment, no proposed constitutional amendment could be placed before the country which is more vital, and which deals with the life of the Republic more directly, than the amendment to the Federal Constitution now proposed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE]. When we reflect that there are to-day pending before the States four proposed amendments, two of which were proposed in 1789, and that many publicists and constitutional lawyers now disagree as to how many States are now necessary for their ratification; when we reflect that in 1810 another amendment was proposed, and is still pending, and that the ablest constitutional lawyers to-day do not know whether or not that amendment has been ratified; when we reflect that the Corwin amendment, submitted March 3, 1861, ratified by three States, and left suspended there, it must appeal, at least to all lawyers, that it is our duty to say that there shall come a time when a particular submission by Congress shall no longer be in force and effect, and that a submission shall expire unless ratified by the required number of States within 10 or 14 or 20 years.

But, Mr. President, there is even a graver and a more vital reform in the proposed constitutional amendment than the time limit. Under the present situation 4,000 men pass upon our fundamental law, and fix upon the people what shall be the policy of this Republic. If we are to democratize the Republic and make this a democracy within a Republic, constitutional amendments should not be ratified by the legislatures, but should be ratified by the votes of people at a referendum, to the end that the people may know what sort of a government they are living under, and what sort of a government it is proposed that they shall live under, and to the further end that the people may directly say whether they desire the amendment.

I congratulate my friend from Connecticut upon having secured a favorable report in the last Congress. I hope the Judiciary Committee will report it favorably and that it will go through this Congress, for it is idle to talk about true liberty when we reflect that this Congress, composed of about 431 men, plus the 3,500 members of the various State legislatures, can fix upon the people and fix upon the coming generations what their fundamental law is. The people are the source of power, and their votes should pass directly upon such grave matters.

I repeat, there is no reform more vital, more necessary, more prudent, and more constructive than the very amendment which has just been introduced.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. CULBERSON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $4,226.14 for the completion of the construction of a bridge across the San Juan River at Shiprock, N. Mex., on the Navajo Indian Reservation, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MOSES submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $65,792.53 to be paid to Walston H. Brown, sole surviving partner of the firm of Brown, Howard & Co., and $26,400.30 to be paid to the Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co., as found due by the Court of Claims, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the third deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHERMAN submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire and complete immediately the hospital at Broadview, Cook County, Ill., as authorized by the act approved March 3, 1919, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the third deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. RANSDELL submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $39,000 for the investigation, improvement, encouragement, and determination of the adaptability to different soils and climatic conditions of pecans, almonds, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $500,000 for the investigation and eradication of the European corn borer, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $75,000 for continuing the eradication of the sweet potato weevil, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Washington submitted an amendment proposing that no limitation contained in section 7 of the legislative appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1920 shall deprive mechanics, laborers, or workmen employed at the arsenals or navy yards of the $240 increase provided therein, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the third deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. UNDERWOOD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY.

Mr. McLEAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 53), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not to exceed $1 per printed page, to report such hearing as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate; and that expenses contracted hereunder shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY.

Mr. GRONNA submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 54), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. WADSWORTH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 55), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

Mr. WADSWORTH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 57), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to employ such counsel and expert assistants as may be necessary; to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

PROTECTION OF MIGRATORY BIRDS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (for Mr. BANKHEAD) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 56), which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game:

Whereas under the terms of the convention between the United States and Great Britain for the protection of migratory birds between the United States and Canada proclaimed December 8, 1916, the migratory bird treaty act approved July 3, 1918, and the migratory bird treaty act regulations effective July 31, 1918, the migratory wild-bird life is adequately protected in the United States and Canada; and

Whereas great numbers and many species of the migratory birds protected in the course of their annual migration pass through and from the United States and temporarily sojourn in the countries of Mexico, Central and South America, where no semblance of protection is afforded them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and is hereby, requested to propose conventions or treaties with the Republics of Mexico and of Central and South America for the protection of birds that in the course of their annual migration pass through or from the United States and temporarily sojourn in the countries of Mexico, Central and South America.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, on the 5th of February, 1919, I made some remarks in the Senate critcizing the inefficiency of the War Department in the work of supplying munitions of war, and so forth, for the proper equipment of our Army.

Maj. Gen. Henry G. Sharpe, formerly Quartermaster General of the Army, has written me that he thinks certain of my statements reflected unjustly upon himself in his conduct of the Quartermaster General's Department, and he has urged that his views might appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

To this end I request that three letters from Gen. Sharpe to myself, dated, respectively, February 26, 1919, May 13, 1919, and May 19, 1919, may be inserted in the RECORD, as suggested by him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

HEADQUARTERS SOUTHEASTERN DEPARTMENT,
Charleston, S. C., February 26, 1919.

MY DEAR SENATOR FRELINGHUYSEN: I received your letter of the 21st instant and have deferred replying until the receipt of the official copy of your speech, which was received to-day.

In your letter you ask me to "point out directly wherein I have in any way criticized you, unless you consider that the statement of facts in the speech is a criticism."

Page 5 of your speeh gives the paragraphs which prompted my letter to you:

"The preliminary investigations made by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs in December, 1917, demonstrated unmistakably that three chiefs of bureaus had each failed as an effective administrator of his bureau."

I maintain, and a perusal of the testimony will substantiate the claim, that the evidence does not justify that assertion, so far as the Quartermaster's Department is concerned, but will show that I obeyed my orders.

2. That the investigation was not conducted on lines to ascertain if the chief of that department had been assisted or hampered in his efforts to organize the department; and if hampered in his efforts to effectively organize, a bureau chief could not justly be blamed for failure. Furthermore, the office of the Quartermaster General was carefully organized after consultation with one of the best firms of efficiency experts in New York which makes a specialty of such work, and was, after consultation with those experts, arranged to efficiently handle the work devolved upon it by law and to meet the requirements of the law then in force. The many changes made in the organization were all based upon the authority now known as the Overman law, but it must be remembered that that law was not in effect at the time of the investigation. The office had, however, a complete plan for expanding under the existing law to transact the greatly increased business consequent to entry upon war, and this plan was put into operation prior to the declaration of war, and was said to be the best, most practical, and comprehensive of any that had been suggested. The Committee on Military Affairs was not informed of this, as matters relating to the clerical force was assigned to another committee, but it is important in connection with your statement concerning administration.

Continuing, you stated: "Yet all of these were advanced to the grade of major general for the emergency."

That is not a correct statement. The facts are that I was appointed Quartermaster General, with the rank of major general, on September 12, 1916, and on October 6, 1917, the other bureau chiefs were, by act of Congress, given the rank of major general, the rank to be a permanent one for the chief of each corps while holding the office, not merely for the emergency.

Continuing, you added: "Two of them being subsequently given permanent rank as major general of the line, reaping a high reward, and for what?

I was not consulted and knew nothing of the intention to appoint me a major general of the line of the Army until I received notification from the War Department that the President had nominated me as such and asking if I accepted the appointment.

I have never asked for promotion nor permitted anyone to use influence to obtain my advancement, for I would be unwilling to hold office if under obligations to anyone for same. These statements can be substantiated by all who know me.

In my letter to you of February 13 I wrote: "The President in a personal autograph letter to me stated that it gave him a great deal of pleasure to show his confidence in me by conferring the promotion which I had earned."

Special legislation was secured from Congress to enable the appointment to be made, and those urging the legislation, and who were familiar with the facts, would not have sought or secured the same if they agreed with your statement as to the demonstrations made by the preliminary investigations conducted by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs.

It is my recollection that you and nearly every other member of the committee who attended the hearings stated to me of your own initiative that you were "not after me, but after the Council of National Defense," and you may recall that I stated then, and also in my testimony, that I thought, under the circumstances, the council had done well.

Then you add, "These officers had seen long service, with honorable careers; further investigation may absolve them from blame," which appears to indicate that you are doubtful that your facts are correctly established.

Was any evidence of failure of effective administration shown in the investigation in matters relating to pay, transportation, construction of training camps and cantonments (for you must remember that at that time the Cantonment Division was a part of the Quartermaster General's office, and he had to submit and explain the estimates); the supply of animals, harness, wagons (to procure the necessary wood, to build which it was necessary to have a force of men to cut the trees and to have the wood seasoned in kilns built specially for the purpose); the supply of automobiles and motor trucks, the latter subject involving the development of the Standard truck, which all qualified to speak of have declared to be one of the important achievements of the war; and attention is invited to the fact that the present organization of the Motor Transport Corps follows practically the lines which effort was made to accomplish, and is now administered by the very officers who were charged with those duties while in the Quartermaster Corps; the establishment of the Quartermaster's Training School at Jacksonville, which provided the officers and personnel to be sent abroad (several thousand officers and over 70,000 men passed through that school); the organization of the Remount Service, together with the establishment of (at that time) 22 remount depots; the organization of the ice-plant companies erected abroad; the Graves Registration Service units for abroad; the mechanical shop truck units; the immense Quartermaster's mechanical repair shops, which made possible the work of salvage and reclamation of the enormous amount of matériel in France (there are three of these shops in this country—at Baltimore, Atlanta, and San Antonio; a visit to one would show the immense plant installed); the stevedore regiments; the labor companies; the motor-truck companies; the motor-car companies; the wagon companies; the pack-train companies; the motor supply companies; the supply companies; over 100 bakery companies, with their personnel and complete equipment, which companies produced the bread so well received in France; the establishment of 27 schools for bakers and cooks, which provided the bakers needed in this country and in France, Russia, and Italy, as well as the mess sergeants and trained cooks for the new organizations created in the National Army and made it possible to handle the drafts, subsequent to the first, by using the personnel then in the service; and the arrangements for providing cooks and supplying hot meals to the first draft upon reporting at the cantonments?

The foregoing organizations and activities were hardly touched upon in the preliminary investigation, but reports from those who have been abroad show that they were in successful operation over there, and the records of the War Department will show that the foundations for them were laid here in this country, and it is a fact that many of these foundations were planned in the office of the Quartermaster General, based upon study of the war in France, many months before our country declared war; and a further fact that all the foundations referred to were constructed within six months after we entered the war, founda-

tions upon which all the building has been erected, and that the officers of the Quartermaster Department are entitled to the credit of preparing those foundations.

More faithful, loyal, devoted, and unselfish service, rendered under trying conditions, can not be found. It is for these officers I appeal to your sense of fairness and justice, for I am convinced that after reading the above you will realize that you did not state the facts concerning the matters I have referred to.

Yours, very truly,

HENRY G. SHARPE,
Major General, United States Army,
Formerly Quartermaster General.

Senator JOSEPH S. FRELINGHUYSEN,
Washington, D. C.

HEADQUARTERS SOUTHEASTERN DEPARTMENT,
Charleston, S. C., May 13, 1919.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Referring to your letter of March 5, in which you acknowledge receipt of my letter of February 26, and also to the statement that you made to me when I met you here in Charleston, I feel quite sure that you have no intention of being unfair, and therefore I am inclosing another copy of my letter and asking if you will not be good enough to have the same inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that my reply to you can be given somewhat the same publicity that your speech was given, although, of course, the same publicity can not be given it as your speech, because that was printed and distributed as a public document.

Further, may I ask that you kindly send me a copy of the RECORD in which you make the publication? I am troubling you in this manner because I am not furnished a copy of the RECORD.

Yours, sincerely,

HENRY G. SHARPE.

Senator JOSEPH S. FRELINGHUYSEN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

HEADQUARTERS SOUTHEASTERN DEPARTMENT,
Charleston, S. C., May 19, 1919.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Replying to yours of May 16, I assume, of course, that you intend to be fair and not deny any opportunity to present a statement setting forth the facts from the opposite side the views which you have expressed.

I am only asking that you, therefore, will request permission to publish my reply to you in the RECORD. I know that such course has always been adopted in the Senate, and I am asking now only that you request authority to publish. I would say frankly that if later on you see that you would like to correct your statements that that can be done later, and would be deeply appreciated by me. I am only asking that you publish my letter to you.

Yours, sincerely,

HENRY G. SHARPE.

Senator JOSEPH S. FRELINGHUYSEN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

REPRESENTATIVES OF IRELAND AT PARIS.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, there is a resolution on the table I offered, coming over from Thursday last. I ask that Senate resolution 48, urging an American peace commission to secure a hearing for the representatives of the Irish republic be taken from the table and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that action will be taken.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

H. R. 3478. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution tendering the thanks of Congress to those who served, or gave others to the service of, the country in the Great War was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no further morning business——

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, was the President of the Senate about to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, the resolution that has been debated?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Chair understands that the unfinished business is the resolution of the Senator from California. That comes down at 2 o'clock.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Then, in pursuance of the notice that was given at the last session of the Senate, I should like to present some remarks on the league of nations.

Mr. SWANSON. I do not think there is anything on the calendar to proceed with under Rule VIII, consequently it would seem to me desirable to take up the unfinished business. I understand from my conversation with the Senator from California that he will not press his resolution to a vote to-day, but will consent to have it go over until to-morrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes; but I do not want it to lose its place on the calendar; and I ask, therefore, in accordance with what has been suggested by the Senator from Virginia, that by unanimous consent it be laid before the Senate now, and then——

Mr. SWANSON. It may go over until to-morrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It may go over until to-morrow.

Mr. SWANSON. Without losing its place.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. But remaining the unfinished business.

Mr. SWANSON. There is no objection to that course. It may remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes the Committee on Rules would get rid of the order for Calendar Monday or provide for its enforcement, or do something with it. The Chair does not know what to do about it.

Mr. SWANSON. I think the Senator from California submitted a request for unanimous consent that the unfinished business be now laid before the Senate, and that it retain its place as the unfinished business, but that it be not disposed of to-day, going over until to-morrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is correct, sir.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Chair lays the unfinished business before the Senate.

The Secretary read Senate resolution 12, submitted by Mr. JOHNSON of California on May 20, 1919, as follows:

Whereas the peace treaty has been completed and has been delivered to the representatives of Germany; and

Whereas a synopsis only of the treaty has been given publicity in the United States, and our people are entitled to know its full contents, and to what, if any, engagements they may have been committed; and

Whereas it is reported in the press that the entire treaty has been cabled to the State Department and is now in the possession of the State Department: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested forthwith to transmit to the Senate the full text of the treaty of peace completed at the Paris conference and delivered to the representatives of Germany.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I am constrained to ask, in the first instance, the courtesy of my colleagues that I may not be interrupted during the course of the remarks that I shall address to the league of nations, because I wish, if I can, to maintain their continuity; and because, too, with interruptions my remarks might reach interminable length.

I have been unable to discuss within any reasonable limits all of the questions that are presented by this league. I have been unable in what I shall present to-day to take up such important propositions as the amendment relating to withdrawal, which constitutes no amendment at all, or the system relating to mandatories or various other provisions of this document; and I have been unable, too, to present at all the interrelated matters of the league and the treaty. I have attempted to discuss the outstanding, plain propositions which seem to me to present a case upon which any of us who are opposed to this document may with absolute confidence go to our people and go to all of the people of the United States; and in speaking upon this instrument I want to insist that no man who is a Member of this body, upon whom in the final analysis rests the obligation to decide the future destiny of his country, shall be deterred from speaking in frank and in open fashion by any fear of personal consequences or political expediency, by any threat from any person, no matter who that person may be; but that Senators of the United States, conscious that upon them rests this great and this solemn duty, shall speak in absolute fearlessness and with the utmost frankness and characterize the acts and the facts that are pertinent to the issue just exactly as their judgments and their consciences may require. This is a time for plain speaking. The man who blinks the facts now does a distinct disservice to his country.

Mr. President, the covenant of the league of nations transcends in importance perhaps any document which has ever been presented to this country. It not only violently wrenches the Nation from its traditional policy, deals with its economic resources, embarks it upon a precarious and a perilous departure, but commandeers, apparently, for all time its blood and its bone. For every sentence of such a momentous document there should be sound reason, and for every clause, rational and logical explanation and demonstration. Indeed, the President himself, after the completion in secrecy of the document, cabled in triumph its adoption with the statement that there was "good and sufficient reason for every portion of it." And yet to this day neither the President has shown us reasons for a single article or clause, nor has any one of the Americans presumably interested in its composition disclosed to the American people anything at all in respect to this document. We are compelled, therefore, from the words of the instrument itself, often ambiguous and obscure, to determine what this document, born in secrecy, denied exposition, and presented to us with a cynical indifference to our right of knowledge, may mean, and what some of its particular provisions portend to the Republic.

The circumstances surrounding its creation are anything but reassuring. It was to be the apotheosis of idealism; it was to

represent the triumph of right, the overpowering direction of the conscience of mankind; it was to sound the knell for all time of selfish national ambition and aggression, of the tyranny of the strong over the weak; it was to realize the hopes, and the aspirations, and the prayers of peoples; it would throttle forever the cunning, greed, and avarice of diplomacy, and curb the grasping selfishness of power. The phrases in which its virtues were sung were almost as high-sounding and alluring and enticing as the phrases of a century ago, in which the world was to enter upon a new era under the Quadruple and the Holy Alliance. And long before we saw a line of this secret document a tremendous propaganda, financed with hundreds of thousands of dollars, obtained from clubs and organizations enthusiastic indorsements. Our people were taught to chant "promote peace and prevent war." The formula "promote peace and prevent war" swept over all the land, and its necessary corollary, before there was any league of nations at all, was the indorsement of the fantastic thing which feared the light in its creation and has denied to those most affected by it the slightest knowledge of the circumstances, events, and details of its composition. I received, just as other Senators did, innumerable resolutions before any one of us had the slightest conception of what the league of nations was, and the resolutions, in like tenor, have continued from that time to the present. Before publication of it various trainloads of distinguished gentlemen were going about the country holding meetings and conventions in different localities advocating an undisclosed document dealing with the future of the Republic.

Of course, when the document ultimately was given publicity, those who had in advance so hysterically and enthusiastically embraced it continued their advocacy. And while most of them grudgingly admitted what the President denied, that it required amendment, nevertheless, whether it had been amended or not, whether the most treasured policies of the Republic had been touched or destroyed, would not have altered the hectic hysteria of the league of nations men. That they have created a tremendous sentiment in this country by the repetition of their formula, "Promote peace and prevent war," is perhaps so. They rush upon the platform and demand of their auditors, "Don't you want to prevent war?" and there is immediate unanimity in the response, "Of course we want to prevent war." Thereupon the advocates say, "Inasmuch as you are against war and desire to prevent it, you must favor the league of nations." And the ordinary man, accepting the statement, subscribes to the resolutions to "promote peace and prevent war." There is another group, too, among them some very excellent people, who have hysterically embraced this document. They are those who conscientiously abhor war and are in general opposed to it. They found themselves during the last two years suppressed and repressed by espionage bills and by the mass consciousness aroused in the Nation in favor of the war. To voice their sentiments then meant jail, and they were compelled either by a regard for the wishes of their fellows or by personal fear to suppress expression of what had been their lifelong thought. With the league of nations and its formula, "Promote peace and prevent war," these people found once more the possibility of expression, and the two years of suppression under the law but made them perhaps more earnest and more vociferous in their newly acquired right to speak upon one subject. There are many other circumstances which contributed to the first hysteria and perhaps to the present sentiment in favor of this league. The awful tragedy of the world, the sorrow, the grief, and the anguish of those whose dear ones had made the supreme sacrifice, the fearful waste and welter, of necessity turned the thoughts of all men and of all women to a prevention of another world tragedy and cataclysm. Those of us who have spent a part of our lives in humanitarian endeavor were resolved after the experience of this great conflict to take, as far as human agency could, some forward step to preclude another. To all of these people—and I number myself among them—the idea of a league or confederation or union of the nations of the earth in behalf of the right, for the protection of the weak against the strong, to preclude the successful culmination of national cunning and cupidity, and to prevent future conflicts of God's creatures possessed a charm and an allurement, a hope and an inspiration, which we would have gone far to realize and consummate. The various phases of our disillusionment I will not dwell upon. Each milestone of the peace conference successively marks them. The beautiful phrases of altruism and idealism are found, as often has been the case in the last few years, but mere words. They were never translated into deeds. And, ultimately, with the presentation of the covenant came the shattering of all our fond hopes.

Of all the singular and astonishing intellectual distortions induced by the advocacy of the league of nations, not the least remarkable is the reproach to patriotism and the denunciation of those who think first of our Republic. It is rare, indeed, that any speech is made in favor of the league which does not bitterly condemn Americans who think of their own country first. We who would protect and preserve our own Nation, who loyally and patriotically would hesitate to involve its sons and its future generations in perpetual and continuous warfare, are designated as "little," "selfish," and "provincial" Americans—even men without international human sympathy and bereft of world vision. For the first time in our history the jealous guarding of our own, the love of our traditions and our institutions, the passion for our land and our liberty, have become grievous sins. We are told that our past affords no precedents; that our history contains no lessons; that all of those who have passed before, whose names we revere, spoke but empty words, and that their counsels give no guide. This strange, psychological phenomenon, apparently accompanying war, is an unnatural distortion of human intelligence which time alone will heal. May it be cured before the injury it threatens is done to the Nation.

There is yet another contributing cause to the present hysteria. We have learned in the last two years a new thing in our national life—national propaganda. We have been picking our pockets to poison our minds. Millions upon millions of dollars we have spent from the Public Treasury, and from taxation wrung from an overburdened people, to publish, not only in America but throughout the world, panegyrics upon those in power. The propaganda has been devoted, not as you would imagine it would be devoted in a country boasting of its democracy, for dissemination of the truth, but the propaganda, paid for by the people themselves, has been devoted to deceiving the people and to glorifying those who by a people's grace have been raised to high position. The heavy hand of a war-time Government has been held upon the press until in the East the liberty of the press has passed into history; upon the people themselves the clutch has been maintained so that only that which the administration desired spoken should be expressed. National propaganda, for the first time in our history suppressing current events, has manufactured public opinion, and that opinion has been made but the echo of what the national propaganda has decreed. This deadening and perverting mind process has had its evil effects and has been one of the powerful agencies for preventing people from knowing the facts or the possibilities of the league of nations.

I wish that I could adequately picture the situation at Paris in the peace conference. The great British Empire is there represented not alone by the ablest and most brilliant officials of the home Government but by the most astute and talented statesmen of England, all for Britain, and all with an eye single to Britain's power and greatness. For France, her grand old premier and her most famous citizens stand there ever alive to France's interest, demanding France's rights, and fighting for France's aggrandizement. Italy, from her various parties, has sent her best, skilled and learned in statecraft, Italians all, for Italy and Italy's future. Japan's cunning and illustrious sons fight Japan's battles for Japan's expansion and Japan's increase in territory and wealth. Every small nation on earth and every one that hopes to be a small nation have sent of their very best and very highest, each intent upon his own nation, its progress and its happiness, its future and its prosperity. There is just one nation unrepresented, perhaps included in a nebulous vision of internationalism, but not otherwise, and that is the United States of America. The position originally assumed by our country of idealism and altruism struck a responsive chord in the generous hearts of Americans, but, unfortunately, we have seen our idealism abandoned, our altruism forgotten. We have observed with astonishment and indignation our country inextricably bound in the sordid, cunning, secret, and crafty designs of European and Asiatic governments. We would wish, if we could not stem the tide of greed and avarice, selfishness and sordidness, and stop the secret plotting and plunder, at least, to be no part of it; to be ourselves again, with our ideals, untarnished, to be just Americans.

We fought a righteous war and won. With our might and our treasure we determined to destroy a ruthless militarism, and it is done. In the peace we would make it impossible for this monster ever again to threaten the world.

The victory for the United States means neither territory nor reparations. It should mean the triumph of our loud-trumpeted ideals for civilization, for the rights of small nations, for self-determination, for democracy. It means for England, France, Italy, and Japan huge territories, vast numbers of people, immense national gain. The burden must be borne of protecting and safeguarding these enormous allied gains. The question is, and the league of nations squarely presents it, Who shall bear the burden? Shall the burden rest upon the gainers, those who

made a mock of self-determination, of the rights of weak people, of all our high-sounding idealism, or shall the burden, at the command of one who was party to the mockery, be thrust upon the only nonprofiting Nation, the United States? The sole reason, whispered in fear or ominously hissed to create fear in the rest of us, why the United States should become the world's guarantor and underwrite the rape of China and the partition of hundreds of thousands of square miles of territory and the transfer of millions of human beings to England, France, Italy, and Japan, is that by doing so the possibility of future wars will be minimized, and there may be a greater sense of security in the possession by England, France, Italy, and Japan of their newly acquired peoples and territories.

But this argument in its last analysis means that United States power and treasure and blood will do for England, France, Italy, and Japan what otherwise they would be compelled to do for themselves. It means not the end of discontent or the cessation of war, for peoples held in cruel subjection like the Koreans or Chinese will ever be striving for their liberty and the self-determination for which we talked so much and did so little. It means that the great democracy of the world—our country—must not only continue a party to the denial of these people's rights whenever they are asserted, but to our diplomatic denial we will add denial economically and by force of arms, too.

On the 11th day of November, America, as no nation on earth ever had been before, was respected, revered, and beloved. After six months of meddling and muddling in European and Asiatic controversies and contests over territory, the end of the peace conference finds Italy detesting us, France secretly despising us, England using us, and Japan bluffing us. They are all willing and anxious that we should have our league of nations, and willing and anxious because of the same spirit which has ruled them in the peace conference. The one going solvent concern nationally is about to enter into partnership with certain national bankrupts. We give of our assets, both moral and material, and assume a part of their liabilities. We do not need them as partners. They require us. They yield to us nothing; they can yield to us nothing. We give to them everything. We can protect our borders for centuries to come, just as we have in the century past. The Lord has given us our geographical isolation, and the Lord has denied just that thing to the different races of Europe. And, while our internationalists in behalf of the league of nations prate of the fact that we can not remain longer isolated, they forget that the geography of the situation remains immutable. Isolation otherwise, except to refrain from European entanglements or to indulge in European controversies and wars, has never existed, and, of course, never will exist. But when distinguished gentlemen say that we can no longer remain in a position of splendid isolation and play our own part in the world, they forget all the events of the past century. We are in constant touch with all the world. We can, whenever we think it in consonance with humanity, go wherever we will and do whatever duty demands. Our position has been, and ought to be, the commanding one in all the world. And it is unnecessary, in order that we preserve this position and maintain ourselves, in order that we may succor the weak or rescue humanity, to tie ourselves irrevocably to the bankrupt nations of the earth or to enter into a confederation for the protection of their boundaries and the preservation of their territories.

We have been told by the President that we must now by this league of nations make the supreme sacrifice and throw in our fortunes with the rest of the world. Why? The very query evokes from league enthusiasts immediate and angry retort, and, while they will not enlighten us, they hint darkly at our motives and deny even our good faith. Occasionally we hear that we have at last entered upon a world career, that we have become a part of world politics, and that we can not now either withdraw from the course into which the war drew us or desert the world which so needs us. In the language of a famous editor of the West, "All of this is partly true," but it by no means establishes that we must surrender our cherished position or our loved ideals by becoming a party to the sordid quarrels and the diplomatic duplicity of Europe and Asia. The United States will play her proud part in the world in the future as she has done in the past—a part prouder because based upon American principles and American ideals. It did not require secret treaties and stealthy bartering of unwilling peoples to make our Nation play her part in the war; it does not require the guaranty of secret treaties and bargaining and bartering of unwilling peoples to have the Nation play its world part after the war. Throwing in our fortune with the fortunes of the rest of the world means, with our altruistic brethren, throwing our fortunes to the rest of the world, that the rest of the world may do with our donation as it sees fit. Gladly will we do what duty commands and humanity and civilization may require, but that duty can be better done, our obligations to humanity and civilization better fulfilled, in the high position of the world's greatest democracy than in the subordinate position of the least consequential of a quintuple alliance, or as one of many bound irrevocably to the guaranty of the many's power and territories.

THE UNAMERICAN ARTICLE 10 OF THE COVENANT.

Organizations to prevent war are as old as civilization. I wish that every American would take the time to read the history of the many attempts which have been made, but one of which in reality reached a riper stage than mere negotiation. I will not, therefore, deal with the earlier attempts to prevent by unity of action future wars, but, because this present covenant bears such a sinister resemblance to the one definite project succeeding the Napoleonic world wars, I turn at once to the Quadruple and the Holy Alliance. The world in 1814–15 was quite as weary of war as the world to-day. There were then some altruistic and idealistic statesmen, possibly, just as, possibly, there are some to-day. And there were very, very many statesmen who saw alone the aggrandizement of their own nations, just as to-day there are very, very many such statesmen. It was May 30, 1814, that the treaty of Paris was signed and the boundaries of the various nations settled. It was then "the big four"—Russia, Prussia, Austria, and England—who remade the map of Europe, just as now it is another "big four" engaged in that task.

The original treaty of Paris was incomplete, so the congress of Vienna was called, where it was hoped that international authority might be established by which questions perilous to the world's peace could be decided. The time was quite as propitious as the present. On November 20, 1815, "the big four" completed their Quadruple Alliance. By article 6 of this alliance it was provided that in order "to consolidate the intimate relations which unite the four sovereigns for the world's happiness" it was necessary to hold periodic meetings either of monarchs or of ministers to concert measures "for the repose and prosperity of the peoples." The four great powers then were to constitute an international court for the settlement of all questions which threatened the existing order as fixed by the treaties concluded at Vienna and Paris. On September 28, 1815, Alexander I, the Czar of Russia, who was as prolific in idealistic speeches and nebulous altruistic generalities as some of our modern statesmen, proclaimed the Holy Alliance, and asked the other powers to join. Nearly every State in Europe became a member of this Holy Alliance. Great Britain indorsed it by a letter from the regent. The Holy Alliance agreed—

> To take for their sole guide the precepts of that holy religion, namely, the precepts of justice, Christian charity, and peace, as being the only means of consolidating human institutions and remedying their imperfections. The monarchs engage to regard themselves toward their subjects and armies as fathers of families, and to lead them in the same spirit of fraternity with which they are animated and protect general peace and justice.

The sole principle of force, it was agreed, should be that of doing each other reciprocal service. Indeed, the language of the Holy Alliance, and even of the proclamations and the speeches preceding it, are quite as ethereal and celestial as the language which has been applied to the league of nations. At Aix-la-Chapelle, November 15, 1818, the "big five"—France having now been admitted—agreed that—

> Neither in their mutual relations nor in those which bind them to their interests ever to depart from the principle of intimate union which has hitherto presided over all their common relations and interest—a union rendered more strong and indissoluble by the bond of Christian fraternity which the sovereigns have formed among themselves. And that this union, which is the more real and durable, inasmuch as it depends on no separate interest or temporary combination, can only have for its object the maintenance of general peace founded on a religious respect for engagements contained in the treaties and for the whole of the rights resulting therefrom.

The protocol provided as well for particular meetings of the sovereigns themselves, or their ministers or plenipotentiaries, to treat of their own interests and the interests of other States of Europe. Observe now our league of nations. Its preamble is—

> In order to promote international cooperation and to achieve international peace and security by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war—

And so forth—

> and by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealing of organized peoples with one another.

A preamble of like character with that of the Quadruple Alliance, not as lofty in purpose or of such broad Christianity as the Holy Alliance, but with the same underlying principle in reference to existing treaties.

There was no such provision in any of the engagements of the European countries in the Quadruple or Holy Alliance, or in the subsequent congresses, at Troppau, 1820; Laibach, 1821; or Verona, 1822, as that specifically set forth in article 10 of the present covenant. And, inasmuch as article 10 is perhaps the most astonishing thing ever attempted to be fastened upon a world, and certainly the most outrageous ever attempted upon America, I quote it:

ART. 10. Territorial integrity: The members of the league undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league. In case of any such aggression, or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

A century ago we had the Quadruple Alliance, and subsequently one made with France in addition, for the maintenance of existing treaties and the preservation of the peace of the world. To-day we have a league composed substantially of five nations pledged to the maintenance of existing treaties, and in addition pledged to the preservation as against external aggression of the territorial integrity and existing political independence of its members. The league of nations comes to us after its principal members have been gorged with territory, with their boundaries and their limits increased beyond the wildest dreams, and with other immense tracts of the world's surface yet to be distributed among them. After these extraordinary accessions of territory, when each of the four nations possesses lands far greater than ever before, the one going solvent national concern on earth undertakes by article 10 to guarantee forever these extraordinary territorial limits. It is answered by the advocates of the league that we guarantee these boundaries only against external aggression. But this was the very question that arose in the Quadruple Alliance a century ago. Castlereagh, England's representative, then recognized the possibilities of the future, and as the historian, Philips, remarks—

It was but a short step from interfering with the external relations of a State to interfering with those of its internal relations which might be supposed to exercise an external effect; and from the first the British Government had realized the danger to national liberties involved in any such claim.

Great Britain's attitude then was justified by subsequent events. It seems unspeakable that America, with the story before it of what was undertaken a century ago, under a provision merely guaranteeing treaties, should now enter into engagements by which she puts her mighty power in the hands of foreign diplomats whose spirit has not changed by the passing of a century for the maintenance for all time of their territories. It is obvious why the British statesmanship just subsequent to the Napoleonic wars and the British statesmanship of to-day are quite at variance. To-day, with the tremendous accessions of lands by England, she can very well insist upon the guaranty of boundaries.

A hundred years ago the guaranty rested most onerously upon England, the guaranty not alone to preserve boundaries fixed by treaties, but what was read into the particular provision then—to destroy internal revolution which might have an external effect. To-day the guaranty, infinitely stronger than in the treaties succeeding the Napoleonic wars, rests upon the United States, and that guaranty once given by our Nation must in the good faith upon which we pride ourselves be carried out to the limit. Now, what happened in the guaranty of preservation of existing treaties made just after the Napoleonic wars, the sort of guaranty immeasurably strengthened to which we bind ourselves? Metternich feared revolution just as the four bankrupt nations with which we have allied ourselves fear it, and he evolved from the engagement of the Allies to respect existing treaties his famous doctrine of intervention. England saw herself thus trapped, and the possibility of having her soldiers sent into every country in Europe, and perhaps abroad, to quell internal disturbances, and would not ultimately subscribe to the doctrine enunciated and agreed to by other nations. That doctrine, which became the law of the alliance, was that internal revolution might constitute or result in external injury or aggression, and therefore was not only within the jurisdiction of the alliance but that, under its terms, it became the bounden duty of the members to quell every internal disturbance and destroy every possible revolution. Under Metternich's leadership, the Congress of Troppau was held. England and France declined to engage in Metternich's enterprises. Revolution had broken out in south Italy. The people were striving for freedom. They forced their king to proclaim a constitution and asked a liberal government. Under the terms of the Quadruple Alliance for the protection of treaties an Austrian expedition invaded Naples, defeated the people, and put back upon the throne with absolute power the recalcitrant sovereign Ferdinand. In Piedmont in 1821 the story was repeated, and revolution was ended in Italy and freedom for the moment died. In 1822 Ferdinand VII of Spain, the most worthless of rulers, was expelled by his people, who adopted a constitution and endeavored to have a government founded upon liberty. The great powers under the formula and definition of Metternich sent a hundred thousand French troops into Spain, who whipped the ill-disciplined people and restored the dissolute monarch. And all this was done under a clause not a tithe as strong as that under which we are asked to bind ourselves in the league of nations.

After the powers had restored absolutism in Spain and again set up worthless Ferdinand upon the throne, they deemed it advisable to restore to Spain her American colonies, which had successfully revolted. England protested strongly against this course, but under the league of nations, as it then existed to preserve existing treaties, the great powers made ready to give back to Spain by force of arms the American colonies of Spain, which had revolted and become free. And then they were stopped, and stopped forever by an American message, the Monroe doctrine. It was America, an American President, who ended for all time the infamous Metternich doctrine, which had grown out of the nineteenth century league of nations designed to "promote peace and prevent war," and to guarantee existing treaties. Now, to-day this American doctrine having played its important rôle is delivered into the custody of the same sinister spirit which it exorcised from the world a century ago.

In the construction of article 10 it will require neither astute lawyer nor cunning diplomat to apply external aggression to any form of internal revolution, which it was feared might be communicated to neighboring States. It was exactly upon this theory that internal revolution was held by Metternich and his associates to be within the jurisdiction of the Quadruple Alliance of a century ago under its obligation to preserve treaties. At the conference of Troppeau, in 1820, the assembled powers solemnly declared:

The powers have exercised an incontestable right in commonly concerting measures of safety against the States in which an overturn of the government effected by revolt can only be considered as a dangerous example which must have for a result an attitude hostile against all constitutions and legitimate governments. The exercise of this right of necessity becomes still more urgent when those in that situation sought to communicate to neighboring States the evil in which they themselves were plunged and to propagate revolt and confusion among them. There is in this attitude and this conduct an evident rupture of the pact which guarantees to all the governments of Europe besides the inviolability of their territory the enjoyment of peaceful relations which exclude all reciprocal encroachment on their rights.

How often of late have we heard language conveying the same thought from those who are advocating the league of nations. If any people with a perfect case for freedom should rebel, the advocates of the league of nations would enthusiastically rush in, because this is exactly the design of the league of nations. To-morrow it may be Ireland, aided in small part from the outside, demanding that of which we have made a mockery—self-determination. Under our guaranty we must prevent it. And parenthetically, Mr. President, I may remark that Ireland, it seems to me, is in the position of a litigant with a perfect case who can get no hearing. In a year hence stricken and cruelly despoiled Korea, or possibly even passive, humble, robbed, and weak China. And, whether it would be the one or the other subject peoples rebelling, the purpose of the league of nations, under article 10, is to use the great wealth, power, and blood of the great democracy of the earth to retain revolting peoples, without regard to the righteousness of their cause, within the governments and the powers from which they would be free. I wish that there were time to insert in full the various pronunciamentos of the allies in the last century, when, under the pretense of preserving peace with the sword, they destroyed freedom. If their various proclamations were recited to-day, and no indication given of the time of their issuance and the specific matters to which they relate, they would readily be ascribed to modern utterances of the advocates of the league of nations, and would be taken as a part of the discussions at Paris. At Laibach, in 1821, the proclamation of the allied monarchs said of themselves:

In the future, as in the past, they will always have the purpose of preserving the independence and rights of each State as they are recognized and defined by existing treaties.

It was under this clause that the incipient revolutions in Italy against discredited and disreputable monarchs, all internal and domestic in character, were cruelly destroyed by the force of the great powers.

In the light of historical precedent and with the solemn determination faithfully to observe every international obligation we may assume, read and analyze this remarkable document. It goes far beyond that which the world, with the exception of one power, in the last century construed as requiring the guar-

antee of nations to preserve inviolate against any attack, external or internal, territorial limits and existing governments. In its preamble the league of nations provides:

The high contracting parties, in order to promote international cooperation, to achieve international peace and security * * * by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organized peoples with one another, agree to this covenant.

And then, in article 10, the members of the league for themselves "undertake to respect," and, far beyond undertaking to respect, they agree to "preserve," as against external aggression, the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league. And if this were not enough to involve us in any dispute or controversy, external or internal, which might affect the territorial integrity and existing political independence of members of the league, article 10 takes cognizance not only of any such external aggression but specifically takes cognizance, too, of any threat or danger of such aggression. It does not need precedent or the construction put upon the maintenance of existing treaties by the quadruple alliance to enable us to understand that "danger" of such aggression may be any kind of revolution, rebellion, internal or external controversy, or difficulty of any character. It is unthinkable that any American wrote article 10. It is unthinkable that any American can subscribe to article 10. Those who penned this provision knew exactly what they meant and exactly what they intended. With scrupulous care the provision was designed to preserve for all time existing governments and the territorial integrity of existing governments. How best could this guaranty, in the light of world events and in the kaleidoscopic changes of the past few years, be accomplished? The shrewd nationalist of Europe or the able diplomat of the Orient, taking unto his country the immense new territories acquired by the peace, at once would realize that the only substantial guaranty in the world of the stability of his country and of the preservation of its enormous gains in territory and people, would be the great, free, giant democracy, the United States. And this league of nations is written around the one central idea that the great democracy of the United States shall guarantee, maintain, and preserve the British Empire's boundaries, with its seething millions of discontented peoples; the increased territories of France; the vastly extended boundaries of Italy, throbbing with revolution; and the rape of China by Japan.

American fathers and American mothers want peace, and they want a league of nations which will give them peace. Ask any American mother in Kansas or Illinois or California if she is for peace. She will say "Yes" with all her heart. Ask her if she is willing that her son and her grandsons shall go to the Balkans, to China, to Korea, to Siberia, to Arabia, to the Dalmatian coast, to Poland to compel peace. She will answer just as promptly "No."

This league of nations, with the men who really wrote it, was meant to obtain peace only in so far as peace maintained forever inviolate their territories and their subject peoples; and it was meant that this kind of peace should be obtained by the exercise of the power and the force of the United States.

How can any man of liberal views agree to article 10? When I speak of men of liberal views I mean those whose hearts throb in unison with humanity; those who believe government's obligation is first to men and women and children. The section freezes the world into immutability. It arrogates to those of us who are here to-day a knowledge superior to that of all those who shall come hereafter. It makes the present generation decide the fate of all future generations. It takes no heed of new world events, of ever-changing advances and progress. It assumes to-day to be the end, and that the men of to-day may write the history of to-morrow. It assumes to put the world in a strait-jacket, wherein there can be no movement for betterment or progress or humanity. But beyond and above all this, the maintenance of the static condition can be accomplished by the blood of just one nation, and that is ours. Are ye ready, Americans, to pledge your sons and your sons' sons to maintain and preserve for all time the present governments of the little nations we are setting up in Europe and the present governments and boundaries of the British and the Japanese Empires?

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

When the President returned from Europe with the original draft of the league of nations, a study of the draft disclosed that the Monroe doctrine had been deliberately scrapped. A very ominous statement was first made by the President that the covenant would not be amended, and all of those who cheerfully had accepted the covenant before ever they had seen it united in a universal cry that amendment was unnecessary. They all agreed, of course, that the Monroe doctrine was not mentioned, but they said it was unnecessary to mention the Monroe doctrine, because the covenant extended the doctrine to the world, as well as to the American Hemisphere. The fact is they gave little heed to the Monroe doctrine and cared less about it. The country, however, soon gave unmistakable evidence that it was unwilling to abandon this traditional policy of the Republic. At first the endeavor was made to soothe the people with bland, urbane, and specious arguments about the extension of the Monroe doctrine to the world, but this was so obviously specious and so plainly in violation of the very essence of the doctrine that the explanation failed to satisfy. The Monroe doctrine being peculiarly a doctrine of our own, designed and adapted for our self-defense and preservation, could not in the very nature of things be applicable to the world, and a league of nations which took it from its proper sphere of necessity destroyed it. The advocates of the league of nations knowing this fact, and being unable to convince our people that a world-wide application, without mention of the doctrine or reservation concerning it, preserved it, finally concluded to amend the covenant in some sort of fashion to overcome the widespread American objection. And what an amendment was presented:

ART. 21. Nothing in this covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe doctrine for securing the maintenance of peace.

If an American, with the purpose in view of protecting the Monroe doctrine, wrote this article, his affection for it was tepid, and his allegiance feeble. If the purpose of the man who wrote this so-called protection of the Monroe doctrine was to place that doctrine specifically within the jurisdiction of the league of nations, he succeeded admirably. The amendment, in fact, is "a fraud, a delusion, and a snare." It does not protect the Monroe doctrine. It could not have been written with any other purpose than the destruction of the Monroe doctrine. It is silly to contend that men who wanted to protect the Monroe doctrine and preserve it could not have said so in simple language. It was unnecessary to describe it, as it is not a "treaty of arbitration" or a "regional understanding." It was a misnomer, as any American knows, and it is neither of these things "for securing the maintenance of peace." The amendment was written either by an American who had no sympathy with the Monroe doctrine or by some one, not American, who was perfectly competent to write ambiguous phrases which will place the Monroe doctrine for all time under the league of nations.

What is meant by the language, "Nothing in this covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of regional understandings like the Monroe doctrine for securing the maintenance of peace"? The language certainly does not mean what the Nation demanded—that the Monroe doctrine should be excepted from the league of nations, should be preserved by the United States for America, and that it should be administered by the United States and the United States alone. The amendment simply says "The validity of regional understandings for securing the maintenance of peace" shall not be affected. In other words, if the Monroe doctrine is to be administered, it will be within the jurisdiction of the league of nations to administer it. The amendment of the Monroe doctrine is like nearly everything that has come to us concerning the league of nations. It is pretended that it does one thing when it is intended it shall do another. It is not frank, nor fair, nor open, nor honest. Where plain language might express, without equivocation or ambiguity or evasion, the plain language is not employed. If there had been a real desire upon the part of the peace conference or the American delegates there to safeguard the Monroe doctrine and to remove it from the league of nations, leaving it for administration by the United States alone, this would have been done. But, instead of doing this, ambiguous and inaccurate phraseology is employed, the very purpose of which, apparently, is to deliver finally this great American policy into the power of European nations. When the amendment was announced at Paris, the semiofficial announcement of the covenant stated:

Concerning the Monroe doctrine, article 21 makes it clear that the covenant is not intended to abrogate or weaken any other agreements so long as they are consistent with its own terms for the assurance of peace. And in so far as the Monroe doctrine tends to the same end, whatever validity it possesses can not be affected by the covenant.

It is obvious that the amendment, therefore, was intended to subject the doctrine to the interpretation of other powers, and the instant this is done the doctrine is destroyed. The amendment is not an amendment safeguarding the Monroe doctrine, but is an attempted amendment to the doctrine itself.

The construction of the Monroe doctrine amendment by the British has been given in the commentaries issued to their people by the British delegates. Unfortunately, the commentary of our only American delegate when he presented the amended covenant was, "Article 21 is new." In this, as in all matters affecting the vital interests of the Republic, Americans must content themselves with the absolute secrecy of their representative and his refusal to enlighten them. The British, perhaps feeling a sense of some responsibility to their people, have in a series of commentaries endeavored to expound the various provisions of the league. Their interpretation of the Monroe doctrine amendment is thus stated:

Article 21 makes it clear that the covenant is not intended to abrogate or weaken any other agreements, so long as they are consistent with its own terms into which members of the league may have entered or may hereafter enter for the assurance of peace. Such agreements would include special treaties for compulsory arbitration and military conventions that are genuinely defensive.

The Monroe doctrine and similar understandings are put in the same category. They have shown themselves in history to be not instruments of national ambition but guaranties of peace. The origin of the Monroe doctrine is well known. It was proclaimed in 1823 to prevent America from becoming a theater for intrigues of European absolutism. At first a principle of American foreign policy, it has become an international understanding, and it is not illegitimate for the people of the United States to say that the covenant should recognize that fact.

In its essence it is consistent with the spirit of the covenant; and, indeed, the principles of the league, as expressed in article 10, represent the extension to the whole world of the principles of the doctrine; while should any dispute as to the meaning of the latter ever arise between the American and European powers, the league is there to settle it.

This declaration of the British is pregnant with meaning. It holds the treaties now existing, such as that between Japan and England, substantially an offensive and defensive alliance, and any which may hereafter be entered into, will continue in full force and effect, notwithstanding the league of nations; and, what is no less important, that should any dispute arise concerning the Monroe doctrine, the league will settle that dispute. To Americans it has repeatedly been declared by league advocates that the amendment fully protected the Monroe doctrine and left the determination of its applicability and its administration to the United States. To the British public it is solemnly and officially announced that the amendment does no such thing, but brings the Monroe doctrine in case of dispute to the league of nations, where it will be submitted to the tender mercies of England, Japan, France, and Italy. Of course, the Monroe doctrine will never be mentioned unless a "dispute" should arise between the United States and foreign powers. To say that then, the only time when we need it, it must be submitted to foreign powers for decision and determination, is to deny the essence of the doctrine and remove it from the very sphere from which it derives its vitality—America.

The British interpretation of this amendment is given added importance and controlling force by the voting strength of the various members of the league. The United States, the richest and most powerful Nation on earth, has one vote. Great Britain has six. Not only has Britain written the league, safeguarded her augmented territories for all time, and with true British farsightedness commandeered our wealth and men for her protection and preservation, but she has in the same spirit given herself a preponderance of voting power to guard against any future contingency. In this league, heralded by its sponsors as a triumph of American idealism, England has the following votes: 1, the British Empire; 2, Canada; 3, Australia; 4, South Africa; 5, New Zealand; 6, India. The moderation of the English statesman in not taking more votes—for, apparently, they could have added, as they chose, votes for any part of the Empire, great or small—ought to be fully appreciated by our people. England had but to ask and the request was granted; Japan but to demand, and we hastened to assent. And so, with England six votes, the United States one, we may be perfectly certain that the English interpretation of the amendment relating to the Monroe doctrine will receive careful and courteous consideration.

QUESTIONS LIKE IMMIGRATION.

Of late the advocates of the league have been advancing some curious reasons for our acceptance of it. Many of them now suggest that the league is so fragile, so weak, of so little compelling force that "it will do no harm" to accept it, and then we can look for improvement in the future. But if there are within it the germs which will ripen into evils, it ought not to be accepted upon any such theory. And this document has within it not only the germs of world evil, but, what is infinitely worse possibly, the germs of our own destruction. The great fundamental question which every American father and mother should answer is: Shall American boys police the world? Shall American blood uphold, maintain, and preserve Old World governments and the territorial integrity of the nations which have immensely increased their boundaries? Once we adopt this league we are bound indefinitely to send American troops into Europe, Asia, and Africa, to sacrifice American blood in quarrels which never have concerned us and never can concern us, and to do all this at the behest and command of foreign nations. It is no answer to say that we may refuse, because no honest man will enter into an agreement with the mental reservation that he will break it, and no decent nation will solemnly sign a guarantee upon the assumption it will violate its plighted word. I iterate and reiterate we pledge ourselves by this document to place our sons and our sons' sons under European or Asiatic command in European and Asiatic disputes, controversies, and wars. The advocate of the league of nations who denies this is either woefully ignorant or, what is worse, endeavors to deceive his people.

Another common expression at present is, "Half a loaf is better than none." But half a loaf poisoned is worse than none at all, and this half loaf, as some of its protagonists describe it that has been given us, is poisoned in its very creation by wrong, injustice, duplicity, and broken faith. It was neither fair nor just nor humane, when the world wanted peace, to delay that peace until the territorial acquisitions, like those of Japan, should be for all time guaranteed. When the peoples of every country, staggering under the terrible effects of war, were longing and praying for its end by the treaty, were begging and pleading that they might resume as best they could their normal lives, it was the worst sort of duplicity to intertwine and intermingle with the treaty of peace a document for the maintenance of existing governments and newly acquired boundaries. Some day some one must answer to the soldiers who have been kept abroad, to those who will be sent abroad, to the mothers and the fathers at home, for seven months of intermeddling that an English document guaranteeing the British and Japanese Empires and the Kingdom of Italy might be fastened upon the American people.

The sordid bargaining, selfish interest, and secret diplomacy which produced the league of nations is best illustrated in the decision of the peace conference relating to China and Japan. At one time during the deliberations the President issued a statement concerning Italy's demands, in substance denouncing secret treaties. During all these wretched months of secret intrigue it was the one clear note which struck a responsive chord with many of us. Some of us immediately indorsed his stand on secret treaties, assuming, of course, that when he took that stand in the doubtful case of Italy he would take it in the clear and unambiguous case of Japan. But, hardly had his words ceased to ring in denunciation of secret treaties when he accepted, without demur or objection, the worst of all the secret treaties presented, that between England, France, and Italy on the one hand and Japan upon the other.

We were not a party to the secret treaties, it is true, when they were made, but in the settlement of the peace we have become a party to them. Of our own choice, after the war is over, we join in the crime against China. It is concerning the secret treaties in their relation to the league that I speak. In disposing of Chinese territory we were dealing not with an enemy but with an ally. We were despoiling not Germany, our enemy, but China, our friend. And we who know something of the oriental character can understand the fate of China and how Japan bided her time at the peace conference until the exact moment for success came, and then demanded and successfully demanded. Just as Japan did with her secret treaties and China, just so will she do with her secret treaties and what she calls race discrimination. When the time seems to her propitious—and it will not be long—she will bring to the league of nations our yet unsettled dispute over our alien land law and her pending controversy respecting immigration and her assertion of race discrimination by us. And when this is done the league will take charge of these momentous questions and will decide them.

Glance for an instant at the jurisdiction of the league.

The preamble recites its purpose:

To promote international cooperation and to secure international peace and security by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war, by the prescription of open, just, and honorable relations between nations, by the firm establishment of the understandings of international law as the actual rule of conduct among governments, and by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organized people with one another.

The council of the league may deal—

with any matter within the sphere of action of the league or affecting the peace of the world. (Art. 4.)

The assembly may deal—

With any matter within the sphere of action of the league or affecting the peace of the world. (Art. 3.)

Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the members of the league or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole league, and the league shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations. (Art. 11.)

It is also declared to be the fundamental right of each member of the league to bring to the attention of the assembly or of the council any circumstance whatever affecting international relations which threatens to disturb either the peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends. (Art. 11.)

The members of the league agree that if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture they will submit the matter either to arbitration or to inquiry by the council. (Art. 12.)

If there should arise between members of the league any dispute likely to lead to a rupture which is not submitted to arbitration as above the members of the league agree that they will submit the matter to the council. (Art. 15.)

From the quotations made it is, of course, obvious that any question likely to lead to a rupture is a matter clearly within the jurisdiction of the league and may be passed upon by it. With the Japanese question as it affects the Pacific coast I am reasonably familiar. I recall in 1913, while I was governor of California, the law pending before our legislature for the protection of our agricultural lands. I remember vividly when we were doing that which was clearly our right to do, the matter became of such international importance that the President sent to California the Secretary of State, who, there for a week endeavored to convince our legislature that it should not pass its alien land law. This law scrupulously observed existing treaties, was not discriminatory in character, and was designed solely as a measure of protection for the fairest lands in all this Nation, and the law was designed to do for California what Japanese law was already doing for Japan. My correspondence upon the subject was illuminating, not only upon the position which then was taken by the administration, but that which was assumed by the Japanese. It is sufficient for me to say that the controversy soon became of more than local importance and assumed international proportions. If the league of nations had been in existence then the question would have been taken from the people of the State of California, who alone were entitled to deal with it, and would have been decided not by those whose right it was to decide and who were most interested, but by foreign nations. Of course, under the provisions of the league which I have cited, any such problem as our alien land law would at once become a subject for the league's determination, and any such question as immigration would likewise be within the league's jurisdiction. It is asserted, however, that the following amendment to article 15 of the league—

If the dispute between the parties is claimed by one of them and is found by the council to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the council shall so report and shall make no recommendation as to its settlement—

would make it impossible for the league to act upon immigration and kindred problems. I deny that this is so. It has never been determined by international law that immigration problems are solely within the jurisdiction of one party, nor has international law ever definitely decided that what the Japanese term as "race discrimination" is solely a problem of domestic jurisdiction. On the one hand, it is asserted by the Japanese that alien land laws, restriction of immigration, and the like, are discriminatory in character, and hence international. On our part, we might assert the reverse. In any event, the matter would come before the council for decision, and we are thus in the position of submitting to the council or the league problems of the gravest moment to us.

Remember that there is in existence an offensive and defensive alliance between Japan and Great Britain, and that when the question of Shantung recently was up Britain very frankly said this treaty alliance still existed. As a Californian, I am not ready to submit any race problems we may have to the jurisdiction of the council of the league of nations or to the league itself.

I am unwilling that either body should pass upon possibly the gravest question that confronts us. I will not leave to foreign powers whether it is a domestic or an international problem. That is for us, and for us alone, to decide. You gentlemen from the South would resent the suggestion that a race problem of yours should be decided by nations bound to the race affected by secret treaties. You ought to be in full sympathy with me when I decline, so far as I am able, to submit to a determination of any sort, jurisdictional or otherwise, by foreign nations joined together by secret treaties, the great problem which confronts us.

Moreover, the peculiar phraseology employed leaves doubtful the intention of the particular reservation. The dispute must be found to arise "out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction" of one of the parties. No domestic question has ever been determined by international law. If the matter is one purely domestic, international law does not and could not deal with it at all. The language employed in the asserted exception of domestic questions is like the language employed in so many instances in the covenant, loose, inapt, and apparently intentionally uncertain and ambiguous. And yet, if it be claimed that this particular amendment excludes the consideration of purely domestic questions, what will be said of the very next sentence in article 15? Immediately after the amendment occurs:

The council may in any case under this article refer the dispute to the assembly. The dispute shall be so referred at the request of either party to the dispute provided such request be made within 14 days after the submission of the dispute to the council.

Thus, even though you assert an exception of domestic questions is embraced in article 15, yet, nevertheless, the council may refer the very excepted case to the assembly, and it is the right of either party to require such reference to the assembly. When you recall that the assembly at Paris voted 11 for the Japanese position and 6 against, our California land law and immigration question would, upon reference to the league assembly, receive short shrift.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from California asked not to be interrupted, but I am going to ask if he can give the names of the nations as they cast their votes. He gave the numbers merely. I desire to know if he knows how the respective nations voted?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No; I am unable to answer that.

Mr. REED. I have been hunting that information, but have been unable to find it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I can not state it. I have only the numerical results.

But for another reason it is absolutely clear that questions like immigration, those arising from the alien land law of California and similar matters, will be within the jurisdiction of the league and will be determinable under the very language of the covenant. We have observed that any war or "threat of war" is a matter of concern to the league, and that if there should arise between members of the league any dispute likely to lead to a rupture the league will take cognizance of the dispute and jurisdiction of the matter. A question of immigration might in the first instance, where a single individual or a number sought admission to the nation, be held as purely a domestic concern; but if the country offended presented to the league that this question, originally of domestic concern, threatened peace and constituted "a dispute likely to lead to a rupture," the very purposes for which the league is formed, according to its advocates, would of necessity require the "threat of war" or the "dispute likely to lead to a rupture" to be brought before the league and there determined. The important question then becomes whether or not the matter constitutes a "threat of war" or "a dispute likely to lead to a rupture," and to say that the league, because the initial argument arose over a domestic question, would not take jurisdiction and cognizance of the impending threat of war and the possibility of rupture of friendly relations of nations would be to deny to the league exactly what its advocates contend it possesses and to take from it any possibility of prevention of war. When a domestic question ripens into a threat of war it comes within the league. Any question, domestic or otherwise, under the covenant which threatens war or constitutes a dispute likely to lead to a rupture, of necessity, if the league is to have the slightest vitality, must come within the league and be decided by it. It seems, therefore, first, that under the amendment domestic questions are not excepted; and, secondly, that any question, domestic or otherwise, which disturbs the peace or is likely to lead to a rupture between friendly nations shall be decided by the league. Californians, therefore, if they are interested in Japanese immigration, if they believe in the California alien land law; Americans, if they are jealous of their right to determine who shall come to our shores and under what circumstances, and who insist Americans must alone decide their domestic problems dealing with other nationals, can not support the present league of nations.

WE COMMIT A WRONG BY THE PEACE TREATY, AS IN THE CASE OF CHINA, AND THEN, BY THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS, UNDERWRITE THE WRONG FOR ALL TIME.

Within the limits of argument here I can show only briefly that the league of nations, a part of the peace conference, is tainted and poisoned at its source with exactly the same duplicity and wrong which have ever characterized Old World diplomacy. Open covenants openly arrived at are now a byword and a joke. Their mention brings but a cynical smile. Utterances of the President concerning self-determination, the protection of the weak from the strong, against special covenants, understandings, or alliances were no less fervid than his statements regarding open covenants. I do not quote them humorously, I beg you to believe. I quote them in all seriousness, and then you may take them and set them side by side with what has transpired at Paris. They are too tragic, in my opinion, to be at all humorous.

June 8, 1918, the President said:

It will be our wish and purpose that the processes of peace, when they are begun, shall be absolutely open, and that they shall involve and permit henceforth no secret understandings of any kind. The day of conquest and aggrandizement is gone by; so is also the day of secret covenants entered into in the interest of particular governments and likely at some unlooked-for moment to upset the peace of the world.

May 26, 1917, he cabled Russia:

No people must be forced under sovereignty under which it does not wish to live. No territory must change hands except for the purpose of securing those who inhabit it a fair chance of life and liberty. No indemnities must be insisted on except those that constitute payments for manifest wrongs done. No readjustments of power must be made except such as will tend to secure the future peace of the world and the future welfare and happiness of its peoples.

September 27, 1918, this:

Special alliances and economic rivalries and hostilities have been the prolific source in the modern world of the plans and passions that produce war. It would be an insincere as well as an insecure peace that did not exclude them in definite and binding terms.

The second of his four factors of world peace, July 4, 1918, was:

II. The settlement of every question, whether of territory, of sovereignty, of economic arrangement, or of political relationship, upon the basis of the free acceptance of that settlement by the people immediately concerned, and not upon the basis of the material interest or advantage of any other nation or people which may desire a different settlement for the sake of its own exterior influence or mastery.

September 27, 1918:

Second, no special or separate interest of any single nation or any group of nations can be made the basis of any part of the settlement which is not consistent with the common interest of all.

Third, there can be no league or alliances or special covenants and understandings within the general and common family of the league of nations.

Instances of like utterances might be multiplied. I add just one more, of February 11, 1918:

Peoples are not to be handed about from one sovereignty to another by international conference or an understanding between rivals and antagonists. National aspirations must be respected; peoples may now be dominated and governed only by their own consent. Self-determination is not a mere phrase. It is an imperative principle of action, which statesmen will henceforth ignore at their peril. We can not have general peace for the asking or by the mere arrangement of a peace conference. It can not be pieced together out of the individual understandings of the powerful States.

Read these utterances in the light of the Shantung decision. Time permits me to discuss but one instance, perhaps the most glaring.

To the Japanese Empire, with only 60,000,000 of people, we turned over shamefully and unjustly and cruelly 40,000,000 of Chinese. To the autocracy of the Orient we delivered 40,000,000 republicans of China. We made the Orient "safe for democracy" by dismembering its only democracy and handing the parts to the strongest autocracy on earth. The blackest page in all our history was written when our name was signed to the treaty delivering Shantung to Japan. It makes a mockery of our pretensions, and if the Senate permits it to stand it stamps us forever with its infamy. The delivery of China's fairest province unto Japan with its 40,000,000 people violated not only every word that had been spoken by us concerning the peace but it violated every principle of fairness, justice, and honor. Its justification by the thick and thin administration papers—and I presume as well by those very good people who advocate this league without knowing anything about it—is that the league of nations may ultimately right the wrong. But remember that with Shantung given to Japan, its people transferred to the Japanese Empire, under the league of nations, we—we, mind you, the 96 men sitting in the Senate—guarantee for all time by this league of nations, if we adopt it, Japan's territorial integrity and political independence. We have not only committed the crime, in the first instance, but we have guaranteed the crime for all time. We give by the peace treaty Shantung to Japan and by the league of nations, part of the same document, we guarantee Shantung to Japan, and guarantee it with our treasure and our blood.

We first rob China and enslave 40,000,000; and at the very time of the wrong we underwrite the robbery and guarantee by our arms and money it shall never be righted. This is the league of nations.

There is another experience that recently we have had with the peace conference.

In April dispatches came to this country that some sort of secret engagement had been entered into by the President with France and England. The story was repeatedly published. April 25 this statement was given out by Mr. Tumulty, the President's secretary, at the White House:

In view of the fact that certain newspapers of wide circulation throughout the country had intimated that the President had entered into secret alliance or treaty with some of the great powers, I conveyed this information to the President and am to-day in receipt of a cablegram from him giving a positive and unqualified denial to this story.

Within a very few days thereafter the French Government officially published that there had been an agreement between France and England and the United States for the protection of France. After this official publication by the French Government, and notwithstanding the original denial, the following telegram from the President was published by Secretary Tumulty on May 10:

Happily there is no mystery or privacy about what I have promised the Government here—

The President cabled—

I have promised to propose to the Senate a supplement in which we shall agree, subject to the approval of the council of the league of nations, to come immediately to the assistance of France in case of unprovoked attack by Germany, thus merely hastening the action to which we should be bound by the covenant of the league of nations.

"Happily there is neither mystery nor privacy" about the document, except in the United States of America. Nobody here has seen it. Nobody knows what it contains. It is impossible to comment upon it, and it is a singular fact that an engagement of this sort has been entered into by the United States, apparently the first of its kind in our history. When you remember that England frankly says her treaties are yet in existence, her offensive and defensive alliance with Japan yet controlling, and then you observe the United States of America making some sort of engagement, the knowledge of which for the present we are denied, you may have, unless you willfully blind yourselves, some conception of what the league of nations is intended to do.

Do you realize the full meaning of the alliance with France? In his explanation the President has given us his first and only construction of the league. He says that an alliance now to come immediately to the assistance of France in case of unprovoked attack by Germany is "merely hastening the action to which we should be bound by the covenant of the league of nations." By the league of nations, then, as understood by the President, the armed force of the United States must protect France in case of attack. By the league of nations, then, the armed force of the United States must protect any country a member of the league when attacked. If under the covenant we are thus committed to France, we are in like manner committed by it to Jugo-Slavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Italy, Japan, England, and the Hedjaz of Arabia. The President by his one utterance in explanation of the covenant has made clear what the document itself plainly says, but what its advocates have occasionally denied, that under article 10 the United States is bound to send its troops and employ its power and treasure at the behest of every nation on earth. This is the definite obligation we assume; this is the so-called league of nations.

It is not a league of nations to prevent war. It is a league of armed nations in a gigantic war trust. In its very creation it has been stripped of every idealistic purpose it ever had. It contains within itself the germs of many wars, and worse than that it rivets, as in the Shantung decision, the chains of tyranny upon millions of people and cements for all time unjust and wicked annexations. It is a great world economic trust, wherein a few men sitting in secret may control the economic destinies of peoples. It is not a league of peoples, nor does it anywhere concern itself with peoples whose past wrongs and future rights were so eloquently portrayed by the President. It is a trust of existing present power. It will never prevent war; it will sanctify power in a new, a terrible, and sinister sense.

If the professions which have been uttered respecting peoples were sincere, if self-determination were honestly intended, if war were sought to be prevented rather than territorial gains safeguarded, this covenant would at some point have touched and recognized peoples. Instead of coming closer to those most concerned, the men and women for whom governments should exist, the league goes a step further from them. The representatives of ruling powers sit far away in secret. Not even is the Congress a part, nor does it have the right of knowledge or any check except that which our fundamental law may interpose—a frail and uncertain barrier in these days of Constitution scoffers. The President will appoint as America's member at the league his personal representative, when he himself does not attend. The attitude of the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber is that he may do with us as he wills, and presumably his representative may do likewise, and a gentle inquiry as to what is intended for our people is treated as treasonable, but above all as partisan. There is control neither by Congress nor the people. Geneva in secret will render its decrees and the only province of our people will be their execution. There is to be a plebiscite or referendum in Schleswig, the Saar Valley, and other places in due time. If those who wrote this document really wanted to prevent war, they would have permitted the men and women who must bear the burdens of war to determine by their votes whether or not there should

be war. Of course, unless all the nations of the world agreed, this could not be done. It would manifestly be unjust for one nation to be compelled to resort to a referendum as to war while its antagonist, without a vote, proceeded to aggression. But here in a league are, or ultimately will be, all the nations of the earth. If every nation agreed to a referendum to its people before a declaration of war, peoples instead of rulers, humanity instead of power, would decide whether wars should be fought, and only in the rarest instances would there ever be war, and then only in the clearest cases. Such wars would be people's wars. Upon what theory do the gentlemen at Paris prate of self-determination, the rights of peoples, recognize the referendum in matters of intimate concern to peoples in small and isolated communities and deny the right when the decision means the very life of human beings? The answer is this is not a league to promote peace, but to protect power. Those who advocate it dare not amend it so that the issue of war shall be made by the men and women who must fight and die for it.

In a word, Mr. President, this league means that American boys shall police the world; that all the tottering nations of the earth shall be upheld by our blood and our bone; that Europe, Asia, and Africa may draw upon us in their every dispute and quarrel; that our Nation will be at the mercy of European and Japanese diplomats who never had and never will have any sympathy with our aspirations or our ideals; that we with our glorious past shall guarantee the territorial integrity of every country on earth and the bondage of every suffering people in anguish begging for freedom; that we destroy our Monroe doctrine and submit controversies on the American Hemisphere to determination by foreign powers. It means that I must abandon the lessons of my youth, which until this moment have been the creed of my manhood, of American ideals, American principles, and American patriotism; that I must deny the Americanism I taught my children, and that under God's blessing I hope to teach my grandchildren. It means the halting and betrayal of New World liberalism, the triumph of cynical Old World diplomacy, the humiliation and end of American idealism.

Certain partisan gentlemen, Mr. President, have of late been making the issue partisanly. For one, I make the issue with them. It is not one political party or the other. The issue is the Republic, the Republic that Washington gave us, that Lincoln saved for us, whose traditions and ideals have been so gloriously upheld by our valiant sons abroad. The issue is America. And I am an American. [Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAPPER in the chair). rapped for order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. CURTIS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harris	McNary	Sheppard
Ball	Harrison	Moses	Sherman
Borah	Henderson	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Brandegee	Johnson, Calif.	New	Smoot
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Newberry	Spencer
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Stanley
Cummins	Kellogg	Nugent	Sutherland
Curtis	Kendrick	Overman	Swanson
Edge	Kenyon	Page	Trammell
Elkins	King	Phelan	Underwood
Fall	Kirby	Phipps	Wadsworth
Fernald	La Follette	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Lenroot	Poindexter	Walsh, Mont.
France	McCormick	Pomerene	Warren
Gay	McCumber	Ransdell	Watson
Hale	McKellar	Reed	Wolcott

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. He is attending the funeral of the late Robert Bacon.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], is detained from the Chamber on account of illness.

Mr. KIRBY. I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] on official business.

Mr. HARRIS. My colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], is detained by illness.

Mr. KING. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], and the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] are necessarily detained from the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-four Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SWANSON. What is the request, Mr. President?

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. SWANSON. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 18) to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor with amendments.

Mr. KENYON. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be read for amendment.

Mr. KING. I object to that. I should like to hear the bill read.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator from Utah object to dispensing with the formal reading of the bill and its being read for amendment, as is the usual practice? The bill in that case will be read in full.

Mr. KING. I withdraw the objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Education and Labor was, in section 1, page 1, line 4, after the word "in," to strike out the word "occupations" and to insert the word "industry," so as to read:

That in order to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same section, on page 1, line 5, after the word "otherwise," to insert "and who are without sufficient means to provide for their own rehabilitation."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, some of us have had no opportunity to examine this bill. It is a very important bill and, as I understand, goes into the States and provides that individuals who may be injured in private employment shall become charges upon the Federal Government. I repeat, I have had no opportunity to read the bill, but the request I was about to submit was that the amendments be not agreed to, that attention be called to them, but that action upon the amendments be deferred until there can be an opportunity afforded Senators to familiarize themselves with this important measure.

Mr. KENYON. That is perfectly agreeable. I will say to the Senator from Utah that the amendments are quite unimportant; they do not touch on the real merits of the bill but relate only to its method of administration. However, I am perfectly willing that the course suggested shall be pursued. I shall undertake to explain the bill very fully as soon as the reading is finished, and I very much hope the Senator will then ask any questions he may be inclined to ask in regard to it.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa whether it is his purpose to press this bill to a vote to-day?

Mr. KENYON. I should like to have a vote on it to-day. I do not think anyone will be opposed to it when he understands it. The bill was reported out of the committee at the last session but failed in the closing days for reasons which the Senator knows. It has been again unanimously reported this session from the committee.

Mr. KING. I hope the Senator will not ask for a vote upon this measure to-day, for, as I have stated, none of us has had an opportunity to examine the bill, except members of the committee.

Mr. KENYON. I will proceed after the reading of the bill has been concluded to explain it as I understand it, and to invite any questions but shall not ask for a vote on the bill to-day. I shall, however, do so in the immediate future.

The reading of the bill was resumed at line 7, page 1, the entire clause reading as follows:

That in order to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment there is hereby appropriated for the use of the States, subject to the provisions of this act, for the purpose of cooperating with them in the maintenance of vocational rehabilitation of such disabled persons, and in returning vocationally rehabilitated persons to civil employment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the sum of $500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the sum of $750,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and annually thereafter, the sum of $1,000,000.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, the dates just read in the bill are erroneous. The first date should be June 30, 1920; the second date should be June 30, 1921; and the third date should be June 30, 1922. I will move those amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to making the amendments suggested by the Senator from Iowa at the present time?

Mr. KENYON. I think there can be no objection to the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears none, and the amendments will be considered as agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. Have the amendments which I have suggested been agreed to, I will ask the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have.

The reading of the bill was resumed, as follows:

Said sums shall be allotted to the States in the proportion which their population bears to the total population in the United States, not including Territories, outlying possessions, and the District of Columbia, according to the last preceding United States census: *Provided*, That the allotment of funds to any State shall not be less than a minimum of $5,000 for any fiscal year. And there is hereby appropriated the following sums, or so much thereof as may be needed, which shall be used for the purpose of providing the minimum allotment to the States provided for in this section, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the sum of $66,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the sum of $46,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and annually thereafter, the sum of $34,000.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, the same error appears in those dates. I move to amend by changing the date "1919," in line 15, on page 2, to "1920"; by changing the date "1920," in line 16, to "1921"; and by changing the date "1921," in line 17, to "1922."

The amendments were agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Education and Labor was, in section 2, on page 4, line 25, after the word "appropriations," to insert "In any State the legislature of which does not meet in 1919 or 1920 if the governor of that State shall accept the provisions of this act, such State shall be entitled to the benefits of this act until the legislature of such State meets in due course and has been in session 60 days," so as to read:

All moneys expended under the provisions of this act from appropriations provided by section 1 shall be upon the condition (1) that for each dollar of Federal money expended there shall be expended in the State under the supervision and control of the State board at least an equal amount for the same purpose: *Provided*, That no portion of the appropriation made by this act shall be used by any institution for handicapped persons except for the special training of such individuals entitled to the benefits of this act as shall be determined by the Federal board; (2) that the State board shall annually submit to the Federal board for approval plans showing (a) the kinds of vocational rehabilitation and schemes of placement for which it is proposed the appropriation shall be used; (b) the plan of administration and supervision; (c) courses of study; (d) methods of instruction; (e) qualification of teachers, supervisors, directors, and other necessary administrative officers or employees; (f) plans for the training of teachers, supervisors, and directors; (3) that the State board shall make an annual report to the Federal board on or before September 1 of each year on the work done in the State and on the receipts and expenditures of money under the provisions of this act; (4) that no portion of any moneys appropriated by this act for the benefit of the States shall be applied, directly or indirectly, to the purchase, preservation, erection, or repair of any building or buildings or equipment, or for the purchase or rental of any lands; (5) that all courses for vocational rehabilitation given under the supervision and control of the State board and all courses for vocational rehabilitation maintained shall be available, under such rules and regulations as the Federal board shall prescribe, to any civil employee of the United States disabled while in the performance of his duty.

SEC. 2. That in order to secure the benefits of the appropriations provided by section 1 any State shall, through the legislative authority thereof, (1) accept the provisions of this act; (2) empower and direct the board designated or created as the State board for vocational education to cooperate in the administration of the provisions of the vocational education act, approved February 23, 1917, to cooperate as herein provided with the Federal Board for Vocational Education in the administration of the provisions of this act; (3) in those States where a State workmen's compensation board, or other State board, department, or agency exists, charged with the administration of the State workmen's compensation or liability laws, the legislature shall provide that a plan of cooperation be formulated between such State board, department, or agency, and the State board charged with the administration of this act, such plan to be effective when approved by the governor of the State; (4) provide for the supervision and support of the courses of vocational rehabilitation to be provided by the State board in carrying out the provisions of this act; (5) appoint as custodian for said appropriations its State treasurer, who shall receive and provide for the proper custody and disbursement of all money paid to the State from said appropriations. In any State the legislature of which does not meet in 1919 or 1920, if the governor of that State shall accept the provisions of this act, such State shall be entitled to the benefits of this act until the legislature of such State meets in due course and has been in session 60 days.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Iowa a question?

Mr. KENYON. I yield.

Mr. SPENCER. The Legislature of Missouri met in 1919 and has adjourned. Under the proposed committee amendment which has just been read it would be impossible for Missouri to avail herself of the provisions of this measure.

Mr. KENYON. Does the legislature meet in 1920?

Mr. SPENCER. It does not. If we should change the first line on page 5 so that it would read "the legislature of which does not meet between the date of the passage of this act and December 31, 1920," that would cover every other State as well as Missouri.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, we could change "1919" to "1920" and "1920" to "1921." That would take care of every State, would it not?

Mr. SPENCER. That would not take care of the matter for the year 1920, because the legislature does not meet until 1921, and it would be impossible for Missouri to avail herself of it in 1920.

Mr. KENYON. I will suggest later, I will say to the Senator, an amendment to the amendment suggested by the committee. I will ask that the amendment be passed over for the present.

Mr. SPENCER. Very well.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, may I be permitted to say in this connection that Vermont stands as does Missouri? We have had our session of the legislature for 1919, and it will not convene again, unless in special session, until 1921.

Mr. KENYON. We will cover that by a change in the proposed amendment. I ask that it be passed over for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Education and Labor was, in section 3, page 5, line 11, after the word "act," to strike out "and," and in line 13, after the word "employment," to insert "and to cooperate, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, with such public and private agencies as it may deem advisable," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. That the Federal Board for Vocational Education shall have power to cooperate with State boards in carrying out the purposes and provisions of this act, and is hereby authorized to make and establish such rules and regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry into effect the provisions of this act; to provide for the vocational rehabilitation of disabled persons and their return to civil employment and to cooperate, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, with such public and private agencies as it may deem advisable. It shall be the duty of said board (1) to examine plans submitted by the State boards and approve the same if believed to be feasible and found to be in conformity with the provisions and purposes of this act; (2) to ascertain annually whether the several States are using or are prepared to use the money received by them in accordance with the provisions of this act; (3) to certify on or before the 1st day of January of each year to the Secretary of the Treasury each State which has accepted the provisions of this act and complied therewith, together with the amount which each State is entitled to receive under the provisions of this act; (4) to deduct from the next succeeding allotment to any State whenever any portion of the fund annually allotted has not been expended for the purpose provided for in this act a sum equal to such unexpended portion; (5) to withhold the allotment of moneys to any State whenever it shall be determined that moneys allotted are not being expended for the purposes and conditions of this act; (6) to require the replacement by withholding subsequent allotments of any portion of the moneys received by the custodian of any State under this act that by any action or contingency is diminished or lost: *Provided*, That if any allotment is withheld from any State, the State board of such State may appeal to the Congress of the United States, and if the Congress shall not direct such sum to be paid, it shall be covered into the Treasury.

The reading of the bill was concluded, as follows:

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the certification of the Federal board as provided in this act, shall pay quarterly to the custodian of each State appointed as herein provided the moneys to which it is entitled under the provisions of this act. The money so received by the custodian for any State shall be paid out on the requisition of the State board as reimbursement for services already rendered or expenditures already incurred and approved by said State board. The Federal Board for Vocational Education shall make an annual report to the Congress on or before December 1 on the administration of this act and shall include in such report the reports made by the State boards on the administration of this act by each State and the expenditure of the money allotted to each State.

SEC. 5. That there is hereby appropriated to the Federal Board for Vocational Education the sum of $200,000 annually for the purpose of making studies, investigations, and reports regarding the vocational rehabilitation of disabled persons and their placements in suitable or gainful occupations, and for the administrative expenses of said board incident to performing the duties imposed by this act, including salaries of such assistants, experts, clerks, and other employees, in the District of Columbia or elsewhere as the board may deem necessary, actual traveling and other necessary expenses incurred by the members of the board and by its employees, under its orders, including attendance at meetings of educational associations and other organizations, rent and equipment of offices in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase of books of reference, law books, and periodicals, stationery, typewriters and exchange thereof, miscellaneous supplies, postage on foreign mail, printing and binding to be done at the Government Printing Office, and all other necessary expenses.

SEC. 6. That the Federal Board for Vocational Education is hereby authorized and empowered to receive such gifts and donations from either public or private sources as may be offered unconditionally. All moneys received as gifts or donations shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States, and shall constitute a permanent fund, to be called the "Special fund for vocational rehabilitation of disabled persons," to be used under the direction of the said board to defray the expenses of providing and maintaining courses of vocational rehabilitation in special cases including the payment of necessary expenses of persons undergoing training. A full report of all gifts and donations offered and accepted, together with the names of the donors and the respective amounts contributed by each, and all disbursements therefrom shall be submitted annually to Congress by said board.

Mr. SPENCER. I move an amendment to the committee amendment on line 1, page 5——

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to offer an amendment which comes from the committee?

Mr. SPENCER. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. On page 7, at the conclusion of section 5, I move to insert the amendment I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 7, line 24, after the word "expenses," it is proposed to insert:

A full report shall be submitted annually to Congress showing all the expense incurred under this section and specifying the names of the parties and the amounts expended by them for any traveling and other expenses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an inquiry? This bill has just been reported and I have had no opportunity to examine its provisions or even read it. Is there any limitation upon the number of employees, the compensation to be paid them, or the amount to be paid in the aggregate for salaries and compensation?

Mr. KENYON. As to salaries paid by the board there is not.

Mr. KING. And there is no limitation upon the number of employees that the board may secure and the number of persons they may send into the various States to execute the terms of this bill?

Mr. KENYON. It is exactly the same as the present law with reference to vocational education. There was an appropriation in that instance of $200,000 to cover the work of the board. There is no limit placed in the law upon the number of employees or the salaries, or anything of that kind.

Mr. KING. But, as I understand, this bill provides an additional $200,000.

Mr. KENYON. It does.

Mr. KING. So that would give to this board $400,000 annually for the compensation of employees?

Mr. KENYON. Yes; and the work of the board, which is extensive. I will say to the Senator that a motion will be made to cut down that appropriation, as I understand.

Mr. KING. It seems to me, if the Senator will pardon me, that he or some other member of the committee ought to prepare an amendment which would limit the compensation to be paid the board and all Federal employees serving under them—an amendment, perhaps, which would classify the employees and provide the compensation to be paid to those serving in each class, because I think the policy which has been pursued, at least for a number of years, of making lump-sum appropriations and fixing no limit to the number of employees or the amount to be paid them is not only unwise but positively vicious, and is unfair to those employees of the United States whose compensation is fixed by law. The application of this unjust policy has resulted in thousands of new employees receiving much larger salaries than tens of thousands of persons doing just as important work who have been in the service of the Government for many years.

Mr. KENYON. I agree with the Senator in regard to the lump-sum appropriations. I do not know that it is feasible in a matter of this kind to fix the salaries. If it can be done, I shall be very glad to see it done. Some men are dear at $1,000 a year, while others might be cheap at $10,000 a year. It is a pretty difficult thing to do, but——

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, if this bill is going over without a vote until to-morrow, I should like to suggest to the Senator that he consider the advisability of adopting some amendment providing that no salary shall be paid to any employee of the board exceeding a certain amount. I have made some investigation of late in connection with some of the salaries being paid to-day in bureaus which have been created, and they range all the way from $5,000 up to $15,000 a year, the latter sum being twice as much as a Senator of the United States is paid; and I know that the men who are holding the places could not command any such salaries as those in any other walk of life. They are being paid those amounts to-day by the Government of the United States; and I think we ought to limit the amount of salary that can be paid to any employee of this board.

Mr. KENYON. I agree with the Senator, and we will do that.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

Mr. KENYON. Just a moment, Mr. President. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] started to offer an amendment and I interrupted him.

Mr. SPENCER. Has the Senator's amendment been acted upon?

Mr. KENYON. It has not been acted upon.

Mr. SPENCER. May the Secretary read the amendment which I send to the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out, in line 1 of page 5, the words "in 1919 or" and to insert in lieu thereof "between the date of the passage of this act and December 31."

Mr. KENYON. I think that will improve the committee amendment, Mr. President. If there be no objection, I shall be glad to have it adopted.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. Now, Mr. President, I should like to explain this bill for a few moments; and I am very anxious to have questions, so that it may be thoroughly understood.

Mr. POMERENE and Mr. LENROOT addressed the Chair.

Mr. KENYON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. I was not quite clear, from the reading of this bill, whether or not this work will be under the control of the same board that will have control of the crippled or disabled soldiers.

Mr. KENYON. Exactly the same board; and the same board that has charge of vocational education, and the same machinery that is now set up all over the country. It is merely extending that work to men hurt in industry and otherwise.

Mr. POMERENE. I am glad to know that, because I did not see any reason why there should be a duplication.

Mr. KENYON. No; there is no duplication.

Mr. LENROOT and Mr. PAGE addressed the Chair.

Mr. KENYON. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the Senator with reference to the proviso on page 6:

That if any allotment is withheld from any State, the State board of such State may appeal to the Congress of the United States, and if the Congress shall not direct such sum to be paid it shall be covered into the Treasury.

I should like to ask the Senator the purpose of that proviso, and what it means.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, may I answer that question?

Mr. KENYON. I shall be very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. PAGE. That follows almost identically the language of the general bill for vocational education. We provide that the States shall formulate a method of handling this fund. If they fail to handle it according to law, or according to the judgment of the board that passes upon these matters, the fund is withheld and is paid back into the Treasury; but a proviso is made that the matter may be taken up by a board appointed by Congress and reheard.

Mr. LENROOT. That was the point I was getting at. It seems to me that under the language of this proviso, while it contemplates that the money shall be covered back into the Treasury if Congress does not direct it to be paid, the money never would find its way to the Treasury, because there is no time limitation within which Congress may act. If the appeal is made, it hangs the money up there for all time.

Mr. KENYON. Of course, that is true; it keeps it from the State.

Mr. LENROOT. It keeps it from the Federal Treasury as well. We segregate it. There certainly should be a limitation.

Mr. KENYON. It probably never gets out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. LENROOT. If it never gets out of the Federal Treasury, I see no reason at all for the proviso.

Mr. PAGE. It may get out of the Federal Treasury upon application of the State from which the fund is withheld. If the State has not properly managed the expenditure of this fund, the money is covered into the Treasury, and it remains there until the State by some initiative on its part sees fit to bring up the matter and have it adjusted by Congress.

Mr. LENROOT. How does it get out of the Treasury unless it is paid over? And, then, if it never gets out, how and why is it to be returned?

Mr. KENYON. It may be that the language should be changed and a limit of time placed as to when Congress shall act.

Mr. LENROOT. That is the only point.

Mr. KENYON. There can be no objection to that.

Mr. PAGE. I want to say in regard to this matter that if the Senator will read the bill carefully he will find that in very many of its provisions it follows identically the language of the vocational education bill, and there was not a single provision in that bill that was not thoroughly thrashed out. I think that if the Senator will fully examine that matter he will find that the safeguards which he suggests have been carefully provided for.

Mr. LENROOT. I should just like to say that if the money never gets out of the Treasury there is no necessity for this

language. If the money does get out of the Treasury, it ought not to be held up for all time to come through mere failure of Congress to act.

Mr. PAGE. No; it is a failure on the part of the State.

Mr. LENROOT. But suppose they do appeal, but Congress takes no action?

Mr. PAGE. Congress is bound to take action if they appeal.

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, no; the Senator certainly does not mean that. There have been many appeals made to Congress—proper appeals—upon which Congress has never taken any action.

Mr. PAGE. But there is a provision made in this bill or in the old vocational-education bill that I think fully takes care of the very suggestion that the Senator has offered.

Mr. LENROOT. If it was in the old bill, it ought to be in this.

Mr. KENYON. If it does not take care of that matter, it can be remedied very easily.

Mr. PAGE. Yes; but I think it has been done in this bill, because I have taken especial pains in looking over this bill to recall the bill for vocational education, and I find that in almost every respect they run along parallel lines. That bill was handled with a great deal of care, and pretty much every feature that could be thrashed out was properly attended to.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator will at once see that if an appeal is made to Congress and Congress does not act, it holds this money in the air.

Mr. PAGE. The presumption is that the State, if any money has been withheld from it, will ask that it be returned. I do not think there has ever been any trouble so far about the withholding of funds.

Mr. KENYON. We will certainly have a provision here that will get it out of the air if it is in the air. Public money does not stay in the air very long, or the Treasury either.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, may I ask the view of the Senator from Iowa? Of course, the object of the bill is to have the States meet dollar for dollar. The State of New Jersey has been appropriating for two or three years a certain sum for this purpose, rehabilitation. How retroactive can this be?

Mr. KENYON. It is not retroactive at all.

Mr. EDGE. But if the money was appropriated at the last session of the legislature, so as to be available during the current year, then it would come under the scope of this bill, would it not?

Mr. KENYON. When would it become available under your State law?

Mr. EDGE. The 1st of July; from July next.

Mr. KENYON. That would depend upon when this bill is passed.

Mr. EDGE. Yes; it would. This bill, however, specifies that it is to apply to the year 1919, so, then, why would it not?

Mr. KENYON. The fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. PAGE. That has been changed to 1920 now.

Mr. EDGE. In other words, Mr. President, as to the States that have been rather enterprising and are already doing this work, it does not seem to be any more than correct and proper that they should participate in the benefits of the bill. We have already appropriated one hundred and some thousand dollars in the State of New Jersey for this specific purpose; and if the bill does not contemplate an appropriation during the current year—I can well understand that it would not go back beyond that—it would seem to me that it should be amended so that it does.

Mr. KENYON. Of course, the current fiscal year is nearly over. This bill will not come into play until the next fiscal year, ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. EDGE. That is coincident with the fiscal year of New Jersey.

Mr. KENYON. Then it would coordinate with the law of New Jersey.

Mr. EDGE. And it would apply to the appropriations made by the last legislature?

Mr. KENYON. I think so; yes.

Now, Mr. President, I realize that the Senate has done perhaps all the work it wants to do for the day. It generally seems to be true that where we listen to one speech on a hot day, that is about all the work the Senate can do. This, however, is a bill of very great importance, and, if the Senators are interested in it, I think it will be helpful if we can have a free discussion here and perfect frankness in asking and answering questions; and, while I do not guarantee that they can all be answered, we can discuss it pro and con.

The purpose of this bill is to take care, by vocational training, of men hurt in industry, and I want to be perfectly frank and say that the bill even goes beyond that. It will provide vocational training for men hurt, whether in industry or otherwise, if the hurt amounts to disability. I want to be perfectly frank in saying that it would go to this extent: If a "bum" fell off of a railroad train where he was beating his way and lost his arm, under this bill he could have vocational training. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] smiles at that, and it does seem pretty radical, but I will try and convince him of its justice.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. KING. Perhaps the appropriation of Federal money for the purpose of caring for the "bum"—using the Senator's word—might be justified upon the theory that he is to be regarded as a part of interstate commerce, or at least an inevitable concomitant of the same.

But, as I am advised, there are plans on foot, and this bill is a part of this general plan, to relieve, in part at least, the States of their duty of providing for the education of those within their borders.

There is a campaign being conducted in the country to secure Federal appropriations for the purpose of educating the children of the land; this plan contemplates the establishment of a department of education, the creation of hundreds and thousands of new positions, and the assumption by the United States of responsibilities that the Constitution clearly imposes upon the States.

This bill seems to be symptomatic of the general plan. The States are supposed to be mere appendages to the Federal Government, not sovereignties possessing sovereign powers and charged with sovereign responsibilities. The theory seems to be that the Federal Government should increase the taxes laid upon the people of the States, collect under drastic revenue laws millions from the people, and then permit to filter back to them such portion as is not wasted or consumed by myriads of employees and oppressive bureaucratic administration methods.

The people of the States are being taxed to put money into the Federal Treasury only to have it returned—for local and State purposes—less a large part of the same, which, as I have said, is lost in the process of transferring it from the pockets of the people to the Federal Treasury and from the Treasury back to the people.

I am now speaking generally and not specifically with reference to the bill before us.

However, this bill, if I understand its terms, will result in taking money from the people by Federal taxation in order that Federal functionaries may return it to the people for expenditure for local purposes.

If the United States can collect taxes to furnish vocational education to the injured or sick, it would seem that there is scarcely any limit to its power. It would be authorized in this view to take over the entire educational system of the States. Where would the limit be placed upon the authority of the Federal Government? And if there be no limit, then our Republic is at an end.

If the Federal Government is subject to no limitations, if it may assume control of the domestic and internal affairs of the States, then the States will soon cease to function and will suffer complete atrophy.

My experience is that many of the measures presented in Congress, which call for appropriations, an increase in the personnel of bureaus and departments, the creation of new bureaus or departments, the extension of the activities of the United States into the States, and the assertion of authority within the States and in relation to the domestic concerns of the people, are prepared and urged by Federal employees.

There are too many who are too eager to increase their authority and enlarge the field of their activities.

I believe the policy should be to strengthen, not weaken, the States; to develop and maintain a feeling among the people in favor of local self-government—a resolute, abiding faith in their capacity to govern themselves and to work out the problems, intricate and difficult though they may be, that must come to a strong and virile people.

Let us preach the gospel of self-reliance—the faith that burned in the hearts of the pioneers who laid the foundations of the mighty Commonwealths composing this Union. Let us not chloroform the States by Federal decoctions or render the people anemic and bloodless by transferring from their shoulders to the Federal Government the burdens, duties, and responsibilities which rest upon them, and the faithful performance of which makes them a mighty people.

Mr. KENYON. Of course, the Senator has not studied this bill or he would not make that statement. We are not trying to take over education in the States. It is entirely Federal stimulation, while the work is really carried on by the States. I believe the Senator from Utah is probably the only person in

this Chamber who is opposed to this kind of legislation, and before we get through with this bill I am sure he is going to stand up here and be for it, because it is a great humane measure, and it is not hurting the Constitution or infringing upon it at all, not nearly as much as many things the Senator from Utah has been voting for in the last few months.

We have established the principle of Federal stimulation of education in the vocational education bill. If Senators will study what has been done in this country under that bill, they will know that it was one of the wisest pieces of legislation that we have ever passed. Over 165,000 persons are now availing themselves of the privileges of that law, and the Board of Vocational Training believes there will be double that number in this year. That was merely a proposition of stimulation. Congress did not take over education in the States. Congress merely matched, dollar for dollar, what the States might do in the way of vocational training, and every State in the Union has gone ahead with its educational board, called that in most cases, but in some cases a vocational training board for cooperation with Congress in that great measure. Now, that machinery is in existence to-day all over this country. This does not require the setting up of any new machinery.

We have gone ahead, too, as to the boys hurt in the war. Nobody has objected to giving them a chance for vocational training, and this board got into touch with something like 53,000 boys in France who had been injured. They have studied their cases. The registration has run up to something like 90,000, but out of those there are about 12,000 cases with which this board are undertaking to go ahead. They actually now have in training something like 3,200 soldiers. There are 4,000 who can not be trained because of some question that has arisen between the War Risk Insurance Bureau and the Board of Vocational Training as to the construction of the act. That will be ironed out, I think, in another bill that will be presented here in a few days.

Nobody raises his voice against that work for the soldiers. It is a splendid thing. We go a step further now and say that that great work—making a man who is injured and may become a burden on society a part of the potential force of society—shall be extended through the application of the same principle, stimulation to the States, on plans made by them and approved by this board before any money can be certified to the States, so as to give a chance to every man injured in occupation to enter into some line of work by which he can make a living and cease to be a burden upon society, but be a potential benefit.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KENYON. I do.

Mr. McCORMICK. Will not the Senator say, by way of anticipation, if his committee does not contemplate or if he does not contemplate legislation looking to a general Federal subsidy of all education?

Mr. KENYON. Whether the committee contemplates that?

Mr. McCORMICK. Yes.

Mr. KENYON. I could not speak for the committee. There is a bill now introduced, as the Senator knows, along that line. There have been no hearings on that bill as yet. There were some at the last session.

Mr. McCORMICK. The measure before the Senate would be a small enterprise by comparison with the other, would it not?

Mr. KENYON. Absolutely.

It is hard to get at the statistics of men injured in industry in this country, but it is safe to say that to-day in this Nation there are in the neighborhood of 200,000 men permanently crippled in occupation. I use that term instead of "industry" because "industry" probably would not include farming operations, and the accidents in farming operations are very heavy. Investigation has shown that in Austria the accidents on farms are equal to the accidents in industry. That is not true in this country; but it is perfectly safe to say that 15,000 men in this country yearly are injured in such a way that their power to labor is impaired more than 50 per cent. Of course, there are hundreds of thousands of men injured in small way, resulting in a week's to a month's loss of time; but I speak now of those who lose an arm or a leg or eyes or are injured in some functional respect that retards their work to a measurable degree. There are 15,000 of those men a year. Not all of them, of course, will want vocational training, but a large number will, and it is the purpose of this bill to give them the chance.

As I said to the Senator from Utah, the bill goes even further, and covers the case to which I referred of a man "bumming" his way on a freight train. He falls off, his arm is cut off, and he is thrown on the scrap heap. Why? If you can take that man to an agency and teach him some useful occupation, you not only save the man but you do a great thing for society. You take him off the scrap heap and have him earn his own way in the world.

So we have gone far in this bill. There is no question about that. At the inception of it it was not the unanimous thought of the committee that we should go that far. Everyone, I think, was in favor of taking the men in industry or the men in occupation and putting them under the act; but when you came to take the drunken man, run over by an automobile on the street and losing his legs, or something of that kind, the committee hesitated. That is a fair question of division for men to differ about and debate about.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. KING. Does this bill limit the aid which is granted to those who have received injuries as the result of accidents or does it extend to those whose ability to earn a living has been impaired by reason of some organic disease or some progressive ailment?

Mr. KENYON. Any disability. That will cover sickness; that will cover an occupational disease that makes it impossible for the man to earn a living.

Mr. KING. Then, as I understand, if a person, say, 50 or 60 years of age should become deaf or, through heart disease or some other ailment, should be prevented from pursuing his usual vocation, this board would take charge of that man and try to give him vocational training in something else in which possibly he might succeed and might be enabled to earn a livelihood?

Mr. KENYON. Why not?

Mr. KING. I am merely asking whether it would go that far.

Mr. KENYON. Yes; if the man is disabled in occupation and is without sufficient means to provide for his own rehabilitation, and the State board are of the opinion, under plans that have been approved by the Federal board, that they can teach that man, even though he be 70 years of age. You can learn something after you are 70 years of age. We have Senators here far beyond that age.

If he can become a useful, working member of society, I say yes; I say they could take charge of such a man, and why not?

Mr. KING. The Senator assumes, of course, that the States are unwilling to discharge a duty which rests upon them, and would not make appropriations to take care of those who might need care and aid.

Mr. KENYON. No; I do not assume that at all. Men who can not make a living and who have nothing become a burden upon society in one way or the other. Somebody has to take care of them. Whether it be the State or whether it be the Nation, it eventually comes out of the people who pay the taxes. This merely stimulates the State to do that work.

The States do not all do that work now. Here are workmen's compensation acts. You would assume that every State in the Union would look after that matter for itself. It is true that there are 38 States of the Union that have their compensation acts. There are 10 States that have no compensation acts. They will have to have compensation acts, in order really to get the benefit of this law.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will allow me, it is the experience in all countries that needed and desirable legislation is not obtained within a day or a year. It is a matter of experience, education, and, in many instances, legitimate, enthusiastic propaganda, in order to effectuate reforms and obtain the adoption of measures conducive to liberty or to social improvement. The Senator referred to employees' compensation acts. It is only within a comparatively short time that this subject received attention at the hands of the people and of legislators. The justice of providing compensation for those injured in industrial and other employments appealed so strongly to the people when the matter was brought to their attention that the States immediately began the enactment of compensation statutes. And it will only be a short time, in my opinion, when every State in the Union will have a humane and rational employees' compensation act. For many years I have strongly advocated workmen's compensation acts, and I shall rejoice when they shall find a place in the statutes of all States of the Union.

If I have correctly followed the Senator, I would say that if there is any difference between us with respect to the question under consideration it would be as to the government or sovereignty which attempted legislation looking to the rehabilitation of the injured members of society. It must be borne in mind that this is a dual form of government. The United States is different from Germany or France or many other nations of the world. Our Federal Government is a Republic composed

of republics. The Federal Government is a government of limited and enumerated powers. It deals with national and international questions. Domestic problems, the questions of local self-government are committed to the sovereign States. The line of demarcation separating the States and their functions and powers from the Federal Government is clear and unmistakable. I believe that it is the duty of every State to provide for the welfare and well-being of the inhabitants thereof. The States are sovereign and omnipotent with respect to domestic and local matters. The question of education is a domestic question. The police powers of the State are multitudinous, and the States should exercise those powers, and the abdication by the States of their functions will destroy this Republic. The perpetuity of this Nation depends upon the preservation of the States. It is as important that the States should maintain their vitality and exercise their sovereign powers as that the Federal Government should maintain its vitality and exercise the powers delegated to it. There has always been a struggle between the centrifugal and centripetal forces in governments. There is a constant effort to centralize and consolidate authority and power in the hands of a few or in a central or overshadowing sovereignty. The highest fruits of liberty have been enjoyed under governments in which the domestic and local questions and problems were committed to the people themselves in their local spheres. It is apparent that these forces to which I have referred find expression in this Republic. Every student of our Nation and its constitutional development must be impressed with the fact that the centralizing tendencies and purposes are stronger now than ever before. There is an increasing disposition to look to Washington and to the Federal Government for laws, for regulations, for administration. We augment the powers of the officials and the departments and the bureaus and multiply the number of departments and bureaus and officials. Officials and bureaus are constantly suggesting and urging the adoption of measures extending their powers and jurisdiction, and the demands which they make clearly call for a diminution of the powers and authority of the States.

Of course, there are imperfections and weaknesses in State administration. The enactment of legislation to secure needed reforms bringing about improved industrial and social conditions can not be accomplished by the waving of some magic wand; but history shows that those reforms that came as the result of thought and effort and education are the most enduring and the most beneficent. The idea that all evils must be cured by legislation is erroneous. A proper foundation must be laid for legislation. That foundation is the result of experience, of education, and in many instances of experiments. Many of the officials in the Federal Government see the wisdom and propriety of reforms within the States, but are not willing for the States to work out in their own way the desired results. Thereupon they engage in a more or less extensive propaganda and oftentimes project the Federal Government into matters that are purely local and domestic and pertain to the functions of the States alone. Unfortunately the States too often fail to comprehend the principle involved; the proposition of appropriating money to aid in some State activity is alluring, and soon a sentiment is developed within the States which leads to a more or less powerful demand for Federal aid and Federal intervention. This course weakens the vitality and the moral fiber of the States; it tends to their devitalization and to their demoralization. In the end policies of this kind, if persisted in, would lead to their degradation and destruction. During the last session of Congress we appropriated $200,000,000 to construct highways within the States. The building of State highways is a State function. I have received communications urging that the States be relieved of the burden of maintaining roads and highways, and that the entire burden of building the roads and maintaining them be assumed by the Federal Government. I have received also communications urging that the Federal Government take over the schools and educate the children within the States. It would seem that many of the people of the States have so little regard for the dignity and sovereignty and prerogatives of the States within which they live that they would be willing to have them submerged and destroyed and their responsibilities and functions assumed and taken over by the Federal Government. The measure which is now up for consideration is new to me as it is to most of the Senators. We had no opportunity to read it nor to analyze its provisions; but from the hasty glance which I have been permitted to bestow upon it since the Senator from Iowa called it to our attention a few moments ago, I have been apprehensive that it might result in its operations in a further aggrandizement of the parent Government and result in a further loss of vigor and authority upon the part of the States and would be regarded as a precedent for legislation clearly destructive of the States.

Of course, all will concede that anything that will ameliorate the condition of the wounded, those who have suffered the loss of limbs, whatever will minister to their comfort and happiness and aid them in reestablishing themselves as vital factors in the social and industrial life of the communities in which they live, not only is commendable but must receive the genuine approval of all humane and right-minded persons. But the whole question is not answered when it is said that the Federal Government is going into the States to engage in the work of vocational rehabilitation. The question we meet at the threshhold is, Whose primary duty is it to provide for the vocational training of those who have been injured? Is it the duty of the State or, under our form of government, is it the duty of the National Government? I believe that the States, under our form of government, are charged with this duty and with the responsibility of educating the children within their borders, of looking after the social welfare and the industrial welfare of their inhabitants. The functions of the Federal Government are different. The States did not, in their grant of powers to the Federal Government, confer upon it the duty to go into the States and exercise the police powers of the States. The States ought to care for those who are injured, provide for their welfare and education, and equip them, so far as possible, for the assumption of the responsibilities of citizenship, and prepare them to enter some gainful occupation, so that they may care for themselves and their families. Legislation of that character by the States I most heartily approve of, and no State should fail in enacting suitable legislation for a purpose so humane and so beneficent. As stated a moment ago, however, legislation is not the child of a moment. It is only within the past few years that there has been any agitation looking to the rehabilitation of injured members of society. It is only within the past few years we have heard the words "vocational rehabilitation." However, as I have been advised, some States have most excellent statutes providing for the training of men and women who have been injured. The matter is receiving earnest consideration at the hands of State legislators and educators within the States. The people are awakening to the necessity of dealing with the question of aiding those who have by reason of disease or injuries been unfitted for some gainful pursuit; and as the subject has received attention remedies have been provided, and the entire subject is receiving intelligent and earnest consideration at the hands of the States. In many States—while it is not perhaps exactly parallel, but it illustrates the point that I am attempting to make—as soon as the attention of the people was called to the blind, the deaf, and the dumb provisions were made to care for these unfortunates, and in nearly every State, if not all of the States of the Union, there can be found schools for the blind and the deaf and the dumb, and everything that science and that a broad humanitarian spirit can suggest is being done to aid them and to equip them for service and responsibility in the social and industrial and political organism. And I have no doubt but that every State in the Union will be perfectly willing to meet this question and to make ample and full provision for the vocational training of those who belong to the class referred to in the bill which is before us for consideration.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator is probably aware of the fact that under the vocational education act many States have gone far beyond the amount of money the Government appropriates, although that is a dollar-for-dollar proposition. The stimulation by the Federal Government—the leadership of the Federal Government—has been an incentive to them just as it will be in this matter.

For instance, referring to the Senator's illustration of education, does he not feel that a high rate of illiteracy in any State of the Union is a question of concern to the citizens of all the other States? I will not mention any State, but there is one State with perhaps a rate of illiteracy of 48 or 50 per cent. In my own State the rate is very low, but the illiteracy of that particular State or of any other State is a matter of concern to my State. These are not entirely State questions; they are national questions.

Mr. FALL. Will the Senator from Iowa yield for a question?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. FALL. Is it not a fact that the duty of citizenship and the obligation of citizenship is dual; that we have citizens of the United States who are necessarily under the Constitution citizens of a particular State?

Mr. KENYON. And we now have citizens of the world.

Mr. FALL. We will have citizens of the world a little later; but the point to which I wish to direct the Senator's attention is that the United States Government itself makes citizens of the

United States of foreigners. The States can not interfere with it, and they have nothing to do with it. One of those foreigners made a citizen under the law of Congress can go into any State in the Union and must necessarily be there regarded as a citizen of the United States. Generally he must have all the rights of a citizen of the United States under that State. Therefore, should it not be a part of the high duty of the National Government to assist in taking care of this great national asset, the citizen of the United States, although he may at the same time be a resident and citizen of a State?

Mr. KENYON. I have no quarrel with the view of the Senator from New Mexico, and I think the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] will gradually come to that opinion as the years go by.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa looks at me in a way which seems to indicate that he expects some observation from me. I merely want to remark, without reference to the bill under discussion, that the tendency in this Republic seems to be toward a strong central government. There seems to be an irresistible tide in the direction of the establishment of a mighty and puissant Federal Government. In every part of the land there are those that are seeking to augment the powers and the authority and the activities of the Federal Government and its bureaus and department officials. People seem to be willing to barter away the liberties which they enjoy and to sell for a mess of pottage the inheritance which the fathers have bequeathed to them. The States are becoming mere shadows. The power of the Federal Government is being invoked to direct the local concerns and the private affairs and the questions that are purely intrastate in character. The States are being debauched by Federal appropriations. The golden stream flowing from the Federal Treasury acts as an acid to eat away the devotion which the people should feel toward the States in which they live. We are being seduced by Federal aid and the States are clamoring for crumbs that fall from the table of this rich and powerful Dives, the National Government, which sits enthroned in this Capital City of the Nation. It is rather paradoxical, when we see the vigor with which we attacked bureaucracy and consolidated government as they found expression in Prussia and yet encourage the adoption of policies in this country that, if persisted in for an indefinite period, must result in evils dangerous and destructive. We denounced the autocracy of Prussia. We claimed that the Prussian system consolidated and centralized the power in the hands of a powerful government; that it built up a military machine, controlled the social organism, laid its powerful hand upon all of the activities of the people, and sought to impose its Kultur upon people beyond its territorial limits. We insisted that, in order that democracy and local self-government and freedom might exist, this autocracy should be destroyed. When we denounced Germany we spoke of our States and local self-government and the rights of the individuals. We called attention to the States and to our form of government and to the immense authority which the States possess for the good of the people and of the vast powers reserved by the people themselves.

We spoke of the splendid, wholesome rivalry between States and accounted for the progress of this Nation because of the differentiations, the broad field for development, and progress left to the States and to the counties and municipalities and individuals within the States. We gloried in the individualism of this Nation, and contrasted it with the tyrannous state socialism and autocracy of other nations of the earth. But, as I have stated, there seems to be a rising tide in our land which beats with mighty force against the pillars and bulwarks that have protected this Nation in the past. There are those who seek the overthrow of States which our Supreme Court have declared should be indestructible. They would reduce the States and the people to a protoplasmic mass and superimpose upon us all the powerful hand of a mighty imperialistic government.

Mr. KENYON. If the Senator will carry his argument still further, it will apply to this league of nations that he is advocating, will it not?

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, I do not want to be brought into a discussion of the league of nations to-day.

Mr. KENYON. Not to state how I feel about it, the Senator is assuming that we are going to strike down the States and all the splendid rivalries between the States to support his argument against this bill; but the Senator knows that the same argument is made against the league of nations, that it will strike down rivalry between nations that are splendidly developed. However, I do not want to get into a discussion of the league of nations at this time.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, if I believed that the league of nations would develop into an internationalism which would destroy nationalism, destroy the proud position of this Republic, take away the patriotic impulses of the American people and the spirit which has made them great and brought this Nation to its splendid proportions, then I would not be for the league of nations.

Mr. KENYON. Does not the Senator think that is just as liable to happen as the passage of a bill to help men in industry to vocational training will destroy the States and the splendid rivalry of the States? The Senator is really not deeply concerned about that, is he; and really does not fear it very much, does he?

Mr. KING. I did not mean to assert that the bill which the Senator is now championing with his splendid ability would accomplish the evils of which I speak. I merely mentioned the tendency of the times and referred to the bill which the Senator is now defending as a possible symptom of the age and of the spirit of which I have been speaking. The bill in and of itself has meritorious features; the object of it is certainly worthy; and I would go as far as the Senator or anyone else in demanding that my State and every State should make the fullest provisions for educational and rehabilitation work. I think every State ought to make liberal appropriations to take care of those who are injured and see that they have a fair opportunity in the race of life, and I have no doubt that the States, filled as they are with humane, Christian, patriotic people, will enact all needed legislation to accomplish this praiseworthy object.

Mr. KENYON. They have not done so as yet. I will say this bill is a splendid symptom of the times. I like the symptom and accept his designation.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

Mr. KENYON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator from Utah expressed the hope that his own State, as well as other States, will take a very deep interest in this subject and provide for the rehabilitation of the men who are injured in industrial pursuits, and so forth. I am in entire accord with that view, but it seems to me that I will go a step further than he will go. My belief is that a bill of this kind will encourage the States to do the very thing which he says he wants them to do.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. KENYON. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. As I understand the object of the bill, it provides for the rehabilitation of soldiers wounded in this war.

Mr. KENYON. No; I will state to the Senator it does not, and that statement shows that the Senator has not read the bill. That is already provided for in the bill we passed that was approved a year ago in June. This takes the principle further, to give vocational training to men injured in occupations and otherwise, practically giving, as I said here when the Senator was out, and I want to be frank about it, an opportunity for vocational training to any man injured, so that it amounts to such a disability that he can not pursue his present occupation.

Mr. KING. The Senator will pardon me. It goes further than that. It provides not only for those who are injured, but those who may become sick and by reason of any ailment are disqualified from following their former profession or occupation, if they had one.

Mr. KENYON. If such sickness is such as to amount to disability, that is true.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. It involves the principle more or less, and it is a step toward the federalization of our system of instruction in the various States. In the State of New Jersey we have builded, through the taxation of our citizens and assisted by the taxation of the railroads and other corporations, a great school system. It is second to none in any section of the country. We are justly proud of that system. I do not think that beyond the ambition of certain of the educators there is a desire to inflict upon the State of New Jersey Federal control or direction. The minute you impose upon the States of the Union direction from Washington you are going to break down the great system of public instruction in this country.

Mr. KENYON. Has the Senator read the bill?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I have read the bill.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator assumes Federal direction. There is no Federal direction.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. It leads toward that, because following it up is the Smith educational bill, involving the creation of a bureau or department of public instruction which will supersede, supervise, direct, and control the systems of instruction in the States.

Mr. KENYON. But the Smith educational bill has nothing to do with this bill. It has no connection with this bill further than the name of the author.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. As it is written it is practically the same verbiage and along the same plan. It appropriates a

certain sum of money to the States and apportions it, and it is only reasonable to assume that appropriating that money it will direct the policy of education in those States, and you can not get away from it.

My object in rising was to point out to the Senate what I believe is the unfair system of apportionment, a system that will compel the taxpayers of the larger States, and the larger States are the industrial States, to pay to the poorer States, the States in the South and the Far West, a larger sum of money than those States themselves pay through internal-revenue taxes. Upon the apportionment of $100,000,000 of the Smith educational bill, reduced to a million dollars in this bill, I base my argument against the unfair apportionment.

For instance, taking the State of Iowa, the Senator's own State, under this appropriation of $1,000,000 it will pay $4,590 in internal-revenue taxes toward the $1,000,000 appropriation, but it will receive $35,050 from the apportionment. The State of Alabama will pay $5,130 and will receive $23,290; while the State of New Jersey, spending $15,000,000 a year on its own school system, establishing an educational system long before the Federal Government undertook it, will pay $27,810 and receive $27,060 in return.

If you are going to adopt the principle that the richer States are to pay for education in the poorer States and redistribute the public funds in that way, I am opposed to that system. I believe that when you are trying to rehabilitate the industrial workers you should appropriate more money to the industrial States than to the western and the farming States.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I do not believe I have heard an appropriation bill or a tax bill under discussion before the Senate for the last two or three years that I have not heard practically that same argument from the Senator from New Jersey—that it is an unfair distribution of public funds, that we are putting it into the South, and that the great industrial centers of New Jersey and New York are paying more than their share. Iowa is now included in his list. It has been heretofore confined to the Southern States.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I should like to have the Senator point out wherein I have protested before upon this question of apportionment of appropriations.

Mr. KENYON. I can find it in the RECORD, I am certain.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I should like to have it pointed out.

Mr. KENYON. These same figures about what is paid in his State through internal-revenue taxes and all that have also been mentioned. Of course, you have more money in New Jersey than certain States in the South have. You have there a great industrial center, and you have to pay more taxes. Perhaps New Jersey does pay more taxes than Iowa, though New Jersey could not live if it were not for Iowa and some of the Western States and some of the Southern States. We have gotten to the point, I hope, in this country where the welfare of the Southern States is as important to us as the welfare of the Northern States. We are one country. I am growing rather tired, when anything comes up here of this nature, of always being confronted with the proposition that New York and New Jersey are paying all the taxes in the country, and consequently we must have some different method of distribution of funds. Let us get over the idea that we are anything but one country.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOSES in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. KENYON. I yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I agree with the Senator that when it comes to the question of any great public improvement, like the irrigation of the lands of the West or the deepening of the Mississippi River, or anything that affects the progress and prosperity of any section of the country, it is perfectly right that we should not consider selfishly the contributions made by the individual States to those projects. But this adopts a new policy. The States have always cared for their own public instruction, and now you are reaching over and taking money from the taxpayers of those States, through taxes, and reapplying it to other districts of the South and West. It may be a good policy, but it is a new policy never heretofore adopted. I think we should hesitate before we impose upon States in the North, in which those industrial centers are found, an increased burden of taxation to be expended through a public department. We should be absolutely certain that it is a wise policy and a wise plan. I believe that the taxpayers of those States, who pay the bills, should first be consulted as to whether this policy should be adopted, and, notwithstanding the reflection which the Senator casts upon me in protesting against the payment by my State of excessive taxes and a redistribution in this manner, I still protest that a policy of this character is unwise when it interferes with the instruction which has heretofore been carried on and maintained and controlled by my State.

Mr. KENYON. Of course, we can all agree with the Senator that we should be perfectly certain it is a wise policy before we go ahead with it. But it is perfectly apparent that he does not understand the bill when he says it is an attempt to control education in the State of New Jersey. It is not at all. New Jersey need not have anything to do with this bill unless she wants to. Of course, there would be a general appropriation that comes out of the Treasury, but the little part that New Jersey would have to pay of the $1,000,000 a year, the whole appropriation being that sum, would be infinitesimal. No State will be compelled to act under this law, no State is compelled to take its benefits. New Jersey is not hurt one particle.

Whether it is a wise policy is a fair subject for argument. Whether it is a wise policy for the Federal Government to have any interest in the poor devil, whether he is in New Jersey or Alabama or Iowa, who has lost a leg or an arm or both legs or both arms, and has a family dependent on him, and does not know where he is going to turn—whether that is anything we should have anything to do with or not is for each one of us to settle for himself.

I say that the Federal Government is just as much interested in these questions of maintaining a vigorous citizenship in the States as are the States themselves. As the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] has said, we grant citizenship. It applies to all the States, and it is a fiction that is raised here so often, as I have suggested, that some particular States in the Union are paying more than their share of taxes, and especially do we always hear it about the Southern States. I thank God I have reached the condition of mind where I care as much for the welfare of the Southern States as I do for the Northern States, and the Northern States are just as much interested in the vital problems of the Southern States as they are themselves. You can not hurt one part of the country without hurting the whole country. The people who accumulate great riches in the great States and then wrap the cloak of arrogance about them and say, "'You can not take this; you are taking it from our State and giving it to another State," can not longer assume that attitude. No; you have the wealth, and you have to pay your fair proportion of the taxes; you have got to help in the redemption work of the whole Nation. If you do not want to do it, we will make you do it by law. You might as well understand it first as last. The boys who went out from various States went not to fight for these States but for the Nation.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President——

Mr. KENYON. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Is it not a fact that in those great industrial centers where they show greater returns in the way of taxes their wealth arises very largely from building up business from other States and other sections? That is true of a great many industrial centers. They are not merely supported by their own States, but they are supported largely by what they get from other States.

Mr. KENYON. Of course, if it were not for Florida they could not have grapefruit up in New York for breakfast, and if it were not for Iowa they would starve.

I have tried, in a mild way, to explain this bill. I have said to the Senate that it covers men hurt in occupations, farming, and everything else. It covers the man who may be run over by an automobile. They may never avail themselves of this vocational training. They do not have to do it. It is entirely optional with them, and a large number of them probably will not do so.

The appropriations covered are not large. After the year 1922 it will be $1,000,000 a year for the Federal Government. The States can only secure anything under this act by a certificate of the Board of Vocational Training that they have approved the plans which the State has for its vocational training for men hurt in industry. These plans are submitted to the Federal board. If satisfactory to the Federal board, it then certifies to the Treasury, and the payments are made dollar for dollar.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. KENYON. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Before the Senator leaves the subject which he is discussing, I should like to have him explain why the amendment on page 1 of the bill, beginning in line 5, was adopted by the committee. The amendment reads:

> And who are without sufficient means to provide for their own rehabilitation.

It seems to me, with those words in the law, a person who has been injured or in any way disabled would have to acknowledge to the whole world that he is next thing to a pauper, and I doubt the wisdom of putting in those words.

Mr. KENYON. I do, too.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I do not think it will make any difference, as far as the number of disabled persons

is concerned who will take advantage of the act, with the single exception that I am fearful there are some persons who may be disabled and who before they would make this statement of proof that they are without sufficient funds to provide for their own rehabilitation would go without it. Really I would very much prefer to see that amendment disagreed to.

Mr. KENYON. I will say to the Senator it was suggested in committee by some member that a person who was very wealthy might ask for this training. I do not think it would occur once in a thousand years, but on that account the amendment was put in there. I agree with the Senator from Utah that it ought to go out. I have no right to bind anybody on it, however.

Mr. SMOOT. I hope the amendment will be disagreed to, because many sensitive persons receiving an injury or suffering a disability when asked, before they can receive the benefits of this law, "Have you not any friends, or can you not get the money, or are you not able to pay for this yourself," I am fearful would never take advantage of it who ought to take advantage of it.

Mr. KENYON. I agree with the Senator. There is a good deal of danger in that provision.

There is an amendment on page 5 which has been inserted by the committee:

And to cooperate, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, with such public and private agencies as it may deem advisable.

It was thought that many institutions, such as the Knights of Columbus, Elks, Young Men's Christian Association, and other institutions, would raise funds for scholarships, and the board desires permission to cooperate with them.

It is an interesting fact to know that there are now over 4,000 maimed soldiers of the war waiting for their vocational training who can not get it because of a dispute, or rather a difference, in construction of the law on the part of the War Risk Insurance Bureau and the Federal Board for Vocational Training, a man being entitled to vocational training only where he is entitled to compensation under the terms of the war-risk insurance act. A man may have lost an arm and still be able to go back to his old job and not be entitled to compensation, so he could not have vocational training. Then the War Risk Insurance Bureau has to investigate all the questions involved, his family, and his own life, to get at the question of whether he is entitled to compensation. He can not have the training vocationally until he is entitled to compensation.

The Elks, to their everlasting credit and possibly to the shame of the Government, have raised a fund of over $200,000 that is being used to be loaned to these boys who are trying to secure vocational training. They give their notes; I have some of them here. They pay them as they get their allotments and their compensation. Those 4,000 boys to-day are waiting for this vocational training.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

Mr. KENYON. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I think if the able and earnest Senator from Utah had reflected a little more upon the matter he would have recognized that this bill is not a departure from the Federal policy of the Government. Ever since our Nation was formed it has deemed it wise to aid States in the matter of education. Early in our history it gave extensive grants of land to States, and upon the demand of every State in the Union it gave great grants of land for the purpose of aiding the cause of education. My recollection is that the State of Utah has been particularly favored in that respect.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator is referring to the remarks of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes; of the junior Senator from Utah. Utah was particularly favored in that respect, its grant transcending, my recollection is, the grant made to any of the neighboring States.

I am quite unable to distinguish in principle between a grant of land to a State in aid of education, land which might be sold and the proceeds covered into the Treasury, and taking money out of the Treasury of the United States and donating it to the State in aid of education. Indeed, if I am not quite in error, that course has been pursued in a number of cases and grants of money have been made to many States in aid of education in order to equalize the benefits that accrued to other States that secured great grants of land.

I see the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is in the Chamber now, and I will say for his benefit that I was advancing the idea that the principle of this bill is not new in the field of national education; that from its commencement the National Government has aided the States in education by making grants of land; and that very extensive grants of land were made to aid education in Utah—exceedingly large grants, as my recollection is—and I said that I could not distinguish in principle between a grant of land for education—land that might be sold and the proceeds covered into the General Treasury—and taking money out of the Treasury in aid of the cause of education.

Moreover, my recollection is also that, in order to equalize the beneficence of the Federal Government among all of the States, grants of money were made out of the General Treasury to many of the States, so that I believe there is no real departure from the settled policy of the Government in the principle of this bill, and I think the Senator will so feel upon reflection.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I am not going to take any more of the time of the Senate. I will be very glad to answer any questions which I can with regard to this bill, if Senators are interested in any of its provisions. I have a very firm belief not only in the justice but in the wisdom of this kind of legislation, not merely from the humane standpoint, the human salvage that is involved in it, but from the standpoint of those who look at the mere dollars-and-cents proposition, the economic side of it.

The average earning of the people engaged in labor in this country is about $548 a year—I do not mean per family, but per person. While, as I have indicated, there are over 15,000 with these serious injuries, there certainly will be 100,000 people, at a conservative estimate, injured in this country every year, and there are over 200,000 of injured now in the country. The reports from the State of Pennsylvania show for one year something like 800,000 are kept away from work for a day or more by injuries. Some of those injuries were very slight. On the railroads throughout this country for the last five years there have been 931,000 men injured. I do not mean seriously injured, but injured so that they were kept from their work possibly over a month. So there is a great army of injured people in this country.

If we show an interest, and stimulate the States to take an interest, in rehabilitating these men, they are also going to take an interest in the question of more safety around those men to prevent those injuries. If you take it merely from the economic standpoint, 100,000 men a year, with $548 as the average earnings—and those were the figures before the war; the amount is greater now—if you could take that many men away from the scrap heap and put them back into industry with an earning capacity, you would have an economic saving of over $50,000,000 a year. So those can deal in these figures who want to sit down calmly and figure out what saving a bill of this kind would involve.

But to my mind there is the greater, broader question. The man on his back in the hospital with a family has his compensation from the State that is carrying him on for a few weeks. The clouds are about him all the time as to what his family is going to do and what he is going to do for them in the future. If you have something of this kind where you can meet him, as the boys from the Army are now being met in the hospitals, and say to the man who is injured and has no future, "We have something for you; the Federal Government and the State government are cooperating to help you; they are not throwing you aside and forgetting you; you are still a part of society," I tell you the clouds will roll away, for dependency makes despondency, and if you can remove that fear from a man's mind, you will have made a better citizen out of him, a better father, and a better husband. So, outside of all economic questions, it is a great humanitarian measure.

I know men are not expected to advocate humanitarian measures very often in this Chamber, and the men who do are considered altruistic and idealistic, and I perhaps would hesitate about it if the measure could not be backed up with a sound saving in economic loss of from fifty million to a hundred million dollars a year.

The men who worked in the factories making the things for the boys to use at the front and were injured are entitled to the same consideration as the men at the front. They were essential to the winning of the war. This bill is to do for the man in overalls what we have done for the boys in the khaki uniforms.

Mr. POMERENE rose.

Mr. KENYON. I am through, I will say to the Senator, although I will be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. POMERENE. I had expected that the Senator from Iowa would reply to and make a suggestion to the Senator from New Jersey. While it may be true that the richer industrial States will furnish a larger proportion of this money than will the agricultural States, yet, at the same time, it must be borne in mind that the accidents which occur in the mechanical and mining industries are very much in excess of those which occur in the agricultural industries. Therefore, while the industrial States will be paying a larger sum perhaps than some of the agricultural States, at the same time they will be caring for a

greater portion of these unfortunates who are to be found in those industrial States.

Mr. KENYON. Of course, you can not have any rule of distribution that will be exactly fair; and I can sympathize to some extent with the viewpoint a man from New Jersey may take on the proposition; but I did not intend by anything I said to reflect in any way upon the opinion of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I merely wish to say to the Senator from Iowa that I understand his observations were made entirely on the bill and its merits, but I felt that there was some reflection in his feeling that my position was one of antagonism to a proper development in the other States of the Union. I was president of the State Board of Education of New Jersey for six years. Three years I spent in an effort to reorganize it, which was finally accomplished. We established vocational education long before the Federal Government assisted the States in any way; and I feel that any interference or anything that would in any way tend to retard the splendid progress and advancement which we have made in New Jersey would be criticized by the constituency I represent.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator understands, does he not, that New Jersey need not participate in the benefits of this law at all but can go right on in its own way?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I understand that; but I also understand that a large portion of the appropriation made under this bill will be taken from the taxpayers of the State which I, in part, represent, and which the Senator from Iowa does not represent.

Mr. KENYON. Will the Senator enlighten us as to how much of this million dollars will be paid by New Jersey?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. As I understand, the State of New Jersey would pay $28,000, and would receive about $27,000 in return. The Senator from Iowa has made the magnificent offer that New Jersey need not avail itself of this appropriation. I hardly believe, however, that if New Jersey paid that amount, it would not want it back; but it does not want any Federal direction or control of its public-instruction system.

Mr. KENYON. Nor does it have under this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. I withhold the motion.

Mr. KENYON. The resolution of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] was laid aside. I do not want the bill which has been under consideration to supplant that resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. It was laid aside temporarily, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. I wish to give notice that, as soon as that resolution has been disposed of, I shall move again to take up the bill which has been under consideration and endeavor to keep it before the Senate until it has been disposed of.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] is very much interested in this bill. He was called to Atlanta on account of the illness of Mrs. Smith. I should like the Senator from Iowa to get into communication with him and ascertain whether it will be satisfactory to him for the measure to be taken up in his absence. He has been for some years chairman of the committee which reported the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say that to-morrow the unfinished business will be the same as the unfinished business to-day.

Mr. SWANSON. I suggest that the Senator from Iowa communicate with the secretary of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. KENYON. I will do that, but I am sure that the Senator from Georgia would not object to the passage of the bill.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator from Iowa could in that way find out what the purposes of the Senator from Georgia are. He might want to be here.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator does not feel that the Senator from Georgia would object to the passage of the bill? It is his measure; it was introduced by him.

Mr. SWANSON. No; but the Senator from Iowa might need his assistance to secure its passage.

Mr. KENYON. I think that that might be so, and I should like to have his presence.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, my recollection is that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] moved to proceed to the consideration of the vocational bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I understood that it was taken up and considered by unanimous consent. I asked that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for that purpose.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The unfinished business was temporarily laid aside in justice to the Senator from California.

Mr. SMOOT. If there is any question about it, I move that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

Mr. SWANSON. It was clearly understood that the bill of the Senator from Iowa was to be taken up by unanimous consent and that the unfinished business was to be temporarily laid aside, the resolution of the Senator from California being the unfinished business.

Mr. KENYON. That was the understanding.

Mr. SMOOT. So that there may be no question about it, I move that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of Senate resolution No. 12, submitted by Mr. JOHNSON of California May 20, 1919, requesting the full text of the treaty of peace with Germany.

CLAIMS AGAINST MEXICO.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, during the last session of Congress I offered a resolution in regard to Mexico. The Committee on Foreign Relations reported the resolution, and it was adopted, but under that resolution the information which was sought has not been fully obtained. I understand that the State Department is making provision to furnish certain information. At the beginning of this session I submitted another resolution, substantially in the same language as the one which was passed at the last session. It was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I invited the attention of the chairman of the committee [Mr. LODGE] to it, and told him that at the earliest opportunity I should ask that the committee be discharged from the consideration of the resolution, and that I would ask for its immediate passage. He assented to that, because the resolution called for substantially the same information that was called for in the former resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. It simply asks for information?

Mr. KING. Yes; for information. I move that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from the further consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 8. If that shall be done, then I will ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. CURTIS. Let the resolution be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PHIPPS in the chair). The Secretary will read the resolution as requested.

The Secretary read the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 8) relative to claims of citizens of the United States against the Republic of Mexico, as follows:

Whereas claims aggregating millions of dollars in compensation for damages to property and for personal outrages and destruction of life suffered by American citizens in the Republic of Mexico have been filed with the Department of State for presentation to the Government of Mexico; and

Whereas some years have already intervened between the commission of such damages and outrages, and no progress is apparently being made toward the liquidation, settlement, and payment of such claims: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate whether or not said claims have been presented to the Government of Mexico, and what steps and measures are being taken to prosecute such claims and to liquidate and settle the same, and if said claims have not been presented, then to report to the Senate what steps and measures are contemplated to be taken with respect thereto and when the department will proceed with the same; also to report to the Senate the number of citizens of the United States who have been killed in Mexico since Porfirio Diaz retired from the Presidency of Mexico, together with the number of nationals of other countries who have been killed in Mexico, as far as the Secretary of State is advised; also to report to the Senate the amount of claims filed with the Secretary for damages suffered by citizens of the United States in Mexico and any information which the Secretary has as to the confiscation of property of citizens of the United States and as to the damage suffered by the citizens of the United States in Mexico.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, in view of the fact that I have had no opportunity to consult all of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee, although I am sure, if I had done so, all would have assented to the mode of procedure which I have just suggested, I shall not ask at this time for the discharge of the committee or for the consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah withdraws his motion.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator is not going to call up the resolution at this time; but I wish to direct attention to its phraseology. If I understood it correctly, it is a joint resolution directing that the information be given to the Senate alone. I think the Senator only intended it as a simple Senate resolution.

Mr. KING. As a Senate resolution. The verbiage will be corrected.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, June 3, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *June 2, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, to be, to think, to act on our own initiative is life—a precious boon yet a stupendous responsibility.

Give us the courage, the grace, that we may meet the high ideals revealed in the prophets and Thy son Jesus Christ, that we may render unto our fellow men and unto Thee the duties laid upon us, that a clear conscience may be ours day by day as we march on in the King's highway and a sense of the life eternal. In the spirit of Him who taught us the way and the truth and the life. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, May 31, 1919, was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

The SPEAKER. Members present who have not yet taken the oath of office will present themselves and be sworn in.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. QUIN, of Mississippi, has not been sworn in.

The SPEAKER. The gentlemen will present themselves and be sworn in.

Mr. QUIN and Mr. GALLIVAN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, the House kindly gave me permission to address the House immediately after the reading of the Journal this morning. I find that the Agricultural appropriation bill is not yet through and that there are other appropriation bills pending, so I have decided to wait until the Army appropriation bill shall come before the House and I will take the time then. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday afternoon late I submitted a few remarks on the luxury-tax bill, so called. I have been sick ever since. I was sick before. I do not know whether that made me more sick or not. Anyway, I have not had a chance to correct that speech, and I desire now to have five days in which to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks five days in which to revise the remarks he made Saturday. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MAMMOTH CAVE NATIONAL PARK, KY.

Mr. THOMAS. I introduced a bill last week to create a national park at Mammoth Cave, Ky. The clerk, it seems, referred that bill to the Committee on Appropriations. At the last session of Congress the same bill was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and that committee decided that it ought to go to the Committee on the Public Lands. I now ask that the reference be changed to the Committee on the Public Lands.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks that a change of reference be made of the bill indicated from the Committee on Appropriations to the Committee on the Public Lands. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think this is a matter that should have a little consideration. So far as the membership of the House knows, the Committee on the Public Lands has not been consulted in the matter, nor the Speaker, nor the parliamentary clerk who first referred the bill to the other committee; and, personally, while I have no objection to the transfer, yet I think the matter had better come up to-morrow, so that for the time being I shall object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming temporarily objects.

Mr. THOMAS. I would just say that I referred it to the Committee on the Public Lands because it was sent there at the last session of Congress. That was the only reason.

Mr. MONDELL. I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky that I think there will be no objection, and I hope he will defer his request until to-morrow.

Mr. THOMAS. I will wait then until to-morrow.

LOAN OF TENTS TO CITY OF DAWSON, GA.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, at the request of my colleague, Representative CRISP, who is unavoidably absent to-day, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House joint resolution 79.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution named, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 79) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the city of Dawson, Ga., tents and cots for use of Confederate veterans in their State convention, June 17 and 18, 1919.

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to loan, at his discretion, to the city of Dawson, Ga., for the use of Confederate veterans in their State convention, to be held at Dawson on June 17 and 18, 1919, 50 tents and 200 cots: *Provided*, That no expense shall be caused the United States Government by the delivery and return of said property, the same to be delivered to said city designated, at such time prior to the holding of said encampment as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of War and the mayor of said city: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War, before delivering said tents and cots, shall take from the mayor of said city a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of said property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO THE MINORITY.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Accounts, presents a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 57.

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, from date of their appointment, not earlier than May 1, 1919, until otherwise provided by law, for the services of a clerk, an assistant clerk, and a messenger, compensation at the rate of $2,500, $1,500, and $1,000 per annum, respectively, the said clerks and messenger to be appointed by and to be under the direction and control of the minority floor leader.

With committee amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 2, strike out the word "their," and in line 4 strike out the words "a clerk, an," and in line 5 strike out the words "and a messenger, compensation at the rate of $2,500, $1,500, and $1,000 per annum, respectively, the said clerks and messenger to be," and at the end of the resolution strike out the period and insert a comma and the following words: "additional compensation of $300 per annum, payable monthly," so that as amended the resolution will read:

"*Resolved*, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, from the date of appointment, not earlier than May 1, 1919, until otherwise provided by law, for the services of assistant clerk, appointed by and to be under the direction and control of the minority floor leader, additional compensation of $300 per annum, payable monthly."

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, this is made to conform to the resolution which was presented some time ago for the majority leader, and it is to equalize matters between the two forces. It is the same matter I asked the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] about when the former resolution was introduced.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

EXPERT AND OTHER ASSISTANTS FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I also ask for the present consideration of another privileged resolution, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois sends up a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 63.

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means is authorized to sit during the sessions and recesses of the present Congress; to employ such expert, clerical, and stenographic services, and to gather such information, through Government agents or otherwise, as to it may seem fit, in connection with the consideration and preparation of bills for the revision of the present tariff law and of other revenue legislation; to purchase such books and to have such printing and binding done as it shall require, in addition to requiring the attendance of the committee stenographers; to employ additional stenographers; and to incur such other expenses as may be deemed necessary by the committee. All the expenses of the committee shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on the usual vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 2, after the word "authorized," strike out the words "to sit during the sessions and recesses of the present Congress."

Page 1, line 4, after the word "services," strike out the words "and to gather such information, through Government agents or otherwise."

Page 1, line 9, after the word "require," strike out the comma and insert a semicolon and the word "and."

Page 1, line 10, after the word "stenographers," strike out the semicolon and insert a comma.

Page 1, line 10, after the word "employ," insert the word "such."

Page 1, line 11, after the word "stenographers," strike out the semicolon and insert a comma.

Page 1, line 12, after the word "all," insert the word "of," and after the word "the," insert the word "said."

So that the resolution as amended will read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means is authorized to employ such expert, clerical, and stenographic services as to it may seem fit, in connection with the consideration and preparation of bills for the revision of the present tariff law and of other revenue legislation; to purchase such books and to have such printing and binding done as it shall require; and in addition to requiring the attendance of the committee stenographers, to employ such additional stenographers, and to incur such other expenses as may be deemed necessary by the committee. All of the said expenses of the committee shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on the usual vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. IRELAND. Certainly.

Mr. KITCHIN. I should like to ask the gentleman if this is the usual resolution?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. The usual resolution that has passed in sessions of Congress when tariff and other revenue legislation has been considered?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes; it conforms almost, if not quite, identically to the Underwood resolution, but that was passed by unanimous consent from the floor, and in some way did not come to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. KITCHIN. I wanted to know if it was the usual resolution.

Mr. IRELAND. There were items in the resolution that we struck out, believing them not to be within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Accounts, and that the resolution would, therefore, be subject to a point of order. Otherwise the resolution is quite similar.

Mr. KITCHIN. The usual resolution?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. I think it ought to pass; that is, provided that side of the House are really sincere in their statement that they are going to consider the tariff at this session; and I believe that is true, that they are really sincere in the statement that they are going to present a tariff bill for the consideration of the House at this session.

Mr. IRELAND. I am absolutely surprised that the sincerity of the Republican Party could ever be questioned in the gentleman's mind.

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, the gentleman from Illinois does not know the Republicans on that side as well as I do. He has not been here as long as I have. [Laughter.]

Mr. IRELAND. I confess the gentleman has the advantage of me in that respect.

Mr. KITCHIN. I think this resolution ought to pass, if it is the usual resolution.

Mr. WINGO. What limit is there on this expenditure for special experts and assistants?

Mr. IRELAND. We asked the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to come before the Committee on Accounts, which he did, and there was no statement made as to that, and there has not been in the past. He informed the committee that he expected to save a great deal by obtaining information through Government agents in the Treasury Department, the New York Customhouse, and so forth.

Mr. WINGO. There is no limitation? That is left to the discretion of the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. IRELAND. No; we talked that over, and it was left to the discretion of the committee.

Mr. WINGO. It may not be wise to limit them. I suspect that they will need considerable expert information and assistance. [Laughter.]

Mr. IRELAND. I believe it will be better to leave the resolution as it is in that respect.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. IRELAND. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DYER. As I understand the resolution as amended, does it prevent the Committee on Ways and Means from sitting and making these investigations during the recess of Congress?

Mr. IRELAND. The Committee on Accounts has nothing whatsoever to do with that. That is outside of their jurisdiction.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will say to the gentleman that at the proper time I will ask unanimous consent that the committee be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House for the purpose of holding hearings.

Mr. GARRETT. I notice that this resolution authorizes the purchase of such books as the committee may deem necessary. Did the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee disclose to the Committee on Accounts the character of the books that he had in mind to purchase?

Mr. IRELAND. No; not the nature and character of the books; and he was not insistent on that being left in the resolution.

Mr. GARRETT. I am not insistent on its going out.

Mr. IRELAND. He might want to purchase an almanac or something.

Mr. GARRETT. Or Prof. Taussig's book.

Mr. FORDNEY. If the gentleman will permit me, similar language has been in resolutions passed in previous sessions. I know of no books which the committee may need, except such as relate to the keeping of the records of the committee; but I do not see any harm in leaving that language in the resolution. If the gentleman wishes to strike it out, well and good.

Mr. GARRETT. I do not ask that it be stricken out.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. IRELAND. Certainly.

Mr. GARNER. I think the House ought to understand that this resolution is bad practice, and for one I certainly would have objected to the passage of it if it had not the precedent set by the Democrats some time ago. Therefore I think our side of the House are somewhat estopped from objecting, because we permitted this resolution to pass in a former Congress when the Democrats were going to make up a tariff bill. The resolution does not place any limitation on this expenditure, but everybody knows that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] is not going to abuse the power given in this resolution. That is one reason why I support it.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not know whether I feel like leaving this unlimited discretion with this Committee on Accounts or not, because in the closing hours of the last Congress, about 3 o'clock a. m., the acting chairman of this committee at that time brought in a resolution to pay an extra thousand dollars to a man who has been drawing $3,600 a year, or $300 a month, as the clerk of a certain committee that had not done any work whatever. When I requested time to oppose that resolution, the gag rule was applied by the acting chairman of this particular committee, and I could not open my mouth against it.

Mr. KNUTSON. All this happened in the last Congress; it could not happen in this one.

Mr. BLANTON. The resolution was passed by a close vote, Republicans furnishing the majority vote after a roll call had been ordered. If the Republicans had been inclined to save that thousand dollars they could have saved it by voting against it. Therefore I do not know that we ought to leave this in the discretion of this committee unless we can be assured by the chairman of this committee that such items as $1,000 of the people's money will not again be voted to a man as extra pay who had been drawing $3,600 a year and whose committee had done no work. I do not care how much work he did for another committee, he could not earn more than $3,600 when the salary of the clerk of a committee is only $2,500 and not $3,600.

Mr. CANDLER. What committee was that?

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will get the RECORD he will find that I requested time from the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS], the then acting chairman of the committee, but the gag rule was applied to me.

Mr. CANDLER. I asked the gentleman what committee this was.

Mr. BLANTON. The RECORD will disclose the committee; it had not sat at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The regular order.

Mr. CANDLER. What committee was it?

Mr. BLANTON. I have forgotten what committee it was.

Mr. CANDLER. It was not the Committee on Ways and Means, was it?

Mr. BLANTON. It was the Committee on Accounts, with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS] as chairman of the committee, and I could not get time.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has the floor, and the regular order is called for.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution as amended.

The previous question was ordered.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

CHARWOMEN FOR CAPITOL BUILDING.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask the further indulgence of the House for one more resolution, which I present.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 90.

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House the sum of $103 for the services of 15 charwomen necessarily employed under the direction of the superintendent of the Capitol Building in the House wing of the Capitol.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, this is for work done during the recess in cleaning up the Capitol.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 1200. An act making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, and for other purposes.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What has become of the Unanimous Consent Calendar?

The SPEAKER. The Chair should have stated that there is no business on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. KITCHIN. Should there not be a motion to suspend the rules?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is not necessary, as there is no business on the calendar.

The motion of Mr. HAUGEN was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. MADDEN in the chair.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I believe when the House adjourned there was a motion pending to strike out $100,000 in the item.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LONGWORTH: Page 51, line 11, strike out "$100,000" and insert "$50,000."

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON: Page 51, lines 6 to 11, inclusive, strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, first, on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] to perfect the paragraph by striking out the figures "$100,000" and inserting "$50,000" in lieu thereof.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I think the Chair is in error, because the committee at the time it rose was dividing upon the motion of the gentleman from Illinois. If the committee erroneously voted on the wrong motion, you can not switch now and take up the motion having preference. The committee proceeded to divide on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois, and the rule is that when the House returns to the committee it takes up the vote upon which it was engaged when it rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that if a mistake was made as to precedence of the motion to amend that it is now in order to correct the mistake. The vote will be taken on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I think the RECORD will show that the motion was offered to reduce the item by $50,000 and that was voted upon. No point of order was raised.

The CHAIRMAN. There was no vote taken on it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, if I recall correctly, the vote was had erroneously upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], which was to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Which vote should have been taken after the vote on the motion to perfect the paragraph. The result, however, was never announced, because the committee found itself without a quorum. It seems to me that vacates this whole proceeding, and that the Chair is correct, and the vote should now be taken upon the motion to perfect the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct. The committee found itself in the original position it was in before any vote was taken.

Mr. HAUGEN. Does the RECORD disclose that the vote was taken upon the amendment to reduce the amount by $50,000?

The CHAIRMAN. No; there was no vote taken.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, may the paragraph be reported again?

The CHAIRMAN. The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] to strike out, on line 11, page 51, the figures "$100,000" and insert "$50,000" in lieu thereof.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the paragraph.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

For investigation and experiment in the utilization, for coloring purposes, of raw materials grown or produced in the United States, in cooperation with such persons, associations, or corporations as may be found necessary, including repairs, alterations, improvements, or additions to a building on the Arlington Experimental Farm, $100,000.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What became of the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] to strike out the paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union found itself without a quorum. That leaves the whole question open as if it never had been acted upon. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio to strike out "$100,000" and to insert "$50,000."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LONGWORTH) there were—ayes 78, noes 78.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed Mr. LONGWORTH and Mr. LEVER to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 77, noes 92.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs upon the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LEVER) there were—ayes 62, noes 84.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation and development of methods for the manufacture of table sirup and of methods for the manufacture of sweet sirups by the utilization of new agricultural sources, $12,000.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. TREADWAY: Page 51, strike out lines 12, 13, 14, and 15.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, in the committee report we find very little reference to this item. It represents evidently a transfer of funds in order to get it into a regular appropriation bill from some previous special item. I have read the testimony before the committee taken last year. Evidently a Dr. Alsberg seems to be interested in the matter. In addition to changing the amount I find that the present chairman of the committee referred to this item as part of it being new.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not take another off his feet with a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RAKER. A point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAKER. There is nothing before the House. The Clerk has not reported any amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is mistaken. The question is on the motion to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. TREADWAY. It seems to me that some consideration should be given to the retention of an item for the "utilization of new agricultural sources." That is a peculiar phrase to me. Agriculture has been going on for hundreds of years, but evidently some one in the Department of Agriculture has discovered something which he considers a new agricultural source. I would like an explanation of that. Further than that, up in the part of the country where I reside they have been manufacturing a very good kind of sirup, known as maple sirup, for a long time, without any sort of assistance from the Agricultural Department about new agricultural products. It seems to me that this must be an effort to continue a very learned gentleman, as I have do doubt Dr. Alsberg is, in the position, because he says progress has been made satisfactory to him. He or some appointee of his has been drawing the salary. Whether or not the progress in the development of this new agricultural product is satisfactory to the Congress of the United States is not stated. I think the matter ought to be looked into.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, a part of this is a transfer of $5,000 from the food-production act. The work is not new; it has been carried on for a number of years. We add $5,000 to it in the expectation, and according to the representation made by Dr. Alsberg, that this work may be finished. We expect

that an appropriation for this purpose will not be necessary hereafter. Notwithstanding the splendid maple sirup made in the gentleman's State, there are still questions open in respect to the skill in boiling and various items that enter into the production and manufacture of sirup.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TREADWAY) there were—ayes 41, noes 75.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, on page 51, line 15, I move to strike out the figures "$12,000" and substitute in place thereof "$5,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York——

Mr. LONGWORTH. May I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that this time, at least, the amendment has not been reported by the Clerk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 51, line 15, strike out "$12,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000."

Mr. CANNON. I would like to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MAGEE. If I can get additional time I will yield.

Mr. CANNON. I did not understand the gentleman had the floor. Oh, no.

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, the provision provides—

For the investigation and development of methods for the manufacture of table sirup and of methods for the manufacture of sweet sirups by the utilization of new agricultural sources, $12,000.

I am in favor of any provision in this act that will be of real benefit to the American farmer. I was born and brought up on a farm myself, and I do not believe that the farmers are in favor of expending public funds, particularly at this time, for the purposes mentioned in this paragraph.

I am for drastic retrenchment in public expenditures wherever possible without detriment to the public interest. I appreciate that this is a small item, but an aggregation of small items soon makes a large amount, and there are many items now remaining in the bill through the solid Democratic vote in the House, aided by a few of my Republican colleagues, which, in my judgment, contain little or no merit and should have been struck out. For instance, the appropriation for investigation and experiment in the utilization of vegetable dyes is, in my judgment, practically a waste of public funds.

I think it is high time, in the matter of public expenditures, that we should get down to earth and stay there. We have billions of dollars of public debts to pay. It is not probable that anyone will propose another popular loan, but the debts must be paid. As stated in an editorial in the New York Sun on May 29—

It is a hard, cold fact that there are some eight to ten billions of dollars of unpaid bills and of bills still running on—bills which are a heritage from the war now half a year old—to be cleaned up by this new Congress. * * *

It is hopeless to think that these billions and billions of dollars of bills can be cleared off the slate without heavy taxes. There is nothing else left now. But even heavy taxes can not clean them up unless present and future expenditures are cut to the bone. This Government can not go on spending the way it has been and still is spending and meet the current charges with any tax program yet suggested, much less clean up the stupendous back bills.

The Committee on Appropriations must take an ax to every item in every department that can possibly be lopped off. They must chop out entirely all the foolish, visionary, and extravagant programs which have been dreamed and set in motion by legislative and executive misfits, who do not know a business proposition from the reflection of a rainbow. All that sort of stuff must be dumped into the wastebasket. Even the practical programs have got to come down to a rock-bottom basis or no taxation measure that can be devised will keep the Treasury supplied with funds to pay the way of the Government and save its name from financial reproach.

When we consider that our national debt has been increased from practically a billion dollars before we entered the World War to more than $25,000,000,000 now, a sum almost beyond human conception, it is apparent how absolutely necessary it is that we should economize in the expenditure of public funds. The interest upon our public debt of to-day approximately amounts to what our public debt was some two years ago.

In connection with the proposed appropriation we should also keep in mind that the people of this country are taxed in almost every conceivable manner for the purpose of providing funds to meet the authorized expenditures of the Government. To illustrate, as to some small yet important things, we tax club dues when in excess of $10 per year, even dues payable to an organization like a chamber of commerce; we tax soft drinks like ice cream sodas; we tax eyeglasses, ordinary spectacles, apparently upon the theory that they are a luxury; and we tax sporting goods, like tennis rackets and baseballs, although we know that every boy in America who has a healthful body indulges in some out-of-door sport, and particularly in baseball, the great national game.

I favor the prompt repeal of the obnoxious, nagging consumption taxes. I am satisfied that we can save more than the amounts of these taxes by the exercise of thrift and economy alone. How many hundreds of millions of dollars can be saved by promptly reducing the Army to a peace-time basis of something less than 200,000 men? [Applause.] How many more hundreds of millions of dollars can be saved by reducing the Navy to a peace-time basis and eliminating the foolish program of attempting to create a Navy equal to that of Great Britain? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAGEE. How many millions upon millions of dollars can be saved by striking from appropriation bills items, like the one under consideration, of little or no merit and items not demanding immediate consideration? How many hundreds of millions of dollars can be saved by promptly returning the railroads to their owners under proper governmental supervision? [Applause.] I do not wish to be understood as speaking in a spirit of criticism. I merely speak as one who would like to do something in the public interest and as one who is willing to cooperate with anybody else, regardless of party affiliations, who feels likewise.

In view of the various burdensome taxes now being imposed and paid by the people of this country, I can not understand why an appropriation should be made in this bill for the investigation and development of methods for the manufacture of an additional Democratic "soothing" sirup. I call it Democratic not in any captious spirit, but because this paragraph in the pending bill appears to have been taken bodily from the Democratic bill from the Department of Agriculture introduced in the House on January 24, 1919, and will be found on page 51 thereof.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. BLACK. In making that statement, does not the gentleman recognize the fact that this bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture at the last session of Congress and was also reported unanimously at this session by the Republican chairman of the committee?

Mr. MAGEE. I am giving my views upon this subject.

Mr. HAUGEN. And, may I add, passed almost unanimously by the House of Representatives at the last session of Congress?

Mr. MAGEE. There does not appear to me to have been any proper revision of the old bill and the striking therefrom of items of little or no merit. Instead of figuring on "new plans of financing" I am in favor of figuring on new plans of economy. I think that this bill should be recommitted to the Committee on Agriculture with instructions to revise the same downward along the lines of efficiency and economy and not upward along the lines of extravagance and wasteful expenditure of public funds. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, to show how economical the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE] really is, the other day when the proposition was offered to save this Government $100,000 on a proposed appropriation of $358,980 for garden seeds there were only two Members who voted for my amendment to save that $100,000, as against 95 who voted to keep it in. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE] had voted to save that $100,000 there would have been one more vote, at least 3 in favor and only 94 against. The gentleman now wants to save $7,000 on finding a better method to manufacture molasses. He had an opportunity to save $100,000 when we had the garden-seed appropriation up in this bill. In a previous paragraph we had already passed the item of $139,780 for the purchase, propagation, testing, and distribution of new and rare seeds, and in addition to this amount the now economical gentleman permitted only two votes to go against the additional ap-

propriation of $358,980, when it was larger by over $100,000 than existing law and larger by over $100,000 than the bill brought in here by the last committee in the Sixty-fifth Congress. I desire to call attention also to the fact that on the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] there appears in the RECORD on page 370 the following:

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.
The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

And following that request, after 30 minutes' debate had been exhausted and the Walsh amendment had been voted upon and completed, another amendment was offered to save $100,000 in the seed appropriation, concerning which there appears in the RECORD on page 373 the following:

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I believe the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto is exhausted. But I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may be granted five minutes.
Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.
The CHAIRMAN. What is it?
Mr. BLANTON. I watched the language closely when the gentleman in charge of this bill asked that the debate close, and if the Chair will refer to the language he will find that it referred only to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts and all amendments thereto, not to this paragraph. Therefore the debate on any other amendment to this paragraph is clearly in order.
The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled. The gentleman from New York is not in order. The debate has closed under the agreement.

I merely call the attention to this erroneous decision, because I do not want this distinguished Chairman of the Committee of the Whole Republican House on the state of the Union to make an erroneous ruling against my point of order and get away with it altogether. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I have been at some loss to know exactly how to vote on some amendments offered to this bill striking out some items and cutting down others. I think we all agree with the sentiments uttered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE] and that it is very desirable to practice the most rigid economy consistent with providing proper funds for the efficient management of these great departments of the Government. I have no expert knowledge of the various items in this bill, neither has the average Member of the House, I take it. The Committee on Agriculture has had hearings on this bill and the various items and provisions of this bill and they bring into the House what they consider a proper bill. Now, under our present method of making appropriations we are compelled to rely, in my judgment, very largely on the recommendations of these appropriating committees when they have studied these questions and make a report to the House.

I think there is great need that this Congress should at as early a date as possible enact legislation creating the budget system, so that these great supply bills can be created and made up and passed upon in an intelligent and comprehensive manner, so that Members may have something to rely on. I believe by this method we can save many millions of dollars annually. But until that is done, unless a Member of the House has certain expert knowledge that would justify him in believing that a recommendation of a committee is wrong or that the amount carried in the bill is excessive, I seriously doubt whether simply in the interest of general economy and retrenchment in these matters we are justified in voting haphazard here and there to cut down the various appropriations or strike them out entirely. We will get nowhere by that method.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly.

Mr. BLACK. I was just wondering whether under that suggested budget system what more expert advice we would have than we have now?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I can not say as to that other than that many of the great governments of the world and a great many States of the Union have adopted budget systems of some kind in preparing appropriations, and that it is claimed they work well in the interest of economy.

The Department of Agriculture is one of the great departments of the Government. It has had a remarkable history. The first Secretary was the Hon. Jeremiah Rusk, of Wisconsin, who was appointed in the administration of President Harrison. The first appropriation that was made by the Congress for the department was a little over $1,000,000, a very modest sum, and for more than 10 years after the creation of the department, with the Secretary of Agriculture a member of the Cabinet, the appropriations in no one year reached the sum of $5,000,000. But there was a gradual growth. I will insert herewith a list giving the appropriations for the various years, beginning with the year 1890, the first year in which appropriations were made for this department.

It will be noticed that these appropriations have in no single year been less than in the preceding year. There has been a gradual but steady growth in these appropriations from year to year without regard to the political complexion of Congress:

Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture from 1890.

1890	$1,669,770.00
1891	1,796,502.85
1892	3,028,153.50
1893	3,233,060.72
1894	3,323,500.00
1895	3,226,915.00
1896	3,303,750.00
1897	3,255,532.00
1898	3,182,902.06
1899	3,509,202.00
1900	3,726,022.00
1901	4,023,500.00
1902	4,582,420.00
1903	5,208,960.00
1904	5,978,160.00
1905	5,902,040.00
1906	6,882,690.00
1907	9,930,440.00
1908	9,447,290.00
1909	11,672,106.00
1910	12,995,036.00
1911	13,487,636.00
1912	16,900,016.00
1913	16,648,168.00
1914	17,986,945.00
1915	19,865,832.00
1916	22,971,782.00
1917	24,911,791.39
1918	25,929,113.00
1919	27,875,353.00

Amount carried in this bill $31,691,562, being only a normal and average increase as compared with former years.

The amount of appropriations for 18 years was under $10,000,000 each year, but beginning in 1908 the appropriations have risen gradually under each successive Congress from $9,000,000, until last year the appropriation was approximately $28,000,000. There has been a gradual increase each year. This department has extended its activities, and that has necessarily required more money. In my judgment, this money from the beginning has been wisely spent in the main.

Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE]——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I wanted to know if the gentleman has examined a brochure that has been sent out by the Federal Board for Vocational Education, which, on page 6, presents a table showing how not only the appropriations of the Department of Agriculture have increased but how those other appropriations, intended for agriculture, in land-grant colleges, have increased. I call his attention to page 6, on which a table appears, showing that in 1904 the Government's appropriation——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This table is a table covering appropriations to the United States Department of Agriculture and land-grant colleges of 1904 to 1916. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] had a great deal to do with this when he was chairman of the committee. These appropriations have advanced, according to this table, from $10,000,000 in 1904 to $70,000,000 in 1916.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Those are items which are carried in the permanent law, and are separate and apart from the annual Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There are other appropriations for agricultural purposes aside from the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. I am referring to the regular annual appropriation bill for this department. I am not prepared to say, Mr. Chairman, that all the items in the bill are proper and that they could not be reduced. I believe many of them could be. I am simply saying that, so far as I am concerned, it is hard for me, not having expert knowledge about a particular provision or paragraph, to set my judgment up against the committee that reported the bill. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN], the chairman of this committee, has had long service in this House and on this great committee. We all have confidence in his ability and his integrity. He is a farmer, operating great farms in one of the great agricultural States of this Union, and understands thoroughly the needs of the farmer. On matters where we lack definite technical information we can safely

follow his judgment. I have been voting with the committee on the various items of this bill. I do not see how I can do anything else, unless there is some evidence offered from some one who knows and has technical and expert knowledge about these different paragraphs that they are extravagant and excessive.

We must reduce appropriations. We must cut down the expenses of the Government, but the place to begin this is in the appropriating committees. If they bring in bills after having given proper consideration and after extended hearings, there is only one thing we can do, in my judgment, if we want to hold together, and that is to support the committees, except in cases where it is shown they are in error.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I understand that there is before the House an amendment to reduce an appropriation for the investigation and development of methods for the manufacture of table sirup from $12,000 to $7,000. Am I correct?

Mr. HAUGEN. Five thousand dollars.

Mr. MONDELL. Five thousand dollars. It is proposed to save $7,000 in the matter of the investigation of the methods of manufacture of table sirup.

Frankly, I do not know how much money is needed to carry on the investigations relative to the matter of manufacture of table sirup. I am willing to believe that it may require more than $12,000. I am willing to believe that on a proper showing we might do all that was necessary to do for less than $12,000.

But, gentlemen, it does occur to me that we are taking up the time of the House in pretty small hairsplitting when we discuss for a considerable length of time the question of the saving of $7,000 in the investigation of the methods of manufacture of table sirup, particularly at a time when our expenditures are running into the tens of billions of dollars per annum.

Now, gentlemen, what is the situation? The Congress that adjourned on the 4th of March left unenacted seven important appropriation bills. I do not propose to go into a discussion of who is responsible for that situation. There are differences of opinion and there are grounds for differences of opinion in regard to it. This Congress when it met had seven important appropriation bills to pass, if possible, before the 1st of July. The Congress might have been called into session the 5th day of March, but it was not. It might have been called into session at any time between the 5th of March and the 19th of May, but it was not.

But I am not going to discuss the responsibility for not calling Congress in session. I can not enlighten gentlemen on that point. They all have their own notions with regard to the responsibility touching that. But the fact is that we met on the 19th of May charged with the responsibility of placing on the statute books of the Nation, if possible, before the 1st day of July seven great bills that ought to have been passed by the former Congress.

Now, in view of that situation what was it necessary for us to do? To get to work, and to get to work at once. There were just two bills that could be presented to this House without careful reexamination, without involving any great danger of making considerable appropriations that were not needed, and those bills were the Indian appropriation bill and the Agricultural appropriation bill. It was necessary to start this program immediately upon the assembling of Congress. We could not ask the Committee on Military Affairs to report at once, because members of the Military Committee on both sides are agreed that there should be some changes in the bill on reexamination. We could not ask the Naval Committee to report immediately, because gentlemen on both sides of that committee were agreed that there must be vital changes in that bill. The sundry civil bill, involving all the departments and activities of the Government from Panama to Alaska, could not be reported without a reexamination, because conditions had changed since it was reported before, and even the bill relative to the expenditures of the District of Columbia must have reexamination in view of the changed conditions. But there were no radically changed conditions in the field of Indian expenditures or in the field of agricultural expenditures, and those two bills could be reported out promptly. Neither of them carries large sums compared with our total expenditures. We can save more on one item in the naval bill or in the Army bill than both of these bills carry, and I hope that we will save ten times as much in the expenditures for military and naval purposes as these two bills carry when the military and naval bills come in. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask that I may have five minutes more, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I feel I am largely responsible for this Agricultural bill being before the House without reexamination. I asked the chairman of the committee to be good enough to get his committee together and report the bill as soon as possible; to report it with reductions, if it could be reported with reductions after brief consideration, but if there was not time for the consideration that would warrant reductions, I did not advise reductions without consideration; and I did want the bill reported as promptly as possible.

Now, I have no manner of doubt but that there are items in this bill that might properly be reduced. I think that during the war, with the spirit of extravagant expenditure that was abroad in the land, and which permeated all the departments, we probably launched out into fields unnecessary to occupy and went further in them than we are justified in doing, in agriculture as elsewhere. I hope that when this new Congress has time, in formulating the next Agricultural bill, to give careful consideration to all those matters, we may find that without injury to the great agricultural industries of the country we may reduce expenditures. I do not anticipate that we are going to have opposition on the other side in reasonable reduction along those lines, because we are all anxious, as far as possible, to lop off and put behind us what were essentially war activities.

But the examination of the manufacture of table sirup is not necessarily a war industry, and $12,000 is not a very large sum of money to put into it, and a saving of $5,000 will not get us very far when we have started out to reduce by millions and billions, if we can, the expenditures of the period of the war; and so, for one, speaking only as an individual——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wyoming yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman see some danger in the insertion in this and other bills of certain war-industries boards that are being carried over now and being made after-war institutions?

Mr. MONDELL. I am not speaking of certain war-industry boards. If there be such in the bill, in the brief time the House has been kind enough to give me, I do think that in view of the fact that much less will be spent under the Agricultural Department if this bill becomes a law before the 1st of July than would be spent if it did not become a law and we had to pass a continuing resolution, the situation would be very much better, even from the standpoint of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, if the bill becomes a law than if it did not become a law before the 1st of July. We can not reform, if it is to be assumed that there is reformation necessary, all these items on the Agricultural bill on the floor of the House.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. To be concrete, for example——

Mr. MONDELL. I have great confidence in this committee; and let me suggest, further, that some gentlemen are now protesting against items in this bill on this side who allowed them to pass through the House in the late session without a protest and without a suggestion that they were not just what they ought to be. I hope the House will stand by the Committee on Agriculture. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I want to ask the gentleman a question. There are millions or billions of war expenditures that are running to-day, and that will continue to run. Will the gentleman indicate at what point we will swallow bills and, for the saving of time, shall make it a hundred millions or half a billion?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, my distinguished friend has had longer experience in this House than any other man on the floor, and he is the most practical man here, and at the same time he is a man who is usually very sound in his views, and I have frequently heard him suggest to the House that while gentlemen might differ in regard to little trifling items on an appropriation bill, in the main the House ought to follow its committees, which have more knowledge on a given subject than the individual.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has again expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] want more time?

Mr. HAUGEN. No. Go ahead.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, this is a small item of $12,000. The purposes of it are well known to those of us who have taken the trouble to read the hearings on this proposition. It was put on the bill about three years ago. It has already resulted in great good to the ribbon cane-sirup industry of this country. They propose further to extend this work, to ascertain if it is possible to manufacture sweet sirup out of grapes, culls of fruit, sugar beets, and the like. But I did not take the floor to explain the purpose of this item. I rose for the purpose of congratulating the new Republican Members who come from rural districts representing great agricultural constituencies, that at last a Republican in authority has seen fit to raise his voice in protest against the actual leadership of the Republican Party of the great State of Pennsylvania. I am glad to see the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], coming, as he does, from the great rolling plains of the West, where men make their living in the sweat of their faces, rising in his place this morning to protest against the continued nagging at this bill of my beloved friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will my colleague from South Carolina yield?

Mr. LEVER. Just for a short question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It will be very difficult for the gentleman from South Carolina to start any differences between the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and myself.

Mr. LEVER. I do not need to do it. The differences have already started, and are very apparent here now.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Notwithstanding the opinion of the gentleman from South Carolina with reference to the State of Pennsylvania, does the gentleman know that that State is a much greater agricultural State than the State of Wyoming?

Mr. LEVER. It ought to be. It is a bigger State.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Well, it is. Do not forget that Pennsylvania is a pretty strong agricultural State. It is sometimes forgotten here.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. Philadelphia is not.

Mr. LEVER. It is suggested by my friend from Louisiana that Philadelphia is not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia is a very large consumer of farm products. We are anxious that the farmer shall succeed in his business.

Mr. LEVER. It is very important that it shall get its proper supply of sirup.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; and we furnish the money to pay for it. We have to pay for what we get.

Mr. LEVER. I am going to make a mere suggestion. This is a very interesting situation. I think as the future develops and as the history of the performances of this morning is read, it is going to be looked upon as rather vital in the life of a great political party in this country. You can no more join the rural West with the industrial East and keep them joined than you can make oil and water mix. You will not do it. The evidence of that crops out this morning.

But I say again I want to congratulate these new Republican Members who are sitting here earnestly listening to this debate, that at last some one has risen on their side who can speak with authority to defend the farmers' bill against the attacks of the city of Philadelphia. [Applause.]

Now, in furtherance of my observations here, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE] wades into this bill. He had spoken nearly his entire time before I discovered what the real trouble was with the gentleman from New York. He is not so much interested in saving $7,000 as he is in letting his Knickerbocker Club friends understand that he wants a repeal of the tax on the membership of that institution. He is more interested in the proposition of letting his tennis-playing friends, dressed in their little dapper suits, bowing here and hitting yonder, know that he is thinking of them than he is of the farmers in South Carolina and Illinois and Wyoming who are sweating blood to produce the stuff that these men eat. He is more interested in that than he is in the matter of saving $7,000. [Applause.] I was glad to see my friend from the great agricultural empire of Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS] discover the difficulty in the mind of the gentleman from New York and rush to the rescue. [Applause.]

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to suggest that debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. WALSH. I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, we are accustomed to the shedding of crocodile tears, and, of course, we can expect it from the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, because this bill is his baby. It was reported to the House in December, 1918, or January, 1919, and the more nearly it can go through now resembling the shape in which he reported it, of course, the greater credit will redound to that side of the House, which since a certain long-remembered proclamation has become a distinguished minority.

But I want to direct my attention for a few moments to the remarks of the distinguished majority floor leader, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], who by virtue of his authority expressed his views in no uncertain tones and in a manner calculated to subdue and quiet those who believe that the time has come for economy in public expenditures. He would have economy in the Army and Navy bill, but he does not want us to touch a penny of the money that is appropriated for the farmer. He and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] come from those sections of the country where if any great public improvement or benefit is to be undertaken it should be pursued at the expense of Uncle Sam. If Wyoming wants some public program put through, let the Federal Government pay for it. If South Carolina wants something undertaken for the benefit of the taxpayers of that State, let the Federal Government bear the burden. I say that the time has arrived in all activities, of peace or war, of farming or industry, to cut down appropriations, and the time has come for the majority party on this side of the aisle to attempt to make good its promise in the program of legislation it held out after its conference here some two weeks ago that it was for economy in expenditures and appropriations and for efficiency in the management of public affairs.

Now, this particular appropriation is a small item, and I know that it would make very little difference in the tax rate; but if we can not have indisputable proof that it is needed, I submit that we might well adopt this amendment. I appreciate the situation of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN], who is one of the best friends on this side of the aisle—and I think in the House—that the farmer has.

He is not superior to the brilliant young man of South Carolina, but he has the farmers' interests at heart. We all agree that we are dependent on the farmer, but in Heaven's name do you think the farmers in Iowa or South Carolina or Philadelphia, if you please, are going to rise up in their wrath and sign pronunciamentos condemning the Congress of the United States because we had the temerity to reduce an appropriation for the investigation of the methods of manufacturing table sirup from $12,000 to $5,000? Do you think that the whole farming interests in the country are going to totter and fall because we are attempting in one small item to save money? I submit that it is incumbent on the gentlemen of this House, regardless of party lines, to turn right in now and, if it can be done, economize in the public expenditures and appropriations.

I know the chairman of this committee will get up and read a few words to justify this appropriation, but I trust if he does it that the amendment may not be defeated, and I do not think it ought to be defeated unless he does show it beyond a reasonable doubt.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, much has been said about this bill being a Democratic bill. It is true, and every bill reported to this House at this session so far is a Democratic bill. Here is a Democratic bill reported in the last Congress carrying $31,691,562. This bill carries the same amount and is word for word the one that was reported in January. Republicans and Democrats spent a week in passing that bill. Here are the results of the labor: Thirty-eight thousand five hundred dollars cut out of the bill, practically all of it went out on points of order, and $20,000 added to it, and, mind you, by Republicans. The bill went to the Senate; the Senate committee added $5,683,290. The Democratic bill as reported by the Senate committee to the Senate carried an excess over this bill of $5,692,290. The committee reported a number of amendments to the bill under consideration. One for $500,000 for the eradication of tuberculosis among cattle; another of $250,000 for the extermination of the corn borer in Massachusetts and other States, half of the amount estimated for by the department.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] calls attention to the fact that $70,000,000 was appropriated for this department in 1918. I take it that the gentleman has reference to the total appropriations made in 1918, including the permanent annual appropriation and various other appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. If so, the amount was not $70,000,000, but $72,359,546.60. Now, let us make some comparison. For instance, the appropriations for 1910 were $17,115,410.35. It jumped up to $37,188,852 in 1917, and from that amount to $72,359,546.60 in 1918. It dropped to $62,939,603 in 1919. The total amount appropriated for 1919 under the general appropriation and the food-production acts was $38,907,216, and this bill carries $31,691,562, a decrease of $7,215,654. If the bill is adopted with amendments, as reported by the committee, it will

carry $32,562,842, which amount is $6,254,374 less than the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year. So, gentlemen, instead of having an increase we have a decrease.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has called our attention to the fact that we are taking over new work. Yes; we are taking over some of the work left undone by the War Industry Board transferred to the Bureau of Markets. Under the regulations issued by the wool division of the War Industry Board approximately 3,600 country dealers were permitted to handle wool of the 1918 clip. These regulations limited the profits of the dealers. To audit their reports and accounts will require some time. In a number of instances actual personal audits must be made of the books. It is estimated that between one and two million dollars of excess profits were secured from the 1918 wool transactions. This money must be located and collected from both classes of dealers. It is then proposed to distribute it to the growers of the wool from which the profits resulted, so far as it may be feasible to do so.

The department is asking for $35,000 to complete the work in order that the wrongdoing may be corrected. Gentlemen, if one or two million dollars can in this instance be recovered, is it not worth an expenditure of $35,000?

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 10 words. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], whom I greatly respect and admire, in common with the rest of the House, suggested that the Republican leaders have a very difficult problem to keep together the interests of the East and the West. Every once in a while South Carolina suggests some such question as that for the Republican Party to solve. The Republican Party has always been able to meet it and will now. The Republican Party is a national organization and is intended to represent all parts and interests of the Union. We will have a few discussions among ourselves, as our friends on the other side do, but do not worry; we will take care of them all and maintain a united party as we did a united Union. The ability of the Republican Party to work for the welfare of each and all is one of the reasons why the American people find it so useful.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman from Kansas observe that the gentleman from South Carolina is harmonizing the manufacturers in this item, that he is supporting an appropriation of $10,000 for the manufacturers and not for the farmers? I wanted the gentleman's time just to read the item—

For investigation and development of methods for the manufacture—

Not the production—

of table sirup and of methods for the manufacture of sweet sirups—

And so forth.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] is already uniting with the Northern States, with the big interests, providing $10,000 that the manufacturers may find the way to utilize the products of the farm.

Mr. LEVER. Let me suggest to my friend from Pennsylvania that you can not produce sirup; you must manufacture it; and if you do not investigate the proposition of manufacturing sirup out of the raw material, the farmer suffers the loss. [Applause.]

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, the suggestion has been made that we ought to economize. I am very strong for economy, but there ought to be some place to begin, of big enough size, so that it would demonstrate that we were not just making motions, but that we mean business. You bring me an item that is for $100,000,000, and I should be very much interested right away, but for God's sake do not start here with an oration about economy and jump onto a little $12,000 appropriation which you have not studied and which the committee has. Take something of your size.

I want to say another thing about this item. I once was employed by the Santa Fe to spend a month in looking up this sirup business, and I know a little something about it. I am going to say that this country could hardly spend $12,000 in a better way than by spending it in investigating the best methods of improving the manufacture of sirup in this country and ascertaining what further development of farm products can be so utilized. Some gentleman here wants to know if it is to improve the flavor. Why, yes; sirup goes into every family, and if there is any way of making better sirup or similar products or enlarging the production of sirup, $12,000 ought to be appropriated every year as long as they use sirup in this country, and it ought to be a continuing proposition. Aside from any agricultural interest, Philadelphia and New York and every city in the country will be as much aided and assisted by this as will the agriculturists, if we can find some more economical way of making sirup, which would help the poor people of those cities. It would be a great advantage to this country to do so. The more farm products can be made into sirup products, the cheaper such products can be manufactured, the greater will be the sale of such products of the farm. If the expenditure of $12,000 a year by 100,000,000 people will give the consumers less costly or better sirups, it will redound to the good of all who must count their dollars as they spend them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act of June 30, 1906, entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated, or misbranded, or poisonous, or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," in the city of Washington and elsewhere, including chemical apparatus, chemicals and supplies, repairs to apparatus, gas, electric current, official traveling expenses, telegraph and telephone service, express and freight charges, and all other expenses, employing such assistants, clerks, and other persons as may be considered necessary for the purposes named, and rent outside of the District of Columbia; and to cooperate with associations and scientific societies in the revision of the United States Pharmacopœia and development of methods of analysis, $600,221.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HAUGEN: Page 52, line 6, strike out "$600,221" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$620,221."

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, this is simply an increase of $20,000 for the enforcement of the food and drug act, and, in view of the increased cost in transportation and material, we think that the $20,000 should be granted.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, as it stands, this represents an increase of some $30,000.

Mr. HAUGEN. We propose to increase the amount $20,000 over the amount recommended.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I observe that the gentleman says, and the report also says, that this increase is necessary largely on account of the increased traveling expenses.

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It has been my hope that in the fiscal year 1920 probably traveling expenses would be decreased rather than increased.

Mr. HAUGEN. I trust that they may be; but there are increases all along the line, and $20,000 in an expenditure of $600,000 is a small increase.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the amount therein stated and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "$589,081," which was the amount carried in the bill of last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] by striking out the figures "$620,221" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "$589,081."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the figures stated in my amendment are the figures carried in the appropriation bill of last year. This bill provides for an increase of $11,000 or thereabouts, and the gentleman from Iowa has offered an amendment increasing it by $20,000.

Mr. HAUGEN. Increasing it to the amount that was estimated by the department at the last session. The committee at the last session cut the estimate $20,000 and agreed to an increase of $30,000, and after reconsideration it has now recommended that the full $50,000 of increase be granted.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then the total increase over last year would be $50,000 if the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa passes?

Mr. HAUGEN. Exactly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is the point I want to speak upon for a moment. This provision is for the enforcement of the so-called pure food and drug act. That goes into the field of narcotics. It also goes into the field of liquor, distilled spirits, and the like. The point I want to make—and this is partly in answer to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and in substantiation of the demand for economy on this bill—is that the Treasury Department already is expending vast sums of money to enforce the antinarcotic law. Here we have it all gone over again in the Department of Agriculture. The Treasury Department is charged with expenditures and gets large appropriations for the enforcement of the internal-revenue laws with respect to the sale and distribution of liquors, distilled spirits, and the like. Here we are going all over it again by making an appropriation for the Department of

Agriculture. We began this discussion by suggesting to our new Members of Congress that they ought to be informed about the way these things are done. I called attention a moment ago to the fact that some of the war trade boards and bureaus created during the war for war purposes only have been unloaded on these regular departments of the Government so that their employees could be put upon the statutory rolls. That is being done in this bill. We are taking over the war trade board on wool in this bill. We are providing permanent places for the men who were employed temporarily for the purpose of war. We are building up a tremendous institution, practically carrying on in the departments the temporary war bureaus we had expected to abolish when the war is declared at an end.

But in addition to taking them over we are also providing two ways for the accomplishment of the same purpose. We provide an appropriation to the Treasury Department to enforce the liquor laws and to enforce the antinarcotic laws, and we make provision in this bill to do the same thing. In other words, we have two sets of officials going about the country performing one service. We continue to give them an appropriation in this bill despite all that has been said here with regard to the desire to pass this bill in the interests of the farmers of the country. The farmer ought to know what is being done in his name. He has to help pay the bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, this item carries an appropriation for the enforcement of what is commonly known as the food and drugs act. It is an extremely important provision. You either ought to enforce the law and enforce it strictly, rigidly, and impartially or repeal it. The department estimated for a certain amount of money to do this. The committee conducted hearings, cross-examined witnesses, and concluded the department needed that much for that purpose, and we gave it to them in this bill. It was brought to the committee's attention that, first of all, traveling expenses in this country were very greatly increased. Now, in the enforcement of the food and drugs act, you all know they have to employ a large number of traveling inspectors, who are in the business of enforcing that law. That is the first proposition. You do not have to argue that as a fact; everybody knows that. It is as certain as that the sun shines. Now, the next proposition is——

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Why the increase in the cost of traveling expenses? I can not quite understand that.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is trying to get me into a political debate.

Mr. LONGWORTH. No; not at all. I am simply asking for information.

Mr. LEVER. Rates have been increased; the gentleman knows that.

Mr. LONGWORTH. This appropriation is for the next year. Is it expected that traveling rates will be greater next year?

Mr. LEVER. I can not tell.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That is what I do not understand, and I am asking for information.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is not on an appropriating committee and he does not know how estimates are prepared.

Mr. ANDERSON rose.

Mr. LEVER. In a moment; I am stating how estimates are prepared. The preparation of these estimates began last summer. They were sent to the Treasury Department as early as the 1st of November, and then they were finally sent to Congress on the opening day of the session. At that time we were engaged in war and it was anticipated we would continue to be engaged in war, and even now we do not know when the railroads will be taken back and when fares will be reduced. Another point: Everybody also knows that chemicals have very greatly increased in price. The Bureau of Chemistry in the enforcement of this act must of necessity buy a large quantity of chemicals. Another proposition involved by this—I want to show in my brief five minutes that these appropriations are not entirely unreasonable, nor have they been dumped in here without real consideration—is that during the past two of three years there has been more adulteration of foods and drugs on account of the let down somewhat, because of the lack of men to do the work, than there has ever been since the food and drugs act passed. They are selling all kinds of stuff under the guise of drugs that will produce a kick as strong as champagne if you drink it. Now, it is proposed by this increased appropriation here to allow for more rigid inspection against the adulteration of foods and in a measure not to enforce prohibition, because prohibition has nothing to do with this item; not a cent of it is spent in the enforcement of the liquor laws of this country, but to enforce an act of Congress to prevent the adulteration of drugs and foods. Many drugs are now being adulterated for the purpose of getting alcohol out of them. Men can not afford to oppose it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is——

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The time has expired by agreement. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the grading, weighing, handling, transportation, and uses of naval stores, the preparation of definite type samples thereof, and for the demonstration of improved methods or processes of preparing naval stores, in cooperation with individuals and companies, including the employment of necessary persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $10,000.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, along with the new Members of Congress I have been very much interested in this debate, and I think I can understand that the Democratic Party wants to get political advantage out of it and the Republican Party wants credit out of it. And I see the entire appropriation amounts to some $31,000,000, which seems to be mostly for the purpose of paying an army of clerks, several thousand of them. Now, I would be very glad if the chairman of the committee, or the former chairman of the committee, or any other person, will tell me what the farmers are to get out of this. I have not heard anybody show that this legislation which has been in operation for many years, what the advantage has been to the farmer. One-third of the people live on the farms, and this great Nation can well afford to make an apppropriation of $31,000,000, or any larger sum, if it is of general advantage to the farmers. Of course, the department wants large appropriations and places for an army of clerks, but I would like to hear and know what they are getting out of it.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation and development of methods of manufacturing insecticides and fungicides, and for investigating chemical problems relating to the composition, action, and application of insecticides and fungicides, $25,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I think the statement made by my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] was a very fair one. His question, however, has been answered several times in the debate. It was admitted by the chairman of the committee, and it was admitted by him during the last Congress, that this department now, by reason of the various bureaus that have been built up, by the unloading upon it of various war bureaus and things of that kind, which were intended to be temporary, but which are to be made permanent in the Department of Agriculture, now has at its command upward of 18,000 employees, who travel over the country instructing the farmer, lecturing to him, showing him how to till the soil, teaching him about the chemistry of the soil, and telling him how to do a variety of things which he is supposed not to know. The farmer under these circumstances ought to be the best educated man in the country, having these 18,000 lecturers and experts to come and go at his beck and call to tell him what to do. Yet the trouble is that the farmer has not been made to understand by his friends in this House that he, the farmer himself, has to pay in part for the education and the salary of these 18,000 lecturers, who tell him what to do. He does not yet understand that the great mass of these lecturers and experts were put upon the pay roll of the Government during the last six or seven years, when the gentlemen upon the other side were in power, and when the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], who has been waxing eloquent in his defense of this bill, was in charge of the measure. These are things that I think tend to explain to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] why. Some of us indicated that the farmer himself, the real, genuine, horny-handed tiller of the soil, does not thoroughly understand sometimes what is being done to him in the name of the farmer in a measure of this kind.

To make it plain, I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has raised this question, whether he can tell just how we would expend this $25,000 and just how the farmer would get a direct benefit from it? It is for the "investigation and development of methods of manufacturing insecticides and fungicides" and for "investigating chemical problems relating to the

composition, action, and application of insecticides and fungicides." To be sure the farmer is annoyed by insects, bugs, and pests of various kinds, and some of them receive no salary from the Government, none whatever.

But here the proposition is to take out of the farmers' funds, the taxpaying farmers' funds, $25,000. To do what? To investigate the development of methods "of manufacturing insecticides and fungicides." In other words, the farmer's money in this instance, the farmer for whom the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] so eloquently pleads, is to be taken, in this instance, by experts to find out a way by which the "manufacturers," not the farmers, can make a fungicide to sell to the farmers.

Does my friend from Pennsylvania understand that the gentleman from South Carolina is gradually coming over from the soil and the furrow and the cotton hill to the big interests and encouraging them in this bill? Does not the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who comes from that grand old Commonwealth which is supposed to represent everything that the big interests stand for, understand that we are getting $25,000 in this farmers' bill to encourage the manufacture of things that we can sell to the farmer?

I do not know whether the farmer knows this or not. The gentleman from South Carolina has gone to his lunch temporarily and is not here to explain. But I wish when he comes back that he would tell why he is for "the manufacturers" in this instance. It sounds like treason.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that I am here.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In due time, then, the gentleman will tell why he is taking up the cause of the manufacturers of insecticides and fungicides. It is surprising.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I represent in part not only an agricultural State but one of the greatest agricultural States in the Union. I come from a State where there are some of the best farmers in the United States, but the farmers of Iowa do not think they have learned all about farming yet or that there can be no further improvement. They are not so conceited as to believe that they can not be taught anything by experts who devote themselves to these subjects who have shown their qualifications and demonstrated them upon the farm itself. We have that kind of men out there, men who have made a success of farming, men who have raised more on their farms and made more profits off of them than their neighbors, who are helping to tell the others how to realize the same profits and raise the same kind of crops.

The Agricultural Department, I will say for the benefit of my two friends from Pennsylvania, is an educational institution. It is not for the purpose of farming, although it carries on experimental farms for the purpose of showing how these things ought to be done. This money is not appropriated to make donations to the farmers—far from it—and yet, from what the gentlemen who are opposed to this appropriation have stated, they seem to think we should not appropriate any money unless we are to turn it over to the farmers in form of a donation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have only five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is not this a donation to the manufacturers of insecticides and fungicides?

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Is it not a fact that your State, in addition to this fund, appropriates funds that are expended at Ames, Iowa, for the purpose of developing the very thing that is in this paragraph?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is another matter I intended to come to. They not only have use for this money in the way it is appropriated here, but they add a million or more of dollars to it out in our State for the purpose of teaching the farmers more about farming, and as a result we have one of the finest agricultural colleges in the whole country at Ames, Iowa.

And we never stint the money on it. We do not have the discussion about the money spent upon it that we have here about some of these paltry appropriations in this bill. They appropriate the money there to carry on an agricultural college of the highest grade, a school which has a reputation all over the world, and to which people come from all over the world to learn about farming. If my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] had a better understanding of what it means to farm, if he had worked upon a farm, and had been brought up on a farm, as I was, when he was a boy, he would learn that largely through the work of the Agricultural Department there has been a greater advance in farming in this country during the last 25 years than has been shown in any other department of industry. Farming is done much better now, and it is done so well in the State of Iowa that, although the virgin soil there has long been exhausted, and although you might expect that it would not raise as good crops now as formerly, yet to-day we are raising one-third greater crops than we did when that soil was new, and largely as a result of instruction given by the Department of Agriculture.

Now, with reference to an appropriation like this, for the development of fungicides and chemicals to destroy insects, according to the estimates of the Department of Agriculture—although I have not the exact figures here, and the chairman can probably give them—somewhere around $300,000,000 a year in value of crops has been destroyed by insects and fungus growths. Is it not worth paying $25,000 to see if we can not get some better system of destroying these insects?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman says this is for the benefit of the manufacturers, partly; but is not that beneficial to the farmer if the manufacturers can be shown how to improve their compositions so that the farmers can get a better and cheaper insecticide or fungicide? But it is not alone for that purpose; part of it is for the purpose of showing the farmer himself how he can make these insecticides on his own farm.

I do not know of any more commendable item in this bill than this item of $25,000, and I say it as one having practical experience in farming, who lives in a farming community; and I say the farmers themselves want this appropriation contained in this paragraph, and that they want this bill passed. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Clerk read the next paragraph, and the gentleman can then move to strike out the last word.

The Clerk read as follows:

For experiments in the manufacture of rare chemicals for use in chemical research, including investigation of domestic sources of supply, $10,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture may furnish, upon application, samples of rare chemicals to investigators for research work and charge for the same a price to cover the cost thereof, such price to be determined and established by the Secretary, and the money received from sales to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to ask the gentleman from Iowa what authority there is for having this item in here?

Mr. HAUGEN. This amount carried here is $200,000 less than the amount carried last year.

Mr. WALSH. It was not in the bill last year.

Mr. HAUGEN. We appropriate $50,000 this year instead of $250,000.

Mr. WALSH. It was not in the last bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. This is transferred from the miscellaneous section.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman state that this was in the bill last year?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes. It was in the miscellaneous section.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order or reserve it?

Mr. WALSH. I make it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation and development of methods of utilizing wool-scouring waste, $9,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. HAUGEN. In order to save time, Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HERSMAN. It is a little difficult for us new Members to get on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from California please wait until we have read the next paragraph?

Mr. HERSMAN. I am willing to stay on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for general expenses, $969,901.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California moves to strike out the last word. The gentleman from California is recognized for the purpose of striking out the last word.

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I find it is about as difficult to get recognized here as it is to kill these insects and bugs that trouble our orchards in California, over which this discussion has arisen. I do not rise to speak for the purpose of telling you gentlemen of the Congress how to guide the Department of Agriculture of this Nation, but as one of the new Members has asked what the farmers of this country were getting out of those appropriation bills, I want to say that I do not believe that any class of people of our Nation are getting so much for the money expended as the agriculturists of our Nation are getting. [Applause.]

I know something about the soil—not of the East, but of the soils of the West—and I know the difficulties that the farmers there contend with, and I know why, in the wisdom of this committee, there was a provision inserted in this bill for the ascertainment of the best methods of manufacturing certain insecticides and fungicides that will kill the insects that trouble the farmer-orchardist. All our orchards depend upon our knowing how these materials should be manufactured. The proper way to mix the various intricate sprays used by the horticulturist and orchardist of this Nation is of the highest importance, and only by extended experiment and careful observation by skilled scientists can the proper results be obtained. A slight variation in temperature while mixing or a small change in ingredients used might result in detriment to the vine or tree; or, on the other hand, we might have a mixture that was worthless. It is also of the greatest importance that the Department of Agriculture should be familiar with the commercial sprays that are placed on the market. It is certainly within the functions of this department to guard the wealth of this Nation in a field where only trained scientists can enter. The money you may see fit to appropriate for this particular item and for most of the items of this bill will be found to yield a great dividend to the Nation. While this Congress will of necessity make large appropriations for the Army and Navy for the proper protection of the Nation, do not let us forget that our greatness primarily depends upon the skill and intelligence we display in handling our soil.

The prune industry, the peach industry, the almond industry, the walnut industry, and many other industries all depend upon the wisdom which you gentlemen put into this appropriation measure. If you will furnish experts to advise us when and how to treat our trees and vines and what material should be used, then you have given to the orchardist the one thing that will preserve his investment, safeguard his property, and add to the wealth of this Nation.

The money that was used from the last appropriation in California did much to increase the food supply of the Nation. The lessons of scientific farming once learned are a yearly recurring asset to the Nation. I know that by the proper selection of seed in California you increase the yield of 50,000 acres of sorghum grains 20 per cent. That is an immense amount. The money you appropriated for that work was inconsiderable in proportion to what was received in return.

I know men who have saved thousands of dollars in the San Joaquin Valley because they acted on the advice of the Department of Agriculture. For a number of years the beans there were blighted by heat. The department suggested that the ground be cultivated for one month without being planted, and then the beans when they came in bloom would come into bloom at a cooler season of the year. They followed those suggestions, and thereby they increased the food supply of this Nation tremendously and added greatly to the value of a large area of land.

Mr. LEVER. And if the gentleman will permit, these are the kind of men who have been accused and ridiculed here on the floor of the House.

Mr. HERSMAN. Yes. I am not speaking of the East. I do not know anything about it. I have not been in the East for 30 years, and I do not know what the Agricultural Department is doing to promote agriculture in the Eastern or Southern States. But I do know we are mightily pleased with what they are doing in the West.

I will tell you that in the State of California you will find one of the greatest institutions that makes for the prosperity and upbuilding of this great Nation. I have followed farming continuously for 30 years, and my observation is that every dollar you put into the Agricultural Department is well expended and that there is little or no waste. The men who represent that department are men of the highest type. They are men who are anxious to come and help you solve your problems. Two weeks before I left California to come to this House of Representatives I telephoned to our county seat, to one of the department men, and asked him to come down to investigate what I thought was the red spider that was threatening my prune crop and that had the year before devastated a large acreage of prunes in California. That entomologist responded at once. He came 30 miles to my orchard and looked it over, and he told me it was not the variety of red spider that the orchardists so much feared, but that the red spider that had devastated the orchards of California came about the 1st of July, and that all I had to do was to have the superintendent of my orchard watch the situation the first week of July, and then I would have two weeks in which the spraying must be done. He gave minute instructions as to the kind of spray to use and the method of application. The Department of Agriculture, together with our State university, is bringing to the development of the West the knowledge of the agricultural world, and each year our acres yield more under their wise guidance. Now, I will tell you, you can not afford to cripple a great institution that is on the very front-line trenches of the Nation's prosperity. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended two minutes, in order that he may answer the question of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from California be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I wish to ask the gentleman from California if the gentleman from Philadelphia [Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania] is correct in his insistence that these agricultural appropriations are not for the benefit of the farmer and not desired by the farmer, why is it that the Members of this House who represent agricultural districts, who live among the farmers and who are acquainted with their wishes and their views and their needs, practically to a man are advocating these measures, whereas those who are opposing them are almost to a man from cities, who do not represent farmers and know nothing about the wishes or needs of farmers? [Applause.]

Mr. HERSMAN. The gentleman from Philadelphia will answer that question. I do not know. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in five minutes. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out lines 7 and 8 on page 53.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SNELL: Page 53, strike out all of lines 7 and 8.

Mr. SNELL. I make this motion for this reason: This is an entirely new section in a regular Agricultural bill. There was an item carried in one of the food-production acts providing for doing this work, but according to the testimony that was given by Dr. Alsberg before the committee, he said that they never spent this money, and, as far as he knew, up to the present time they were not sure whether they would need it or not; and if this gentleman is not sure up to the present time that they need this money we certainly should not appropriate it, and I hope that the paragraph will be dropped from the bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. The fact that the money has not been expended shows that if it is not expended it will impose no additional burden upon the Treasury. But some work has been done, and it is possible that some results may come from it—that is, for the utilization of the wool grease.

Mr. SNELL. Dr. Alsberg says in his testimony that he does not know whether he wants this money or not.

Mr. HAUGEN. If it is not used, it will do no harm.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Bureau of Chemistry, $1,381,571.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from Iowa to the fact that $50,000 was stricken out on a point of order, and this is not the correct total.

Mr. HAUGEN. I think the Clerk has authority now to correct the totals.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 55, lines 11 to 17 inclusive, strike out the paragraph.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS], in discussing another item in the bill, took the very proper position that in the ordinary course we should pay very careful heed to the Committee on Agriculture in all these various items contained in the appropriation bill which they have submitted to the House. I agree to that, and there is no man in the House whose judgment I have more usually valued than that of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], who was the former chairman of this committee. But on the other hand I think it is proper sometimes that we apply the test of our own investigation and our own judgment on some of these items. If we do not do this, if Members are to make no investigation of their own, but blindly follow the recommendations of our committees, then the committees might as well legislate in the first instance and save the House the formality of adopting their conclusions. I have made some investigation of this item which I have moved to strike out, and I insist that it ought to go out of the bill for the reasons which I will now state. It was a war emergency item pure and simple. The experiment has been made and the results are known. Why continue it when it has ceased to be an experiment? Its prohibitive cost as a commercial proposition has already been demonstrated.

We are all familiar with the fact that before the war the potash supply of the United States, and of the world as for that matter, was from the Province of Saxony in Prussia and the Province of Alsace, also a German territory. We imported about 250,000 tons of potash prior to the war, and the demand was constantly increasing. The most of it, or a good part of it, was used in commercial fertilizer, and munitions factories used quite a good deal.

Soon after the declaration of war—to be exact, in January, 1915—the Imperial German Government put an embargo on the export of potash, and we, as well as the world, were left without any considerable source of supply. It did not take long before the reserve supply in this country was used up, and the United States Government very properly set about, by all means available, to develop sources of supply of potash in this country.

Several sources have been found since that investigation started, and some have been developed with considerable success. The alkali lakes of western Nebraska, those of southern California, and the Great Salt Lake in Utah have been developed as sources of supply. But one of the most practical sources, according to the expert testimony in this matter, is the reduction of cement dust and blast-furnace dust by an electrical process. That discovery came about in a very unusual way. It was found that these cement plants and blast furnaces must find some way to prevent discharging their poisonous fumes in the air. It was obnoxious to surrounding neighborhoods, and States and municipalities were enacting laws to abate the nuisance, and so they reduced the fumes to dust, and it was soon found that this dust was readily soluble and that the potash could be recovered by a simple process of leeching. So far as I have been able to learn this is the only source that is thus far developed that will really be able to compete as a commercial proposition with the sources of potash in the Provinces of Alsace and Saxony.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. As soon as I complete this statement I will. Now, this item of $127,600 which I have moved to eliminate from the bill is to be used to continue the operation of a Government plant at Summerland, Calif., engaged in reducing the giant kelp found on the Pacific coast to potash and other by-products. It is a great seaweed, as we all know. The process is to go out and harvest the kelp, transport it to the factory, and by a process that has been discovered get a certain amount of potash out of it.

But what does it cost to get a ton of potash out of kelp? On this point we have in the hearings on this bill the testimony of Dr. Milton Whitney, Chief of the Bureau of Soils, and here is what he says in answer to the question by the chairman of the committee, who at that time was the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER]. Mr. LEVER asked him, "At what price do you produce this ton of potash from kelp?" He says, "I do not know what the average is, but I should say about $4.50 a unit, on an average."

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that that was the price at which the product was sold and not at which it was produced, the law requiring that sales shall be at the market price.

Mr. BLACK. I should feel justified in accepting that explanation of the gentleman, because I do not believe the specific question was asked as to the production cost. As a matter of fact, there is nothing in the hearings to show that even the sale price of $450 per ton was equal to the production cost. This statement was made by Mr. Whitney:

We have harvested the kelp in our harvester, brought it in, dried and ashed it, and we have sold up to the present time about $50,000 worth of potash.

Then the question was asked at what price, and he said at $4.50 per unit. Now, the unit of potash is 20 pounds, and therefore you would have 100 units to make a ton, and the price at which the potash was sold was $450 a ton. Suppose they had sold the entire output of potash at the prewar price of $40 a ton; how much did they produce? Five thousand dollars' worth, at an expenditure of $127,600 to do it. Because you can readily see if they sold $50,000 worth at $450 a ton, if they had sold it at $40 a ton, the prewar price of commercial potash, they would have produced about $5,000 worth of it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the gentleman understand that the Department of Agriculture intends to pursue experiments in kelp further? The gentleman knows that the experiments were small compared with what the commercial companies did on the Pacific coast. I understood that it was agreed by all hands that kelp could not be used profitably in these times for the production of potash.

Mr. BLACK. I think that most men do agree on that proposition, but the Department of Agriculture does not seem to be aware of it and contemplates the continuance of this fund, and $127,600 is to operate the plant at Summerland, Calif. It is true the largest plant which was used in this new enterprise was the Hercules Powder Co., and they have abandoned it, because they know that they can not produce potash economically by this process.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If the gentleman will permit, I understood that the Agricultural Department expected to use this money more for the purpose of trying to find natural sources of potash in the West. Now, in reference to the cement industry, the gentleman understands that so far only a small quantity of potash has been obtained from cement factories.

Mr. BLACK. I admit that, but if the gentleman will study the situation he will find that the experts on this subject have come to the conclusion that that is the only feasible supply, and the only way in which potash can be produced in this country in competition with the foreign sources.

In the May, 1918, issue of the World's Work Mr. Frank Parker Stockbridge published a very interesting article dealing with the steps which had been taken in developing potash in the United States, and in that article he says:

One source of potash supply has given evidence of probable ability to meet all the requirements of permanent potash independence for the United States, namely, practically inexhaustible supply of raw materials, low enough cost of production to withstand competition under any conditions, and geographical distribution such as to minimize transportation costs.

This is the process of recovery of potash from cement and blast-furnace dust. It is too early to claim that this has already proved the panacea sought for, but the evidence so far is all in its favor, and I am merely passing along the judgment of Government experts who have delved deeply into every phase of the potash question in saying that on the basis of results thus far obtained it offers the best chance now in sight to compete with German potash in normal times.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have just examined the lengthy report of the Tariff Board upon this subject, and they differ with the conclusions the gentleman has stated. They doubt very much whether it will be successful in a commercial way to obtain potash from cement dust.

Mr. BLACK. It is successful over here at the Security Cement & Lime Co., of Hagerstown, Md., where they have already a plant with this process in operation. I also understand that the Beth-

lehem Steel Co. is installing a plant for the reduction of its blast-furnace dust to potash.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman first permit me further in answer to inquiries about the manufacture of potash from kelp to call the attention of the gentleman from Iowa to the fact that that is what this item of $127,600 is for, and it has no connection with the development of potash from other sources, as he seems to think? We have already passed another item of $31,340 for looking up other sources of the supply of potash. I have no objection to that. It was under that appropriation that we discovered the alkali lakes, and have discovered this reduction process in cement and blast-furnace plants.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended for five minutes.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The potash question is a very important one. I want to ask whether we provided for an inquiry as to potash in the $50,000,000 mining bill that was passed during the war session?

Mr. BLACK. I shall have to refer that to the gentleman from South Carolina, because I confess I do not recall.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We appropriated $50,000,000 during the war for the investigation and discovery of minerals throughout the United States, with a view to promoting various war activities, including agriculture, and I want to know whether potash was contemplated in that $50,000,000 bill.

Mr. LEVER. I think not.

Mr. BLACK. Does the gentleman refer to the Bureau of Mines bill?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. That was not included.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then the Department of Agriculture is alone in this potash inquiry, so far as these appropriations are concerned?

Mr. BLACK. Yes; and the investigation of all other sources outside of kelp is covered in the item we have already passed—$31,340—and I have no disposition to interfere with that. I am perfectly willing to vote money to investigate any practical source of supply, but it has been demonstrated very clearly, I think, that potash manufacture from kelp is not feasible.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The point is to find out whether we are duplicating the work in two departments.

Mr. BLACK. No; nothing is being done about it in the $50,000,000 bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman inform the committee what the average prewar price of potash was from the German fields?

Mr. BLACK. Yes; $40 a ton.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. Has the gentleman read the statement of the Alien Property Custodian in connection with his story about the German chemical factories in this country to the effect that there had been a widespread German propaganda to make American farmers think they needed a great deal more potash than they really did?

Mr. BLACK. Yes; they conducted a propaganda of that sort, and it is probable that some farmers used potash on soils where they did not need it, but I do not believe that was at all general. That is, of course, a matter for the judgment of the farmer. As to the German monopoly, of course, we might have some prejudice against buying our potash from Germany, they having so recently been our enemies; but I call attention to the fact that since Alsace has been awarded to France we are assured of competition in the potash matter, and that from one of our most faithful and loyal allies, and there can be no danger of a German monopoly such as there was before the war.

In the World's Work Magazine article of Mr. Frank Parker Stockbridge, to which I have already referred, he says about the deposits of potash in Alsace, which was then in German possession:

> But when it shall have been restored to France its potash resources will not only break the German monopoly but provide France with a valuable export commodity to exchange for the vast supplies of all kinds she must obtain from us.

That is true; the greatest deposits of potash in the world are in the Province of Alsace, which now belongs to France; and it looks to me just as reasonable to suppose that you can go out on the Pacific coast, harvest that great kelp seaweed, carry it to the reduction plant, and reduce it to potash in competition with the natural deposits that nature has placed in the bowels of the earth—it would be just as reasonable to suppose that you could do that as that you could go to the great forests of the country, cut down the pine trees, reduce them to charcoal, and compete with the great coal deposits of the country for fuel. The whole thing is unreasonable, except as a war-emergency proposition, and now that the war is over it is the worst kind of extravagant waste to continue the experiment, and it should be stopped and that without further delay.

In the remainder of my time I want to pay respect to another practical phase of the matter. We have a great many people in this country who seem to hold to the belief that we can produce everything in the United States and buy nothing elsewhere and still carry on foreign trade with other nations. It can not be done. If we carry on foreign trade, if the United States stands in the front rank of the great commercial nations, as I hope it will, we must trade with other people and we must buy commodities which they can produce under economic conditions, and which it will not be feasible and practicable to produce in this country. We know that in 1918 the United States had a balance of trade in our favor of $3,000,000,000.

Now, how is that settled? It can only be settled in three ways—one by imports of gold, another by exchange of credits, or, rather, an extension of credits, and the third way by the exchange of commodities, and up until now we have been settling it, for the most part, by extension of credits. The conditions have not admitted of its being settled in any other way. But are we going to be willing to keep that up? Are we going to be willing to keep up extending from year to year the credits to these foreign countries? It is certain that they can not export their gold, because they are already on a fiat-money basis and do not have it to export, and therefore there must be an exchange of commodities. If there is not, then the whole commercial fabric of the world is going to be turned upside down. France owes us to-day two and a half billion dollars, and before we cease to extend them loans I dare say they will owe us $3,000,000,000, and the interest on that will be $150,000,000 annually. How are they to settle that interest debt? It must be, gentlemen, by the exchange of commodities, and I hold that the potash which they can dig from their mines in the Province of Alsace cheaper and under more economical conditions than it can be produced anywhere in the world will be one of the commodities that we naturally should buy from them, and it is absurd to continue an experiment to try to produce, as a commercial proposition, potash from the giant kelp of the Pacific coast, costing $450 per ton.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. I do.

Mr. REAVIS. The gentleman touches on a very interesting subject in regard to the balance of trade that will follow the payment of interest on loans and the purchase of our materials in the rehabilitation of Europe, but does the gentleman take the position that we should decline to develop to the fullest possible extent all the industries of this country so as to avoid balancing trade with credit?

Mr. BLACK. No; I do not. And that has not been my argument.

Mr. REAVIS. Well, we have a potash industry in this country that can, with proper sympathetic attention, be developed. Does the gentleman take the position we ought not to have that development?

Mr. BLACK. I do not. I simply contend that the facts in this case show that the production of potash from kelp is one source that can not be an economical process and should be discarded. I am in full sympathy with the production of potash by the reduction of cement dust and blast-furnace dust, because the testimony shows that is a commercial process and is economically sound. Of course, it is all right to produce potash from the alkali lakes of Nebraska and southern California and the Great Salt Lake of Utah, but when you undertake to go out and cut down kelp and haul it to the factory and make it into potash at $450 a ton, and everyone knows it will not sell for more than $70 or $80 a ton, and very probably not that high, from the mine fields of Alsace and Saxony, why it looks to me like it would not be the part of wisdom to continue an experiment of that sort. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] has made a very strong statement. Fortunately, it is not necessary to take issue with anything that he said to

justify this appropriation in its entirety. This appropriation was initiated, in the first place, for the purpose of making an experiment. That experiment was to determine whether or not potash could be produced from kelp on a commercial scale in competition with the potash that was brought from other sources to this country. I think we might as well admit from the very outset that it is not possible, and that we do not expect it will be possible to produce potash alone from kelp at a price which will enable us to compete with imported potash or with potash produced elsewhere in the United States; but it so happens that in the production of potash from kelp there are a number of by-products of very great value. Among them is a very high grade of high-temperature charcoal which sells for about $100 a ton. Another by-product is iodine, the price of which I am unable to state at the moment, but which is a very important product.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Who uses that high-grade charcoal which sells at $100 a ton? What commercial value has it?

Mr. ANDERSON. I can not tell you; I am giving the testimony of the experts of the department in respect to the product and the price at which it is sold. I understand it is used, however, in the tempering of a very high grade of steel. It is a very high-grade, high-temperature charcoal.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. If this has already been discovered, and I ask the question in good faith, why do you want to continue the investigation?

Mr. ANDERSON. We know that these by-products can be produced from kelp in conjunction with potash. We do not know whether they exist in sufficient quantities and can be gotten out from kelp at a cost which will enable us in connection with the return from the potash itself to make an industry of this sort self-sustaining. I am entirely frank when I say it is entirely experimental. They have conducted this investigation to the point so that we have every reason to believe now we can make this plant commercially a self-sustaining one, and this $127,600 in no way represents the cost of operating this plant, because we have every reason to expect that amount will be reduced by a very considerable revenue from sales of potash, charcoal, iodine, and other by-products.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. REAVIS. Is this appropriation of $127,600 for the purpose of providing money that the Agricultural Department will use to investigate the kelp proposition only?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. There is nothing in this appropriation that affects in any way the question of obtaining potash from the alkali lakes?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think not. I think that covers the kelp proposition entirely. I may be mistaken about that.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do.

Mr. BLACK. Speaking of return, is it not a fact that even at selling their product at $450 a ton last year the total receipts were only $50,000?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, with his permission. How long has this experiment in kelp continued up to date?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think this will be the third year, if my recollection is correct.

Mr. BANKHEAD. How much further time is it anticipated it will require to conclude these experiments?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is very likely, in order to determine just what by-products can be commercially taken out of kelp in the process of manufacture, a considerable amount of machinery now in operation will have to be taken out and other machinery substituted for it, and the process will have to go on for at least another year.

Mr. KINKAID. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. KINKAID. Has investigation been made in different portions of the country for producing potash from purely mineral sources, and have not disclosures been made in the last year or two showing that a very great amount of potash may be found in the United States in mineral forms?

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent for three minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KINKAID. Another question, if the gentleman please. Is it not a fact that reports coming through, say, the Geological Survey, and through other authentic sources, are to the effect that the United States may develop sufficient potash for its own use and consumption?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that is true, and I will say to the gentlemen of the committee that if this experiment is to stop with the determination of whether you can produce potash alone from kelp at a price that will compete commercially with potash produced from its sources, it can stop now and ought to stop now. We believe it is possible to produce potash and the by-products of kelp in such quantity as to make this plant a paying proposition.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. And some of the products that are produced in addition to potash are much more valuable and much more important than is the potash itself.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I want to ask the gentleman if the point is not about this: This is really not an investigation of any production, but it is an investigation of the commercial possibilities of the seaweed called kelp, because you have proceeded sufficiently far to discover that kelp is not a promising source from which you may hope to get potash.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true if you base your proposition entirely on potash.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Is it not a misnomer to say that this is a potash investigation? Should it not be said that we are investigating the seaweed possibilities?

Mr. ANDERSON. Potash is, of course, the prime result of the investigation of the kelp. The other products are by-products.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I would like to know if this investigation has gone far enough so that the Government is sure that as a potash-producing proposition kelp is a failure? Has it gone that far?

Mr. ANDERSON. I can not answer that question categorically, because the proposition has to be considered together. If you only go so far as the production of potash from kelp, the proposition is a failure commercially, but if you go the next step and produce iodine and charcoal and products similar to coal-tar products we have every reason to believe the process will be successful.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. And that leads to this question. This is an agricultural bill. Are we justified in making an appropriation of this size or of any other size for the Department of Agriculture for something that is not akin to agriculture?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would not were it not for the fact that we already have the plant there and have $166,000 invested. We have gotten about so far that it is cheaper and more economical for us to go the rest of the way with the experiment and conclude it than to cut it off now.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. Is it not true that the Hercules Powder Co. had a much greater investment and that they abandoned it?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true, but their activities were directed entirely to the production of potash alone.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FESS. The topic under consideration now involves two very important lines of thought that I think will enlist the sympathetic attention and consideration of every Member. The line that was enunciated by our friend from Texas [Mr. BLACK] opens up a world of suggestion. It has some values; it has some dangers. I think that my friend would admit it. To-day in the Balkan States the biggest problem before the peace conference is due to the fact that one of the States produces one thing mainly and little else; that another State produces another thing mainly and little else. One has a great wheat market and is dependent almost entirely upon that production, not only for food, but it is the chief production which it exchanges for needed articles; another produces no wheat but a great abundance of oil, and depends almost entirely upon that source for its livelihood; while another has some particular mineral wealth

but is without either the agricultural or the oil wealth; while still another is the chief manufacturer of that section of Europe. The effort to get an agreement whereby no one will be shut out from the use by embargoes of what it has not but must depend on another for is really the biggest problem before the peace conference as to those States. In a country like ours, made up of a vast territory of a wide diversity, where one State or section devotes its energy to one line and others to different lines, there is no trouble, since they are all under one Government. In fact, this wide diversity of industry and the great expansion of territory are the conditions upon which our frame of government largely depends. But even in that case no one section of our country can be so independent as when it produces a variety of articles rather than but one. Especially is this true when applied to independent countries such as the Balkan States.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there for one brief statement?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. BLACK. I hope the gentleman will not understand me to advocate the discouragement of the production of potash in this country under economic conditions. What I wanted to point out was that the facts indicated that you could not produce it economically out of kelp.

Mr. FESS. Probably if we both clearly understood what was meant, it would be found that we are not far apart.

The time was when we had a flock of sheep upon almost every farm in the country, upon the basis that a flock of sheep is more of a value than a detriment to any farm; and I do not believe that there is a farmer anywhere that could not profitably maintain even to-day a flock of sheep, which would add, first, to the wool product of the country, and, second, to the meat product of the country.

Now, my friend from Texas [Mr. BLACK] will recall that one of the strongest arguments ever produced on this floor against the sheep industry was by your famous Roger Q. Mills, who claimed that we could not go into the sheep business in this country in competition with Australia; that there the grazing fields are unlimited—lands inexpensive and adapted to the raising of sheep, with which we could not compete. He asserted that to undertake to utilize for the sheep industry land sold at such tremendous prices as ours are sold in competition with a country like Australia was foolishness. That is the principle for which our friend from Texas [Mr. BLACK] now contends. Well, whatever be the source of the depression of the sheep industry of the country, whether it was argument of that sort or something else, all of us recognize that the country has grown poorer by the fact that we have ceased to be a great wool and sheep growing country, both from the standpoint of the fiber and the standpoint of the meat products. We have ceased to be an independent country in that degree, because the industry has given way to a dependence upon a foreign supply. I think that no country can safely go upon the basis that it will not develop to the very last limit its ability to produce anything it can produce, so that it will never be dependent on any other country for anything.

The dye industry and the chemical industry, I think, are two splendid concrete examples of where this country was dependent for a time upon a foreign country, and that a country which became our enemy, Germany, and we were unable to produce those articles in competition with the foreign country because of the difference in our standard of wages. But the war, which was an absolute embargo, the strongest possible protection our Nation or any nation can have, opened up the opportunity for us to see what we could do. In the short space of four years we are producing both the dyes and the chemicals, not perhaps of such fine quality as those made in Germany, but sufficient to supply our needs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FESS. I thought I had 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman was recognized for five minutes. Otherwise the gentleman has five minutes remaining.

Mr. FESS. It might be that we are not producing these elements in the fine type and quality that Germany was producing them, but I believe—and this is not braggadocio—that if the opportunity is afforded so that the genius of America can be put to its maximum, to the very limit, we shall produce as fine coloring materials as Germany ever did, and in abundant quantities, although we may have to take time to do it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to my friend.

Mr. LEVER. I very fully agree with the suggestion of the gentleman, and two items are carried in this bill for that purpose, one the coloring item and the other the kelp item. Yet on a stand-up vote the Members of the gentleman's party voted almost unanimously against the coloring item.

Mr. FESS. I do not think it is the special duty of the Department of Agriculture to carry on that work, since we have a Bureau of Standards, especially adapted for just such expert investigation, and therefore I think this side of the House is not subject to the friendly criticism of my friend, who, I think, is generally fair.

Mr. LEVER. I try to be fair. There is absolutely no duplication between the work of the Bureau of Chemistry and that of the Bureau of Standards, so far as I am informed, and I put in the RECORD a year or so ago a statement by the Department of Commerce, perhaps the statement of Dr. Stratton himself, the Director of the Bureau of Standards, showing that that was true.

Mr. REBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. REBER. The gentleman made a statement a moment ago as to our chemicals and dyes not having attained the efficiency and quality that those of Germany had attained before the war. I wish to state to the House and for the information of the gentleman, if I may, that the dyes that are being produced in the United States, from my own practical knowledge, are better than any dyes that we ever got from Germany. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. I want to applaud that statement, because it is a revelation of a fact that I was not aware of and at which I am very happy. I did not know that we had reached that stage of efficiency, and I am glad to have the assurance of one who knows that we have. Now, the big thing is not to forfeit the opportunity to continue.

Along the lines of that suggestion that I made a moment ago is this, and I would like to have the thoughtful attention of the membership for just a moment: The acreage out of which we produce the foodstuffs of the world can not be enlarged to a very great extent in the future. We shall reclaim, it is true, some of the swamp lands and shall irrigate some of the arid lands, and we will thereby add to the acreage in a degree. However, this country will not very greatly add to the available cultivable acreage. But our population is growing by leaps and bounds, as is apparent to all of us. This fact means that the consumptive power is increasing most rapidly, both in increased desires and increased numbers, while our productive power must be limited. Only two considerations will meet this problem: First, the acreage out of which we produce it, and, second, the scientific application of the newer views to increase the production of the available acreage. And while this Congress may be able to increase in a degree the acreage from which we produce the foodstuffs of America, yet the thing we ought to think most about is how to make the acreage produce double or treble or quadruple the amount that we produce now. It can be done, and I take it all will admit that it must be done. If there is from any committee a suggestion that through the expenditure of some money to carry on investigation a plan or discovery may be found whereby we can increase the productivity of the acreage, we ought not only to vote for it because it is an institution already established, but we ought to vote for it because it is an institution designed to increase a going concern and to meet the multiplying needs of the race. The item under consideration is designed to do this, and if fertilizer is a source out of which we are to multiply our capacity to produce, and thus make the acre produce twice or three or four times what it now produces, that is, make it produce to the maximum, then you do no wiser thing than to give this aid and thus help to reach the maximum production. This proposition is certainly incontrovertible, that consumption is growing from the need of the race, not only in the increase of desires but in the multiplication of the race. Consumption is not a constant but a continuously increasing quantity, while production based on acreage is a somewhat fixed quantity. In other words, demand is growing and will continue to grow, while supply will be at a standstill unless we find a way to so cultivate the acreage that the unit of production will be greatly increased. For that reason, while I sympathize very much with my friend from Texas in his desire to curtail expenditure, yet I want to know whether we have gotten all there is to be found before I vote against this item. [Applause.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I agree in part with the general statement of the gentleman who has just addressed us [Mr. FESS]. We should develop our industries as far as it is practical to do so, but we are not confronted here primarily with the necessity of passing upon fundamental government or economic problems. This is a concrete proposition as to whether or not the Members of this

Congress shall do that which I dare say no practical business man would do if he were putting up the money out of his own funds. There is a necessity, of course, for governmental exploration and activity in many lines, but if we are to command respect for the work of the Government we must use the same sort of sound business judgment in expending the public money that a hard-headed, practical man displays in expenditures in his own business.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Not just now. I will in a minute. Now, I leave it to the common sense of the Members here that if you had spent three years and some hundreds of thousands of dollars in investigating a proposition, and at the end of that time it should be disclosed from your experiments that the commodity which you had hoped to produce could not be economically produced in this sort of way, or at least you had not discovered that it could be, and your own common sense and experimentation should tell you that there was no reasonable hope that it could be done, what would you do? Let us look at this as a practical proposition. I submit that it is absurd to say that we can go out into the ocean and get this wet seaweed, bring it in and dry it, and convert it into its chemical elements, extracting its potash at a price which will enable us to compete with those sections of the world where nature has already concentrated potash in great deposits, where it may be mined. With all due respect, I say, it strikes me as an absurd proposition. Now, I agree that as far as it is practical we should make our country self-sustaining, but we can not go to the extreme of expending money and energy in trying to produce something at a cost far greater than that at which we can purchase it, and I do not understand that any school of political philosophers in any age of the world have ever undertaken to support such a position as that. Now I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDERSON. I simply want to suggest to the gentleman that the application of strict business rules to the question of actual profit from the direct expenditure of the dollars and cents of the appropriations in this bill would destroy every one of these appropriations. The gentleman overlooks the fact that the Department of Agriculture is purely a scientific institution, conducting scientific investigations which no private concern has engaged in or could afford to engage in as a matter of commercial profit.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly; but after you have pursued your investigation to the conclusion of the inquiry which prompted the investigation and report that the thing is a failure so far and there is nothing in the situation upon which to base hope, why ask that Congress appropriate the money to run the experiment for another year?

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The committee has not made any such report. The report that the committee brings in is that the potash alone is not a profitable commercial proposition, but that the so-called by-products will pay the cost of manufacture. Now, I put this proposition to the gentleman——

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Do not take up all my time.

Mr. HAUGEN. I will ask to have the gentleman's time extended if he needs it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. All right.

Mr. HAUGEN. If you are engaged in the manufacture or production of a highly desired article and you found that the by-products would pay the expense of the manufacture, would it not be wise to continue the operation of the plant?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not concede the premise, but I will answer the gentleman upon the assumption that the premise has been established. If I were conducting an investigation purely as an investigation and had determined that the plan was feasible and that my investigation had disclosed it, I would report back the results of my investigation and stop the expenditure of money for the investigation. Now, I do not understand that the gentleman contemplates that the Government shall go into the manufacture of potash and the by-products of that manufacture as an industry to be permanently operated by the Federal Government. I understand that the Federal Government has undertaken to investigate certain questions and explore certain fields seeking a domestic supply of potash, among them kelp. I understand from the gentleman that he is able upon his responsibility as the chairman of this committee to report to this Congress and to the country at large that the conversion of kelp is a feasible field for industry to enter. Now, if you are able to do that, and you do not contemplate that the Government shall produce but merely explore and experiment, why not take our hands out of the Federal Treasury and let industry pursue the project as a desirable field to enter? Somebody must pay this money which you are asking for in this item. [Applause.] Either way you take it, it seems to me this appropriation ought to stop.

Mr. HAUGEN. If the gentleman's understanding of the situation were entirely correct I think I should agree with him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All debate is closed, and the question is on the motion to strike out the paragraph.

The question being taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAUGEN and Mr. LEVER) there were—ayes 29, noes 51.

Accordingly the motion to strike out the paragraph was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Bureau of Entomology: One entomologist, who shall be chief of bureau, $5,000; 1 chief clerk and executive assistant, $2,250; 1 administrative assistant, $2,250; 1 editor, $2,250; 1 financial clerk, $1,800; 4 clerks, class four; 7 clerks, class three; 16 clerks, class two; 22 clerks, class one; 8 clerks, at $1,000 each; 1 insect delineator, $1,600; 2 insect delineators, at $1,400 each; 2 entomological draftsmen, at $1,400 each; 1 entomological draftsman, $1,080; 1 photographer, $1,200; 1 entomological preparator, $1,000; 4 entomological preparators, at $840 each; 8 entomological preparators, at 720 each; 7 entomological preparators, at $600 each; 1 laborer, $1,080; 2 messengers or laborers, at $900 each; 1 messenger or laborer, $840; 3 messengers or laborers, at $720 each; 6 messenger boys, at $480 each; 1 laborer, $540; 1 laborer, $480; 2 charwomen, at $480 each; 3 charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $124,010.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the increase in the salary of one entomologist, who shall be chief of bureau, $5,000, in line 24, page 55. That is an increase from $4,500 to $5,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HAUGEN. I offer an amendment to make the salary $4,500.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 55, line 23, after the colon, insert "one entomologist, who shall be chief of the bureau, $4,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of insects affecting deciduous fruits, orchards, vineyards, and nuts, $95,780: *Provided*, That $9,600 of said sum shall be available for the investigation of insects affecting the pecan and method of control of same.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 57, line 4, strike out "$95,780" and insert in lieu thereof "$105,780."

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the department asks that this sum be increased $10,000, and the committee thinks that the request should be granted.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask some member of the committee if this appropriation is for the service of the entomologists at the various stations which were established a few years ago? I would like to know if the station at North East, Pa., in the heart of the Erie County grape belt, is to be maintained under this appropriation?

Mr. HAUGEN. This amendment is for the purpose of increasing the amount in the bill by $10,000, bringing the total up to $15,000. This sum is needed in connection with the campaign against the Japanese beetle, a dangerous insect pest of orchards and other fruit trees, recently introduced in this country. At the time the estimate of $5,000 was submitted the insect occurred more or less abundantly over some 10,000 acres, as compared with the known infestation of 600 or 700 acres in the preceding fall. The beetles are now known to be present over an area of approximately 25,000 acres.

Mr. SHREVE. I will ask the gentleman, if he can tell me, Is it the intention of the department to maintain the service in the Erie County grape belt?

Mr. HAUGEN. The data furnished me does not give that information.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is the section to which the gentleman refers the one for which provision was made when the gentleman was in Congress several years ago?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; as a Member at that time, which was about six years ago, I had inserted an amendment providing the sum of $3,000 for the purpose of establishing an entomologist at North East, Pa.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Has that appropriation been reduced?

Mr. SHREVE. For many years the Government had carried these appropriations, but for some reason afterwards the appropriation was dropped.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If I recall correctly, the section of country to which the gentleman refers is one of the important grape-growing sections of the United States.

Mr. SHREVE. It is probably the greatest section of the country for the growing of Concord grapes, which reaches its highest expression in the form of grape juice.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman tell us why the appropriation was shut off?

Mr. SHREVE. I never knew; I took it up when I came to Congress with the chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, who very willingly and readily assented to the amendment and who recognized the great necessity for it. I might say that my remarks at that time cover the conditions as they exist to-day. We had the assistance of the Department of Agriculture for several years, and I might say that the grape growers of that vicinity would have been out of business long ago if it had not been for the Agricultural Department.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has not been answered by the gentleman from Iowa as to whether this station is to be continued. I presume it is, but I should like to know myself, because prohibition is about to be established and the grape industry is still to be fostered. Grape juice is coming in while fermented liquor is going out. The gentleman from Iowa ought to be able to tell us whether or not we may lose this station in Pennsylvania, for which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] had provision made when he was here before.

Mr. HAUGEN. I regret to say that I am not able to state whether this work will be continued at a certain station or not.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to read a telegram from one of the largest manufacturers in my district. I asked a few days ago something about the situation, and this is the reply:

WESTFIELD, N. Y., *May 28, 1919.*

Hon. MILTON W. SHREVE,
Washington, D. C.:

We estimate that 15,000 tons of grapes were used last fall for unfermented grape juice, and 6,000 tons for food products such as jam and jelly. We have no information on wine production, but know that the quantity made in New York State, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan was small.

WELCH GRAPE JUICE CO.

Mr. HAUGEN. Has the work been continued at this station or has it been neglected?

Mr. SHREVE. No; it has not been neglected; it has been a splendid work under the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HAUGEN. And the proposition is to continue the work?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; that is what my people are here inquiring of me—whether or not the work is to be continued during the next two years.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman appreciates that 20,000 people are employed in the Department of Agriculture. There are thousands of projects of importance. The committee could not take the time to ascertain exactly where every dollar is to be expended and what projects are to be continued. I think the gentleman can be assured that his project will be continued.

Mr. SHREVE. I thank the gentleman for his kindly assurance.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing the speech I made on this subject in the Sixty-third Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The following is the speech referred to:

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the purpose of restoring to the grape belt, on the southern shore of Lake Erie, in Erie County, Pa., a station which was removed during 1913. For many years the Government has maintained a station at North East for the purpose of studying insect pests in the vineyards. I can safely say that the fact that the vineyard business is alive to-day is entirely owing to the Government assistance which we have had. Mr. Johnson was stationed there for many years, and he seems to have had a faculty of studying out ways to combat all the inspect pests. He did this up to the time that he left the service, which was entirely of his own accord. During the last year the grape-berry moth has infested this district. I will say that this moth can be found in all parts of the world. In fact, last year the entomologist of France, Mr. Marechal, came to this country and visited our district for the purpose of investigating the grape-berry moth. Even Mr. Johnson himself, in an article which he published at the end of his labors in 1912, declared that he knew nothing about it, that the grape-berry moth had been largely misunderstood. In this article he says:

"The grape-berry moth (*Polychrosis viteana* Clem.) is an insect enemy of the grape of long standing in the vineyards of the Lake Erie Valley. Since the first reports of its serious injury to the grape crop near Hudson, Ohio, in 1868, it has been an almost continual menace to grape production in vineyards located along the shores of Lake Erie from Sandusky, in Ohio, eastward into Pennsylvania and New York. Most of the data dealing with this insect covers a series of life-history records and field experiments conducted during the seasons from 1907 to 1909, inclusive, in connection with the investigations of the grape rootworm and other insect pests of the grapevine which have been carried on at North East, Pa., by the section of the Bureau of Entomology engaged in deciduous fruit insect investigations under the direction of Mr. A. L. Quaintance.

* * * * * * *

"During the seasons of 1907 and 1908 the investigation of the grape rootworm occupied the greater part of the time of the force engaged in the study of grape pests. For this reason the life-history studies covering those seasons were rather fragmentary. During the season of 1909, however, the junior author devoted the greater share of his time to a detailed study of the life history of this pest. From the records secured by him in this relation the data covering the various stages of a large number of individuals, presented under the topic of 'Seasonal history for 1909,' have been compiled.

"Recommendations offered for the control of this insect in regard to the time and manner of making spray applications are based upon the data obtained in the study of the life history and habits of the grape-berry moth during this investigation, correlated with the field experiments and observations covering that period. Since these life-history studies have shown considerable deviations from those previously recorded in regard to the time of appearance of certain stages of the insect and in the number of broods each season, it has been necessary to revise our ideas somewhat as to the relative importance of the spray applications formerly recommended; and since suitable opportunities have not presented themselves for a thorough trial of this revised spray schedule, some of the recommendations along this line are offered rather in the form of suggestions than as definitely demonstrated and proved methods.

* * * * * * *

"At the present state of our knowledge of the habits of this pest and of the methods that have been suggested and employed for its control it is impossible to recommend any one method which of itself has given results that are as satisfactory as could be wished."

Mr. Johnson says that they have been in error in their studies and investigations of the proper means of eradicating this pest. Now, in my own district, where we have 10,000 or 15,000 acres of grapes, the damage last year amounted to several hundred thousand dollars, and I have a number of telegrams from our people which I wish to read. The first is from Mr. George E. Pierce, who is a wholesale dealer in grapes:

NORTH EAST, PA., *March 6, 1914.*

M. W. SHREVE, *Washington, D. C.:*

I understand there is a movement to reestablish a Government station in this county. I investigated grape pests. Please use your utmost efforts in its favor. Some of the best located and cultivated vineyards are being cut down on account of berry moths, and the pests are spreading rapidly. The output is decreasing. The acreage in the township is 7,000. My shipments in 1912 were 550 carloads; in 1913, 100 carloads.

GEORGE E. PIERCE.

I have also received the following telegrams:

NORTH EAST, PA., *March 6, 1914.*

Hon. MILTON W. SHREVE,
Washington, D. C.:

Grape industry in urgent need of expert help to find way to control pests that threaten its ruin. Do everything possible to secure the help needed. You know from personal knowledge grape crop is decreasing, whereas to supply market a substantial gain is required.

A. I. LOOP.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of insects affecting cereal and forage crops, including a special investigation of the Hessian fly and the chinch bug, $147,060, of which sum $10,000 shall be immediately available.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the words "of which sum $10,000 shall be immediately available."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HAUGEN. I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HAUGEN: Page 57, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the establishment of the European corn borer in Massachusetts, New York, and other States, and to provide means for the control, prevention, and spread of this insect in these States or elsewhere in the United States, in cooperation with the State or States concerned, including rent outside of the District of Columbia, employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all other necessary expenses, $250,000, which shall be immediately available."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the words "which shall be immediately available." I am not particular about that part of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to withdraw the language "which shall be immediately available." Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, for the present I object.

Mr. LEVER. I was about to object myself.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, we are now along after the 1st of June. This money will be available the 1st of July if

the bill is passed before that time. It will make a difference of only a week, probably. In all probability the bill will not be passed before the 1st of July. Why take up the time of making this money available for only a week? The department could not expend it, anyway, before a week.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman from Iowa that he offer the language without those words.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment without those words, and ask that it be so modified.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 57, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following as a new paragraph:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the establishment of the European corn borer in Massachusetts, New York, and other States, and to provide means for the control, prevention and spread of this insect in other States, or elsewhere in the United States, in cooperation with the State or States concerned, including rents outside of the District of Columbia, employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all other necessary expenses, $250,000."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee the reason for this somewhat large appropriation and how much these States are doing themselves to eradicate or overcome the ravages of this pest.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the bill reported to the last Congress and passed by this House included an item of $25,000 for this purpose. A supplementary estimate asking for $500,000 was presented to the committee. The committee has recommended $250,000, so that there will be available $25,000 carried in another paragraph of the bill, and $250,000, making a total of $275,000. If the gentleman desires more information as to the absolute need for the appropriation, then I shall yield to the gentleman from his own State [Mr. DALLINGER], who is very familiar with it.

Mr. WALSH. Has not the chairman of the committee any information as to how much Massachusetts and New York are spending?

Mr. HAUGEN. Undoubtedly those two States will spend a large amount of money, but this pest is not confined to the two States mentioned. It is spreading all over the United States. The gentleman knows the importance of the corn crop of the country, and he knows that if we are going to meet this proposition we should do so at the beginning; we should nip it in the bud, as we have been doing with the citrus-fruit canker and as we undertook to do with the cotton-boll weevil. The committee, in recommending the $250,000 on the urgent suggestion of the department to make it $500,000, did what it thought was best. If the gentleman will examine the photograph that I have here, he will appreciate the danger that we are facing.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. BAER. I want to say in regard to this pest that it started in Massachusetts and New York and it has already spread out to North Dakota. This is the only item in the bill that I have received any communication from my district about, urging that we hold this appropriation in the bill. Inasmuch as $397,000 are appropriated elsewhere in the bill for the boll weevil or pink bollworm down in Mexico, to cooperate with the Mexicans to exterminate, I believe the North in this case should have this appropriation, and I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to know to what extent there has been cooperation.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to read from the hearings. Dr. Howard stated, among other things:

We have conducted a survey during the past summer, and find that it has now spread to an area of about 300 square miles around Boston. It is a very difficult insect to control, for the reason that it is not confined to corn, but breeds in the stock of orchard grasses, ragweeds, dahlias, and every kind of annual plant which has stocks large enough, etc.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigation of insects affecting southern field crops, including insects affecting cotton, tobacco, rice, sugar cane, etc., and the cigarette beetle and Argentine ant, $85,400.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 14, page 57, add the following words: "*Provided*, That $25,000 of the above sum of $85,400 be used for investigation of insects and worms affecting tobacco and for demonstration in destroying such insects and worms."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, in the Sixtieth Congress this item was in the Agricultural bill, for the investigation and improvement of methods of growing, producing, and handling tobacco, $23,180. That was a separate fund. That was continued during the Sixty-first Congress, except that the amount was $23,330, and was continued on down to the Sixty-third Congress, when the sum was $31,630.

After that this appropriation was put into a lump sum just as it reads in this paragraph, and after the appropriation had been put into this lump sum I do not think there has been a proper investigation of those insects affecting the tobacco crop over the country. Now, the tobacco crop of the United States is a large crop. We raise tobacco from Connecticut to Florida and from Missouri to the Atlantic coast, and we ask simply the sum of $25,000 to carry on these investigations. The Department of Agriculture uses arsenate of lead for the purpose of destroying what is called the tobacco hornworm and other insects or worms affecting tobacco, and in order properly to use this arsenate of lead it is necessary for the Government to establish laboratories. It has one at Clarksville, Tenn., and, I think, one in Florida, and ought to have one in Connecticut, so men can go among the farmers and demonstrate to them how to use this remedy to kill tobacco worms and other insects. You put this sum, heretofore intended to be used for this purpose, in a lump sum and it is likely to be diverted, as I believe it has been heretofore, to other purposes, and I offer this amendment so as to make sure that this amount of $25,000—nothing is added to this appropriation whatever—is used for the purpose for which it was originally intended, and that is the investigation concerning insects affecting the tobacco crop of the United States. For that reason I ask the committee to separate this fund and give the tobacco investigation a separate fund, so we may know it will go to and be used for that purpose for which it was originally intended, and I hope that the committee will adopt the amendment. As I stated, it does not add a single cent to the appropriation in this item, but there is $60,400 left for the investigation of insects affecting other southern field crops. Now, I think that one of those stations should be established in Connecticut, and I think one west of the Mississippi River for the purpose of these investigations and demonstrations. I ask the House to pass this amendment so that this fund may be appropriated and used for the purpose for which it was originally intended.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the paragraph under consideration and is not in order. The paragraph under consideration relates to investigations of insects affecting southern field crops, and so forth. The amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky provides for demonstration of methods to destroy insects affecting tobacco. Inasmuch as the section itself is limited to investigation an amendment relating to demonstration of work would not be germane to the paragraph. For that reason I make the point of order.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, it does not seem to me that point of order is good. Probably there is a point of order that might be made to the paragraph that might hold good, but based simply upon the proposition that it is not germane to the section it does not occur to me that the point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not care to make any extended argument on it. I merely call the attention of the chairman to the fact that to a paragraph providing for investigation, including among other things insects affecting tobacco and other southern field crops, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky is certainly germane. If that is the only point of order, it is not well taken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It is a limitation upon the appropriation and clearly not subject to the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to submit this observation in behalf of the amendment. Here is an appropriation of $85,400 for an investigation of insects affecting southern field crops, including insects affecting cotton, tobacco, rice, and so forth. Now, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky is simply a direction as to how a part of this fund should be expended. It simply provides that $25,000 of the amount appropriated shall be expended for the investigation of insects affecting tobacco, and, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] states, it is a limitation, or certainly a direction, as to how the money shall be expended.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question? Does the gentleman from Tennessee think it would be germane to offer an amendment to authorize the

shipment of tobacco or rice or sugar in connection with the investigation?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not, Mr. Chairman; but I submit this amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky does not by any means go that far.

The CHAIRMAN. This amendment provides for demonstration, whereas the paragraph provides for investigation.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. But, Mr. Chairman, the paragraph in question itself provides for an investigation of these insects. The amendment also provides for an investigation, and I submit it is perfectly proper to offer an amendment to this provision saying how the money so appropriated should be expended. It certainly seems to me to be germane to the paragraph in question, because it provides for an investigation and, as I understand, a demonstration, which, I submit, is necessary to establish the value of the investigation.

Mr. THOMAS. I desire to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question. Is it not a fact that this lump-sum fund of $85,000, or a like sum heretofore appropriated, has been used in demonstration as well as investigation?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Unquestionably. Mr. Chairman, that is a fact.

Mr. THOMAS. I would like to ask this question: Is there not a laboratory in your own district fitted up for the purpose of demonstrating the use of arsenate of lead in killing these insects?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is true, and it has been in existence for several years. As the gentleman from Kentucky suggests, it is used in investigating work, and there is also demonstration, just as the gentleman from Kentucky provides in his amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I believe the Chair had better hear the amendment read again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Then, I believe the Chair will see it provides only for a limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair does not think that this is a limitation on the appropriation, because it does not reduce the amount of the appropriation. While the paragraph relates to the investigation of tobacco, it does not relate to the demonstration. And two subjects are not necessarily germane because they are related. The amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS] relates to tobacco, but the paragraph relates only to the investigation of the subject and not to the demonstration of the subject. Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment to strike out the word "demonstration."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS] asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment by striking out the word "demonstration."

Mr. THOMAS. No. I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modified amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS: At the end of line 14, page 57, add the following words: "*Provided*, That $25,000 of the above sum of $85,400 be used for investigations of insects and worms affecting tobacco.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment by adding, after the word "tobacco," the words "wherever grown throughout the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LONERGAN offers the following amendment to the Thomas amendment: At the end of the amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS add the following: "wherever grown throughout the United States."

Mr. HAUGEN. I desire to ask the gentleman's attention to page 26 of the bill, lines 6 and 7, in which is carried an appropriation of $30,000, and last year $27,000 was used for the very purpose indicated in the amendment of the gentleman. So if the amendment carried it would cut the appropriation $2,000. I take it the gentleman would rather have the appropriation $27,000. I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. THOMAS. I wish to ask the gentleman if that amount of money was actually used in this work?

Mr. HAUGEN. Twenty-seven thousand eight hundred dollars.

Mr. THOMAS. I wish to ask if that was used?

Mr. HAUGEN. It was used. The amount is $27,800.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think it was used. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LONERGAN].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. LONERGAN), the committee divided; and there were—ayes 21, noes 37.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is now on the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. THOMAS), the committee divided; and there were—ayes 25, noes 41.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of insects affecting truck crops, including insects affecting the potato, sugar beet, cabbage, onion, tomato, beans, peas, etc., and insects affecting stored products, $84,960.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAUGEN: Page 57, line 19, strike out "$84,960" and insert "$134,960."

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, about a year ago the department, through the Bureau of Entomology, undertook to determine the feasibility of eradicating the sweet potato weevil, which threatened to destroy the sweet potato industry in many sections of the South. More than 30,000 farms have been inspected in Mississippi, Georgia, Alabama, and northern Texas. The actual eradication work is now in progress in Florida and southern Georgia, and highly satisfactory results are being secured. I am quoting from a statement of the department.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the chairman of the committee has spared me the necessity of offering my amendment. He has taken the ground from under my feet. I want to say I proposed to make a similar amendment in response to the request of the agricultural department of the State of Delaware. The State Board of Agriculture of Delaware addressed to me the following letter:

STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE,
Dover, Del., May 19, 1919.

Hon. C. R. LAYTON, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your attention is respectfully called to the fact that the sweet potato industry in Texas, Louisiana, and Florida is seriously menaced by the sweet potato weevil, and there is danger that the trouble will spread to all the sweet potato growing regions of the country. It is believed that steps should be taken at this time by the United States Government to control this insect if possible.

Many entomologists believe that the insect may be entirely eradicated. It is estimated that the sweet potato crop is worth more than $100,000,000 annually, and it seems worth while therefore to do everything possible to save it.

Thanking you in anticipation for your interest, I am,

Very truly, yours,

WESLEY WEBB, *Secretary.*

I want to say just a few words in this connection, that not only is this a large crop on the alluvial soils along the Gulf of Mexico, in Texas, and in some of Florida and Louisiana, but it is one of the great growing crops of the States of New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia. Owing to the discovery of cold storage, we have been enabled to store up for the use of the people in the large cities certain products. We have also now devised another proposition, and that is a warm storage. The sweet potato, as many of you possibly know, is stored up in the fall of the year in warm storage houses and kept for the supply of the cities during the winter months and let out according to the public demand. I am glad that this appropriation has been provided for in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Bureau of Biological Survey: One biologist, who shall be chief of bureau, $4,000; 1 chief clerk and executive assistant, $1,800; 1 administrative assistant, $2,250; 1 executive assistant, $1,800; 1 financial clerk, $1,600; 3 clerks class 3; 6 clerks class 2; 1 clerk, $1,260; 10 clerks class 1; 1 clerk, $1,100; 1 clerk, $1,080; 3 clerks at $1,000 each; 4 clerks at $900 each; 1 clerk, $840; 1 clerk, $720; one preparator, $1,200; 1 preparator, $900; 1 messenger, $720; 1 photographer, $1,300; one game warden, $1,200; 2 messenger boys at $480 each; 1 messenger boy, $360; 1 laborer, $600; 2 charwomen at $240 each; in all, $55,970.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on line 12, page 59, "one biologist, who shall be chief of bureau, $4,000," it being an increase which is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAUGEN: Page 59, line 11, after the colon, insert "One biologist, who shall be chief of bureau, $3,500."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the food habits of North American birds and mammals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry, including experiments and demonstrations in destroying wolves, coyotes, prairie dogs, and other animals injurious to agriculture and animal husbandry, and for investigations and experiments in connection with rearing of fur-bearing animals, including mink and marten, $389,440: *Provided*, That of this sum $15,000 shall be used for the destruction of ground squirrels on the national forests and other public lands: *And provided also*, That of this sum not less than $123,800 shall be used on the national forests and the public domain in destroying wolves, coyotes, and other animals injurious to agriculture, animal husbandry, and wild game: *And provided further*, That of this sum not more than $125,000 shall be used on the public lands, national forests, and elsewhere in the Western and Northwestern States for the protection of stock and other domestic animals through the suppression of rabies by the destruction of wolves, coyotes, and other predatory wild animals.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico will be recognized.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, the question has been asked here repeatedly in connection with the consideration of a good many of these items what, if any, cooperation have the different States given in connection with the work? In the behalf of the State of New Mexico, I would say that in January, 1918, the State of New Mexico, in connection with the Bureau of Biology, cooperated in the destruction of predatory animals to the extent of $25,000. The governor of our State authorized the council of defense to take out from the war fund, so called, that amount in order to cooperate with this bureau in the eradication of animals such as are named in this paragraph.

I have before me a set of resolutions which I ask leave to extend in the RECORD, together with my remarks. They say:

Asking for appropriations for destruction of predatory animals.

Whereas we believe that the work of exterminating predatory wild animals and range-destroying rodents carried on under the direction of the Biological Survey during the past few years has been very successful, and that, under the thorough organization and efficient plans of that bureau, this evil will be largely minimized, if not entirely removed, provided the different States will heartily cooperate with the Federal Government in its plan of work; and

Whereas at the present time the funds appropriated by Congress for this purpose are wholly inadequate to meet the real requirements of the Biological Survey in carrying on this work, and on that account the results obtained are not satisfactory in most sections of the West; and

Whereas it is our belief that the present bounty laws of the States should be repealed, and in lieu thereof the various States should, through their several legislatures, enact laws appropriating sufficient money to equal the amounts to be expended by the Federal Government in the different States, and that such State appropriations should be expended under the direction of the Biological Survey, to be handled in conjunction with the funds appropriated by Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved by the New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association in convention assembled at Albuquerque, N. Mex., March 25, 26, and 27, 1919, That we urge Congress to appropriate the additional sum of $300,000 for immediate use in the extermination of predatory wild animals and range-destroying rodents, and that we petition the various States to make appropriations at least equal to the amounts expended by the Federal Government in the various States, said money, both Federal and State, to be expended under the direction of the Biological Survey.

One of the serious problems confronting those engaged in promoting increased production of food crops and meat animals was the tremendous damage to growing crops and to range grasses caused by prairie dogs and other rodents, and the loss of cattle, sheep, and poultry from wild animals. Investigations by the United States Biological Survey show that the annual losses in the United States from predatory wild animals amounted to several hundred million dollars, and the loss from rodents is probably greater. The annual loss in New Mexico was variously estimated at from fifteen to twenty-five million. The method used by the Biological Survey has been perfected by years of investigation and experimenting and are very successful. The "kill" of prairie dogs is generally from 85 to 95 per cent by the use of poisoned oats. They followed up the work by using poisoned rolled barley and later by using fumigants, such as bisulphide of carbon, which if carefully and thoroughly used a good start has been made. Owners of lands and farmers and stockmen have been shown that prairie dogs can be exterminated at a cost of about 4 cents per acre for infested areas. The infested areas are so large that it will require several years of intense work to completely eradicate the pest. The work of trapping and poisoning predatory wild animals is being carried on and shows good results.

The Biological Survey has cooperative arrangements in several States for exterminating rodents and predatory wild animals, and in every case the results are much more satisfactory and less expensive than under the bounty system. I have before me now a partial report made by the men in charge of this work in the southwestern part of the country through the council of defense of the State of New Mexico.

In the spring of 1918 the governor of the State authorized the use of $25,000 from the fund known in our State as the war fund, and under an agreement covering the plan for the cooperative work as executed. Under this agreement $10,000 of this amount, in conjunction with an equal amount by the Department of Agriculture, was set aside and applied in reducing losses in live stock due to predatory wild animals, an increased force of hunters was placed in the field, trapping was resorted to by this experiment; the results have been very satisfactory. State hunters have a total of 1,972 days, at a cost of $5,741.44. They have taken 642 coyotes, 124 bob cats, 14 gray wolves, 5 predatory bears, including 3 grizzlies. The average cost of animals in June was $88.87; in July, $8.53; August, $5.93. The Government operations in the State during the same periods cost $9,225.70, and resulted in the killing of 417 coyotes, 77 bob cats, 41 gray wolves, 13 mountain lions, and 2 bears. No reasonable estimate of damage inflicted by predatory animals that has been advanced can show anything other than returned for this investment a very high rate of interest. The estimate generally accepted—and it is conservative, indeed, in view of the present high value of live stock—is that each gray wolf destroys annually $1,000 worth of live stock; each mountain lion, $500; each coyote and bob cat, $50 worth; predatory bears may be rated in the same class with wolves. On this basis the saving represented in this cooperative work is nearly nine times the amount of expenditure. Thus you will observe that the estimated saving to the people of the Nation, you might state, is $131,500, at a cost of about $20,000.

I have before me a copy of a resolution adopted by the New Mexico Cattle and Horse Association, which met in Albuquerque, N. Mex., on March 25, 1919, in which they ask for an additional sum in this appropriation of $300,000, and they say, in part:

We believe that the work of exterminating predatory animals and range-destroying rodents carried on under the direction of the Biological Survey during the past few years has been very successful, and that under the thorough organization and efficient plan of that bureau in cooperation with the States this evil will be largely minimized, if not entirely removed.

The New Mexican Horse Growers' and Cattle Growers' Association, in convention assembled, asked me, I say, to introduce an amendment to this paragraph authorizing an appropriation of $300,000 for this purpose. I have refrained from presenting such an amendment, because I know that the department knows what it is doing, and we are expected to have faith in the department, and I believe that this is not the proper time to ask for an increase in these appropriations. But I am glad that in this bill are contained other items which go toward the destruction of rodents and also to the destruction of obnoxious weeds mentioned in a former paragraph—weeds such as the loco and other weeds that go toward destroying the meat-animal industry in this country.

We are all interested in that industry. We send our wool—20,000,000 or 25,000,000 pounds—to the cities of Philadelphia and Boston, so that those merchants can have that product, which will increase the employment of their people. We send our meat to the packing houses. All the American people are interested in that. There was a time when the people did not care how many animals were destroyed by predatory beasts, because meat was then plentiful. But since meat has become almost a luxury, since sheep are worth all the way from $10 to $15, instead of from $1.50 to $2.50, we urge that the department give us experts in cooperation with our own activities for the extermination of these pests.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks by inserting these resolutions.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting the resolutions indicated in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following are the resolutions referred to:

THE NEW MEXICO CATTLE AND HORSE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
Albert, N. Mex., May 18, 1919.

Hon. B. C. HERNANDEZ,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Perhaps the following matter we are bringing to your valued notice herewith has passed that stage of its being a stern necessity that is reluctantly supported by a few staunch advocates of advancement and better methods, but the cooperative work now being done by the Federal and State authorities in the eradication of rodents and predatory animals, having had to take a chance on as thin ice as it did at our last legislature, makes me write you this letter of support in the effort that we are sure that you will make, for the continuation of the Federal aid in this splendid cooperative work, so well being carried on by S. E. Piper, who in this line of work stands second to none, both in his knowledge of the work, as well as his wonderful ability in organization and the successful handling of difficult situations so often met with in the field work. Speaking from our own experience as far as that has extended along this line, we are convinced that the benefit derived to the State is far beyond its usual estimate. We would not give it up for ten times the cost, and New Mexico could not have a worse loss than for the Federal Government to withdraw its part of the fund usually appropriated.

The far-reaching effect for the amount of range practically created, though its redemption from a state of unproductive aridity, in prairie dog infested sections, if allowed to so continue, would not only be of incalculable damage to the present live-stock industry now existing, but be an actual menace if neglected longer to its ultimate destruction. We feel sure that your own practical experience in the stock business will make you a strong champion of this being increased rather than cut down; that the only sound economic business way that the State keep its place as an agricultural and live-stock producer is through the progressive methods now being so successfully carried on, in so far as the appropriation will permit, by Mr. Piper and his collaborators.

Very truly, yours,

T. E. MITCHELL.

Resolution asking for Government cooperation in eradicating loco weed.

Whereas since the introduction of the live-stock industry in the West the loco weed has been an ever-recurring menace to the industry, causing great losses of cattle and horses annually; and

Whereas it has been proven through experiments by the Poisonous Plant Bureau of the Department of Agriculture and by individual experiments of stock growers that the poisonous weed can be permanently eradicated by cutting off the plants a few inches below the surface of the ground: Therefore be it

Resolved by the New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association in regular convention assembled at Albuquerque, N. Mex. March 25, 26, and 27, 1919, That we petition the Department of Agriculture to cooperate with us in the eradication of the loco weed; and be it further

Resolved, That we petition the Congress of the United States to make adequate appropriation to the Department of Agriculture for the eradication of the poisonous plant; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief Forester, our Senators and Congressmen, and Dr. C. D. Marsh, of the Poisonous Plant Bureau.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto now close.

Mr. RAKER. Not at this time.

Mr. HAUGEN. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. RAKER. I want 20 minutes. It is very vital and important, and I think when the House hears me it will conform to my wishes.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman always speaks interestingly and instructively, but I do not think the gentleman should have that time now.

Mr. RAKER. Let us not close the debate now. Let it go for 10 minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. I will renew my request after 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAKER: Page 60, line 22, strike out the figures "$389,040" and insert "$489,440."

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this matter is of considerable importance and one worthy of the attention of the committee. We are all members of the Committee of the Whole, and here is where we get an opportunity to present matters that have not been presented or have not been fully presented to the committee in charge of the bill. Otherwise all we would have to do would be read a bill, or not read it, and have the House pass it, and the Committee of the Whole would be absolutely useless.

This item affects that which has been raised. After it has been grown, and after these seeds you have provided for have been planted, after the plowing of the land, and the sowing, and the tilling, the destruction then comes between that time and its harvest. We are asking not for a donation, not because the people in these localities have not provided for their own preservation and their own homes, but because of the fact that the Federal Government owns two-thirds of the adjoining land, upon which it has absolute control and upon which the private individual has none.

For instance, we will take a case in the State of California, and it is a good case for illustration: A man owns 160 acres adjoining, we will say, the public domain or a national forest. I want to get this to the attention of our western friends and the Members of this House who are in favor of giving the man who actually spends his money a fair deal and who believe that the Government should provide for its property the same as the individual. The squirrels or rodents upon that 160-acre tract of land must be destroyed by the private individual. If he fails to destroy the squirrels or rodents upon his land notice is served upon him through the board of supervisors. If he then fails to do it the district attorney makes application to the board, and the county destroys them itself, and then the man's property, if he does not pay this debt, no matter what it might be, is sold, the same as when a mortgage is placed upon it or a road is built upon a county highway, the same as State or county taxes. The people of our country have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in destroying the rodents upon their own individual land. But after you have destroyed rodents upon your own land, here is a territory, enormous in extent, owned by the Government, upon which the animals are raised, reared, and protected, and they come down like blackbirds upon the land again, and the farmer must keep on destroying them until his resources have all been exhausted.

Now, what we want is that the Government do its part to assist in the destruction of these rodents. It is vitally important, it is necessary, it ought to be done, and it should not be neglected. This bill should help provide the necessary means to assist. The committee, for whom we have the highest regard, were limited in the time which they had for the consideration of the bill that failed in the last session. There is nothing in the testimony with reference to these particular items. We are not making any accusation on that account, but it is just one of those things that went over. Now, we who are so vitally interested in this subject expected that this bill as reported at this session would contain the amount to which the Senate raised the item in the former bill; that is, an increase of $100,000. It has been explained that the committee could have no hearings at this session on account of the lack of time, and therefore it is not included, so we are asking to have the same amount placed upon the bill that the Senate placed upon it last year.

In this connection, so as to get the facts before the committee, I wrote a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended five minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] to have 5 minutes, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to have 5 minutes, and I to have 5 minutes for myself.

Mr. RAKER. Now, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HAUGEN. I hope the gentleman will appreciate the fact that it is necessary to finish this bill as soon as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the question. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. RAKER. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman to give me 10 minutes, and then I will quit.

Mr. WALSH. I do not think we ought to have any of this bargaining about time.

Mr. HAUGEN. I hope the gentleman will help us in expediting the passage of this bill.

Mr. RAKER. I can get time on other paragraphs. Gentlemen have been taking 15 and 20 minutes. Here is a vital question, and the facts ought to be gotten before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. The letter that I wrote to the Secretary is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., May 31, 1919.

Hon. DAVID F. HOUSTON,
Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am much interested in the item in the Agricultural appropriation bill which relates to the investigation of the food habits of North American birds and animals, including experiments and demonstrations in destroying wolves and other animals injurious to agriculture and horticulture, with especial reference to the destruction of these predatory animals on the public lands, national forests, and elsewhere in the Western and Northwestern States and on the Pacific coast. I would be much pleased to have you furnish me with a statement—

1. The work that has been done.
2. The necessity for this appropriation.
3. The States that are asking for additional aid and cooperation.
4. The States that are this year asking aid for the first time.
5. The amount that the States are contributing to this work.

I have at different times taken this matter up with Mr. E. W. Nelson and Dr. Fisher, of the bureau, and would like to have a full statement so that I may be in a position to present the situation to the end that the Congress may recognize this splendid work.

Respectfully submitting the same, I am,

Very truly, yours, (Signed) JOHN E. RAKER.

Here is the reply:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, June 2, 1919.

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. RAKER: I have your letter of May 30, in which you request certain information concerning the item in the Agricultural appropriation bill under which the campaign of the department for the destruction of injurious mammals is being conducted.

The Bureau of Biological Survey estimates that prairie dogs and other injurious rodents cause an annual loss of crops and forage valued at $300,000,000 and that wolves and other predatory animals are responsible for the destruction annually of live stock valued at more than $20,000,000.

The bureau has an organized corps of hunters under expert supervision for the destruction of predatory animals. To the end of March, 1919, these men have captured 2,016 wolves, 75,103 coyotes, 10,033 bobcats, and 278 mountain lions. In addition, enormous numbers of coyotes and many bobcats have been killed by organized poisoning campaigns over great areas. The total result of this campaign, conducted in cooperation with many of the States has been the destruction of more than 200,000 predatory animals. It is estimated that, through the destruction of predatory animals during the calendar year 1918, live stock valued at more than $4,000,000 was saved. The skins of the predatory animals taken by hunters of the department are sold on Government account and more than $196,000 has been realized from this source.

In many sections of the West rodents destroy from 10 to 15 per cent of the total crops grown, and in some localities render successful agriculture impossible, even causing landowners to abandon their holdings. An extended and organized campaign, in cooperation with many of the Western States, is now in progress under the direction of the Biological Survey for the control of these rodents. In 1918 more than 100,000 farmers and landowners cooperated in this work, and a still greater number are cooperating during the present season. Estimates made by farmers and officials of agricultural colleges of the various States as a result of last year's campaign against rodents indicate a saving in crops of more than $13,000,000, in addition to the great increase in forage, due to the destruction of these animals over enormous acres of the western stock ranges. Thirteen States have been cooperating with the Biological Survey for several years in control of the injurious animals, and during the present year six additional States have requested the department to organize the work there, including Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Missouri. Seventeen States have either appropriated or otherwise provided funds for cooperation in the destruction of injurious animals. Owing to the fact that Government lands in the West are the principal breeding grounds for predatory and other injurious animals, a large number of the States are urging that the Government appropriate an amount equal to the sums contributed by them to the work. The funds of the various States, which have either been directly appropriated by the State legislatures or otherwise provided, for the present year amount to $1,172,000, as follows:

Arizona	$50,000.00
California	388,000.00
Colorado	65,085.00
Idaho	67,165.00
Kansas	3,954.00
Montana	103,700.00
Nebraska	3,388.80
Nevada	35,000.00
New Mexico	115,325.00
North Dakota	80,000.00
South Dakota	50,000.00
Oklahoma	5,000.00
Oregon	5,000.00
Texas	32,417.84
Utah	110,750.00
Washington	32,500.00
Wyoming	24,817.77
	1,172,103.41

If you desire any further information concerning this work, I shall be glad to supply it.

Very truly, yours, D. F. HOUSTON, *Secretary.*

Now, I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that over $1,000,000 has been appropriated by these States for the purpose of destroying these rodents. Over two-thirds of the land is owned by the Government, and this Government land is the breeding ground of these rodents. If the people do not destroy them upon their own land their land may be sold, but when they have destroyed them on their own land a new supply of these destructive animals will come back from the Government breeding grounds, come onto their lands and destroy their crops. As the Secretary says here, over 15 per cent of the crops are destroyed, and in many instances, to my personal knowledge, farmers have been compelled to leave their homes because of the destruction of crops upon their lands by these rodents, and I say it is only right and proper that this Government should deal properly with this subject and increase this appropriation $100,000. It ought to be $300,000 this year, and then $500,000 next year, because, as a matter of fact, with a real campaign of cooperation these rodents can be entirely wiped out. I have here an article which I am going to insert in the RECORD, showing where in my own county whole school districts have turned out—men, boys, women, and girls—using the poison at the proper time and destroying the rodents, so that the crops are saved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I am a little disappointed that the committee has shut me off. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I hope this appropriation will be placed on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. The article referred to is by Mr. FRENCH, which fully describes what is being done and the method, and is as follows:

[From the Alturas Plaindealer, Friday, May 23, 1919.]

ESTIMATED $1,000,000 DAMAGE TO MODOC FARMERS.

Following requests from the boards of supervisors of Modoc County as well as from the county horticultural commissioner for Federal and State aid in controlling ground squirrels, the greatest animal pest of crops in the northeastern counties of California, representatives of these two agencies were detailed to the work.

At the behest of G. H. Hecke, State commissioner of horticulture, the superintendent of rodent control of his commission, W. C. Jacobson, came to lend assistance, while the United States Biological Survey is represented by Edward Tallman, jr., of Berkeley.

During the past five years crews have been on national forests and public domain to assist ranchers and stockmen in their efforts to stem the depredations of the squirrel, and these agencies in turn sought the cooperation of those owning lands bordering the Government area. Not until the coming of the amended county horticultural commissioners act of 1917 was it possible to procure the necessary cooperation to make the work of any particular value. This act provided for the abatement of a nuisance occasioned by the presence of ground squirrels, and under this statute remarkable progress has been made in many of the counties of California. Modoc County, in addition to being endowed with one of the most destructive species of ground squirrels, has enormous acreages of vacant lands belonging to some one, but which are not treated for squirrel in the ordinary course of events. To remedy this condition and in order to make the assistance from State and Federal agencies the more helpful, a plan of drive has been set forth which has taken with great favor in all localities where presented.

The area included for a drive is decided upon by the farmers in the locality, and it is entirely up to those representing the community by attending the meetings called for the purpose as to whether a community shall have a squirrel drive or not. If favorable those detailed to assist are ready to devote their time and energy toward making it a success. The results which the ranchers in the localities already experimenting with such a type of control methods have met bring the procedure far out of the experimental stage. Progressive communities throughout the State are availing themselves of the assistance being rendered in this manner.

Committees for each school district are chosen for the various localities by those at the meeting, the duties of said committees being to line up all landowners willing to participate with all their help and as much stock as will be needed to accommodate their men; also, the nonresident tracts, the amount of poison each will need, the negligent landowners, who have always been lax in controlling squirrels and who likely will be unfavorable at the time of the drive. These latter are dealt with by serving them with a legal notice to abate the nuisance occurring upon their holdings, which precludes the possibility of their escape from the duty that other members of the community have taken upon themselves. Every public-spirited, whole-souled, progressive landowner does not hesitate for an instant, but rather considers the drive a most satisfactory expedient in the control of a pest which is annually costing the State of California upward of $30,000,000 and Modoc County no less than $1,000,000.

The residents of a community are divided into suitably sized crews and all of the land within the confines of the area specified is treated without regard for boundaries.

What does it cost the landowner? Just his time and the amount of poison used in treating his place. Who decides the amount of poison he should use? A committee of his fellow citizens. This entirely is a ranchers' own organization, all outside agencies merely acting as advisory assistants and to supply labor and materials for the areas with which they are directly concerned, namely, State and Government lands. The basis of estimate for amount of poison is about 75 to 100 pounds of poisoned grain per section of 640 acres. Poisoned grain is prepared by the office of county horticultural commissioner and cooperating agencies at actual cost, which is brought down to the low figure of from 12 to 13 cents per pound, due to the purchase of supplies in large quantities at Government contract prices, through the rodent-control division of the State commission of horticulture. If that is all there is to it, then why can't each landowner work individually? They have been working just so for the past 50 years, and lack of concerted, cooperative work simultaneously has brought about only partial results, and it has, furthermore, been impossible for State and Federal bureaus to work their areas at the same time.

By means of a drive all types of land are treated at one and the same time; thereby danger of reinfestation back and forth is eliminated. The same degree of control is arrived at for all acreages concerned in the drive, and a greater permanency to the work is established, if experience with previous drives can be taken for examples, where a clean-up of from 75 per cent to 90 per cent has been made in from one to three days. It means that everyone benefits from the work of all others without danger of the neighbors' squirrels being any more numerous than our own. The cost is reduced to a minimum and relieves for a considerable time the need for repetitive poisoning due to reinfestation. Many who are zealous to protect their crops are in this way safeguarded and need not feel that nothing is being done on adjoining lands.

Modoc County has the following drives under way: Surprise Valley from Washington school district south to the Lassen County line, including Cedarville, Eagleville, and the intervening lands between the lakes and the mountains. The drive starts off with a poison mix on May 28. Big Valley and Round Valley follow during the first week of June. It is here that enthusiasm is unbounded, for they went through just such a drive during 1918 and hotfoot for it this year. Then the Davis Creek-Goose Lake Valley drive, starting about the 10th of June. These drives last for one or more days, depending upon the amount of land to be covered and the number of men available. Notices in the form of posters will announce the dates of the poison mixes and drives.

Committees have been working hard and these public-spirited men are worthy of a great deal of commendation for the zeal with which they lined up their school districts.

Young squirrels are out now over most of the county, and as soon as the natural feed begins to ripen and go to seed poisoned grain will be taken with great avidity. The drives have been at times as to avail of a period when maximum results can be obtained with a minimum of effort. Get in touch with the committeemen in the above districts and learn more about the drives.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] increasing the appropriation for the destruction of predatory animals and injurious rodents by $100,000, in spite of the fact that it is too small, because the amount allowed in this bill is totally inadequate. As a matter of fact good business judgment would insist that at least $300,000 additional be appropriated for this purpose. The committee, it is true, authorized an appropriation of $389,440, which is the amount estimated for by the Department of Agriculture, but that estimate was made over a year ago, and the conditions have greatly changed since that time. The people of the stock-growing States have at last realized the immense value of the work done by the Biological Survey in the destruction of predatory animals and injurious rodents, and because of that realization the people are now willing, as individuals and by States and counties, to contribute funds for cooperative work with the Government. The Biological Survey is to-day embarrassed by offers of cooperation which it can not meet on any equitable basis. The report of the Secretary of Agriculture shows that 17 Western States have appropriated or otherwise provided more than $1,172,000 for cooperative work with the survey in the extermination of these noxious animals.

An appropriation by Congress of half a million dollars would still leave the stock-raising States of the West offering to assist in more than twice that sum; and it is entirely proper in this, as it is in other matters, for the United States to go at least half way, particularly where the Government owns such large areas of forest and public lands which serve as breeding grounds for these injurious animals. We must not forget that the States have no control over nor any power to tax these Government lands. I am quite positive that if the wolves and coyotes and prairie dogs could be eliminated from the national forests the increase in grazing fees would more than pay for all of the expense of exterminating them.

Over $20,000,000 each year is lost to this country in cattle and sheep killed by the predatory animals on the ranges; and yet it is entirely possible to eradicate these animals and save that amount of meat supply. Last year the organized hunters of the Biological Survey killed 2,000 wolves, 75,000 coyotes, 10,000 bobcats, and 278 mountain lions. Live stock valued at over $4,000,000 was saved by the destruction of these predatory animals, yet the expense to the United States for this good work was only about $100,000. Certainly that was a good investment. Gentlemen from city districts who are always interested in an adequate supply of meat should heartily support this amendment, because it means a greater meat production.

But the damage done by predatory animals is small compared to the loss created by injurious rodents. It has been conservatively estimated that crops and forage valued at $300,000,000 are annually destroyed in the United States by rodents.

That interesting little prairie dog which one sees from the car windows as he travels over the West destroys grass enough to feed a million cattle and a million sheep. Exterminate them and the meat production of America will be increased by that amount. Last year the Biological Survey spent about $150,000 in the campaign against prairie dogs and other rodents, which resulted in a saving of at least $13,000,000 in crops alone. Is there anywhere else in this appropriation bill that a greater return can be shown for the money?

This is a work that should be completed. It is possible to exterminate the gray wolf within five years, and the Biological Survey will do it if Congress appropriates the money. It is possible to completely eradicate the prairie dog—to make it as extinct as the dodo. The grass they now waste will be left to support increasing numbers of cattle and sheep. Congress can not appropriate any sum of money that will accomplish more good for all of the people of the United States than the amount carried in this appropriation, and which for that reason should be materially increased. The plan of the Biological Survey is to map the localities in which these rodents exist and then completely eradicate them in a given area. If a colony of prairie dogs is left in a part of the area they will soon multiply and be as destructive as ever. The whole colony must be absolutely exterminated, not a prairie dog left. If the work is done in that way the counties and States are glad to cooperate, because experience has shown that effective results can be obtained.

The American National Live Stock Association at its last annual convention at Denver advocated an additional annual appropriation by Congress of at least $300,000 for this purpose. The association recommended that all of the State bounty laws be repealed, and that the money which has been wasted in the payment of bounties to trappers be turned over to the Biological Survey for expenditure in cooperative work in the destruction of predatory animals and injurious rodents. The State of Arizona, in common with many of the other Western States, has repealed its bounty laws, and the money formerly paid in bounties, with a larger sum, has been offered to the Biological Survey, so that they may employ expert hunters to kill the mountain lions and coyotes, and other men to eliminate the prairie dogs and other rodents that do so much damage to the range. I want to impress upon the committee the vital necessity for increasing this appropriation. The people of the West are waiting for it anxiously.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to extend my remarks by printing a resolution recently adopted by the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association, which is as follows:

PREDATORY ANIMALS AND RODENT PESTS.

Whereas the American National Live Stock Association, in convention assembled at Denver, Colo., January 21, 22, and 23, 1919, adopted resolution No. 7, as follows:

"Whereas we believe that the work of exterminating predatory wild animals and range-destroying rodents carried on under the direction of the Biological Survey during the past few years has been very successful, and that, under the thorough organization and efficient plans of that bureau this evil will be largely minimized, if not entirely removed, provided the different States will heartily cooperate with the Federal Government in its plan of work; and

"Whereas at the present time the funds appropriated by Congress for this purpose are wholly inadequate to meet the real requirements of the Biological Survey in carrying on this work, and on that account the results obtained are not satisfactory in most sections of the West; and

"Whereas it is our belief that the present bounty laws of the States should be repealed, and in lieu thereof the various States should, through their several legislatures, enact laws appropriating sufficient money to equal the amounts to be expended by the Federal Government in the different States, and that such State appropriations should be expended under the direction of the Biological Survey, to be handled in conjunction with the funds appropriated by Congress: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the American National Live Stock Association, in convention assembled at Denver, Colo., January 21, 22, and 23, 1919,* That we urge Congress to appropriate the additional sum of $300,000 for immediate use in the extermination of predatory wild animals and range-destroying rodents, and that we petition the various States to make appropriations at least equal to the amounts expended by the Federal Government in the various States; said money, both Federal and State, to be expended under the direction of the Biological Survey"; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Arizona Legislature senate bill No. 15, as amended, repealing the bounty laws of the State, and making appropriation for the extermination of predatory wild animals and range-destroying rodents, to be expended under the direction of the Biological Survey, together with a like amount appropriated by the Federal Government; and

Whereas we believe that this is the only efficient and successful method of securing the extermination of such predatory wild animals and range-destroying rodents: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association in convention assembled at Phoenix, Ariz., February 11, 12, and 13, 1919, That we heartily indorse the said resolution of the American National Live Stock Association as adopted, and that we urge the passage of senate bill No. 15 as amended, and that the president of this association is instructed to use his best endeavors to secure the passage of said senate bill No. 15 as amended, and also to secure the adoption by the Arizona State Legislature of a memorial to Congress asking that the appropriation requested in said resolution No. 7 be made, and that the sum of $50,000 a year be appropriated to the use of the Biological Survey in the State of Arizona; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Representatives in Congress, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Chief of the Biological Survey, and to the necessary committees and officers of the Arizona State Legislature.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that there is a great deal of justice in the request made by the two gentlemen who have preceded me. There is absolutely no injustice, as far as I can see, in the proposed amendment. One of the worst pests that the people of the Western States have to contend with is the ground squirrel. It does more damage, I believe, than any other animal alive. The ground squirrel—and I say this because I recently heard the question asked, What is a ground squirrel?—is not a game squirrel. It is not of the nut-eating, tree-climbing variety of squirrel. It is about the mangiest, most disreputable, repulsive animal you can imagine. It belongs to the rat species.

It is accused of carrying disease germs. It has been accused of almost every crime on the squirrel calendar. As my colleague from California stated, we are required by law to clear the ground squirrels from our land. If we do not do it, the State does it and the tax is assessed upon the land, and the lands are taken and sold the same as land would be for delinquent taxes. We have paid in such taxes as high as 50 cents an acre. Now, there are millions of acres of Government-owned land——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired, and all time has expired by limitation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in spite of the fact that an agreement was made limiting the time, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may have two more minutes to complete his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, during the campaign for extinction which was carried on, when the work was done we were assessed as high as 50 cents an acre for killing off these rodents. And yet they come down in swarms and droves from Government land over which the State has no control. The only appreciable method of destroying them is by running over them with automobiles on the State highways.

Now, when it comes to multiplying, these ground squirrels which are so destructive to our interests and to our property, why, the jack rabbit is not in the same mathematical class.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAUGEN) there were 26 ayes and 29 noes.

So the amendment was lost.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read two lines of the next paragraph.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to have tellers on this.

Mr. WALSH. I make the point of order that it is too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman is too late; the Clerk had begun reading the next paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for enforcing the provisions of the migratory-bird treaty act of July 3, 1918 (Public, No. 186, 65th Cong.), and for cooperation with local authorities in the protection of migratory birds, and for necessary investigations connected therewith, $147,000: *Provided*, That of this sum not more than $22,000 may be used for the enforcement of sections 241, 242, 243, and 244 of the act approved March 4, 1909, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," and for the enforcement of section 1 of the act approved May 25, 1900, entitled "An act to enlarge the powers of the Department of Agriculture, prohibit the transportation by interstate commerce of game killed in violation of local laws, and for other purposes," including all necessary investigations in connection therewith.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on this paragraph. What are these two statutes referred to—March 4, 1909, and May 25, 1900?

Mr. HAUGEN. One of them is the Lacey Act and the other is an act passed later, an act that was held unconstitutional by the district courts, and I believe by the courts of one or two of the States. This is to enforce the various acts as well as the treaty with Canada. It is the purpose here to combine the items and to carry the appropriations under one item.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any authority for setting aside a sum of money under this appropriation for the act of March 4, 1909, nor do I think they can make applicable a portion of this money for the enforcing of sections of the act of May 25, 1900. The item is for the enforcing of the migratory-bird treaty. This proviso, of course, is not at all germane to anything contained in the item for enforcing the migratory-bird treaty, and I make the point of order on the proviso and——

Mr. ANDERSON. What is the point of order—that it is not germane?

Mr. WALSH. It is not germane and——

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to suggest that the rule of germaneness does not apply to a proviso reported by a committee. It applies to an amendment offered on the floor of the House. Certainly it does not apply to a proviso reported in the bill by a committee.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer the wonderful contention of my friend from Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. If the rule does not apply to the proviso put in by the committee, you never could get anything out on a point of order, because they would simply put in a proviso, when they wanted to raise the statutory salaries, to the effect, provided, that the salary shall be $4,500 instead of $3,000.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman made the point of order that it is not germane. Of course, if it is not authorized by law, that is another proposition.

Mr. WALSH. I said that I made the point of order that it was not germane and was about to continue when the gentleman interjected his contention that the point of order was never good against a proviso inserted by the committee. I wish to further submit the contention that there is no authority for the Department of Agriculture under the act to revise and amend the penal laws to expend this sum of money out of this particular appropriation; that it is neither authorized by law nor is it germane to the item under consideration.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, this proviso is simply a limitation upon the expenditure of the money. It would be in order as an amendment if offered from the floor. Consequently, it must be in order as a proviso in the bill, which provides that of this sum of $147,000, not to exceed $22,000 may be expended for the purpose mentioned, and, as a matter of fact, that item is taken over from another item in the consolidation of the two appropriations. This is the exact sum, $22,000, which was appropriated before for the enforcement of the Lacey Act, which provides against the exportation of game from one territory to another—deer, and so forth. It has been in force for years, and there is no reason why this limitation should not be put in here; it certainly can not be out of order to limit expenditures to a particular item.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the contention is that the money can be expended to better advantage by merging the two items. It is just a question of whether you are going to segregate or merge these items. It was suggested by the department that it should be carried under one head. There is no question but that an appropriation for the enforcement of either act would be in order. It is just a question of policy, whether it should be carried in one item or in three or four items.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman the act of 1900 before him?

Mr. PLATT. The act of May 25, 1900, is the Lacey Act.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the sections referred to here are parts of the Lacey Act, unquestionably.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the act of 1900 it is proper to appropriate, and the Chair thinks that the proviso that not more than $22,000 may be used for the enforcement of sections 241, 242, 243, and 244 of the Lacey Act, which provides that it shall be unlawful for any person to deliver to a common carrier for transportation, and so forth, certain game, would be in order. The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Division of Publications: One chief of division, $3,500; 1 chief editor, $3,000; 1 assistant chief of division, $2,500; 1 superintendent of distribution, $2,500; 1 chief clerk, $2,000; 1 assistant, $2,000; 1 assistant, $1,400; 1 assistant in charge of indexing, $2,000; 1 indexer, $1,400; 1 assistant in charge of illustrations, $2,100; 2 draftsmen or photographers, at $1,600 each; 2 draftsmen or photographers, at $1,500 each; 3 draftsmen or photographers, at $1,400 each; 1 draftsman or photographer, $1,300; 10 draftsmen or photographers, at $1,200 each; 1 lantern-slide colorist, $840; 1 laboratory aid, $720; 1 assistant in charge of document section, $2,000; 1 assistant in document section, $1,800; 1 assistant in document section, $1,400; 1 foreman, miscellaneous distribution, $1,500; 1 clerk, class 3; 2 clerks, class 2; 10 clerks, class 1; 16 clerks, at $1,000 each; 40 clerks, at $900 each; 21 clerks, at $840 each; 5 machine operators, at $1,200 each; 5 skilled laborers, at $1,000 each; 2 skilled laborers, at $900 each; 7 skilled laborers, at $840 each; 4 skilled laborers, at $780 each; 1 chief folder, $1,200; 1 messenger or laborer, $900; 13 messengers or laborers, at $720 each; 1 skilled laborer, $720; 1 folder, $1,000; 2 folders, at $900 each; 2 skilled laborers, at $1,100 each; 1 skilled laborer, $1,000; 2 messengers, at $840 each; 7 messenger boys, at $720 each; 3 messenger boys, at $600 each; 2 messenger boys, at $480 each; 2 messenger boys, at $420 each; 2 messenger boys, at $360 each; 1 laborer, $840; 2 laborers, at $600 each; 3 charwomen, at $480 each; 3 charwomen, at $240 each; in all $195,620.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph, and direct the attention of the chairman to line 24, page 62. I desire to make a point of order upon the office of 1 superintendent of distribution at $2,500. This, I understand, is new. If the chairman desires, I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the language is subject to the point of order, I concede that. This matter was gone into very thoroughly at the last session of Congress. I raised the point of order myself, but after conferring with the department I was satisfied that this gentleman was deserving of every cent suggested here. It is only a just recognition for valuable and faithful service, and I trust the gentleman will withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts make the point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I will reserve it if the gentleman from Missouri desires to be heard.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, as suggested by the gentleman from Iowa, that this matter was gone over very thoroughly last January when we had this bill up. Two years ago when we appropriated $11,000,000 under the food-production act the department reorganized the Division of Publications and they selected in that department the very best man they had and put him in charge

of the distribution in the Division of Publications. This man has been in the department for 28 years. He has gone from the bottom clear to the position he is now in. When the estimate was presented to the committee last January they asked us to give them this man at $2,500 a year under the title of superintendent of distribution, the title which was given to him under the food-production act. He was put there and is there rendering efficient work. It is absolutely necessary to have somebody there to look after the distribution of public documents and they have got the best man they have in the division for that work, a man who has been there, as I said, for 28 years, and I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will not make the point of order.

Mr. ANDERSON. It would really be in the interest of efficiency in the service, would it not?

Mr. RUBEY. Absolutely; there is no question in the world about that.

Mr. McKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to add to what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] has said, that this is absolutely true in regard to this man, and I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will not press his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the position of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. WALSH. Well, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for a moment. The then Representative from Wisconsin, Mr. Stafford, made a point of order, but we prevailed upon him to withdraw it. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] then made the point of order, and after investigation he withdrew it, and I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will be as kind to us as those two gentlemen were.

Mr. HAUGEN. And this matter was held open for nearly a whole day, so that the matter might be thoroughly investigated.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts insist on his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. Well, in view, Mr. Chairman, of the universal desire upon the part of members of the committee that I should complete the trinity, I shall withdraw the point of order. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 63, line 7, after the semicolon following the word "each," insert, "one assistant photographer, $900."

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, this provides for a $900 position, an assistant photographer, and is absolutely needed.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For photographic equipment and for photographic materials and artists' tools and supplies, $22,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, under such rules and regulations and subject to such conditions as he may prescribe, to loan, rent, or sell copies of films: *Provided*, That in the sale or rental of films educational institutions or associations for agricultural education not organized for profit shall have preference; all moneys received from such rentals or sales to be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. I will withhold it. I did not see the gentleman from California seeking to strike out the last word. Of course, I would not have the point of order stand in his way.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to take this method of getting before the committee an item later, and to go on each item as I would not otherwise do. I have noticed a good deal of time taken up on various items, but when you get down to a vital point we get into a furious hurry. That is not criticizing anybody at all. I am throwing no reflection, but it seems to me on these important items which really amount to something the effort is to keep facts from the Committee of the Whole, but on things upon which we do not expect to vote, but just to talk, we take half an hour or an hour or an hour and a half.

I am going, when the time comes, to offer to amend the bill—because this item relates to education and the advancement of the school children, boys and girls—when we get to page 71, line 4, by asking to strike out that one item of $1,500,000 and insert in lieu thereof $5,750,000.

Mr. HAUGEN. We have not reached that item yet.

Mr. RAKER. I know we have not, but I am trying to get it before the committee while discussing this item, because they sort of relate to it, some of the facts in respect to that item, so that before the vote on that the committee may have the information they ought to have. I have a letter here, dated April 9, 1919, as follows:

PLACERVILLE, CALIF., *April 9, 1919.*

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Though Congress is not in session, no doubt some preliminary work will be done on the appropriation bills, and we wish to respectfully and earnestly urge that the small appropriation for the "farm adviser" or "Smith-Lever" work be not omitted.

We have had a "farm adviser" organization here for something over a year, in which time we have come to realize its possibilities. This community, we believe, is on the threshhold of great development. During the period of reconstruction upon which the country is entering many inexperienced people will "go back to the land," and no doubt many will come here. These people should have expert guidance or disaster awaits some of them. Not only will they be handicapped by inexperience generally, but they will find peculiar local conditions in many places, and unless they do have expert guidance many who go back to the land will be unable to stay there.

But the need to assist the inexperienced, aid in the work of reconstruction, and take care of returning soldiers and others who are urged to go on the land is not the only need for the work. We find it valued also by the skilled and experienced ranchers who are already on the land. The increased production resulting will make the small relative cost a profitable investment rather than an expense, and we are convinced that its loss would be a serious setback to our community and others like it.

For these reasons we respectfully urge that you use your influence to see that the farm-adviser organization is taken care of.

Very respectfully,

ELDORADO COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
H. E. BILLINGER, *Chairman*,
JOS. SCHERRER,
W. A. RAULS,
S. H. RANTZ,
H. J. WILCOX,
Legislative Committee.

Now, I sent that letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, and I saw him to the end that the facts might be had relative to this appropriation of $1,500,000 and necessity for its increase, and which was increased last year by the Senate committee from $1,500,000 to $4,500,000. And I ask unanimous consent that I may read this letter within my time.

Mr. HAUGEN. Does the gentleman ask additional time?

Mr. RAKER. If my time should run out.

Mr. HAUGEN. How long will it take?

Mr. RAKER. I will read pretty fast.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman will not get any additional time to read letters. We are not on this item, anyhow.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent so that I will not be cut off.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will not the gentleman defer that until we reach the item?

Mr. RAKER. The trouble is that when we get to that item I will not be given time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I ask that I may have five minutes additional time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] asks unanimous consent that his time may be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. HAUGEN. I shall have to object at this time.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I want to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. I move to strike out the last word. I observe this authorizes the Agricultural Department to rent or sell copies of films, and I would like to inquire whether any of these films have been rented to private parties or corporations for exhibition purposes?

Mr. HAUGEN. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Do you know?

Mr. HAUGEN. My understanding is that they are lent to private parties or people who are engaged in delivering lectures and to municipalities.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. The reason I ask about this is that I am advised, and believe it to be true, that the Public Health Service and other departments of the Government are renting films to private persons, who are making large sums out of them. It is being done under the guidance and supervision of the United States Government. And I would like to know whether it is done under the Agricultural Department.

Mr. LEVER. The practice would not be very extensive, because the amount carried is very limited.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Does the former chairman of the Agricultural Committee know how many films the Government has?

Mr. LEVER. I do not know offhand. I will say to the gentleman if the department is doing anything of the kind suggested by him it is doing it in violation of law. It reads:

For sale or rental of films, educational institutions or associations for agricultural education not organized for profit shall have preference.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. It says, "Shall have perference." What does that mean?

Mr. LEVER. I am sure it was the intention of the committee when this item was put in the bill a couple of years ago that these films might be loaned and only loaned to educational institutions.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I think that ought to be the purpose and ought to be the law. But if the Government is renting out these films to people to make a profit out of the business it ought to be stopped.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is entirely right about that.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, for the purpose of expedition, I may offer an amendment now, to be pending on page 71, line 4.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. RAKER. Let me get my request presented.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. RAKER. I am not. If the Chairman so ruled, I yet have a right to present the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is asking unanimous consent to present an amendment to page 71, line 4.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] state his request?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the letter be printed and that I may print a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture in response to the letter from the El Dorado Chamber of Commerce in response to it, showing the necessity of this appropriation, to the end that the Members may have it in to-morrow's RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, where does the gentleman from California expect to be to-morrow?

Mr. RAKER. I hope to be here when the House opens and until the gavel falls at adjournment, as I always am. I am trying to present certain matters to the House that have a great deal of justice in them, and I am never away and never absent when the interest of the people are at stake.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the request of the gentleman from California for unanimous consent. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Division of Publications, $239,690.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to make an observation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, here is carried an appropriation of a little over $400,000 for carrying on publications. I think the publications referred to here are very creditable, but I want to ask the members of the committee a question about the source of the appropriation that is used for these various weekly letters that indicate current prices, coming probably from the Bureau of Markets or other bureau of this department. I am told that there are something like 32 different bulletins that are issued from the various departments here in Washington, and a few of the 32 come from the Agricultural Department. So far as I can judge, the bulletins from the Agricultural Department are fairly creditable. But, if I may be permitted, I think I would be justified in criticizing some of the bulletins that come from some of the departments, which indicate that they are a little more than self-advertising; that they are autobiographical; that they seem to exist for the sake of convincing the public that they should be perpetuated, and they are but little more than a mere agency of self-adulation.

I believe that Members here will agree with me that public money should not be used for any purpose that is merely to perpetuate these establishments doing this sort of work, when their primary purpose is to convince us that what is being done is the best thing possible to do. I want to say that, so far as I know, the bulletins of this department are pretty creditable, as I said, with but little ground for criticism. The Members who have gone into this more fully will, I think, agree with me.

Mr. HAUGEN. Does the gentleman refer to the bulletins or the market reports?

Mr. FESS. When I say "bulletin," I refer to publications usually marked "bulletins," not particularly agricultural bulletins, because I think those are very good in the main. But we have weekly publications that are merely exploiting what they are doing.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman has reference, I think, to the periodical publications of the department, which contain a good deal of propaganda?

Mr. FESS. Almost totally propaganda; yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree with the gentleman about that.

Mr. FESS. My thought was that Congress ought to be free to carve out some of that, even if you have to use a corn knife to do it. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Permit me to say that I am becoming more and more convinced each day as to the correctness of the gentleman's position in that regard. Not only the Department of Agriculture, but practically every other department that has leave to print seems to be doing that. You go into a newspaper office and you find you can scarcely get into it on account of the publications, and you go into your own mail, and you can not without difficulty get to the real essence of it on account of the publications. While a number of them are creditable and ought to be authorized, yet it seems to me—and I am becoming fully convinced of it in my own mind—there is a lot of useless waste in the publications conducted by the departments of the Government.

Mr. FESS. I am glad to have the gentleman's opinion of that, and I am convinced we ought to cut out a good deal of this waste of public funds. At least it is our duty to ascertain the specific authority by which this propaganda on behalf of self-interest is being carried on in most if not all of the departments. If a decent regard for the protection of public funds is not enough to insure against self-adulation, it would appear that proper modesty at least would operate as a restraint.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It has taken the soothing influence of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] to bring to a reasonable frame of mind our amiable friend from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], and I want to express my deep appreciation of the signal service the gentleman from Ohio has rendered to the Committee of the Whole in bringing about so desirable a result. [Laughter.] The gentleman from South Carolina is an ardent advocate of this bill, because in the early stages of it he helped to prepare it. In fact, he is the parent of it, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN], distinguished as he is, has only fallen heir to the gentleman's handiwork.

Mr. HAUGEN. I suggest that the gentleman from Pennsylvania direct his remarks to another committee. The Committee on Agriculture does not authorize appropriations for the items he refers to. I think the gentleman will render valuable service if he will call the attention of the proper committee to the unwise expenditures that he refers to.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman. But does not the gentleman from Iowa agree with me that it was a very happy office which the gentleman from Ohio performed a little while ago in inducing the gentleman from South Carolina to finally agree that there was just a little waste, just a little extravagance, in the publications of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; but fortunately the criticism does not lie with the committee that is now in charge of this bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Now, let us see who rises to the defense of the committee. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. RUBEY. I was a little bit late in coming in, but I would like to know what those two last words were that the gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The vital words of the paragraph. I was proceeding to indorse what the gentleman from South Carolina said by quoting from the Philadelphia Commercial List and Price Current of May 24, 1919, and this may have suggested some of the things that were in the mind of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] when he came to induce the gentleman from South Carolina finally to agree with some of us on this side. I read:

MORE WASTE.

We received on Saturday, May 17, from the United States Bureau of Markets a circular entitled "Extraneous material for use in accordance with bureau memorandum No. 178."

It contains an article on "Foreign trade in butter and cheese," comparing the trade of the United States with foreign countries for the

years from 1913 and 1914 to 1918. This article is not useful or even interesting to enough people to warrant its publication. Information of this character ought to be furnished by the Department of Commerce, anyhow, and probably is.

That is one of the points I made heretofore—that you duplicate work here. I read further:

It also contains an article on the butter shortage in Paris, all of which we know and have known since before the armistice was signed.

It also contains maximum prices for condensed milk in Norway, which interests practically nobody.

It also contains an article on "Argentine butter bought by England," copied from the Canadian Weekly Bulletin of April 7, 1918—over 13 months ago.

It also contains a whole page of "Ocean freight rates on dairy products" from North Atlantic ports of the United States to foreign countries, which are not useful to a single exporter, and the publication of which is therefore wasteful. Unless shippers have freight rates "up to the minute," they are useless for them to trade on. They vary according to the supply of and demand for freight room, and they vary sometimes at different ports. If an exporter wants to work an order for butter and cheese, would he go to the Bureau of Markets to get his freight rate? Not on your life! He would go to a steamship agent.

The gentleman from South Carolina is confirmed by this editorial.

It is an outrage that the people of the United States should be taxed for this kind of work. If the Bureau of Markets shall continue to be allowed to run wild, as it recently has been, and extend its activities to all branches of business—as it has to the produce business—the number of employees in its service would be past counting and the expense something terrific.

Congress must get busy, cut out this useless work, and define the bureau's activities. The Bureau of Markets was originally started "to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire and diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing and distributing of farm products."

It has developed into a beautiful scheme "to increase the number of Government employees in useless, unappreciated, and wasteful work at the expense of the taxpayer."

Its appropriations have increased in six years from $50,000 to nearly $4,000,000. Its possibilities in this respect are unlimited, so long as its chief thinks the people need his fatherly help and nobody kicks.

So I am grateful to the gentleman from Ohio for having enabled me thus to indorse what the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] has said about the uselessness of a number of these publications which emanate from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Philadelphia [Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania] covers his real motive in taking the floor at this time by his facetious references to the amiable relationship that exists between the gentleman from Ohio and myself. Now, here the Bureau of Markets is publishing information that is said to be of vast value to the dairy industry of this country, and not only to the dairy industry of the country but to the consumers of butter, cheese, and dairy products. The real motive of the gentleman from Pennsylvania was to continue his assaults upon the Department of Agriculture, and especially that part of the Department of Agriculture whose business it is, by furnishing valuable and timely information, to protect the producer on the one hand against fake information gotten out by certain produce exchanges and on the other hand to protect the gentleman's own constituents, the consumers, against like fake information by furnishing as a basis of comparison real facts and figures produced by a tribunal of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Library: For books of reference, technical and scientific books, papers and periodicals, and for expenses incurred in completing imperfect series; for the employment of additional assistants in the city of Washington and elsewhere; for official traveling expenses, and for library fixtures, library cards, supplies, and for all other necessary expenses, $18,000.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HAUGEN: Page 66, line 17, after the word "reference" insert "law books."

Mr. HAUGEN. That is offered simply to make a part of the appropriation available for the purchase of law books.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES.

Miscellaneous expenses, Department of Agriculture: For stationery, blank books, twine, paper, gum, dry goods, soap, brushes, brooms, mats, oils, paints, glass, lumber, hardware, ice, fuel, water and gas pipes, heating apparatus, furniture, carpets, and mattings; for lights, freight, express charges, advertising, telegraphing, telephoning, postage, washing towels, and necessary repairs and improvements to buildings and heating apparatus; for the purchase, subsistence, and care of horses and the purchase and repair of harness and vehicles, for official purposes only; for the payment of duties on imported articles, and the Department of Agriculture's proportionate share of the expense of the dispatch agent in New York; for official traveling expenses; and for other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the department, $142,500.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HAUGEN: Page 67, line 17, strike out "$142,500" and insert "$175,500, of which $33,000 shall be immediately available for necessary repairs to the central heating plant of the department."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. HAUGEN. I take it the amendment is in order and that all will agree that it will be necessary for the department to maintain a heating plant if it is going to continue in business.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; particularly during this weather.

Mr. HAUGEN. It may turn colder along in December.

Mr. WALSH. I make the point of order to that part of the amendment which makes a portion of this appropriation immediately available.

Mr. HAUGEN. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa to increase the amount from $142,500 to $175,500.

The question being taken; on a division (demanded by Mr. HAUGEN and Mr. CANDLER) there were—ayes 25, noes 11.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. HAUGEN. If the gentleman will withdraw that, I will move that the committee rise.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. HAUGEN. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore (amid applause), Mr. MADDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the Agricultural appropriation bill, H. R. 31057, had come to no resolution thereon.

ORDER OF BUSINESS FOR TO-MORROW.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from Wyoming if the program is to go on with the Agricultural appropriation bill to-morrow?

Mr. MONDELL. To continue the consideration of the Agricultural bill until it is disposed of.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD on House resolution 5, a resolution for the purpose of providing for the volunteer officers of the Civil War.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the resolution indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. KNUTSON. Will they be composed entirely of remarks by the gentleman himself?

Mr. RAKER. I have a few extracts in regard to the subject.

Mr. WALSH. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASES REFERRED.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair finds on the Speaker's table the papers in an election contest case from Alaska and refers the papers, with all accompanying documents, to the Committee on Elections No. 3; also some papers in the Berger case, which are referred to the Committee on Elections No. 1 and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted—

To Mr. IRELAND, for 10 days, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. TILSON, for three days, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HAUGEN. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 3, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting tentative draft of legislation authorizing the purchase of the Cape Cod Canal (H. Doc. No. 68); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Silver Lake Harbor, Ocracoke Island, and entrance thereto from Pamlico Sound, N. C. (H. Doc. No. 69); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Peace River, Fla. (H. Doc. No. 70); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of St. Paul (Minn.) Harbor, with a view of determining whether the channel of the Mississippi River can be changed to or near the bluffs on the west side thereof (H. Doc. No. 71); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting supplemental estimates of appropriations required by the St. Elizabeths Hospital for support, scientific department, and buildings and grounds, for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 72); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Panama Canal to provide increased compensation to certain employees of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 73); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a letter from Hon. James Wickersham, inclosing the original copy of a notice of contest and the petition and statement specifying particularly the grounds of his contest for a seat in the House of Representatives of the Sixty-sixth Congress as Delegate from the Territory of Alaska (H. Doc. No. 74); to the Committee on Elections No. 3 and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. ZIHLMAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1713) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to appoint a commission to investigate and report upon the available sources of water supply for the District of Columbia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 18), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 4378) to further amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4379) to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads and other roads, and for other purposes; and amendatory to House bill 7617, enacted by the Sixty-fourth Congress, and House bill 13308, enacted by the Sixty-fifth Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. STEVENSON: A bill (H. R. 4380) relative to compensation of soldiers and sailors incurring partial disabilities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4381) relative to the retirement of officers of the National Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: A bill (H. R. 4382) to confer on the Court of Claims jurisdiction to determine the respective rights of and differences between the Fort Berthold Indians and the United States Government; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 4383) to further amend section 858 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 4384) to increase the pay of certain grades of officers of the Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 4385) to authorize the Judge Advocate General of the United States Army to classify the soldiers, sailors, and marines of the United States military and naval forces from April 5, 1917, to June 1, 1919, inclusive, and who have been court-martialed and return those who were fined for misdemeanor the amount of fine collected from them; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 4386) to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the manufacture of philosophical, scientific, and laboratory apparatus in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 4387) appropriating money for the improvement of Connecticut River between Long Island Sound and Hartford, Conn.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 4388) donating captured cannons to the cities of Rosedale, Bonner Springs, Osawatomie, Pleasanton, Bronson, Louisburg, Kansas City, Kans., and the University of Kansas, in the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4389) donating captured cannons to the counties of Allen, Anderson, Bourbon, Douglas, Franklin, Johnson, Linn, Miami, and Wyandotte, in the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 4390) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the State normal school, Edinboro, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4391) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Erie, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4392) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Titusville, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4393) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Elmwood Home for Boys, North Springfield, Pa., one German fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4394) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Sagertown, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4395) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Union City, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4396) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Meadville, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 4397) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hamilton, Butler County, in the State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4398) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Middletown, Butler County, in the State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4399) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Oxford, Butler County, in the State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4400) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Eaton, Preble County, in the State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4401) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Dayton, Montgomery County, in the State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4402) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Miamisburg, Montgomery County, in the State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ECHOLS: A bill (H. R. 4403) to donate a captured cannon or fieldpiece to the town of Ronceverte, Greenbrier County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 4404) to purchase a post-office site in the city of French Lick, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4405) to purchase a post-office site in the city of Huntingburg, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4406) to purchase a post-office site in the city of Tell City, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 4407) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at

Norwalk, in the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4408) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Bridgeport, in the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 4409) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Mesopotamia, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece with accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4410) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Andover, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece with accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4411) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Orwell, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece with accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4412) donating two captured German cannons or field guns with carriages and projectiles to the county of Cheatham, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4413) donating two captured German cannons or field guns with carriages and projectiles to the county of Stewart, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4414) donating two captured German cannons or field guns with carriages and projectiles to the city of Springfield, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4415) donating two captured German cannons or field guns with carriages and projectiles to the city of Clarksville, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4416) donating four captured German cannons or field guns with carriages and projectiles to the city of Nashville, State of Tennessee, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 4417) to establish the department of marine and fisheries; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 4418) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Norris City, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 4419) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Culver Military Academy, county of Marshall, State of Indiana, one German cannon, fieldpiece, or other war trophies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4420) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Michigan City, county of Laporte, State of Indiana, one German cannon, fieldpiece, or other war trophies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4421) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Laporte, county of Laporte, State of Indiana, one German cannon, fieldpiece, or other war trophies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4422) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the cities and towns of Mishawaka, New Carlisle, Walkerton, North Liberty, and Lakeville, all located in St. Joseph County, State of Indiana, one German cannon, fieldpiece, or other war trophies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4423) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Notre Dame University, county of St. Joseph, State of Indiana, one German cannon, fieldpiece, or other war trophies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4424) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the towns of La Crosse, Westville, Rolling Prairie, Wanatah, Stillwell, Hanna, and Union Mills, all located in county of Laporte, State of Indiana, one German cannon, fieldpiece, or other war trophies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4425) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of South Bend, county of St. Joseph, State of Indiana, one German cannon, fieldpiece, or other war trophies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4426) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the towns of Warsaw, Syracuse, Pierceton, Milford, Mentone, and Etna Green, all in the county of Kosciusko, State of Indiana, each one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4427) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the towns of Knox, Hamlet, and North Judson, all of which are located in the county of Starke, State of Indiana, each one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4428) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the towns of Plymouth, Culver, Bremen, and Bourbon, all located in the county of Marshall, State of Indiana, each one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4429) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the towns of Rochester, Kewanna, Fulton, and Akron, all of which are located in Fulton County, State of Indiana, each one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4430) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wakarusa, county of Elkhart, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4431) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the town of Millersburg, county of Elkhart, State of Indiana; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4432) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the town of Middlebury, county of Elkhart, State of Indiana; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4433) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Elkhart, county of Elkhart, State of Indiana; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4434) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the town of Bristol, county of Elkhart, State of Indiana; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4435) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Nappanee, county of Elkhart, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4436) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Goshen, county of Elkhart, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 4437) to provide revenue for the Government and to promote the production of tungsten ores and manufactures thereof in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 4438) to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HASKELL: A bill (H. R. 4439) to amend the Penal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 4440) conferring citizenship upon Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4441) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to appoint competency inspectors; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 4442) to provide for the extension, enlargement, and remodeling of the Federal building at Plattsburg, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4443) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Potsdam, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4444) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Ticonderoga, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROSE: A bill (H. R. 4445) to provide for the erection of a public building in the borough of Tyrone, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 4446) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Morrilton, Ark., two captured German cannons or fieldpieces, with carriages, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4447) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Little Rock, Ark., two captured German cannons or fieldpieces, with carriages, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4448) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Perryville, Ark., two captured German cannons or fieldpieces, with carriages, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4449) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Danville, Ark., two cap-

tured German cannons or fieldpieces, with carriages, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4450) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Dardanelle, Ark., two captured German cannons or fieldpieces, with carriages, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 4451) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Madisonville, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4452) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Owensboro, Ky., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4453) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Sturgis, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4454) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Dixon, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4455) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Henderson, Ky., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4456) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Jefferson Davis Home Association two German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PARRISH: A bill (H. R. 4457) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Bowie Pelham Camp and its successors, Bowie, Tex., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4458) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Victory Park and its successors, Graham, Tex., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 4459) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Baltimore, Md., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4460) to provide for an examination and survey of Patapsco River comprising that portion of the harbor of Baltimore lying between the 30-foot channel going from the main channel into the Prudential Oil Co. channel and the anchorage basin on the north, and between the 35-foot channel on the line of the western side of the anchorage basin extended southerly to meet the Prudential Oil Co. channel; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 4461) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Frankfort, Ky., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4462) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of New Castle, Ky., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4463) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Winchester, Ky., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4464) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Owenton, Ky., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4465) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of La Grange, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4466) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 4467) authorizing the Secretary of War to present to the city of Bogalusa, La., one German cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 4468) to provide for the sale of certain Indian lands in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 4469) authorizing the President of the United States to make regulations and appointments covering participation by the United States in the work of the so-called International Aircraft Standards Commission; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 4470) making an appropriation to meet State cooperation in the destruction of wolves, coyotes, mountain lions, prairie dogs, ground squirrels, gophers, and other animals injurious to animal industry, agriculture, and forestry; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 4471) to enlarge the jurisdiction of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, and to regulate appeals from the judgments of said court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 92) to provide the service of a messenger to the Committee on the Judiciary and fixing compensation therefor; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Resolution (H. Res. 93) directing that there shall be printed as a House document 1,500 copies of the Soil Survey of the Yuma Area, Arizona; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 91) to provide for the removal of the remains of our deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines who fell in battle or who died in the prosecution of this World War from France to the United States for final disposition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 92) relative to the interpretation of section 905 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919, as applied to eyeglasses, spectacles, and lenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 93) extending the thanks of Congress and providing an appropriate medal to governors, adjutants general, members of local and district boards, medical and legal advisory boards, and Government appeal agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 94) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the town and country department of the Young Women's Christian Association of Illinois tents, cots, and blankets for the use of said association in its community training camp at Hamilton, Ill., during the month of July, 1919; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 10) requesting the American peace commissioners at Paris to protect the right and liberties of the Jewish race; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMTON: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Michigan, urging the passage of legislation by Congress for deportation of interned enemy aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing Congress in behalf of the lakes-to-ocean waterways improvement; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, urging Congress to advocate independence and protectorate for Armenia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 4472) granting a pension to Sarah J. Rollins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4473) granting a pension to Mary J. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4474) granting a pension to Martha J. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4475) granting a pension to James Overton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4476) granting a pension to James Rupe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4477) granting a pension to Lorens Stoser; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4478) granting a pension to Charles A. Wilkerson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4479) granting a pension to Thomas Alley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4480) granting a pension to James Boyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4481) granting a pension to Reuben Phillip; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4482) granting a pension to George W. Drake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4483) granting a pension to Willis Arnold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4484) granting a pension to James R. Thornton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4485) granting a pension to James W. Tippett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4486) granting a pension to William Kier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4487) granting a pension to James R. Storms; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4488) granting a pension to Nathan G. Dillen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4489) granting a pension to John Crump; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4490) granting a pension to Archibald Groom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4491) granting a pension to Phillip Gentry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4492) granting a pension to Wilburn Munkers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4493) granting a pension to Ambrose Giseburt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4494) granting a pension to Jeremiah R. Whitsell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4495) granting a pension to Thomas T. Pratt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4496) granting a pension to Elizabeth Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4497) granting a pension to Catharine J. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4498) granting a pension to Jonas Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4499) granting a pension to George Baxter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4500) granting a pension to Henry C. Poe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4501) granting a pension to Eri Bentin Mullin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4502) granting a pension to Richard Truex; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4503) granting a pension to Barton Ellison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4504) granting a pension to Alfred L. Fann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4505) granting a pension to Daisy Manore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4506) granting a pension to Elizabeth Jenkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4507) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4508) granting a pension to Rachel O. Noah; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4509) granting a pension to Arminda J. Osborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4510) granting a pension to Sabina Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4511) granting a pension to Fannie Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4512) granting a pension to Susan Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4513) granting a pension to Nancy Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4514) granting a pension to Eliza Sturdevant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4515) granting a pension to Barbara F. Hicks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4516) granting a pension to Lucena R. Filson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4517) granting a pension to Mrs. Thomas H. Loyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4518) granting a pension to Margaret J. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4519) granting a pension to Caroline E. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4520) granting a pension to J. A. Neff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4521) granting a pension to William H. Corbin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4522) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. De Witt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4523) granting an increase of pension to William A. Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4524) granting an increase of pension to J. M. Dunham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4525) granting an increase of pension to Levi Slinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4526) granting an increase of pension to James D. Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4527) granting an increase of pension to John H. Woodruff; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4528) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Brewer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4529) granting an increase of pension to William A. Pullen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4530) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Watkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4531) granting an increase of pension to George Duff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4532) granting an increase of pension to J. D. Lewman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 4533) granting an increase of pension to John W. Towner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4534) granting an increase of pension to William M. Silver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 4535) granting a pension to Fred J. Jahrries; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 4536) granting a pension to George E. Lovin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4537) granting a pension to John A. Kennepohl; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 4538) granting a pension to Charles W. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4539) granting a pension to Henry Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4540) granting a pension to Joseph E. Rogers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4541) granting an increase of pension to Richard J. Fanning; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 4542) for the relief of James Duffy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 4543) for the relief of Edwin S. Metcalf; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4544) granting an increase of pension to Daniel B. Reddecks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4545) granting an increase of pension to Henry P. Logsdon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4546) granting a pension to Hiner A. Rawlings; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 4547) granting a pension to Marie Barisch; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4548) granting a pension to Amelia Erdman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 4549) for the relief of the legal representatives of W. H. Mills, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 4550) to give the rank of captain in the Regular Army of the United States to William B. Trembley, of Kansas, and Alvin C. York, of Tennessee, and to place them on the retired list of officers of said Army with said rank and with the pay given officers of said rank on said retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 4551) granting an increase of pension to Hiram P. Ring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 4552) granting a pension to John Fitzgerald; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 4553) to correct the military record of William L. Million; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 4554) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Combs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 4555) granting an increase of pension to Aaron W. Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 4556) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Swails; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: A bill (H. R. 4557) granting an increase of pension to Abner Elam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROSE: A bill (H. R. 4558) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth L. Kinkead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 4559) granting a pension to Margaret J. Cutright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4560) granting a pension to John Reis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 4561) for the relief of Charles L. Galloway; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 4562) for the relief of Rufus L. Cole; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 4563) granting a pension to Margaret Glynn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 4564) granting a pension to J. W. Gossett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAILE: A bill (H. R. 4565) for the relief of Edward H. Lockwood; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WARD: A bill (H. R. 4566) granting a pension to Annie S. Marsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEBSTER: A bill (H. R. 4567) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to John D. Sherwood, of Spokane, Wash., the right to overflow certain lands on the Fort George Wright Military Reservation at Spokane, Wash., and to accept the conveyance to the United States of other lands to be designated by the Secretary of War and suitable for a rifle range in exchange for the land so overflowed; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WELLING: A bill (H. R. 4568) for the relief of the estate of Moses M. Bane; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 4569) granting an increase of pension to Erasmus B. Manahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 4570) granting a pension to Robert M. Mann; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of United National Association of Post Office Clerks, Branch No. 1029, Springfield, Mass., for the readjustment of the salaries of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of 186 citizens of Jersey City, N. J., urging against repeal of prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of Chinese People's Foreign Relation Association, relating to Chinese affairs in peace treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of Dennis Bros., Evansville, Ind., asking repeal of automobile tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of Jewish citizens of Washington, assembled in mass meeting June 1, 1919, protesting against the continuance of pogroms and religious persecutions practiced in Poland, Roumania, and other countries against the Jews; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of city council of Cambridge, Mass., requesting repeal of luxury tax on ice-cream cones and ice-cream sandwiches; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of Chicago Alumni of Northwestern College, expressing hope that the coming treaty of peace will provide for a plan whereby there will be formed among the nations of the world a league which will provide for settlement of disputes among nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Petition of 122 citizens of Worth County, Mo., against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Braymer, Me., against the repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CROWTHER: Telegram of the Amsterdam Board of Trade of Amsterdam, N. Y., opposing the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of certain residents of rural delivery routes 3 and 4 out of Schenectady, N. Y., praying for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition of Michigan Implement and Vehicle Dealers' Association, protesting against the repeal of the zone advances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of several churches of Port Hope, Mich., against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Elba Center Arbor of Gleaners, for investigation of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of John H. Wakefield and 49 other farmers of Huron County, Mich., for investigation of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, protest of Jasper Johnson and 21 other citizens of Michigan, against tax on sporting goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Alexander McConnachie and other citizens of Michigan, for increase of pay for Federal jurors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of J. N. Gardiner and 110 others, of the Lapeer Commercial Club, of Lapeer, Mich., for repeal of the so-called luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Federation of Women's Clubs, in behalf of legislation for rank for Army nurses; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of home-economics section of the St. Clair County Farm Bureau and the women's section of the St. Clair County Red Cross, in behalf of appropriation for the continuance of home-demonstration work; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: Petition of C. D. Boyssen and eight others, protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of T. W. Foster and nine others, of Butler, Mo., protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition with 11 signers of Butler, Mo., for retention of war-time prohibition and laws to enforce the same; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition with 12 signers of Harrisonville, Mo., for retention of war-time prohibition and immediate passage of laws for its enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of Society of Sacred Heart of Jesus, St. Louis, Mo., relating to Jugo-Slav affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the National Ammonia Co., St. Louis, Mo.; Mallinckrodt Chemical Works, St. Louis, Mo.; and Wheeler & Motter Mercantile Co., St. Joseph, Mo., protesting against appropriation for continuance of United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Velie Automobile Co., of St. Louis, Mo., urging repeal of tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William B. Baker and 38,000 members of organized labor of St. Louis, Mo., asking repeal of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National Ammonia Co., St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the repeal of present zone system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of L. & A. Scharff Distilling Co., Bourbon Mercantile Co., Frank Sittermann Wine & Liquor Co., Edwin Schiell Distilling Co., G. Riesmeyer Distilling Co., Cane Ridge Distilling Co., and Gold Spring Distilling Co., all of St. Louis, Mo., asking repeal of war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS of Nebraska: Petition of citizens of Chapman, Nebr., for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Wausa and other points in Nebraska for the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Clarks, Nebr., against repeal of war-time prohibition and request for an act of enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREEMAN: Petition of George D. Wells and others, of Willimantic, and Mahlan L. Russell and others, of Ellington, in the State of Connecticut, for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petitions of the Chicago Shoe Retailers' Association and Lamberson-Hunt Co., Streator, Ill., opposing luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERSEY: Petition of George Littlefield protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Hans Bille and eight others, of Bangor, Me., protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of W. Q. Genge and 29 others, of Bangor, Me., protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES: Protest of the Woman's Welfare Club, of Marywith, Mich., against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Communication from the secretary of the Michigan State Grange, protesting against repeal of the ban on the sale of wine and beer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Savinska Dolina, No. 123, S. S. P. Z., of Highland Park, Mich., relative to the Italian-Jugo-Slav situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petitions of Joseph H. Gainer, mayor of Providence; John W. Horton, mayor of Cranston; the board of aldermen of the city of Newport; Jenckes Spinning Co., Pawtucket; Manhasset Manufacturing Co., Providence; S. Powers, Louis A. Phillips, William G. Bagley, and Providence employees of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.; J. J. Corriveau, of Pawtucket; William H. Rogers, of Woonsocket; Chester T. Newcomb, of Providence; and Wright & Ditson (Inc.), of Providence, all in the State of Rhode Island, against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Providence Real Estate Exchange; Atlantic Mills, Dr. Marion A. Gleason, and Dr. John G. O'Meara, of Providence; Elmer E. Hubbard and Robert Cushman, of Pawtucket; and Oliver Ainley and Joseph Wilde, of Mapleville, all in the State of Rhode Island; and Smith Webbing Co., of Boston, protesting against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Ralph W. Eaton, Providence Engineering Society, Providence Chamber of Commerce, E. C. Church Co., Belcher & Loomis Hardware Co., A. W. Harris Oil Co., Gladding Dry Goods Co., and Theodore W. Foster & Bro. Co., of Providence; Practical Men's Club of Everlastik (Inc.), of Pawtucket; Woonsocket Chamber of Commerce; and Harry E. Davis, of Woonsocket, all in the State of Rhode Island, protesting against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of General Assembly of State of Rhode Island and of City Council of Central Falls, R. I., opposing repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Horace B. Foster, of Centerville, R. I., favoring repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petition of the Imperial County Farm Bureau, indorsing the plan for the reclamation of lands for soldiers, sailors, and marines who have served the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, protest against the lifting of ban on beer and wine, from Methodist Episcopal Church, Huntington Beach; Methodist Episcopal Church, Upland; Methodist Episcopal Church, Santa Ana; Methodist Episcopal Church, San Marcos; Mission Hills citizens; and J. W. Fleming, San Diego, all in the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of many members of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal Churches at Cuyler and Keeney, Cortland County, N. Y., protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of Methodist Episcopal Church of Stratford, Conn., and Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, of Bridgeport, Conn., protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Art Club of Philadelphia, favoring repeal of import duties on works of art; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Goldsmiths' and Silversmiths' Association of California, urging repeal of tax on jewelry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: Resolution adopted by the Indiana State Dental Association in its sixty-first annual session condemning and disapproving of all agitation and propaganda emanating from the radical Socialists, the I. W. W.'s, and the Bolsheviki, etc., and reaffirming its faith in our present Executive and legislative powers, and pledging the loyalty of said association and constant support to any preventive or remedial legislation or procedure which their wisdom might direct; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NOLAN: Petition of San Francisco Board of Trade, protesting against a provision depriving the Interstate Commerce Commission of their authority to authorize from long and short haul clause; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of California State Federation of Labor, urging the repeal of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of William A. Woods and 14 other citizens and A. M. Holden and 8 other citizens of Madison, Me., regarding prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: Petition of Methodist Church of Meredosia, Ill., opposing repeal of war-time prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES: Petition of Rev. J. E. Bane, pastor of First Baptist Church, Piedmont, Mo., and six others, protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSE: Telegram from R. A. Cougill, of Newport, Ky., protesting against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Ukrainian National Committee, New York, N. Y., and 5,000 representatives of Ukrainians, Lithuanians, Letts, and Esthonians residing in the United States of America, asking allied nations to recognize the complete independence of these Republics and render them assistance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Continental Guaranty Corporation, Boyce's Tigers, 25,000 Army and Navy, Yale Club, W. Roger Hunt, and L. Littlejohn & Co. (Inc.), all of New York City, favoring daylight-saving law and against the repeal; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of National Foreign Trade Council, New York, relating to American merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of Orleans Pomona Grange, of New York, protesting against the repeal of the war-prohibition law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Waterport Grange, No. 1059, of New York, with 65 voters present, urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Orleans Pomona Grange, of New York, urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Methodist Sunday School of Brockport, N. Y., unanimously protesting against the repeal of the war-prohibition law, and urging the passage of an enforcement bill for the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of members of Schuyler Falls Grange, No. 1021, New York, protesting against the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Lisbon, N. Y., protesting against the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Westville Center, N. Y., for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition by voters of Sligo, Pa., protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WASON: Memorial of Prospect Grange, of Mont Vernon, N. H., Edward A. Milne, secretary, urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Morning Star Grange, of Lyme, N. H., Harriet A. Balch, secretary; urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Mascoma Valley Pomona Grange, H. L. Webster, secretary pro tempore, Lebanon, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Anti-Saloon League of America, department of New Hampshire, by J. H. Robbins, superintendent, urging the enforcement of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINGO: Petition of various citizens of Fort Smith, Ark., for repeal of tax on ice cream, soda water, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *June 3, 1919.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come to Thee submitting ourselves to the divine will, for out of Thy hand we have received every good and perfect gift, and our great purpose in life is to glorify Thy name, to extend the kingdom of righteousness and peace and truth among men. We thank Thee for the brotherly love that prevails, for the unity of spirit, for the great national spirit that has moved us forward and inspired us with mighty purposes and with high ideals and with glorious ambitions. We pray that Thou wilt guide and govern us as, true to the traditions of the past and true to the gleam that shines along the pathway of the future, we press onward to accomplish Thy divine purpose in us as a Nation. We ask these things for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Vice President being absent, the President pro tempore took the chair.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. SMOOT and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation in the sum of $25,000 required by the Division of Public Moneys for "Contingent Expenses, Independent Treasury," fiscal year 1919 (S. Doc. No. 24),

which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter of the 2d instant from the Secretary to the President, submitting, by direction of the President, a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of $500 to increase the salary of one expert stenographer in the office of the President, etc. (S. Doc. No. 23), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the United States Employees' Compensation Commission submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of $100,000 required by the commission for the "Employees' compensation fund" (S. Doc. No. 25), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 79) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the city of Dawson, Ga., tents and cots for use of Confederate veterans in their State convention, June 17 and 18, 1919, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE presented a telegram embodying a resolution adopted at a mass meeting of sundry citizens of Omaha, Nebr., favoring the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CURTIS presented a resolution adopted by Wilmington Grange, No. 1741, Patrons of Husbandry, of Burlingame, Kans., favoring the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Motor Trades' Association of Topeka, Kans., favoring the creation of a national highway commission, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a resolution adopted by local branch, Kansas Threshermen's Association, of Salina, Kans., favoring the continuance of the United States Employment Service, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Association of Collegiate Alumnæ of Topeka, Kans., favoring the continuance of the School Service Division of the Bureau of Education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Merchants' Association of Topeka, Kans., praying for the repeal of the so-called luxury tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Farmers' Club of Burlingame, Kans., praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Kansas Bankers' Association, praying for the repeal of the farm-loan act, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Western Fruit Jobbers of America, setting forth their views regarding certain needed legislation for railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Railroads.

He also presented a petition of Local Branch, Kansas Automobile Trade Association, of Topeka, Kans., praying for the repeal of the tax on automobiles, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Lancaster, Clements, and Winona, all in the State of Kansas, and of the Northern Baptist Convention, held at Denver, Colo., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against the adoption of the amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HALE presented a resolution adopted by the Diocese of Maine of the Protestant Episcopal Church in convention at Portland, Me., favoring the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LENROOT presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Bloomington, Wis., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a resolution adopted by the Board of Trade of Fort Myers, Fla., favoring the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. ELKINS presented a petition of the West Virginia Dental Association and a petition of the West Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs, praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the West Virginia State Federation of Labor, in convention at Clarksburg; of William Henshaw Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Martinsburg; and of sundry members of the faculty of the University of West Virginia, Morgantown, all in the State of West Virginia, favoring the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Business Men's Association of Fairmont, W. Va., remonstrating against the repeal of the present zone system of postage rates as recently advanced, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 101, American Federation of Glass Workers, of Morgantown, W. Va., remonstrating against the prohibition of the manufacture and use of beer, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Martinsburg, W. Va., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the National Association of Manufacturers, of New York City, N. Y., favoring the return to private ownership of the railroads of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Eastern Shook & Wooden Box Manufacturing Association, of Boston, Mass., favoring the appointment of James C. Jeffreys as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 267, S. N. P. J., of Rock Springs, Wyo., and a petition of Local Lodge No. 10, S. N. P. J., of Sublet, Wyo., praying for the independence of the Jugo-Slavs and for justice and fair dealing in connection with peace deliberations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Pioneer Grange, No. 1, Patrons of Husbandry, of Burns, Wyo., favoring the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

MEXICAN OIL SITUATION.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing on page 5 of the Marine News referring to the Mexican oil situation. I do not know as to the facts in the article and the conclusions reached, but it deals with a very important subject, and I think should be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MOSES. I object. Let it go to the Committee on Printing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire objects to the printing of the publication in the RECORD and desires to have it referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is not a matter, it seems to me, that the Committee on Printing could deal with. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire to allow this article to be printed in the RECORD. It is a matter of great public interest, and it is a short article dealing with the fuel and oil situation, a very important subject. I think it is a matter that really ought to appear in the RECORD for the benefit of the public and the information of Congress.

Mr. MOSES. I submit to the Senator from Florida that in view of the fact that the Committee on Printing meets every other day, and such matters are being disposed of very rapidly, and in view of the position which I have repeatedly announced on the floor of the Senate at this session, I can not withdraw my objection, but I can assure the Senator from Florida that the Committee on Printing will immediately consider the matter.

Mr. FLETCHER. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The article will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CURTIS. From the Committee on Indian Affairs I report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 2480) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and I submit a report (No. 2) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION.

Mr. KENYON. From the Committee on Education and Labor I report back, with amendments, the bill (S. 1213) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918. I wish to give notice that on to-morrow I shall submit a report to accompany the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE ON CONTINGENT EXPENSES.

Mr. CALDER, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which were referred the following resolutions, reported them severally without amendment, and they were considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Senate resolution No. 45, submitted by Mr. TOWNSEND on the 29th ultimo:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

Senate resolution No. 46, submitted by Mr. NELSON on the 29th ultimo:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

Senate resolution No. 47, submitted by Mr. CUMMINS on the 29th ultimo:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

Senate resolution No. 51, submitted by Mr. SMOOT on the 29th ultimo:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

Senate resolution No. 53, submitted by Mr. MCLEAN on the 2d instant:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not to exceed $1 per printed page to report such hearing as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate; and that expenses contracted hereunder shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Senate resolution No. 54, submitted by Mr. GRONNA on the 2d instant:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

Senate resolution No. 55, submitted by Mr. WADSWORTH on the 2d instant:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

THE CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY.

Mr. CALDER, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred House concurrent resolution No. 4, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That an edition of the Congressional Directory for the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress be prepared and published, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, as provided for in section 73 of the printing act approved January 12, 1895, and that the sum of $800 be paid for preparing, compiling, and indexing said edition, one-half of the said sum to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. NEWBERRY. On yesterday I introduced for my colleague, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND], the bill (S. 1309) to establish a national highway system, to create a Federal highway commission, to encourage efficient and economical highway transportation, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I move that that committee be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The motion was agreed to.

LOAN OF TENTS.

H. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the city of Dawson, Ga., tents and cots for use of Confederate veterans in their State convention, June 17 and 18, 1919, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think I heard a message handed down from the House of Representatives announcing the passage of a joint resolution authorizing the War Department to loan Army tents for the use of Confederate veterans in a reunion to be held within a short period at Dawson, Ga. In the haste the joint resolution took the usual course and was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I intended to ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. Is it now in order to ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution, and that it be put upon its passage?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the committee will be discharged. The Senator from New York asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House joint resolution No. 79. Is there objection?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I did not hear the Senator's request. Will he restate it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. This is a joint resolution which has passed the House of Representatives and was handed down this morning. It authorizes the War Department to loan Army tents for the use of a Confederate veterans' reunion.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I have no objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Legislation of this character has been habitually passed.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WATSON. Has the routine morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has not. If there be no further reports of committees, the introduction of bills is next in order.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 1325) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Ohio Soldiers and Sailors' Home, Erie County, Ohio, two pieces of artillery captured from the German Army by the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FALL:
A bill (S. 1326) for the relief of John Y. Carpenter (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.
By Mr. WALSH of Montana:
A bill (S. 1328) providing that Indians and other persons on Indian reservations and superintendencies shall be subject to certain State or Territorial laws, and for other purposes; and
A bill (S. 1329) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain Indian lands necessary for reservoir purposes in connection with the Blackfeet Indian reclamation project; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.
By Mr. CURTIS:
A bill (S. 1330) for the relief of V. E. Schermerhorn, E. C. Caley, G. W. Campbell, and Philip Hudspeth; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 1331) donating captured cannon and unloaded projectiles to the city of Chapman, Kans., for the county high school; and
A bill (S. 1332) for the relief of Elizabeth Dickson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 1333) granting a pension to Charles Baxter (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1334) granting a pension to Matilda McDowell (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1335) granting a pension to Charles A. Lauman (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1336) granting a pension to Sarah Wilson (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1337) granting a pension to Carey O. Amsbaugh (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 1338) granting a pension to Josephine M. Bourke (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:
A bill (S. 1339) to amend sections 2237 and 2240 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.
By Mr. McCUMBER:
A bill (S. 1340) granting a pension to Mattie Jackson; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. NORRIS:
A bill (S. 1341) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of O'Neill, Nebr., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 1342) granting a pension to Harvey Hill; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. JONES of New Mexico:
A bill (S. 1343) fixing the term of service of Welton W. Pratt during the Civil War; and
A bill (S. 1344) to amend section 224 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to certificates of discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 1345) for the relief of William E. Moses; to the Committee on Public Lands.
By Mr. LODGE:
A bill (S. 1346) providing for the refund of certain duties incorrectly collected on cutch; to the Committee on Finance.
A bill (S. 1347) for the allowance of certain claims for difference in pay growing out of service in the Navy, as reported by the Court of Claims; and
A bill (S. 1348) for the relief of Elizabeth H. Rice (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. HARDING:
A bill (S. 1349) to amend an act entitled "An act to prevent the extermination of fur-bearing animals in Alaska," etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.
A bill (S. 1350) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, consider, and adjudicate claims which the Cherokee, Creek, and Seminole Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. HARRISON:
A bill (S. 1351) establishing standard grades of naval stores, preventing deception in transactions in naval stores, regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.
By Mr. ELKINS:
A bill (S. 1352) legalizing the issuance of free transportation and service to eleemosynary institutions and charitable organizations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.
By Mr. KNOX:
A bill (S. 1353) for the relief of the McClintic-Marshall Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. CUMMINS:
A bill (S. 1354) granting an increase of pension to David L. Armstrong (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 1355) granting an increase of pension to Storm T. Roberts (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. PHELAN:
A bill (S. 1356) for the relief of Patrick Savage; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.
A bill (S. 1357) granting a pension to John McCary (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
A bill (S. 1358) providing for an additional judge for the northern district of California; and
A bill (S. 1359) to amend an act approved November 21, 1918, entitled "An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the purposes of the act entitled 'An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products, and for other purposes,'" and also an act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel," approved August 10, 1917; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
A bill (S. 1360) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to refuse to permit the exportation of any work of art purporting to be a gift made by an individual or organization to a foreign nation or municipality, unless by consent of the Secretary of State; to the Committee on the Library.
By Mr. UNDERWOOD:
A bill (S. 1361) further extending the time for the commencement and completion of the bridge or bridges authorized by an act entitled "An act to amend an act to authorize the Dauphin Island Railway & Harbor Co., its successors or assigns, to construct and maintain a bridge or bridges or viaducts across the water between the mainland at or near Cedar Point and Dauphin Island, both Little and Big; also to dredge a channel from the deep waters of Mobile Bay into Dauphin Bay; also to construct and maintain docks and wharves along both Little and Big Dauphin Islands," approved June 18, 1912, as extended by an act approved June 30, 1916; and
A bill (S. 1362) to authorize Hiram I. Sage, a citizen of Baldwin County, Ala., to construct and maintain a bridge across the Perdido River at Nunez Ferry (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.
By Mr. POINDEXTER:
A bill (S. 1363) authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Snake River about 3 miles above its confluence with the Columbia River, near Pasco, Wash.; to the Committee on Commerce.
A bill (S. 1364) authorizing the Secretary of War to make donation of a captured German cannon and cannon balls to the city of Hoquiam, Wash.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 1365) to repeal sections 630, 800, and 906 of the war-revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Finance.
A bill (S. 1366) granting an increase of pension to John E. Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. HALE:
A bill (S. 1367) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bangor, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
By Mr. BALL:
A bill (S. 1368) granting an increase of pension to Oliver L. Bell; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. CALDER:
A bill (S. 1369) to regulate the height, area, and use of buildings in the District of Columbia and to create a zoning commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.
A bill (S. 1370) to abolish the office of the Comptroller of the Currency and transfer the functions thereof to the Federal Reserve Board; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.
By Mr. GAY:
A bill (S. 1371) providing for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building thereon at Donaldsonville, Ascension Parish, La.; and
A bill (S. 1372) providing for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building thereon at Plaquemine, Iberville Parish, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
By Mr. BALL:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 43) directing the United States Peace Commissioners now in Paris to see that justice is done Italy in the matter of Fiume (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.
By Mr. EDGE:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 44) creating a commission to devise a policy of cooperation between the employing and the

working elements of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ELKINS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 45) pertaining to Barnes's Federal Code of 1919; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—ELISHA PAINTER.

On motion of Mr. JONES of Washington, it was

Ordered, That leave be granted to withdraw from the files of the Senate the papers accompanying the bill (S. 1227, 65th Cong., 1st sess.) granting a pension to Elisha Painter, no adverse report having been made thereon.

NATIONAL BUDGET SYSTEM.

Mr. McCORMICK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 58), which was read and referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That there be appointed a special committee of the Senate to devise a plan for a budget system, and that said committee shall report a plan for a national budget not later than September 1, 1919.

COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS.

Mr. SPENCER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 59), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Claims, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

WORK FOR THE UNEMPLOYED.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 60), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Whereas the demobilization of 4,000,000 soldiers and millions of war workers in the United States has created a great body of unemployed men and women; and

Whereas this condition is brought about as a direct result of the exercise of the war-making power of Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the plain and imperative duty of Congress to at once initiate the necessary steps to open opportunities for employment to all workers in the United States who face enforced idleness.

Resolved further, That as a first step to remedy the evil of widespread unemployment among the people of the United States in the immediate future the Senate hereby authorizes and directs the Committees on Education and Labor, Agriculture and Forestry, Coast Defenses, Commerce, Conservation of National Resources, District of Columbia, Fisheries, Forest Reservations and Protection of Game, Geological Survey, Industrial Expositions, Interoceanic Canals, Interstate Commerce, Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands, Manufactures, Mines and Mining, Mississippi River and its Tributaries, Naval Affairs, Post Offices and Post Roads, Public Buildings and Grounds, Public Lands, Railroads, Territories, Transportation Routes to the Seaboard, University of the United States, to each make an investigation as to the possibilities of work for the unemployed in those branches of industry, either in public or private employment, coming within the purview of each of the aforesaid committees of the Senate.

Resolved further, That said committees shall have power to subpœna witnesses and administer oaths, to send for persons and papers, and employ such assistants as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution, and to report on or before June 15, 1919.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. NELSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 61), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to hold hearings, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not to exceed $1 per printed page; to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee; to sit and act at such times and places as it may deem necessary during the sessions or recesses of the Senate, the expenses thereof, including the cost of travel and subsistence of the members of the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, incident to any hearings which may be held in places other than Washington, D. C., to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. PAGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 62), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page; to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

SUPPRESSION OF ANARCHISTIC OUTRAGES.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, toward the close of the last session there was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary a bill originally introduced by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW], popularly known as the red-flag bill. In the form in which it came from the committee its scope was much wider than as originally introduced, and was intended to penalize the teaching or advocacy of the overthrow of the Government by means of violence, and deny the use of the mails for the circulation of literature so advocating or advising, to prohibit the transmission in interstate commerce of literature of that character, and to prohibit the importation of literature of that character. The tragic events recorded in the morning newspapers afford added evidence of the necessity of stringent legislation along the lines of the bill referred to.

I introduce this morning a bill in the form of the report of the committee upon the so-called red-flag bill and ask that it may be read from the desk.

The bill (S. 1327) to declare unlawful the exhibition of a red flag and to fix a penalty therefor was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

A bill (S. 1327) to declare unlawful the exhibition of a red flag and to fix a penalty therefor.

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any person to advocate or advise or to write, or with intent to forward the purpose hereinafter mentioned, to print, publish, sell, or distribute any document, book, circular, paper, journal, or other written or printed communication, in or by which there is advised the overthrow, by force or violence, or by physical injury to person or property of the Government of the United States or of all government.

SEC. 2. That the display or exhibition, at any meeting, gathering, or parade, public or private, of any flag, banner, or emblem, symbolizing, or intended by the person or persons displaying or exhibiting the same, to symbolize a purpose to overthrow, by force or violence, or by physical injury to person or property the Government of the United States or all government, is hereby declared to be unlawful.

SEC. 3. Every document, book, circular, paper, journal, or other written or printed communication, in or by which there is advocated or advised the overthrow, by force or violence, or by physical injury to person or property of the Government of the United States or of all government, or in or by which there is advocated or advised the unlawful use of force or violence or physical injury to or the unlawful seizure or destruction of persons or property as a means toward the accomplishment of economic, industrial, or political changes, is hereby declared to be nonmailable and shall not be conveyed in the mails or delivered from any post office or by any letter carrier: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be so construed as to authorize any person other than an employee of the Dead Letter Office, duly authorized thereto, or other person upon a search warrant authorized by law, to open any letter not addressed to himself.

SEC. 4. It shall be unlawful, with intent to forward the end in or by the same advocated or advised, to import or cause to be imported into the United States or any place subject to its jurisdiction any matter declared by section 3 of this act to be nonmailable, or with such intent to transport or cause to be transported any such matter from one State to another or to any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

SEC. 5. Whoever shall use or attempt to use the mails or Postal Service of the United States for the transmission of any matter declared by section 3 of this act to be nonmailable, or who shall otherwise violate any provision of this act, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

SEC. 6. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to operate as a repeal, in whole or in part, of section 20 of the act approved October 15, 1914, commonly known as the Clayton Act, or to limit or abridge any right conferred or guaranteed thereby, or to prohibit the transmission of any document, book, circular, paper, journal, or other written or printed communication in or by which there is advocated or advised the exercise of any such right, and which does not otherwise offend against this act.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, as a specimen of the literature the circulation of which this proposed act is intended to prohibit, I send to the desk a copy of the circular found near the remains of the individual who on last night endeavored to take the life of the Attorney General of the United States, which circular is entitled "Plain Words."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the reading of the circular presented by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I do not ask that it be read, but I ask that it be incorporated in the RECORD, unless some Senator shall desire to have it read.

Mr. ASHURST. Let it be read, Mr. President.

Mr. SMOOT. Every Senator has read it. It has been printed in all of the newspapers this morning.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have no desire that it shall be read.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, we can not hear what the Senator from Montana is saying on this side of the Chamber. I should like to hear the article read.

Mr. ASHURST. I should also like to hear it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, the Secretary will read the article. The Chair hears none.

The Secretary read as follows:

PROCLAMATION OF A REVOLUTION FOUND IN EFFECTS OF ANARCHIST.

PLAIN WORDS.

The powers that be made no secret of their will to stop, here in America, the world-wide spread of revolution. The powers that must be reckon that they will have to accept the fight they have provoked.

A time has come when the social question's solution can be delayed no longer; class war is on and can not cease but with a complete victory for the international proletariat.

The challenge is an old one, oh, "democratic" lords of the autocratic Republic. We have been dreaming of freedom, we have talked

of liberty, we have aspired to a better world, and you jailed us, you clubbed us, you deported us, you murdered us whenever you could.

Now that the great war, waged to replenish your purses and build a pedestal to your saints is over, nothing better can you do to protect your stolen millions and your usurped fame than to direct all the power of the murderous institutions you created for your exclusive defense against the working multitudes rising to a more human conception of life.

The jails, the dungeons you reared to bury all protesting voices, are now replenished with languishing conscientious workers, and, never satisfied, you increase their number every day.

It is history of yesterday that your gunmen were shooting and murdering unarmed masses by the wholesale; it has been the history of every day in your régime; and now all prospects are even worse.

Do not expect us to sit down and pray and cry. We accept your challenge and mean to stick to our war duties. We know that all you do is for your defense as a class; we know also that the proletariat has the same right to protect itself since their press has been suffocated, their mouths muzzled, we mean to speak for them the voice of dynamite, through the mouth of guns.

Do not say we are acting cowardly because we keep in hiding; do not say it is abominable; it is war—class war—and you were the first to wage it under cover of the powerful institutions you call order, in the darkness of your laws, behind the guns of your bone-headed slave.

No liberty to you accept but yours; the working people also have a right to freedom, and their rights—our own rights—we have set our minds to protect at any price.

We are not many, perhaps more than you dream of, though; but are all determined to fight to the last, till a man remains buried in your bastiles, till a hostage of the working class is left to the tortures of your police system, and will never rest till your fall is complete and the laboring classes have taken possession of all that rightly belongs to them.

There will have to be bloodshed; we will not dodge; there will have to be murder; we will kill, because it is necessary; there will have to be destruction; we will destroy to rid the world of your tyrannical institutions.

We are ready to do anything and everything to suppress the capitalist class; just as you are doing anything and everything to suppress the proletarian revolution.

Our mutual position is pretty clear. What has been done by us so far is only a warning that there are friends of popular liberties still living. Only now we are getting into the fight; and you will have a chance to see what liberty-loving people can do.

Do not seek to believe that we are the Germans' or the devil's paid agents; you know well we are class conscious men, with strong determination, and no vulgar liability. And never hope that your cops and your hounds will ever succeed in ridding the country of the anarchistic germ that pulses in our veins.

We know how we stand with you, and know how to take care of ourselves.

Besides, you will never get all of us—and we multiply nowadays.

Just wait and resign to your fate, since privilege and riches have turned your heads.

Long live social revolution! Down with tyranny!

THE ANARCHIST FIGHTERS.

DEVELOPMENT OF WATER POWER.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I do not know that it is the proper order, but I desire to call up the motion made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to reconsider the vote by which the bill (S. 220) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable water," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce, introduced by myself, was referred to a joint committee consisting of the Committee on Public Lands and the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it is a matter of perfect indifference to me to what committee the bill is referred. I have no more interest in the bill than any Senator has in an important piece of public legislation. All I desire to protest against was this method of referring one bill to two committees. As has been suggested, it might as well be referred to 10 committees. It seems to me it would throw the whole business of the Senate into utter confusion to have two committees consider the same measure. Which committee is to report it? Which committee is to deal with it? Are they both to deal with it at the same time? In fact, I can not very well understand how we can refer one bill to two committees at the same time. One committee must have control of it. I merely desire to protest against it as a novel and confusing method of doing business; that is all. The rules contemplate no reference to two committees. I do not know whether it is strictly out of order—I have not examined the rule carefully—but the rule says "reference to a committee." All I desire is merely to make the point against referring a measure to two committees.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, under ordinary circumstances the position taken by the Senator from Massachusetts would be entirely unanswerable, but we confront a very unusual situation here. The bill deals with the subject of power sites on the public domain, on public land, and, considering that feature of the bill alone, it would, of course, properly go to the Committee on Public Lands; but the bill likewise deals with the construction of dams in navigable streams, and, considered in that aspect, it very properly would go to the Committee on Commerce.

During the last session such a bill was introduced in the House of Representatives. That body, recognizing that it could not be appropriately referred either to the Committee on Public Lands or to the Committee on Commerce, referred it to a special committee, consisting of certain members of the Committee on Public Lands and certain members of the Committee on Commerce, an equal number being selected from each of those committees. The bill passed that House, and the Senate disagreeing to the bill, a committee of conference was appointed by this body to consider the subject. This body, recognizing that it would be quite improper to select a committee of conference to deal with that particular bill chosen exclusively from the Committee on Public Lands or exclusively from the Committee on Commerce, ordered that it be referred to a conference committee consisting of three members of the Committee on Public Lands and three Members of the Committee on Commerce. So that both Houses have already determined that a bill of this character is properly referred to a special committee consisting of members chosen from both of those committees.

My motion now is that this bill be referred to a special committee consisting of the Committee on Public Lands and the Committee on Commerce. Those two bodies can get together, work out the features of the bill, and make a report upon it; in other words, 20 members can constitute a committee as well as 10 members and can act upon the measure.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, of course, the question of conference committees is hardly parallel, because either body can select any of its Members it chooses for any conference, and can make up a conference representing, if it chooses, more than one committee. I have seen that done heretofore. I think it was done in the case of the Philippine bill; but here is a bill containing two subjects. Let it be referred to one committee first, and when they have dealt with their part of it refer it to the other committee. Here it is proposed to refer the same bill at the same time to two committees. It seems to me it would create endless confusion in the business of the Senate if that system should be adopted. There are plenty of ways of managing it afterwards. The committees can arrange it amongst themselves. Send the bill to each committee, if that is desired, and let them arrange how they shall deal with it. I think, however, that the principle of referring one bill to two committees to be a dangerous one to put into our practice for the orderly conduct of business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that the pending motion is not debatable at this time. The question is upon the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to reconsider the vote of the Senate agreeing to an order referring the bill in question jointly to the Committee on Commerce and Public Lands. Those who favor the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts will say "aye." [A pause.] Those who are opposed to the motion will say "no." [A pause.] The Chair is unable to decide.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not desire to waste the time of the Senate on a point of this character, but it seems to me one that could be arranged without much difficulty and without involving us in establishing a precedent that may lead to a great deal of trouble. I think the object can be attained in other ways.

On a division, the motion to reconsider was adopted.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I now move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further concurrent or other resolutions, the morning business is closed.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House joint resolution No. 1, which is also No. 1 on the calendar, proposing an amendment to the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women, which the Secretary read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE ——.

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to enter upon any extended discussion of this proposition. It has been discussed as have but few other questions that have ever engaged the thought and the attention of the American people. Hearings have been repeatedly held by committees of both House and Senate on this question in the past. It has been debated on the floor of both bodies and has been discussed throughout the country in every forum where the people are wont to gather to listen to public discussions. What is needed now is action and not speech. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, I shall enter upon no debate touching the merits of this proposition, which are well understood throughout the country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment and have it pending.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On line 9, page 1, it is proposed to insert, before the word "citizens," the word "white," so that it will read:

The right of white citizens to vote—

And so forth.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. REED and Mr. WATSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. WATSON. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. REED. I rose to make an inquiry at this time. I wanted to ask the Senator if he intended to urge this amendment, or if he intended to have it printed.

Mr. HARRISON. I desire a vote on the amendment.

Mr. REED. Without debate?

Mr. HARRISON. My own idea is that the amendment is thoroughly understood, and I do not care to delay the vote on the main proposition. I do not think anything more can be said than Senators already understand, and personally I do not particularly care to debate it.

Mr. REED. The reason why I asked the question was that when the Senator sent up his amendment he said, if I heard him correctly, that he desired to have it printed.

Mr. HARRISON. No; I said "pending."

Mr. REED. I misunderstood the Senator, then.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. FLETCHER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harding	McLean	Smith, Md.
Ball	Harris	McNary	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Harrison	Moses	Smoot
Brandegee	Henderson	Myers	Spencer
Calder	Johnson, Calif.	Nelson	Stanley
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Sterling
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Newberry	Sutherland
Cummins	Kellogg	Norris	Swanson
Curtis	Kendrick	Nugent	Thomas
Dial	Kenyon	Overman	Trammell
Dillingham	Keyes	Page	Wadsworth
Edge	King	Phelan	Walsh, Mass.
Elkins	Kirby	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Fall	Knox	Pittman	Warren
Fernald	La Follette	Poindexter	Watson
Fletcher	Lenroot	Pomerene	Williams
France	Lodge	Ransdell	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Reed	
Gay	McCumber	Sheppard	
Hale	McKellar	Sherman	

Mr. HARRIS. My colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], is detained by illness.

Mr. KING. I wish to announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent from the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

[Mr. REED addressed the Senate. See Appendix.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. GAY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hale	McLean	Smith, S. C.
Ball	Harding	McNary	Smoot
Borah	Harris	Moses	Spencer
Brandegee	Harrison	Myers	Stanley
Calder	Henderson	Nelson	Sterling
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	New	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Newberry	Swanson
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Thomas
Cummins	Kellogg	Nugent	Trammell
Curtis	Kendrick	Page	Underwood
Dial	Kenyon	Phelan	Wadsworth
Edge	Keyes	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Elkins	Kirby	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Fall	La Follette	Poindexter	Warren
Fernald	Lenroot	Ransdell	Watson
Fletcher	Lodge	Reed	Williams
France	McCormick	Sheppard	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	McCumber	Sherman	
Gay	McKellar	Smith, Md.	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore resumed the chair.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] is absent on account of illness. The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] is necessarily absent on account of illness in his family.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I desire to announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] is absent from the city on important public business.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] is absent on important business.

Mr. KIRBY. I announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] on public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when Mr. BANKHEAD's name was called). I wish to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. BANKHEAD] from the Chamber on account of illness.

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Has the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have a standing pair with that Senator. I transfer the pair to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. NEWBERRY. My colleague [Mr. TOWNSEND] is detained at home on account of illness in his family.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. May I inquire if the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have a general pair with him and withhold my vote. If permited to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. CALDER. On the final vote upon this question I am paired with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. If they were present, they would vote on this question the same way as I vote, and therefore I vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. ASHURST. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Arizona] is unavoidably absent to-day, and that if present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. SWANSON. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. MARTIN] is detained from the city on account of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. KELLOGG (after having voted in the negative). I have received a note from the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] in which he stated that he desired me to protect him on all matters except the final vote on woman suffrage. On the question of woman suffrage the Senator from North Carolina is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH]. I have not the letter before me, and I therefore withdraw my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. HARRIS. I wish to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], is detained by illness.

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 59, as follows:

YEAS—16.

Borah	Harris	Overman	Trammell
Dial	Harrison	Phelan	Underwood
Fletcher	McKellar	Smith, S. C.	Williams
Gay	Myers	Swanson	Wolcott

NAYS—59.

Ashurst	Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Ransdell
Ball	Hale	McCumber	Sheppard
Backham	Harding	McLean	Sherman
Brandegee	Henderson	McNary	Smoot
Calder	Johnson, Calif.	Moses	Spencer
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Stanley
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	New	Sterling
Culberson	Kendrick	Newberry	Sutherland
Cummins	Kenyon	Norris	Thomas
Curtis	Keyes	Nugent	Wadsworth
Edge	Kirby	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Elkins	Knox	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Fall	La Follette	Pittman	Warren
Fernald	Lenroot	Poindexter	Watson
France	Lodge	Pomerene	

NOT VOTING—21.

Bankhead	Hitchcock	Penrose	Smith, Ga.
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	Reed	Smith, Md.
Dillingham	Kellogg	Robinson	Townsend
Gerry	King	Shields	
Gore	Martin	Simmons	
Gronna	Owen	Smith, Ariz.	

So Mr. HARRISON's amendment was rejected.

TREATY OF PEACE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Senate resolution No. 12, submitted by Mr. JOHNSON of California May 20, as follows:

Whereas the peace treaty has been completed and has been delivered to the representatives of Germany; and

Whereas a synopsis only of the treaty has been given publicity in the United States, and our people are entitled to know its full contents, and to what, if any, engagements they may have been committed; and

Whereas it is reported in the press that the entire treaty has been cabled to the State Department and is now in the possession of the State Department: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested forthwith to transmit to the Senate the full text of the treaty of peace completed at the Paris conference and delivered to the representatives of Germany.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I ask that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside, to be taken up on the conclusion of the pending joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not desire to object, but before the order is entered I wish to say that it is now an established fact that the treaty which this resolution is calling for is public to the people of Europe, particularly those with whom we were lately engaged in war. It is also true, Mr. President, that the treaty is now in the possession of certain interests in New York City. While the Senate of the United States is asking for a treaty with which it will ultimately have to deal, and while the American people are asking for a treaty by which they will ultimately, in all probability, be bound, and are unable to secure it, certain interests in the city of New York are in the possession of this treaty and are discussing it.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I desire to say in this connection that I have seen a statement in the Associated Press and other reputable papers that there was an understanding between the parties who made this treaty that it should not be officially given out. If Germany or German interests have broken that promise and given it out, the responsibility is with them. The question presented here is whether, if that statement is true, we shall officially ask the President of the United States to break faith and give out a treaty which the Associated Press says it is understood will not be given out. I see it stated also that the French prime minister has refused to give it out, and Lloyd-George has refused to give it out on account of this understanding. If there is such an understanding, it is reasonable to presume that there was some reason why the treaty should not officially be given out. All we have contended for here in a matter of foreign affairs, in which we have no partisanship, is that it should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I wish to inquire whether the request of the Senator from California which has been presented for unanimous consent is debatable?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request has not been granted, although the Chair has as yet heard no objection.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I understand the matter before the Senate is the request of the Senator from California for unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is entirely right.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I inquire whether that request is open to debate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is not a debatable question.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I demand the regular order.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I renew my request, then, for the very reason that has been suggested. I will not reply.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I will now take occasion to say what I was going to say out of order when the request for unanimous consent was before us. Now, I will say in order upon the woman-suffrage joint resolution that the treaty is in New York. I had a copy of it in my hand yesterday, and I heard of several others. I was offered a copy to bring on here and show to my colleagues. I said that no copy could come into my hands without being made public. Therefore, it was not given to me, but it is there in New York. I heard of four copies in existence in New York. How many more there may be in the country I do not know, but, as far as I can make out, the only place where it is not allowed to come is the Senate of the United States.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President——

Mr. NEW. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he has not seen newspaper reports to the effect that copies of the treaty are on sale on the streets in Germany at 15 cents a copy?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; that I have seen stated in the newspapers, and I have no doubt it is quite true.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator from Massachusetts, as usual, avoids the direct issue on this subject.

Mr. LODGE. What is the issue?

Mr. SWANSON. The issue is whether we shall officially ask the President to officially give out a treaty which it has been stated that he has agreed not to give out.

Mr. LODGE. Who stated that he agreed not to give it out?

Mr. SWANSON. The Associated Press and other reputable papers. I understand the prime minister of France has said——

Mr. LODGE. The Senator's understanding of what the prime minister of France said is not entirely convincing.

Mr. SWANSON. Nothing is convincing to the Senator on this or any other question appertaining to the league of nations or this question. The only position we have advocated on this question is that it has been customary to refer delicate foreign affairs to the Foreign Relations Committee. That committee is organized to handle delicate questions. If it was true, as stated, that our representatives agreed that it is unwise and improper to give us the treaty officially, why should the Senate ask the President to do something that he has agreed not to do? We have not asked that this question be disposed of finally. All we have asked is that the committee, of which the Senator is chairman, shall have the matter referred to it to ascertain the reason why the treaty has not been given out and to ascertain what is proper in a delicate situation of this kind and report to the Senate what its conclusions are. The Democrats do not control that committee. The question is whether the Foreign Relations Committee shall now, as heretofore, exercise its functions and pass upon this question.

I do not know whether such a specific agreement was made or not, but I have seen it stated in the Associated Press and other sources that Lloyd-George and Clemenceau had stated that it was understood that the treaty was not to be officially given out. If it is given out unofficially somebody is responsible for doing it, and why should we be responsible? Who knows that it is official?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Virginia says he has observed what Clemenceau and Lloyd-George have said. I do not know whether that is exactly reliable for our discussion or not, but if it is, the same Associated Press said that Mr. Clemenceau and Mr. Lloyd-George were willing that it should be made public and that the President of the United States put his veto on it.

Mr. SWANSON. There has been a discussion as to who is responsible. If that is true and there is a difference of opinion, why can it not be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee and let that committee consider the reasons why it should not be made public?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. In view of what was just said by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], let me say that one of the morning papers of New York—I think the Times—on Sunday morning

announced that the President had stated that he had reluctantly consented to withhold the text of the treaty, but had yielded to the importunities of Lloyd-George, Clemenceau, and his other associates.

Mr. SWANSON. Now, what is the situation here? The prime ministers of these countries and the President have considered it unwise at this time to give the treaty out. We presume that they have reasons for it. What is the contention on the Democratic side? Our contention is that we shall conduct our foreign relations in an orderly manner. Such resolutions have been referred to the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. LODGE. They have not.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Virginia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I assume we can get some enlightenment on this question from the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. As I recall his language a moment ago, he said that the Senate of the United States is the only place where this treaty has not been allowed to come. The word "allowed" was used.

Mr. LODGE. I said it appears to be.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I do not remember the word "appears," but assuming that the word "appears" was used——

Mr. LODGE. I said "appears" or "apparently."

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I would have to further assume that there is some information which the Senator from Massachusetts has which makes it apparent that somebody allowed the treaty to get into other sources or rather other hands than the Senate of the United States. The implication of the Senator, it seems to me, must be based on information which he has withheld from the Senate or else it is unfounded.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. Is it open to me now to extricate myself from the extraordinary dilemma which the Senator from New Mexico has presented? If it is, I will say that I had little more difficulty in getting information than this. The copies of the treaty were given out that I have referred to, and they found that many of them were going to America, and an order was issued from our headquarters in Paris that no more were to be permitted.

Mr. SWANSON. By whom were they given out?

Mr. LODGE. Given out by the authorities.

Mr. SWANSON. What authorities?

Mr. LODGE. The representatives of the United States.

Mr. SWANSON. What representatives?

Mr. LODGE. I suppose some of the President's followers. I do not suppose he gave them out himself.

Mr. SWANSON. What followers? They are not representatives. I have understood they do not represent the United States.

Mr. LODGE. There are no representatives over there except the President's personal agents.

Mr. SWANSON. There is nobody authorized to give out foreign affairs under the Constitution except the President of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. Very well, then, they were given out by his order.

Mr. SWANSON. Does the Senator make that statement on his own responsibility?

Mr. LODGE. No; I do not know whether he ordered it or not.

Mr. SWANSON. Does the Senator know where they came from?

Mr. LODGE. They came from Paris. They were given out by our representatives there.

Mr. SWANSON. I want to ask the Senator this question: If this agreement was entered into, if they considered it unwise that the treaty, which is a tentative treaty submitted to Germany, tentative until signed and agreed to, should be given out, and agreed not to give it out, would the Senator break faith and give it out?

Mr. LODGE. I am not dealing with a newspaper hypothesis. The Senator says if this and if that and if the other. There have been half a dozen different newspaper reports.

Mr. SWANSON. What the Senator ought to deal with as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and that is the very suggestion made, is to ask that the resolution be referred to his committee to ascertain what the facts are. The Senator objects to obtaining the facts.

Mr. LODGE. I will wait until the Senator is through.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Virginia yield further to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I have been on the Foreign Relations Committee longer than the Senator from Virginia. I am as familiar with its methods as he is. I have defended its privileges and prerogatives, I think, as often as anyone, and I shall continue to protect them. This case is utterly different. There is no prerogative here of the Foreign Relations Committee. To go through the farce of referring it to the Foreign Relations Committee, in order to be told what we already know, is useless. This is a request for a document which has been given out in part officially in a summary, a wretched summary, and imperfect, but that was given out. Other fragments of it, like the one about the procès verbal and others, have come dribbling out from time to time. The whole treaty is here in various private hands. The people who have received it were given those copies, given them abroad. Some may have been mailed, for aught I know. They are here. We know as well as we know anything that they are on sale in Berlin. And yet we are told this is a very delicate question on which we must argue to know why, if they are held back, and why a document the whole world is reading should not be printed in completeness. That is all there is to it.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMICK. I wish to read a cable dispatch published in the Philadelphia Public Ledger yesterday:

[From the Philadelphia Public Ledger of June 2, 1919.]

PRESS PEACE DIGEST SHARPENED FOR ITS POLITICAL EFFECT ABROAD.

(By our own correspondent; special cable dispatch.)

LONDON, *June 1.*

While President Wilson and Premiers Lloyd-George and Clemenceau imagined that they were keeping from the world the exact text of the peace treaty, Germany stole a march, for she has put it out in pamphlet form, selling it upon the streets of her cities. As cabled last Friday, some of these pamphlets had reached Norway. A version, going by way of Holland to Chicago, now also is probably of the same German origin.

Mr. SWANSON. What is the contention of the gentlemen on the other side? It is not denied that this promise was made. I understand that the Parliament of England and the Parliament of France have no official copy of the treaty. I do not think there is any doubt but what it was understood that it would not be officially promulgated, and yet we are asked to request the President to break faith with an agreement made with his colleagues when the treaty was entered into as a tentative treaty. Germany has broken faith; and because Germany has broken faith the Senate of the United States is requested to ask the President to break faith. I am not willing to be put in that attitude. It seems to me it is the proper province of the committee to investigate whether he has entered into obligations not officially promulgated. When we have that information, we can determine whether it is wise or unwise. I see no purpose of organizing a committee like the Foreign Relations Committee unless it is to determine whether a delicate matter like this should be considered by it.

The Senator says, Why ask this? If he has the treaty—and he seems to have been able to get it if it has been offered for 15 cents—what is the occasion for demanding it, except to ask the President officially to give the treaty out, which he has agreed, the Associated Press says, not to do.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. Nobody has notified me officially or notified you officially that there was any reason why it should not be published.

Mr. SWANSON. No; and all I ask you to do is to refer it to the Foreign Relations Committee and allow the Secretary of State to appear before that committee and let him make a statement of the circumstances, and then ask you to vote with full information.

Mr. LODGE. Frankly, Mr. President, I have too much respect for the committee to go through all that nonsense.

Mr. SWANSON. Of course, the Senator does not want the information; the Senator does not want the reason. The Senator does not want it sent to that committee to ascertain why the treaty should not be given out at this time. All we have asked in this discussion of the situation is that the Foreign Relations Committee shall meet to-morrow, hear the Secretary of State and hear his reasons why the treaty should not officially be given out. It seems to me that any State Department or any President is entitled to have that opportunity to present to the Foreign Relations Committee the reasons. He can not appear before this body. You have organized a committee to hear the reasons why it should not officially be given out.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to conclude what I have to say in regard to this matter by saying that, regardless of what the

agreement was between the big three, I assume that when the President learns that notwithstanding the agreement certain interests in New York have gotten possession of it, interests which are peculiarly interested in the treaty, the President will no longer feel that he is under an obligation to keep faith with those people, and that he will give it to the other branch of the treaty making power and to the people generally.

Mr. SWANSON. I have not any connection with interests in New York. Consequently I am not posted as to what they have or have not, but if Germany broke faith and sold copies of the treaty for 15 cents it ought not to have sold and they were obtained in New York, or if parties representing the United States broke faith with the President, or the parties that represented France broke faith with the prime minister and gave it out, there is no reason why the United States should be made a party to a breach of faith, if such a condition exists.

Mr. BORAH. I think the facts are that copies of the treaty which are in New York did not come from Germany. I think the Senator will find that they came under a confidential promise or a promise to be treated as confidential. But, nevertheless, they are there being discussed and considered by a great many people who are interested in the question but not as interested as is the Senate of the United States. They are representing themselves while we are representing a constituency.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator gives reasons why the committee should investigate it.

Mr. BORAH. No; I do not want any investigating. I want the President to know that those people in New York who have these copies are using it in a semipublic way, to wit, in a way which will inform all those who are interested with them as to its contents, and I shall not assume until the facts have shown the contrary that when that fact is brought to the attention of the President he will withhold from the people that which those who are particularly interested in the treaty have in their possession.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator will see that this resolution is not directed to the President. It asks the Secretary of State for the text of the treaty, and not "if it is not incompatible with the public interest." It does not have even that. Not the President but the Secretary of State is requested to send the treaty here. That is contrary to the entire precedents.

Mr. BORAH. We are wandering from the subject. I do not care anything at all about the technical language of the resolution. We will change that any time which will suit the Senator. What we want is the treaty, the substance.

Mr. SWANSON. Does the Senator want the treaty if we have agreed not to give it out officially?

Mr. BORAH. I do not know whether we have made that agreement or not.

Mr. SWANSON. Would not the Senator like to know whether we are breaking faith when we give out the treaty or not?

Mr. BORAH. If that agreement has been made——

Mr. SWANSON. Are our agreements scraps of paper?

Mr. BORAH. It seems some are.

Mr. SWANSON. Do you think this one ought to be, so far as this Government is concerned?

Mr. BORAH. If the President has made an agreement with the other members with whom he is associated in the peace conference that the treaty should not be given out, then there is no reason why the President should not communicate the fact to us that the agreement exists. We have only an Associated Press dispatch, which is modified in different ways, in one instance stating that the President himself has denied it to the public. But even if that agreement has been made, nevertheless a number of copies have gone into the hands of special interests in this country which are particularly interested in some of its terms, and so I am sure the President would be relieved from that obligation and should give it to the people who are interested in it.

Mr. SWANSON. If differences exist, we have appointed a committee to ascertain the definite facts and make a recommendation to the Senate. Such resolutions have from time immemorial been addressed to the President, but for some reason—I do not know why—this is addressed to the Secretary of State.

Under the Constitution the President is in control of our foreign affairs. The Secretary of State, so far as foreign affairs are concerned, is simply a representative of the President, acting under his direction.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SWANSON. I do.

Mr. NELSON. Can not the Senator from Virginia see the obvious reason why we have to address this communication to the Secretary of State? The Secretary of State is here in this country, and the President of the United States is 3,000 miles away. How can we reach him except by cable?

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator from Minnesota is entirely mistaken. The Secretary of State is in Paris with the President, and yet this communication is directed to the Secretary of State, who is in Paris. It is to be communicated to him. Consequently the Senator is mistaken as to his facts.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Who is here? Is there anybody left in the executive department at all? [Laughter.]

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, there are enough left here in the executive department.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Just a moment, if the Senator from Virginia will suspend. The Chair hopes the occupants of the galleries will remember that there is a rule of the Senate which forbids demonstrations in the galleries. Whether the Chair will feel it his duty to enforce that rule remains to be seen.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, this resolution is addressed to the Secretary of State, who is in Paris. The President also is there. Why it was purposely directed to the Secretary of State instead of to the President I can not understand. It has been the uniform practice that such resolutions should be addressed to the President, because he derives his authority in relation to foreign affairs not from Congress but from the Constitution.

It is not even stated in the resolution that the information is to be communicated "if not incompatible with the public interest." It seems to me that this resolution being in reference to a treaty which is simply a tentative treaty, not being addressed to the President, he not being requested to communicate the information if not incompatible with the public interest, it should properly be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

What injury could come from that? The committee could meet to-morrow or the day after to-morrow, get the entire facts, and make its recommendations thereon to the Senate with complete and full knowledge. All we ask Senators to do is to satisfy themselves as to the wisdom of the course which they contemplate pursuing.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President——

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FALL. I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia if it is not a fact that the Secretary of State, here in the United States, apparently has issued what he calls a synopsis of the treaty, which has been presented and considered here?

Mr. SWANSON. I may be mistaken, but my understanding is that the synopsis was officially given out by all of the associates in the peace conference; that it was agreed by them to give it out as a synopsis. Consequently there was no breach of faith made in giving out the synopsis. I am not speaking authoritatively, but my impression is that the synopsis was given out by them in Paris and cabled here. The agreement those gentlemen made was that they would give it out as the substance of the treaty, but officially that they would not give the treaty out in full. As to whether that is true or not, I have no authority to say, but the Associated Press say it is true, for they published it; but the Prime Minister of France refused to give it out, and Lloyd-George said that that was the agreement. If there was such an agreement, it does seem to me that we should not put ourselves in the attitude of asking our President to break it.

Mr. FALL. I may be wrong, and I am interrogating the Senator from Virginia for the purpose of making myself right, but I have understood that the object of the resolution of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] was to obtain the material from which this synopsis was made; in other words, that the synopsis having been given out and circulated, and being considered by the newspapers of the country, the public may obtain very erroneous ideas as to the treaty itself; and this synopsis, being an official or semiofficial document, if it is not correct, the public may be very badly misinformed, while if the Senate itself had the document before it from which the synopsis was made it could very readily ascertain whether the synopsis is a correct one. I understand that that is the purpose of the resolution, and it seems to me eminently proper that the request should be made to the Secretary of State, as it was reported by the newspapers here that the synopsis was given out by the State Department.

Mr. SWANSON. No; as I understand, it was cabled from Paris. I am under the impression that this was the semiofficial or official—I can not say which—summary that was given out by all of the associates at the peace conference to the world.

Mr. FALL. Very likely. I have no information about that; but it came from the State Department here.

Mr. SWANSON. It was cabled from Paris; I am satisfied of that.

Mr. FALL. Well, it had to be cabled from Paris, and it had been drawn up for a month or six weeks or two months, of course.

Mr. SWANSON. The difference is this: The summary, not the treaty, was cabled from Paris to the State Department.

Mr. FALL. Then, an answer to that effect by the Secretary of State would at once settle the proposition.

Mr. President, there is another question I desire to ask the Senator from Virginia. Is the Senator aware of any treaty by which the United States was bound not to make peace with Germany except in conjunction with England, France, Italy, and Japan?

Mr. SWANSON. Does the Senator mean to make the treaty at the same time?

Mr. FALL. The other Allies were bound by such an agreement. Has the United States made any such committal?

Mr. SWANSON. I think the President has stated to some of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee—possibly the Senator from Massachusetts was present at the time and others during the war—that he had made no committal of that kind whatever.

Mr. FALL. The United States could not have such a treaty unless it was submitted to this body and ratified by this body.

Mr. SWANSON. I say the President has made no committal of any kind whatever during the war, as I understand, and that at the meeting of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee with him he so stated.

Mr. FALL. Then, it seems to me, it is all the more apparent that the request of the Senator from California is proper.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Virginia permit a suggestion of the Chair?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the ruling which has been made oftentimes by permanent occupants of the chair heretofore, the present occupant will feel compelled to hold that, if the Senator from Virginia or any other Senator yields for more than a question, he will thereby lose the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield for just an instant to a question?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want to say to the Senator from Virginia, preliminary to the question, that I will ask in this particular instance that the pending business be laid aside in order that the suffrage amendment may be taken up and disposed of. I am just as anxious to debate the pending resolution as is the Senator from Virginia, but I have refrained from saying anything in respect to it. May I beg of him therefore—and this is my question—that we permit our debate to take place when we reach the unfinished business, and that we now go on and pass the suffrage amendment?

Mr. SWANSON. I will say to the Senator from California that that was my purpose. I did not precipitate the debate, but I rose to reply to the address of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], followed by a very earnest discussion of the matter by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I simply rose to reply to statements made by these two distinguished Senators. I am willing for the discussion to proceed on the suffrage joint resolution.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution, extending the right of suffrage to women.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution is before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, and is open to amendment.

Mr. BORAH. Is there an amendment pending, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is no amendment pending.

Mr. BORAH. What has become of the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has not offered an amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Vote!

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have no desire to delay the consideration of the joint resolution. I realize that it will be voted on at no distant hour, but before it is voted upon I desire to make some brief observations. I do not do so because of any particular satisfaction which I shall derive from the statement myself, but largely because I have the good fortune to represent a suffrage State and I do not wish my vote to be construed as a condemnation of suffrage when secured by State action.

The fact that I am opposed to this proposed amendment has been construed in some quarters as denoting my opposition to woman suffrage as such. I am not opposed to woman suffrage. Indeed, I have been an advocate of it in an humble way for twenty-odd years. It has prevailed in my State for over 20 years, and after these years of observation I am still a believer in such suffrage. I realize, of course, that it does not and will not accomplish all that is claimed by its most enthusiastic advocates in the way of elevating and purifying politics, but the effect of suffrage in the cause of better government and better politics, in my judgment, is all to the good.

But while I have always been an advocate of suffrage, I have always believed the matter should be settled by the action of the respective States. It is for that reason that I shall cast my vote against this joint resolution. That is a principle which does not change with the number, so far as I am concerned, of votes in favor of or against a proposition. It is fundamental to my way of viewing things, and I am not in a position, therefore, doing justice to myself and my own convictions, to waive my views. If I felt the objections which I have were one of minor importance, a subsidiary proposition, I should unhesitatingly vote for suffrage. If I were called upon, in other words, to weigh one against the other, I might support suffrage as the major proposition; but suffrage can be enjoyed through the action of the respective States. There is, therefore, no occasion for doing violence to what I conceive to be a very fundamental principle in our Government. There are two reasons why I think that suffrage ought not to be achieved in this way: The first is that of the principle with reference to local self-government or home rule, and the second is one of policy.

Mr. President, when this Government was being organized and men came forward from 1770 on to 1789, when they consummated their work in the Constitutional Convention, to take charge of the affairs of a new government, the thing which astonished the world was the capacity, the ability, the statesmanship, and the leadership of the men who moved out of obscurity into the affairs of the world. Other peoples had undertaken, and have since undertaken, to accomplish revolution, to set up free institutions, and to assume for the people the burdens and responsibilities of free government. The enterprise has failed time after time by reason of the fact that the men who were called upon to take the leadership in such a movement were not fitted either in poise, experience, judgment, or wisdom to carry forward the work.

The revolution which took place in France only a few years after the Revolution in the United States failed because of the incapacity of the leaders. The revolution which has taken place in Russia within the last few months has broken down because of the incapacity of the leaders. But the American Revolution was a success, as the subsequent 150 years have demonstrated, because of the remarkable capacity and the leadership of the men who came out of the different Colonies to take hold of that great affair. Where did they get their training? From what university had they graduated? In what school was it that they had been trained to assume these responsibilities? The university of the different Colonies, in the town meetings of New England, in the burgesses of Virginia, in the legislatures of the various Colonies. Under the principle of local self-government and home rule these men had been trained so that they were prepared when the task came to take on the work which was before them. Realizing the great worth of the principle, when they came to organize the Government and to write the Constitution they were very careful to preserve self-government or home rule for local affairs and to provide a national government and a national constitution for national affairs.

It was not a mere matter of administrative efficiency or a mere convenience of government, neither was it local prejudice or alone the bias of tradition which caused this principle to be so carefully preserved in the final framework of the Constitution. It was a deeper and profounder reason. These men understood perfectly that without it free institutions would be but a passing scheme with which to again delude for a season the advocates of liberty. They realized fully, and if we were not so deeply moved by the cry of party expediency we would realize, that this principle is the rock foundation upon which our whole vast fabric rests. Without it our house is built upon shifting sands. Without it the influence of the people in our Government will be wholly thwarted. Without it the right of suffrage is an illusion, a toy in the hands of an impotent constituency. Without it corruption and extravagance and the

whole pack of centralization's treacherous and deadly evils will sweep on and on, imperious, rampant, and unrepentant, until discontent and revolution finally seize the reins of government. Without it there can be no splendid and sturdy citizenship or orderly, lawful, and responsible government.

Democracy carries in its system every hour of its existence the germs of autocracy. The tendency is always toward centralization. And only a brave and self-reliant and vigilant people can hold it within reasonable and proper bounds. There is, after all, only one guaranty for the success of popular government, and that is the worth and capacity of the individual citizen, and self-government is the only school in which he can be trained to his task. Anything that keeps him in touch with his government, which feeds his interest and deepens his concern in public affairs, not as an officeholder but as he lives his daily life, is vital and fundamental. The watchman upon the walls is not the coddled and anemic satellite of a federal bureaucracy, but the self-helping, self-reliant, wholesome individual whose intellectual and moral fiber in daily contact with his government has wrought its sense of duty and its appreciation of responsibility.

To give men, to give women, the right of suffrage and at the same time administer all the affairs and center all authority of government at Washington is, indeed, to keep the word of promise to the ear and break it to the hope. It is not and can not be democracy. It is bureaucracy, the most vicious, the most expensive, and the most deadening form of government ever devised by the wit of man.

The thing, therefore, which has strengthened us through all these years, which has given us success where others have failed, has been the fact that the Government through the local organizations or processes of government has been brought in touch with the citizen. He has been trained in the State and the subdivisions of the State in the duties of citizenship, as his great forefathers and forebears were in the century past. But for the last 25 years, step by step, day by day, and year after year, we have been withdrawing from the States all power and centering it in the Government at Washington. We are gradually entirely destroying the principle of home rule or of local self-government, and this, to my judgment, is the most pronounced step in the utter destruction of that principle that we have yet taken. If I am correct in this view, Mr. President, it can by no means be a matter of minor import. If I am correct in the view which I entertain, it is a principle which is indispensable and prerequisite to the wholesome maintenance of our Federal system of government.

It has often been said to me that as a member of the Republican Party it would seem peculiar that I should be jealous of the principle of State rights. The doctrine of State rights or the doctrine of local self-government or home rule is just as essentially a principle of the Republican Party, and has been through all its life, as of any other political organization in this country. The State-rights theory, based upon the proposition of the right of a State to withdraw from the Union, was settled at Gettysburg and Appomattox; but the right of a State within the Union to govern its own affairs and control its own local concerns, to preserve and to manage its own local interests, was just as highly appreciated a principle of the organizers of the Republican Party as it has ever been of any other political organization.

This is a principle upon which Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Jefferson never differed; a principle upon which none of the framers or leaders of the Republic have ever differed. The right of a State to control its own local affairs exclusively and to manage its own concerns is indispensable to the preservation of the Federal Union, without which we can not as a Republic endure. It is because this constitutional amendment does violence to that principle that I am going to cast my vote against it. There is no necessity to bring in conflict the right to vote and the right of home rule.

Mr. Lincoln, upon an important occasion when the question of State rights came pointedly before him, declared:

> To maintain inviolate the rights of the States to order and control under the Constitution their own affairs by their own judgment exclusively is essential for the preservation of that balance of power on which our institutions rest.

This states the principle as all students of our Government understand it and have understood it from the beginning. We have not always lived up to the principle. Expediency, party interest, or party advantage, or selfish and ulterior motives, may often cause us to violate this tenet of free government, but no one misunderstands it.

The same principle has been stated with reference to this particular amendment by President Wilson when he declared, in 1917:

> I am tied to a conviction which I have had all my life that changes of this sort ought to be brought State by State. It is a deeply matured conviction on my part, and therefore I would be without excuse to my own constitutional principles if I lent my support to this very important movement for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Yes; this has been a conviction with all of us who believe in our form of government. Whatever the causes or the excuses for its abandonment, or for doing violence to it upon any particular occasion, in sober moments we go back to the belief that it is vital to our whole scheme and purpose, our whole framework and plan of government. For myself I utterly reject the doctrine that party expediency can ever justify the breaking down of such indispensable principles of free government. Perhaps it was something of this kind that Washington was thinking of when in his Farewell Address he warned against party divisions.

No one can be more interested in preserving home rule than the women of this country. The woman is naturally tied to her home not only physically, but spiritually, and from her home she must exert her influence upon public affairs, if at all. Not many of them will desire, and a still less number will have an opportunity, to take part in affairs at points widely separated from their homes and their families. The nearer you can bring the processes of government to the home the more closely you can associate affairs with the daily life of the woman who holds the ballot, the more serviceable you will make the ballot after she secures it. She will come to realize, if she does not now, that any act of Congress which has a tendency to remove government from local influence is so greatly to her disadvantage that it will practically overcome the advantage of the ballot. The great body of the women of this country, upon reflection, will not approve of destroying home rule.

But there is another question, which I will refer to only very briefly, and that is the question of policy.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Before the Senator takes up the next topic may I ask him whether he voted for the amendment prohibiting the use of alcoholic liquors in the United States after the 1st of next January?

Mr. BORAH. I did.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, I am rather curious to know how the Senator can differentiate between his action on that occasion and his contemplated action on this.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I voted for the constitutional amendment providing for national prohibition. I might answer the Senator's question by a simple statement to the effect that, even assuming I was in error in that instance, there would be no justification for my being in error the second time. If I violated the rule of local self-government by voting for that amendment, that is positively no reason why I should continue in my course of error, and I would have just as much right to vote against this as if I had been correct in that instance. But there is a wide difference, indeed, between the two propositions. In the first place, the national prohibition amendment infringed the right of local self-government only to a very limited degree. It was impossible under the Constitution as it stood for the States to settle exclusively with the question of prohibition. Although the people of the State might wish to have prohibition, under the commerce clause of the Constitution it was within the power of the people outside of the State to prevent it. They could ship liquor into the State and could demoralize the entire situation under the commerce clause. In other words, already under the commerce clause the liquor traffic was very largely within the control of the National Government. The fight for national prohibition by national amendment began by reason of this situation. I know, so far as I am concerned, that I was led to support the proposition in the first instance because witnessing the conditions in my own State I found that Idaho could not have prohibition of its own individual action. I therefore became committed to the principle of national prohibition through constitutional amendment—not for the purpose of destroying local self-government but really in aid of it. There was no other way by which a State could be dry.

It is true that after the campaign for the national prohibition amendment began, what is known as the Webb-Kenyon law and the Reed amendment were adopted, which helped the situation very much. But the Webb-Kenyon law was for a long time in doubt, and is even yet in doubt in the minds of a great many able lawyers in this country. The Supreme Court has sustained it. Whether it would in time modify that decision or not is a different question. We had had prohibition in the State of Idaho in so far as we could have it by action of the people of the State. But liquor was shipped into the State under the commerce clause of the Constitution, and we were therefore at the

mercy of the National Government. I conceive that to be a wholly different situation to that of suffrage, where each State may act for itself and the National Government does not undertake to interfere. In other words, if any State in the Union wants woman suffrage it can have it, and the people on the outside can not in any way change the situation. If the States could have settled the question solely and alone by their own action I do not believe I should have ever consented to cast my vote for action upon the part of the Government in regard to prohibition.

It should be remembered also that the Webb-Kenyon law and the Reed law were national enactments; that in all these instances we were dealing with the matter from a national standpoint. Indeed, the liquor traffic had become a national enterprise carried on upon a national scale in utter disregard of the State lines. This condition justified a treatment of the matter in its entirety from the national standpoint.

I was going to refer, Mr. President, to another question, and that is the question of policy. I am not going to enter upon any defense of the South. The South needs no defense from me. She has her able and loyal Senators here who will wisely guard her interests. But as a part of our common country I am bound to consider her interests the same as I would that of my own great West. We are all influenced more or less by our local surroundings, and no man rises wholly above his environments. But in the great questions which affect the Nation as a whole I propose to consider the Nation as a whole. The South has had her heavy burden to carry. I do not propose to add unnecessarily to the weight of that burden. If I were wise enough I would help to lift it. I am sure that feeling is shared by all upon this side of the Chamber. If so, shall we go recklessly forward and thrust upon her a condition for which she is not prepared? Is that the way to maintain unity—to preserve national good feeling and to make us as a Nation strong? Is that a wise policy for a people so widely separated in territory and so diverse in local environment? No; that way lies dissension and dissatisfaction, and if pushed to extreme, disintegration and national weakness.

To impose upon the Southern States a rule for local affairs for which they are not prepared and which they do not want, simply because we have the voting power to do so, is Prussianism, while to give to them the right and privilege of settling these matters in their respective States according to their interests and as they see fit and in harmony with the views of their own people is democracy—American democracy. It is not the name which tests, defines, and distinguishes justice from injustice; it is the quality of the deed. Tyranny and force in the name of democracy are tyranny and force still. Utter disregard of the local conditions and local interests of a people, the compelling them to conform to laws which do not fit their situation, is the most sterilizing and discouraging form of modern tyranny. Shall we give of our treasure and shed our blood that Serbia and Rumania may have local government and deny it to Georgia and Alabama? When the people of Idaho and Wyoming impose their will upon a people 3,000 miles away, living under conditions of which the people of Idaho and Wyoming know but little, how shall you distinguish that from the Magyars, the imperious and conscienceless Magyars, imposing their will upon Bosnia and Herzegovina?

I want to ask my friends upon the other side of the Chamber, if this amendment is passed, do you propose to go home to your people and say, "We now have the fifteenth amendment, which inhibits discrimination on account of race or color, and the eighteenth amendment, which inhibits discrimination because of sex, and the power under each amendment in Congress to enforce the rule, and we propose to see these guaranties of the Constitution of the United States faithfully carried out? Does anybody suppose that this amendment is anything but a white amendment, unless party exigency leads to a different rule? On the other hand, let me ask my friends upon this side of the Chamber, when this guaranty is written into the Constitution, which gives to from two and one-half to three million Negro women the right to vote in the South and gives you the power to see that the provision is carried out, do the men upon this side of the Chamber propose to see that that is done? Do you propose to put the South under Federal control as to elections? If you do, you will have a great task, which you seem lightly to contemplate.

I should like to have somebody rise and answer me here and now, and tell me whether or not this which we are writing into the Constitution is not a solemn lie. Nobody intends that the two and a half million Negro women of the South shall vote, unless, as I say, party expediency compels action for the sheer purpose of party advantage.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. There is nothing in this proposed amendment that provides that they shall vote. All that this amendment provides for is that they shall not be prevented from voting on account of sex.

Mr. BORAH. Precisely; that is the suggestion I would expect. The fifteenth amendment provides that there be no discrimination as to color. For forty-odd years it has been there. It is a dead letter, as dead as if it were written in the private memorandum of the exiled Kaiser of Germany. It has been dead because the South could not submit to domination by the colored race and the North realized the task of enforcing it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understood the Senator from Idaho to say that the fifteenth amendment provided that there should be no discrimination on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And that that amendment has been a dead letter in the South. My own State has been held up to the world as the chief offender in that respect. I wish to ask the Senator if he can find in the laws or the constitution of the State of Mississippi, or in their administration, one single thing which is a discrimination on account of race or color or previous condition of servitude, and I wish to ask him if he is not acquainted with the fact that in the case of the State of Mississippi versus Williams the Supreme Court of the United States decided that nothing at all in any of the provisions of the Mississippi constitution, or the laws enforcing them, constituted any violation of the fifteenth amendment?

If the Senator will pardon me one moment, I am with him in his opposition to this measure.

Mr. BORAH. Why?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the fifteenth amendment is a mistake, and I think this is a mistake.

Mr. BORAH. Why?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think it is a mistake, because the entire people of the United States are called upon to say what shall be the political constitution of a State, to say what shall be its political structure; and that is where the Senator from Colorado was altogether wrong in the question which he propounded to the Senator from Idaho. The prohibition amendment does not affect the political structure, the life and political soul, of a State, and a State ought to be allowed to take care of its own soul without the interference of people of other States. But I rose for the purpose of denying that there is one word or jot or tittle of violation of the fifteenth amendment in the consitution of the State of Mississippi, and to quote the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States agrees with me in that opinion.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. One word.

Mr. BORAH. Let me have a word, and then the Senator can go ahead with the rest of his speech.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. BORAH. I realize that the State of Mississippi escaped the condemnation of the Supreme Court of the United States, but, nevertheless, the Negro does not vote in Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. He does not when disqualified.

Mr. BORAH. No; and disqualification is adjusted to the situation of the colored man.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And he does not for several reasons: First, because a part of them are disqualified because they do not come under the educational qualification; a part of them are disqualified because they do not pay their taxes; a part of them are disqualified because they have been convicted of felonies or misdemeanors involving moral turpitude, and that is all; and every white man is disqualified for the same reasons wherever the same reasons apply.

It is true that we took advantage of the fact that we knew there would be nine Negroes to one white man disqualified for these reasons, but not one of them is a disqualification "on account of race, or color, or previous condition of servitude." They are on account of the disqualifications themselves. Now, they may be made to apply to the Negro women, but thus far there is no law to make them applicable; and the Senator is exactly right in saying that every State in this Union ought to be left to take care of its own political soul. That is a different thing from a mere police regulation like that as to selling

liquor. This goes to the very substance, it goes to the very life of the people.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I only wanted to say that which I think I did say—that it makes no difference how the juggling takes place; the result is that the Negro does not vote because he is black. That is the only crime which he has committed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The white man does not vote in Mississippi under the same conditions.

Mr. BORAH. Oh, the white man votes because you are careful to apply tests which do not apply to the white man. You pick out those tests which exclude the Negro and write them into your law, and that excludes the Negro. Take the case which came up in Oklahoma only a short time ago, the "grandfather" clause of the constitution of Oklahoma. The Supreme Court of the United States held that that was in violation of the Constitution of the United States, and that it was enacted for the purpose of preventing the colored man from voting.

Now, I am not discussing at this time the question as to whether or not the South could submit to the domination of the inferior race. I am not discussing the justification of what you have done. We would do the same thing in the North if the situation was the same. That is not the proposition. I am saying that you do not do so, and the Senator from Mississippi will agree with me that you never intend to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, I agree, cordially. We never intend to do it if we can lawfully and constitutionally prevent it.

Mr. BORAH. No; but, on the other hand, Mr. President, the North takes no interest in the enforcement of the fifteenth amendment. I believe there was an effort a time or two, but it amounted to nothing.

Why, Mr. President, we sometimes talk about the difference in the treatment of the Negro in the South and the North. Mr. Taft, in an article a few days ago upon this subject, said that the emigration of the Negro to the North would compel the southern men to treat him better and to give him better consideration, and that that would go far toward solving the race question. The case is not so simple. Did not Mr. Taft know when those Negroes he was talking about emigrating to the North reached the State of Illinois—the soil made sacred by the ashes of the martyr, the man who emancipated the Negro—the northerner decimated them, massacred them because they would have earned their bread in the sweat of their brow? You can not settle the race question or the Negro question by enacting laws here in the Congress. Neither upon my side of the Chamber nor upon your side of the Chamber do you expect this guaranty to be anything but a dead letter when it is passed. Others may do as they think best, but when I am called upon to write into the Constitution of the United States a solemn guaranty, I propose to be prepared to see that it is enforced; and that is the reason why, when this white amendment was presented, I voted to make it a white amendment, because that is what it will be.

I have said that this amendment would not be enforced unless party expediency demanded a different course. The fifteenth amendment was passed as a matter of party expediency, and the only efforts that have ever been made to enforce it arose out of party necessity. It will be remembered when the fifteenth amendment was first brought forward Thaddeus Stevens, leader of the House, was opposed to it for the very reason that it infringed upon the rights of the States; but afterwards he yielded, because, as he frankly declared, he thought that it was necessary in order to maintain the Republican Party in power. It may be that at some time when some of the States seem to be drifting permanently away from the Republican Party it will seek to recoup by taking control of some of the southern or border States, thus making it necessary for the Federal Government to take control of the elections. But if this constitutional amendment depends for its execution not upon the inherent justice of the amendment itself but upon mere party expediency, it will be a disturbing and a vicious provision and will serve neither the white people nor the colored people. To be entirely frank, I do not think we ought to force this situation. I believe that the wiser and the better solution of the race question runs along different lines. I certainly want to see the Negro secure justice, but I realize, and every sane man realizes, that you can not force colored rule upon the South. It will bring renewed racial warfare, which in the end will be vastly more injurious to the colored race than to the white race, and heaven knows it would be bad enough for either. I think it infinitely better that we leave the situation to be dealt with through the several States than to undertake to force a rule which is not acceptable.

I regard the race question as the Nemesis of American life. I sympathize deeply with the people upon whom falls most heavily the burden of solving it. Sphinxlike, inscrutable, and intractable it intrudes itself at every national feast and jubilee. There is no phase of national life, no outlook but is colored by the sinister shadow of this problem. We of the North can afford to take counsel upon this matter. We can afford to listen to the requests of our southern friends. We ourselves are not without fault. As I have just said, look at East St. Louis—within the grand old Commonwealth whose soil holds the sacred ashes of the emancipator, the man who gave the Negro his freedom. Talk about enfranchising 3,000,000 Negro women, of widening the political power of the Negro of the South, when we massacre him, shoot him down like a dog, burn him as we would inanimate rubbish merely because he appears in our midst as a laborer. We will not even endure him as a competitor in the field of industry. Let us see if we can not first do justice to this ward of ours, this race among us by no volition of his own, this race which sheds its blood for the Republic when the Republic is in peril. eLt us, I say, first do justice to the Negro in the industrial world that he may educate and train his children for the duties of citizenship, then we shall be much nearer a final solution of the race question.

But, Mr. President, I come back to the point from which I started—the right of local self-government, of home rule, an illusion when you take from the States the control of suffrage. I would not for any ordinary cause, for any transient or passing circumstances, place anything in the way of woman to vote. But this principle is fundamental; without its preservation the right to vote in time will be fruitless—yes; I go further, and say that without its preservation our form of government must ultimately fail. It is the source of character in citizenship, the fountain from which is fed the moral and intellectual life of all those who must carry on in the great and ever-increasing burdens of the Republic. I want the principle of democracy extended as far as possible. I know I am a believer in woman suffrage, but I would be blind to every page of printed history, from the experiment at Athens to this hour, if I did not know, and I would be recreant to my belief if I did not declare, that without the principle of local self-government democracy is a sham—aye, a deluding and debauching lie. The two great rights, the right to vote and the right of local self-government, of home rule, are the very pillars of sound and wholesome free government. They are not in conflict. They are not at war with each other. They should not be brought into conflict. They should go hand in hand. The friends of republican institutions should not consent that one shall destroy the other.

Is it our purpose, our conscious and deliberate purpose, to remove the last vestige of this great principle which it took the human family 2,000 years to discover and infinite suffering and sacrifice to establish as a workable principle in government? Do we propose to tear away and obliterate the very foundation stones upon which rests the integrity of the States? Do we propose, as serious men intrusted for a brief season with great responsibility and with fearful power for good or evil, to disregard the teachings of Hamilton and Marshall, of Jefferson and Monroe, of Jackson and Lincoln? De we propose to break down the lines which separate the States and compound the American people into one mass, all to be directed and governed from Washington? Do we intend to enact again upon this western continent the tragedy of Rome—the fearful, destructive, consuming tragedy of centralization which destroyed that nation? If so, are we fully advised of the consequences? Have we measured the step we are about to take, or are we simply moral delinquents fleeing before a revolution? Are we prepared to take the responsibility of such a course and to receive the final judgment of posterity? I recognize change as the law of life. I understand fully that a government without the power of change is without the means of life. But when a principle long fought for, long sacrificed for, comes at last to be established, and after more than a century of experience has proven itself to be wise and just, it seems intolerable, it seems a challenge to reason and a defiance of the first principles of human progress to disown and disregard it. Especially does it seem so when the thing we are seeking to accomplish can be achieved without such sacreligious iconoclasm.

I am told, I have been told over and over again, that we have outgrown these things and outlived the principles so dear and which seemed so vital to the fathers. We are informed that another age has come and we are moving forward under new duties and in accordance with the great law of change. But this principle of local self-government, of home rule, is not old; it is not and never can be antiquated. It is not one of those principles of government born of expediency and which passes away with time. You had just as well tell me that free government is old and out of date; that liberty is obsolete; that good citizenship is antiquated, as to tell me that this principle is no longer of sufficient moment to be preserved and vigilantly guarded. Like good citizenship which it helps us to build, it is

just as imperative now as it was a century ago. It will only grow old and worthless when liberty and free government are rejected and disowned of men. It was the denial of this great principle that contributed so much to the bringing on of this war. It was the belief that it was to be vouchsafed to millions of people that helped to lighten its burden and assuage its sorrows. It will be the failure to grant the principle to those who are asking for it that will leave the world fallow for war again. But while this principle is recognized everywhere else, while millions have fought and suffered and sacrificed for it, step by step we are rapidly moving away from it; with an indifference incredible to every reflecting man we are about to abandon it. Not the stone which the builders rejected, but the stone which the builders put in and without which the temple could not have been reared we would tear away. They, the wisest in statecraft that the living God ever permitted to assemble for a common task, declared we will incorporate in this new scheme local government for local affairs, national government for national affairs; and I can not get my consent to destroy both or either. I have no reverence for things because they are old. I have no superstition for precedents. But I have a conviction which amounts to a religion that this Republic can exist only and alone upon the underlying principles upon which it was built.

Mr. President, the historian has told us that the halo of power played with peculiar brilliancy around the brow of the elder Napoleon the night he first wore the crown of emperor. But to the more thoughtful minds who looked upon the emperor as the salvation of France there was just appreciation also, even a more substantial glory perhaps for the common soldier, who, standing guard, protected the body of the emperor from the bullets and poisoned scimiter of the Bourbons. In these days of great moment when we are called upon to exercise vast and unusual powers, in these extraordinary times when the most stupendous problems that can vex and torment the minds of men engage our attention, and the most exalted energies of the Republic are being exerted, let us not forget that, after all, the life of this Government, the perpetuity of these institutions, depend upon the constant presence in the affairs of government of the average citizen from the common walks of life. Without his initiative, his self-reliance, his sturdy strength of mind, and his unswerving purpose, we can not succeed. Let us therefore never surrender the means by which he exerts this influence, the processes by which he is brought in contact with the Government and by which the Government is brought close to him. Without home rule, without local self-government, the average citizen soon ceases to be a law-abiding citizen and becomes an irresponsible factionist or revolutionist. These are his heritages, these are the things which make this Government his Government, and when we surrender them we signify our willingness to exclude him from the affairs of the Republic.

Therefore, viewing this matter as I do as involving a great and vital principle of government, much as I dislike to vote against the wishes of so many of the people of my State, I can not get my consent to record my conviction in favor of further destroying the fundamental principles upon which this Republic is established and without which it can not long endure.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I did not intend to discuss this joint resolution, as I am anxious, with others, for an early vote; but the argument of the distinguished Senator from Idaho has taken such a trend that I feel called upon to speak very briefly upon it, because there was a time when I held views very similar to those which he has just expressed, but which I was compelled to abandon if I would be consistent with the principles of popular government that I have long advocated.

Let me say in this connection, Mr. President, that I know of no man who has been more zealous or influential in advocating popular government throughout the land than the distinguished Senator from Idaho, and knowing that to be so, I have been very greatly surprised at some of the things which he has said in the speech which he has just concluded.

Before discussing that matter, Mr. President, I want to make just one brief reference to the minor objection that he makes as to the guaranty that is embodied in this joint resolution which he says the Congress never intends to carry out, because the guaranty contained in the fifteenth amendment has been ignored and abandoned.

The Senator knows full well that the fifteenth amendment embodied the color question, and the Senator knows just as well that there is no color question at all embodied in this amendment. It relates only to sex. There is no one in the South who will attempt to differentiate between a black man and a black woman; and if there were, either in the South or in the North, Congress would not hesitate to enforce the terms of this constitutional amendment, because that peculiar Negro problem would not be involved in it at all. I am not going to discuss at this time at any length the merits of the fifteenth amendment or the failure of Congress properly to enforce it.

Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho takes the position, carried to its logical extent, that if there be 33 United States Senators who believe that a proposed alteration of the Constitution of the United States is not for the best interests of the people of the United States, notwithstanding all of the other people of the United States may be in favor of it, it is the duty of those 33 Senators to prevent the people of this Republic from securing such alteration of their Government as they desire.

Mr. President, I can conceive of no more dangerous attack upon popular government than such a theory as that. Why, especially during the past year or two, there is not one of us upon this floor this afternoon who has not said, in hundreds of speeches, that under our form of government the people have the right in an orderly way, through the means provided by the Constitution, to secure such alterations in the form of their government as they desire, and that in this Republic, whatever may be said of other lands, there is not the slightest excuse for the presence of the anarchist or the man who advocates "direct action"; and yet the Senator's argument is that if 33 Senators believe that an alteration in our Constitution is not for the best interests of the country, public opinion, however settled, however deliberately formed, shall be flaunted and cast aside.

Mr. President, because I believe in popular government, because I believe in the right of the people to rule, because I believe in their right to secure any amendment to the Constitution that they desire if they go about it in an orderly way by using the methods provided by the Constitution, I can not subscribe for a moment to the theories or the arguments advanced by the Senator from Idaho; and in this connection it might not be out of place to read just a paragraph from the Declaration of Independence:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

I believe that is good doctrine to-day, Mr. President, and I believe that when the people of the United States form deliberately a judgment as to an amendment or change in the Constitution it is our duty to permit them, in the form provided by the Constitution, to act upon it.

The Senator from Idaho talks about Prussianism, about three-fourths of the States being able to enforce their will upon one-fourth of the States that may be unwilling. But the Senator forgets that in this Constitution, to which we are now proposing an amendment, express provision is made for amendment, and when ratified by three-fourths of the States after having been adopted by two-thirds of the Congress, it becomes a part of the Constitution, and is as much a part of the Constitution of the United States as are any of the other provisions.

Prussianism? There can be no Prussianism in according to the people of the United States the right to secure such alterations in their government as they desire to secure. Prussianism is a thing upon the side of the Senator from Idaho in the argument he makes. Prussianism, indeed, it would be if 32 Senators against the will of the people of the country should, because they thought they were wiser than all the people, denied to them the right to secure such alterations in the Constitution as they desire.

Mr. BORAH. I doubt if there is very much difference of opinion between the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Idaho with reference to fundamental matters. He makes use of the word "people" as against 33 Senators who may have the view that this ought not to be submitted. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin when the people are going to get a chance at this amendment? Will the Senator from Wisconsin vote for an amendment providing that before this constitutional amendment shall be made a part of the Constitution it shall be ratified by popular vote in each State of the Union?

Mr. LENROOT. Does the Senator ask me that question?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator will say that we have no power to attach such a condition to the amendment. The Constitution itself provides how it shall be ratified, and there is no other means that can be provided. But I will say to the Senator from Idaho that I will gladly vote for the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] a day or two ago providing for a popular vote upon all constitutional amendments.

Mr. BORAH. Will the Senator agree to an amendment which will provide for the election of delegates to popular conventions to ratify it? That is, of course, what I meant when I spoke of a popular vote.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator will say with reference to that, no; and for this reason: There are only two or three legislatures now in session. Before the great mass of the legislatures will have an opportunity to vote upon ratification they will have been elected by the people, and there is no occasion for holding two elections for that purpose.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, they just had an election in Texas upon this question, where the people were permitted to vote. There are about 800,000 voters in Texas. Two hundred and fifty thousand of them voted, and about 110,000 of them voted for woman suffrage. When the legislature meets in Texas the legislature can ratify this amendment without any expression from the popular will at all, and yet according to the present status of popular sentiment in Texas it is overwhelmingly against suffrage. I think there have been two votes on woman suffrage in the State of Iowa, where the majority rule obtains. In both instances it has been voted down. The majority of votes which have been cast against suffrage in this country in different States is something over a million, as against a majority of about 254,000 in the States where it has obtained. The popular vote as a whole has been against suffrage. It is not the intention under this provision to have a popular vote upon this matter. That could be accomplished by a convention to ratify, but that will be rejected. The women who have been playing politics around the city of Washington for the last five or six years have learned their lessons well.

They much prefer to reason with the Members of Congress and to reason with the members of legislatures than to undertake to control the citizen's vote when he enters into the secrecy of the voting booth.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And they do not want it left to any State convention.

Mr. BORAH. We are more amenable to sweet reason than those who are in the voting booths. It is not intended that the people of whom the able Senator speaks are to be permitted to pass upon this question at all.

So far as the right of 33 Senators to hold up an amendment is concerned, the fathers provided that when two-thirds of the Senators and Representatives determined to submit an amendment it should be submitted. I assume that was intended to call forth the deliberate judgment and conviction of each Member of Congress as to whether or not it was wise to submit that particular amendment. Otherwise they would have said that when a certain number of petitioners came up from the people, it should be submitted. But the fathers so arranged that the judgment of the Senators and Representatives should be had upon the question, and I am exercising my judgment under the Constitution. I do not believe I would be performing my duty to vote for the submission of an amendment which I think ought not to be adopted.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BORAH. In just a moment. If it could be provided in this amendment that the amendment should be ratified by conventions elected by a popular vote it would go far toward ameliorating my opposition to the amendment. In fact, I think I may say that if the Senator will assist me in putting into this amendment the provision that it shall be ratified by conventions selected by popular vote I will withdraw my objection. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the Senator differentiate at all between a Senator exercising his judgment as to the merits of a proposition and exercising his judgment as to whether the people of the country desire an alteration in the form of government, and therefore it becomes his duty to support it?

Mr. BORAH. The Senator again lays stress upon the people. As I said a moment ago, if the Senator will provide me with a method by which the people can express themselves on this question, I will withdraw my objection to the amendment. I do not believe the people want to provide for suffrage in this way; the fact is, those who are advocating it are not willing to leave it to a vote of the people; that is precisely what they are seeking to avoid. I am willing to take the people's vote, but I am not willing to accept the legislatures' as a vote of the people.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to say in reply that the States did not make the Constitution. The people made the Constitution and provided how amendments to it should be proposed and ratified.

Mr. BORAH. The Constitution provides two ways. The framers undoubtedly believed that there might come a time when it would be desirable to have a more direct voice of the people, so they provided ratification by legislature and ratification by convention. It has been a long time since the people have had a say about it. Let us give them an opportunity to have a say and provide a convention elected by the people.

Mr. LENROOT. The people will have exactly the same kind of say in the legislatures to be elected next year that they have on any question, some of them, I think the Senator will admit, even more important than this question.

Mr. BORAH. I understand; in other words, the Senator is not willing to have a convention?

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly not.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator knows if a convention is held the delegates will be elected upon that issue alone, and there would be no other question involved. The thousand questions which enter into an election of a legislature, the question of partisanship, the division of parties in the State, and so forth, would subordinate the suffrage question until perhaps it would not be considered at all in the question of the election; but if a convention were held and that were the reason for adopting the convention alternative, the people have but one issue before them and that is the ratification of the amendment. In that way a vote of the people could be had.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to ask the Senator whether he urged a constitutional convention to ratify the amendment proposing the election of Senators by direct vote, and if not why not, if his position now is well taken.

Mr. BORAH. I do not recall that that question was ever raised. I certainly should not have been afraid of the popular vote in that instance.

Mr. LENROOT. But the Senator could have raised it upon that matter as well as upon this.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator has raised a question here that the people are arrayed against these 33 Senators, but I see that the Senator is not willing that the people should have a voice in this question, because this suffrage matter has been defeated over and over again in the States by majority votes. I am led to urge a convention because of the argument of the Senator that the people will settle this. I say the people will not in any true sense, if ratification by the legislatures is had.

Mr. LENROOT. I take it that my own State of Wisconsin is one by which the Senator makes up that majority. It is true that some years ago the suffrage amendment was defeated by a very large majority in the State of Wisconsin—if I recollect rightly, by nearly 100,000 majority, and yet in the last campaign both the great parties declared for it in their State platforms.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly, just as a distinguished Senator on the other side of the Senate told me a day or two ago that all the people of his State were against it, and all the politicians in both parties were in favor of it.

The Senator says that no one has been a more arden advocate of popular government than the Senator from Idaho. I desire the Senator to understand that my conception of popular government is that there is no such thing as popular government unless the people are permitted to control their local affairs. If home rule or matters which concern communities in their several localities are brought here to Washington and settled by the Congress of the United States, it is the most deadly method by which we could possibly attack popular government.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the Senator think we have attacked popular government in the wet States in the prohibition amendment?

Mr. BORAH. In a measure; yes. As I said a few moments ago, if the State of Idaho, for instance, could have voted dry and have been protected as against the National Government there would have been no reason in the world for the adoption of the national amendment.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the Senator think that prohibition is more important than popular government?

Mr. BORAH. I do not think it is; but the National Constitution has provided, and it was not within our power nor would it have been wise to repeal the commerce clause of the Constitution. The prohibition amendment was necessary in that instance to enable the States to have what they wanted. Now, I want to be frank. If the Webb-Kenyon law and the Reed amendment could have been relied upon as standing the final test of the courts or the test against repeal, I should not have felt that prohibition was justified. But for 40 years States had been voting dry and yet could not be dry, because under the commerce clause the liquor could be shipped in. That led me and others to support the amendment. If a State could adopt suffrage, and yet the National Government could interfere and prevent its enjoying suffrage, then I would vote for this amendment. But a State may have suffrage or may reject it, and no power may say nay. I see a wide difference.

Mr. WATSON. Did not the Webb-Kenyon law protect the people of Idaho in their choice on the temperance question?

Mr. BORAH. It did; but, as I said a few moments ago, the constitutionality of that law was disputed by some of the ablest lawyers in the Senate at the time it was passed, and at the time the constitutional provision was first advocated by those who were urging it. It is true that before the amendment was finally submitted that the Webb-Kenyon law had been upheld. At least, that is my recollection. But some of the ablest lawyers in this country still contend that decision was unsound and will ultimately be modified or overruled. I have no doubt at all but what if the Webb-Kenyon law and the Reed law had been sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States before the campaign had committed the country to prohibition even the advocates of prohibition would not have been in favor of the national amendment. The advocates of prohibition were driven to it by reason of the fact that States like Maine, or other prohibition States, which had been prohibition or dry for years, were supplied with liquor under the protection of the national law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In aid of State rights?

Mr. BORAH. Yes. It was for that reason that the States were not permitted to settle the question and that the prohibitionists of the country were driven to protect themselves by a national amendment. Local self-government was denied to the States already by virtue of the commerce clause and especially by its abuse. I have never felt under the circumstances that I was untrue to this principle, in which I devoutly believe. But if I erred in that instance, I have repented, and I do not propose under any pressure that may be exercised to err again. And there has been some pressure.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, we have heard it repeatedly said that this and other amendments to the Constitution should be ratified or submitted because there is a popular judgment in their favor. Of course, I recognize if I were to propose an amendment to the pending resolution to submit the resolution to popular vote in the States, it would immediately be said that the purpose of the amendment was to defeat the resolution, because there is no such method of submission provided in the Constitution of the United States; and that might properly be said. But the Constitution does provide a method that is analogous to a popular vote, just as close to a popular vote as the election of a President of the United States is by a popular vote.

In the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of a President, an electoral college was provided, in which the electorate selects certain men to cast their vote in the electoral college for their choice for President. I do not suppose there is a man or woman in the United States who really differentiates between the election of a President by the electoral college and a direct election of a President by the people of the United States, except in so far as representation in the electoral college limits the right of suffrage or the power of the people of each individual State to act. Otherwise, the election of a President of the United States is directly by the people.

The Constitution provides a method that never has been exercised in the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution, and that is to authorize the Congress to submit amendments to the Constitution to conventions called for the purpose of ratification and for no other purpose. We hear the appeal resounding through this Chamber that the people of the United States have a sovereign right to pass on this question. I am no prophet nor am I the son of a prophet, but I am willing to stand here and prophesy that a most pronounced vote in this Chamber against an opportunity for the people of the United States to pass judgment on a proposed amendment to the Constitution will be cast by those who have cried the loudest that the people of the United States should have the opportunity given them. But to give those Senators a chance to voice their sentiments I propose the following amendment to the pending resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 6, strike out the words "the legislatures of" and in lieu thereof insert the words "conventions in," so that the paragraph will read:

Resolved, etc., That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the several States.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The language of the Constitution is familiar to the Members of this body, but in order that it may appear in the RECORD I will read Article V of the Constitution of the United States, which says:

The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress: *Provided*, That no amendment which may be made prior to the year 1808 shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article, and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

It does not take a revolutionary method to accomplish this result. The opportunity has been here from the beginning. There is not a Senator in this Chamber who does not know that if this amendment is adopted to the pending resolution conventions will be called in each of the several States for the purpose of deciding whether or not the woman-suffrage amendment shall become the supreme law of the land.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit an interruption——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator in the beginning of his able speech stated that a convention for ratification of constitutional amendments had never been resorted to. Let me call the attention of the Senator to the Corwin amendment, submitted by Congress March 3, 1861, and which is still pending, by the way. It was ratified by the legislatures of two States, Maryland and Ohio, and the State of Illinois in 1862 called a convention and delegates were elected upon the specific question as to whether or not they would ratify the so-called Corwin amendment, and the convention was held, which ratified or attempted to ratify that proposed amendment. For myself I do not believe that particular convention was of any efficacy, because the amendment was not submitted to conventions, but there was a convention called to consider the amendment in that form.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I thank the Senator for his contribution to the history of the matter, but what I referred to was that the Congress of the United States had never submitted an amendment to conventions for ratification.

Mr. ASHURST. That is quite true.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Congress must select one or the other method. I do not believe if we referred this amendment to the legislatures of the several States for ratification, a State could call a convention to ratify it by that method. On the other hand, if we submit it to conventions of the several States, the action of the legislatures in reference to the matter would be null and void. Yet Congress in submitting an amendment must first determine by which method it proposes to have the process of ratification take place.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FALL. If the Senator's amendment were adopted, would the Senator then think it necessary for Congress to enact legislation to carry it out or would it be self-operating?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think myself it would be self-operating, but I believe the power would still rest in the Federal Government, if it desires to do so, to provide the method by which the conventions should be called.

Mr. FALL. In the event the Senator did not go further and follow his amendment, if adopted, by legislation, how would conventions be called?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They would be called by the several States.

Mr. FALL. But the constitutions generally of the several States provide how a constitutional amendment, for example, shall be adopted and how a convention shall be called.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; for an amendment to a State constitution, but not for an amendment to the Federal Constitution.

Mr. FALL. No; and they are silent upon it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. FALL. Therefore, you are up against exactly the reason why Congress has never submitted an amendment for approval by conventions.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No one knows better than the Senator who has just addressed me that because the State constitutions are silent the legislatures of the several States have full power to act in the matter.

Mr. FALL. Under the contention of the Senator from Alabama it would be necessary, if any amendment is adopted, for the legislatures then to meet and pass upon the proposition as to whether or not they would call a convention and provide for a method of calling it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not at all.

Mr. FALL. How would it be done, then?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It would be necessary for the legislatures to provide for the calling of a convention, provide the machinery for calling it, unless Congress itself, after the submis-

sion of the amendment, chose to provide the machinery for the conventions to meet.

Mr. FALL. Does the Senator think that State rights would not be violated if the Congress of the United States submitted an amendment to be passed upon by the State conventions and proceeded to say how a State convention should be called and to call it itself? Does the Senator think that would not be a violation of State rights?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am surprised that the able Senator from New Mexico should inject such an argument. I expect next for the Senator to charge me with being derelict to the principles I believe in, in local self-government, because at one time in my life I dared to bring before the Congress of the United States a revenue bill raising revenue for the Federal Government or, perchance, that I voted for a bill to raise an army. The Senator has not forgotten, but his argument would lead us to suppose he has forgotten, that there are certain delegated powers to the Federal Government that it has the right to exercise, and one of those delegated powers is the right to propose amendments to the Federal Constitution, and the power to propose them carries with it the incidents to see that the proposal is carried into effect. The Senator from New Mexico is too good a lawyer not to know that conclusion and to believe in it. But the Senator proposed to have a little fun with his colleague, and I understand his jokes.

Mr. FALL. No; if the Senator will permit me, the Senator has simply placed himself in the position I knew he would be compelled to occupy. In other words, if his amendment is adopted, then we proceed to fight over the question as to how he proposes to carry it into effect, as to how he proposes to submit it. You have to put all the machinery into operation, the machinery of the National Government into the different States, to call the very conventions which the Senator is now calling for.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, no; not at all. There is no doubt the Federal Government has the power to fix the time and place of the election of Senators or Representatives in Congress. For many years it failed to exercise that power and left it to the State laws and the State legislatures to exercise the power; but in its wisdom and judgment it finally concluded to pass a law and define the time when Members of Congress should be elected. Yet, if my memory serves me right, even as to that Federal law, providing for the election of Members of Congress and fixing the date on which all Members of Congress shall be elected throughout the United States, there is one State in the Union that continues to follow its old laws and elect its Members of Congress on a different date, and their places in the Congress have never been opposed or contested on that ground.

If you adopt this amendment, I do not hesitate to say that there is not a State in the Union whose legislature will not provide for a convention and hold the convention in proper form. The power to make quarantine regulations against disease coming from abroad rests with the Federal Government. As long as the National Government failed to act the courts sustained State quarantine laws, but when the Federal Government finally concluded to exercise its jurisdiction its laws superseded the laws passed by the States. In the failure of the Federal Government to act the States can act, and they will act. There is no necessity for any further legislation if this amendment is adopted, because we can safely leave it to the States to call conventions that are in favor of woman suffrage, and if they are not in favor of woman suffrage it would be futile to call the convention, because the assumption is they would not ratify it.

But Senators on this floor say the people are for it. If the people are for it in the several States, I think we can safely indulge the presumption that the people of those several States will provide conventions for its ratification. The only answer I make to the Senator in reference to the reserve power of the Federal Government in this matter is that I do not propose to admit the condition that neglecting exercising the Federal power, not the State power, the Federal Government does not lose the opportunity to act and protect itself.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Alabama will allow me, in the first place, I will say to the Senator that I have not made an argument either in favor of or against woman suffrage. I am simply trying to get at the legal conclusion that the Senator has undoubtedly reached in his own mind, I presume, prior to offering this amendment, as to what the status will be afterwards.

First, as I understand him to say—and I agree with him—the Congress of the United States may have the power to put in operation the machinery for calling these conventions. I believe he agrees to that?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do; Congress has the power; but I do not think it is necessary for it to exercise it.

Mr. FALL. But the Senator says that in the absence of that undoubtedly the States would call conventions, and that, therefore, there would be no necessity following his amendment for congressional legislation, as I understand?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Undoubtedly not.

Mr. FALL. The Senator has stated, I think—at least, that is what I have understood him to say—that the States must act through their legislatures in calling a convention.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I know of no other power of the States that could appropriate the money, call a convention, prescribe how many delegates there should be, and pay them their salaries. If there is in some State the power vested in the governor already—I know of no such condition, but it might be—then it would not require the action of the legislature.

Mr. FALL. I think there is no other power, as the Senator said awhile ago, to call a convention for the amendment of the State constitution; but I do not think that there is any provision in the constitution of any State in the Union for calling a convention to ratify an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Therefore, it would require legislation to be adopted at once by the State legislatures. Those of us who propose to vote for this amendment are proposing to submit it to that very State legislature. The Senator has said that if the legislature was not in favor of the amendment, possibly it would not call a convention; and that, if it were in favor of it, that it would call a convention. If it is in favor of it, it will ratify the amendment; and if it is not in favor of it, doubtless it will not. Meanwhile very much time and a great deal of money would be saved.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, we all congratulate ourselves that our friend, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, after declining to be a Member of this body, was sent back here to be our colleague; but I fear that the war and the fight on the political hustings have become so closely allied with the Senator that since he has gotten back to Washington he can not forget it. Like the mustard gas of the battle field, it clings to him even after he has left the field of combat.

Of course, if we are looking at this question purely from a political standpoint, of the swinging tides of political opinion, the Senator may say, and truthfully say, that this method might cause delay, or that it might cause inaction; but I offer the amendment to sustain the great principle for which men have been contending here for an hour or more, that the people of the several States have the right to determine this question; and, I take it, there is not a State in the Union that, whether it be in favor of or adverse to the adoption of this amendment, when its legislature met would not provide a method by which the people of the several States might exercise their voice in this matter.

Mr. FALL. Will the Senator yield to me for a statement?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. FALL. The Senator has said that he is afraid that I came back here somewhat excited.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not excited; the Senator from New Mexico never gets excited.

Mr. FALL. However, that I returned at least yet influenced by the war which we have been through and by the political war in which I have just been engaged. I simply want to say to the Senator that my age precluded my entering the war, and that during the last political campaign I did not leave my ranch home and made no speech and no appeal whatsoever for votes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I did not refer to the Senator's personality.

Mr. FALL. No; I understand that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I was referring to the atmosphere of a political campaign.

Mr. FALL. Well, in so far as the atmosphere of politics is concerned, it did not reach Three Rivers, I am glad to say.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am always glad to have the Senator's interpretation of his own view.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Before the Senator from Alabama leaves this very interesting question which has been precipitated, I desire to inquire of him whether, if the Congress of the United States has the right to provide the machinery through which the various conventions in the several States shall be called, it also has the right, as a part of that legislation, to prescribe who shall vote for the delegates to the convention?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I do not think it has, for the right of suffrage, either for a Federal or a State election, is now fixed in a definite way by the Constitution of the United States and could only be changed by an amendment to that Constitution.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. To what provision of the Constitution of the United States does the Senator refer? The Constitution of the United States fixes the qualifications of the voters for Members of the House of Representatives, and that is all, so far as my recollection goes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is the clause to which I refer; but if that clause does not apply——

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It certainly does not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, of course, the Congress of the United States has no power; for this is a Government of delegated powers, and, as has been said by a very distinguished jurist in a decision some years ago in the Supreme Court of the United States, when you are asked whether the Government of the United States—the Federal Government—has a certain power, you must find that power defined in the Constitution; but when you are asked if a State has a power, you know that it has the power when you do not find it inhibited either by the Federal Constitution or the State constitution.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. So I understand; but I understand the Senator to say also that there is an implied power in the Congress of the United States to provide all the machinery by which the conventions are to be called and held.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, no; the Senator is inserting a few adjectives in my remarks that I did not place there. The Senator says that I stated that I could define all of the machinery. No; I did not say that. I said that the Federal Government would have the power to define the machinery for calling the convention as an incident to the power granted in the Constitution to propose amendments to it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly; but I inquire of the Senator where he draws the line? All the rest of the machinery, all the other provisions concerning the election, are to be prescribed by Congress, but Congress can not prescribe who shall vote at that election?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, no.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. How does the Senator draw that distinction?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not draw it. The Constitution draws it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly. That is what I am asking the Senator. What provision of the Constitution draws it?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. When the Constitution prescribes the terms and the qualifications of the electorate for Members of the House of Representatives and of the electors for President and now for Senators of the United States, and thereafter is silent, unquestionably the power of the Federal Congress, in reference to the electorate, is exhausted, except when it is revitalized or vitalized anew by an amendment to the Constitution. But the Senator from Montana knows even better than I do—for I yield to his premiership, so far as I am concerned, as a constitutional lawyer—that the courts of the land have always held that a grant of power to the Federal Government carries with it all of the incidents that are necessary to put that power into effect.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is just the point for which I am contending.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Surely, but it does not carry the incidents that are not necessary. It will be necessary, if this amendment is adopted, for some provision to be made as to the time and place and manner of holding conventions in the several States for the ratification or rejection of this amendment, but it is not necessary as an incident of that power at all to define who shall be the electors to vote for delegates to that convention, because the electorate is already provided for by the several States of the Union. I take it that the fathers who wrote this Constitution did not intend to do a futile thing when they provided for the holding of these conventions. They certainly did not propose that the qualification of the electors of the several States should be changed, but they assumed that, if these conventions were held, those who have the powers of the electorate in the several States to-day would select the delegates to this convention.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Just one more question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But the Senator will remember that different qualifications are prescribed in the various States for different elections. For instance, in my own State, for many years before we had woman suffrage, women could vote on certain subjects. So when the Constitution provided in relation to the election of the Members of the House of Representatives, it provided that any person who had the qualifications of an elector of the most numerous branch of the State legislature would have the qualifications of elector for Representative in Congress. But what are the qualifications prescribed in the various States for electors or delegates to a convention to ratify or reject a constitutional amendment? Are there any such?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, there is an electorate in all the States. There is an electorate, and also a limited electorate, in some States. I take it that when in any State a constitutional amendment is to be submitted to the electorate it means the general electorate and not the limited electorate. There is no real difficulty about this proposition.

I realize that this amendment may be embarrassing to some gentlemen who have contended that this resolution should pass, because the people of the United States have a right to have their voice reflected in the Constitution. I realize further that it is possible that many men have on the hustings promised their constituents or have pledged themselves to vote for the pending constitutional amendment, and they fear the criticism of those to whom they have rendered those pledges, unless they dot every "i" and cross every "t" in the submission of this amendment as originally prepared.

I never criticize my colleagues. I realize that there are abler men than myself representing the people of the United States in the Senate. There is only one thing that I claim for myself, and so long as I have the right to represent my State in the Senate I shall exercise that right independently of every man and of every woman. I conceive that it is my duty to retain unto myself the high privilege to represent what I believe the best interests of my people; to reflect their views in this Senate; and, whenever I think that the existence of the Government or the liberties of the people may be endangered, to change my viewpoint and exercise my own free will on all questions that may come before this body at all times.

I think one of the most unfortunate things that happen in a legislative body is the modern tendency of men to commit themselves on public questions before they come to the final day of submission in the legislative body, and therefore unthinkingly and ill-advisedly sometimes they shackle their hands so that in the end they find themselves in embarrassing situations. I think that if we could free this question from all considerations of that kind this great issue could well be submitted, not to the people of the whole of the United States but to the people of the several States in the manner and form where the final decree of the electorate could be registered without any other conflicting interest to carry the question away from the real principles involved.

I do not know that I can hope or expect the Senate at this late hour to modify the proposed constitutional amendment, but I do know that if we want to read this proposed amendment into the Constitution so that it will really receive the approval of the American people at heart, then we had better adopt the amendment I propose and give the people of the several States a free and full opportunity to act in this matter.

Other Senators know as well as I do that there are legislatures of the various States in session now which if this proposed amendment were submitted to them within this week, or within the month, would act on it, ratifying or rejecting it. Why should that power be taken away from the sovereign people of the States? Why should they not have a full and free opportunity to act? I know of no reason except that it might cause delay. Well, there will be delay before this proposed amendment to the Constitution is ratified, but if it is delayed long enough to give the electorate a full and fair opportunity to reflect their sentiments in the final law of the land it will be far more satisfactory to all concerned.

Now, I wish to say on the main question that I am not opposing the adoption of the proposed constitutional amendment giving the women of the United States a right to vote because they are women. There are far more disastrous powers to place in the hands of women than that of the exercise of the elective franchise. As a distinguished Senator said here this morning, in my study of this question I do not find that the high standards of the States that have given to women the right to vote for the past decade or two have been pulled down because the franchise has been granted to women; neither do I find, in my study of the question, that the States wherein women have had the right to vote for the last quarter of a century have risen above the standard of their sister States where men alone exercise the franchise. It is not from that standpoint that I view the issue. If the women of America were a separate people there might be some question as to whether their views are reflected in the Government, but the women of America are a part of the American people; they have certain votes in their family circle, and those votes, whatever they are, whether they be cast by father and son, or hereafter whether they be cast by mother and

daughter, will continue to reflect the sentiment of that family circle, whether it be for the good or the ill of the Nation. That is not the question about which I am concerned.

I hear men justify themselves in voting to submit an amendment to the Federal Constitution because they say the Constitution itself provides for its amendment, and therefore we are justified in proposing the amendment. That is an argument in a circle that continues to chase itself around the horizon without a place to alight. It is not the amendment of the Federal Constitution that is involved here; it is a great fundamental principle of government that we are considering to-day in the Senate. Yes, we can propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution provides for a President of the United States to serve for four years. We could submit an amendment to it providing that the tenure of the President shall be for life; aye, if the votes could be obtained, by constitutional amendment a king could be enthroned at the White House; but would you be justified in doing that because you had the power to do so? No man can justify himself in voting for this amendment because we have the power to submit it. The real question involved is the fundamental principle of government.

The great diversity throughout the United States of race, of climate, of geography, of business conditions, is such that, except for the great laws that are necessary for the Federal Government to enable it to uphold its strong arm, the central Government at Washington is incapable of making laws for all of the people of the United States. There is no more possibility of the Legislature of Alabama being able to make just laws for the people of Maine than there is for the people of Maine to make just laws for the people of Alabama. Not that the people of the two States are not akin; they are closely akin; in those two States they come primarily from the same original stock, without much influx of alien blood, and yet, living in two different communities, in two different sections of the United States, they think along different lines, they act along different lines, they live along different lines, and it would be impossible for the legislative body of one State to reflect into law the matured wishes of the people of the other State for a government that responded to the will of the people. That is true of the Federal Government. Our greatest differences upon the floor of the Senate grow out of geographical conditions. The interests and the wishes of our people are diversified, and because of that we clash here. The stronger succeeds, often to the material detriment of the weaker side.

So far as the exercise of the delegated powers of the Federal Government is concerned, the great powers of war and peace, the control of our foreign affairs, the collection of taxes at the customhouse for the support of the Government, all of these great questions we must intrust to the Federal Government at Washington; but when it comes to those powers of government which invade the family home and the fireside, that welcome the infant into life and carry old age to the cemetery, those laws of our intimate life and living, if we want just government, must be determined by the local people who live under them. That is the only way we can accomplish the desired result.

You may say that this proposed constitutional amendment does not tear down the superstructure of local self-government. It may not tear down the principle at one fell swoop of the ax, but each time the ax stroke cuts the block from the tree the superstructure is growing weaker at the root. This proposed amendment involves the real pyramid of local self-government, because whenever you destroy the power of the State to control its electorate the day is at hand when you destroy the State itself.

But more than that, you may say that this proposal only affects the electorate by adding voters to it. So might an amendment providing for universal suffrage, an amendment providing for suffrage of all ages, all conditions, all races, and all kinds of people only affect the electorate, but it is drawing that power that remained in the States, that reserved power, away from the States to that extent and placing it here in Washington for final determination. What effect does that have on the voter? The more you centralize that power in Washington the more you diminish the reflected power of the individual citizen of the Republic and of the States. If you had a plebiscite, and submitted your laws to the will of the electorate, to all the people of the United States, you might have 10,000,000 people voting at the election. If you submit them to the people of Alabama, you may have 100,000 or 150,000 people voting at the election. If you submit them to some smaller county in some State of the Union, you may only have an electorate of 1,000 people.

So far as the great powers of the Federal Government are concerned, of necessity they must be determined by the larger electorate; but when you come to the local questions of government, the questions that are in the home of every man and a part of his daily life, do you want those powers concentrated in the city of Washington, where the voter, the citizen, only reflects one part in ten million; or do you want him, as to local conditions, to reflect the voting strength of 100,000 or 200,000 people in the State? Or, if it comes down to a minor question in each county, do you want him to have his reflected strength in that electorate of one in a thousand or two thousand or five thousand people, instead of the ten million of which his vote is only a part, if the decisions in the last analysis be rendered in Washington?

Where are we going to stop on this downward road of popular government or this upbuilding of centralized power at the seat of the Federal Government? The proposal of this amendment not only works an injury in itself, but it reflects the injury in its method of submission. Until the time came when those seeking additional power for certain purposes commenced knocking at the door of the Congress to accomplish results, rather than working out their accomplishments through their own State legislatures, the question among the people of the several States of breaking down local self-government was far afield. But now that certain great interests have determined that they must work out their plans through the power of the Federal Government, we hear the orator on every stump denying the protection of the Constitution of the United States, some even going so far as to proclaim that it would be better for these people if we had no Constitution at all, overlooking the fact that the brutal will of a majority is a soviet government; that the brutal will of the leader of that body is anarchy; that the protection of our liberties and our rights grows out of the protection of law; that our freedom is not guaranteed by men, it is guaranteed by constitutional enactment; and where you tear down that Constitution for the purpose of writing the will of a brutal majority into the law of the land you destroy the minority. You need no protection, if you be in the majority, against the will of that majority, because that majority is your will; but who knows but perchance to-morrow you may find yourself in the minority? And when that hour comes, without a government of law, without a constitutional restriction for the protection of your life, your home, your property, or the integrity of your family itself, tell me whence the protection will come to you that you inherited from your fathers of old.

No, Mr. President, it is not a question to-day as to whether the women of America should have the right to vote. It is a question of whether, in the end, our Government shall live. It is a question as to whether the fundamental principles that are necessary for the life of this great Republic shall survive.

There can be no doubt in the mind of any man who has studied the fundamental question that when you destroy the principle of local self-government and center the powers of government under the dome of this Capitol, then the disintegration of this great Republic has begun and the hour of downfall is only a question of time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I understand there are several Senators who desire to be heard on this question, and it is not possible to get a vote on it to-night; and I understand that the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] desires to make a statement.

Mr. SMOOT. It will take just a few moments. I will say to the Senator that I also understand that an executive session is desired.

Mr. WATSON. As soon as the Senator from Utah shall have finished his statement I shall move for an executive session; and then, at the end of the executive session, I desire to say to the Senators present that I shall move a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock, and when we convene to-morrow I shall insist on the Senate remaining in session until this question has been finally disposed of.

Mr. SMOOT obtained the floor.

Mr. POMERENE. Will the Senator yield to me to make a brief statement?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. I had very much hoped that there could be a vote upon this matter to-day. I am very anxious to have my vote recorded, but I am simply obliged to leave on the 5.50 train this evening, and I shall not be able to be here to-morrow.

Mr. WATSON. I very much regret the situation, Mr. President, because I know that the Senator from Ohio is quite anxious to be recorded on this question; but a number of Senators were compelled to leave this afternoon, and it was not possible

to hold them here in sufficient numbers to have this vote. Therefore, out of deference to their wishes, I consented earlier in the afternoon that the matter might go over for a final vote until to-morrow.

I very greatly regret the situation, and I trust the Senator from Ohio will be able to procure a pair.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I was informed, either yesterday or this morning—I have forgotten which—that pairs would be arranged for; and, in view of that fact, I certainly hope that one can be arranged for me. I am not in the habit of being away when it comes to voting upon matters of this kind, but the circumstances are such that I am simply compelled to go.

THE SINKING FUND.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, on last Saturday, in an interview with Mr. Welliver, for the New York Sun, I discussed the question of the obligations that the Government of the United States will be under June 30, 1920; and I also referred to a proposition of providing for a sinking fund for the purpose of refunding the obligations of the Government. Mr. Welliver reported that correctly in the New York Sun.

When the last session of Congress opened I took up the question of a sinking fund with officials of the Treasury Department, and also made public statements as to what I thought the plan ought to be to refund the public debt. I had in mind at that time a plan of doing so, and repeated it to Mr. Welliver last Saturday, hoping that it would be the policy of the Government to adopt a plan by which the obligations of the Government could be paid within a reasonable time.

Yesterday I looked up the bill which was introduced in the House at the last session of Congress covering this question, knowing it passed the House, came to the Senate, was referred to the Committee on Finance, and was reported from the Finance Committee to the Senate. On the 2d day of March the bill passed the Senate. It passed without an amendment to the House bill. My recollection was that in the closing days of the session that bill failed of passage; but I find that the President approved it on the 3d day of March, 1919. So that the country may know just what provision is made under existing law for providing a sinking fund for the retirement of the bonds and note issues of the Government, I ask that section 6 of that act be incorporated in the RECORD now.

I have received so many letters from all over the United States in relation to this matter that evidently its passage is not widely known. I am pleased that the act is now in force. If the rate of 2½ per cent proves too great a burden, it can be reduced by future legislation. I thought myself that the bill had failed; and now I ask that section 6 of that act be incorporated in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it will be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of the remarks of the Senator from Utah.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SEC. 6. (a) That there is hereby created in the Treasury a cumulative sinking fund for the retirement of bonds and notes issued under the first liberty bond act, the second liberty bond act, the third liberty bond act, the fourth liberty bond act, or under this act, and outstanding on July 1, 1920. The sinking fund and all additions thereto are hereby appropriated for the payment of such bonds and notes at maturity, or for the redemption or purchase thereof before maturity by the Secretary of the Treasury at such prices and upon such terms and conditions as he shall prescribe, and shall be available until all such bonds and notes are retired. The average cost of the bonds and notes purchased shall not exceed par and accrued interest. Bonds and notes purchased, redeemed, or paid out of the sinking fund shall be canceled and retired and shall not be reissued. For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1920, and for each fiscal year thereafter, until all such bonds and notes are retired there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purposes of such sinking fund, an amount equal to the sum of (1) 2½ per cent of the aggregate amount of such bonds and notes outstanding on July 1, 1920, less an amount equal to the par amount of any obligations of foreign Governments held by the United States on July 1, 1920, and (2) the interest which would have been payable during the fiscal year for which the appropriation is made on the bonds and notes purchased, redeemed, or paid out of the sinking fund during such year or in previous years.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to Congress at the beginning of each regular session a separate annual report of the action taken under the authority contained in this section.

(b) Sections 3688, 3694, 3695, and 3696 of the Revised Statutes, and so much of section 3689 of the Revised Statutes as provides a permanent annual appropriation of 1 per cent of the entire debt of the United States to be set apart as a sinking fund are hereby repealed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. WATSON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS.

Mr. WATSON. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, June 4, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 3, 1919.

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD.

Thomas A. Scott, of New London, Conn., to be a member of the United States Shipping Board, vice Colby, resigned.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy from the 7th day of June, 1919:

Royal W. Abbott,
Laurence A. Abercrombie,
Charles M. Abson,
Jim T. Acree,
Albert W. Akers, jr.,
Eugene T. Aldridge,
Stephen T. Allen,
Harris C. Aller,
Charles C. Anderson,
Erik L. Anderson,
Marshall A. Anderson,
Warner W. Angerer,
Samuel H. Arthur,
Fred B. Avery,
Myron A. Baber,
Edwin C. Bain,
Felix L. Baker,
Leon J. Baker,
Ralph D. Baker,
Clarence J. Ballreich,
Frederick V. Barker,
Loyd K. Barry,
Melvin H. Bassett,
Turner W. Battle,
Ninian Beall,
Francis W. Beard,
Emanuel C. Beck,
Charles S. Beightler,
Alf Ole Ruh Bergesen,
Thomas H. Binford,
Henry T. Birmingham,
Allen D. Blackledge,
Victor F. Blakeslee,
Charles S. Boarman,
Robert W. Bockius,
Julian M. Boit,
Calvin M. Bolster,
Robert Bolton, jr.,
Carroll T. Bonney,
Harton I. Booker,
John T. Bottom, jr.,
Neill D. Brantly,
Edwin L. Brashears,
Kenneth E. Brimmer,
Thomas B. Brittain,
William B. Broadhurst,
Roger Brooks,
Maurice E. Browder,
Gilbert W. Brown,
Harold R. Brookman,
Ferguson B. Bryan,
Rene F. A. Buchholz,
Goold N. Bull,
Tighlman H. Bunch, jr.,
William H. Buracker,
George F. Burdick,
Julius A. Burgess,
Alfred W. Burket,
Eugene F. Burkett,
George H. Burnham,
Horace Burrough, 3d,
Frederick R. Buse,
William Butler, jr.,
George C. Calnan,
Samuel W. Canan,
James B. Carter,
Amariah B. Cartwright,
James H. Chadwick,

Henry G. Chalkley,
Carleton C. Champion, jr.,
Selden Chapin,
Hjalmar A. Christensen,
Walter F. Christmas,
Karl J. Christoph,
Campbell Cleave,
Harold Cline,
John S. Cohen, jr.,
Harold Coldwell,
Charles A. Collins,
Lucius P. Collins,
Thomas S. Combs,
Frank H. Conant, 2d,
Bailey Connelly,
Gyle D. Conrad,
Edwin F. Conway,
Harley F. Cope,
Orville G. Cope, jr.,
Harry Corman,
Lewis Corman,
Alexander J. Couble,
Roy T. Cowdrey,
Thomas G. Cox, jr.,
Wilmer T. Cox,
Thomas T. Craven,
Armon D. A. Crawford,
Marion E. Crist,
Mitchell P. Crist,
James A. Crocker,
Mark H. Crouter,
John F. Crowe, jr.,
Richard H. Cruzen,
Frederick J. Cunningham,
George B. Cunningham,
Robert P. Cunningham,
Winfield S. Cunningham,
Lawrence W. Curtin,
John P. Curtis,
Maurice E. Curts,
William R. Cushman, jr.,
Roswell B. Daggett,
George H. Dana,
Valentine M. Davis,
Michael D. Dearth,
Benton W. Decker,
Earl R. De Long,
Harry H. Deringer,
Frank C. L. Dettmann,
Wade De Weese,
Alexander J. Diepenbrock,
Wallace Dillman,
John A. Dillon,
William J. Dinneen,
Augustus H. Donaldson,
James B. Donnelly,
Jerome F. Donovan, jr.,
Edward H. Doolin,
Stephen C. Dougherty,
Jennings B. Dow,
Wallace R. Dowd,
Edwin H. Downes,
Willard M. Downes,
Austin K. Doyle,
James H. Doyle,
Henry S. Dunbar, jr.,
Marcy M. Dupre, jr.,
George M. Dusinberre,
William L. Eagleton,
Charles D. Edmunds,
Julian B. Edwards,
Robert P. Erdman,
Delmer S. Fahrney,
Bennett L. Falknor,
Raymond C. Ferris,
Harold F. Fick,
William W. Fife,
Herbert Finebaum,
Harold C. Fitz,
Carroll H. Fleming,
William D. Fletcher,
Emmet P. Forrestel,
Richard R. Foster,
Allen B. Fowler,
Oliver W. Gaines,
William H. Galbraith,
Charles B. Gary,
Thomas A. Gaylord,
Hilyer F. Gearing,
Martin J. Gillan, jr.,
John F. Gillon,
John E. Gingrich,
Richard P. Glass,
Cato D. Glover, jr.,
William B. Goggins,
Charles N. Goldenberg,
Milton D. Goldsmith,
Roscoe F. Good,
Jesse B. Goode,
John P. Graff,
Roy W. Montrose Graham,
George H. Gregory,
Marvin H. Grove,
Ignatius L. Guerin,
Darrough S. Gurney,
George C. Haeberle,
Theodore G. Haff,
Wesley M. Hague,
Hance C. Hamilton,
Siegfried Hannah,
Robert H. Hargrove,
Archibald O. Harrington,
Mark H. Harrington,
Mason D. Harris,
Drayton Harrison,
Lloyd Harrison,
Walter T. Hart, jr.,
Justin D. Hartford,
Charles C. Hartman,
Beverly A. Hartt,
Richard R. Hartung,
James D. Haselden, jr.,
Orin S. Haskell,
Maurice E. Hatch,
Lawrence T. Haugen,
Hugh E. Haven,
Kenneth C. Hawkins,
Clarence M. Head,
Paul R. Heineman,
John H. Heintz,
Elmer F. Helmkamp,
William P. Hepburn,
William Hibbs,
Raymond L. Higgins,
Wallace L. Higgins,
Richard Highleyman,
John W. Higley,
Harry H. Hill,
Rowlond D. Hill, jr.,
Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter,
Warner U. Hines,
Norman R. Hitchcock,
Allen Hobbs,
Raymond W. Holsinger,
Norman B. Hopkins,
Herbert G. Hopwood,
Royal A. Houghton,
Edgar B. Howell,
David A. Hughes,
Ralph Humphreys,
Peter F. Hunt,
Burton L. Hunter,
Charles M. Huntington,
Jack E. Hurff,
William H. Hutter,
Charles L. Hutton,
William A. Ingram,
William G. Ingram,
Clayton S. Isgrig,
Solomon S. Isquith,
Norman S. Ives,
Phillip N. Jackson,
David Jaffe,
Royal F. Jewett,
Douglass P. Johnson,
Felix L. Johnson,
Bascom S. Jones,
Warner E. Jones,
Frederick B. Kauffman,
Russell Keith,

Bernard J. Kelley,
George J. Kelley,
John N. Kelty,
Asel B. Kerr,
Dixwell Ketcham,
Eugene W. Kiefer,
Elmer Kiehl,
Philip R. Kinney,
Hugh P. Kirby,
Vilas R. Knope,
Virgil E. Korns,
George P. Kraker,
Edgar P. Kranzfelder,
Joseph U. Lademan, jr.,
Sam L. La Hache,
Oberlin C. Laird,
Paul W. Lambright,
La Rue C. Lawbaugh,
William I. Leahy,
Clarence V. Lee,
Philip Lemler,
Ericson Lewis,
Trevor Lewis,
Ernest W. Litch,
William G. Livingstone,
Fridthjof W. Londahl,
John B. Longstaff,
Ralph C. Lowes, jr.,
James A. Lusk,
John B. Lyon,
Hugh D. Lyttle,
Herbert L. MacBride,
Ford H. MacElvain,
William S. MacLaren, jr.,
Frank M. Maichle,
John B. Mallard,
Brook S. Mansfield,
Stanley E. Martin,
William A. P. Martin, jr.,
John W. Marts, jr.,
Lunsford Y. Mason, jr.,
Lisle J. Maxson,
John T. McDermott,
John A. McDonnell,
Ellsworth McEathron,
John V. McElduff,
James H. McKay,
Frederick W. McMahon,
Edward H. McMenemy,
Charles B. McVay, 3d,
George W. Mead, jr.,
Robert E. Melling,
Henry N. Mergen,
Stanley J. Michael,
Paul Miller,
Raleigh B. Miller,
William E. Miller,
Olin R. Miner,
Charles B. Momsen,
Jewett P. Moncure,
Maurice Montgomery,
William F. Moran,
Terry B. Morehouse,
George D. Morrison,
Richard S. Morse,
Moultrie Moses,
Reinhard C. Moureau,
William E. A. Mullan,
Allen P. Mullinnix,
Charles D. Murphy,
Charles H. Murphy,
Neil B. Musser,
Morris B. Myers,
Paul B. Nibecker,
Henry S. Nielson,
James E. Nolan,
Charles O. O'Donnell,
Francis P. Old,
Forrest M. O'Leary,
Donald R. Osborn, jr.,
Lemuel P. Padgett, jr.,
Harry E. Padley,
Dudley M. Page,
Khem W. Palmer,
Edward E. Pare,
Harold R. Parker,
Gordon A. Patterson,
Mead S. Pearson,
George H. L. Peay,
Howard D. Peeples,
Harold E. Pelfer,
Perley E. Pendleton,
John Perry,
Lyman S. Perry,
Robert F. Perry,
James M. Plaskitt,
Edwin A. J. Poehlmann,
Charles D. Porter,
Raeburn P. Powell,
Harry D. Power,
George F. Prestwich,
Van F. Rathbun,
DeWitt C. Redgrave, jr.,
Kendall Sturtevant Reed,
John F. Rees,
Frederick O. Repplier,
William A. Rice,
Thomas H. Robbins, jr.,
Frederick W. Roberts,
Walter H. Roberts,
Wolcott Roberts,
Robert E. Robinson,
Frank Rorschach, jr.,
George E. Rosenberry,
Howard C. Rule, jr.,
Herbert C. Rust,
Abel C. J. Sabalot,
Frederick C. Sachse,
Earl L. Sackett,
George R. Sanner,
Thomas C. Scaffe,
Frank W. Schmidt,
Herbert P. Schubert,
Leo B. Schulten,
Sampson Scott,
Sumner T. Scott,
George A. Seitz,
Joseph H. Severyns,
Horatio C. Sexton, jr.,
John E. Shoemaker,
Horatio G. Sickel, 4th,
William Sinton,
Charles R. Skinner,
George C. Skinner, jr.,
Paul S. Slawson,
Alexander F. Smith, jr.,
Clyde W. Smith,
Robert H. Smith,
Walton W. Smith,
William M. Smith,
Raymond D. Sollars,
Edmund P. Speight,
Alva J. Spriggs,
Merrill F. Sproul,
Paul W. Steinhagen,
Morton B. Sterling,
Paul R. Sterling,
Ernest E. Stevens,
Francis B. Stoddert,
Elmer S. Stoker,
William J. Strother, jr.,
Charles L. Surran,
Chester A. Swafford,
Clarence F. Swanson,
William A. Swanston,
Evander W. Sylvester,
James R. Tague,
Joseph T. Talbert, 2d,
Barnett T. Talbott,
Francis Taylor,
Hugh M. Taylor,
John C. Ten Eyck, jr.,
Francis J. Thomas,
William A. P. Thompson,
Thomas S. Thorné,
John M. Thornton,
Robert D. Threshie,
Edwin H. Tillman, jr.,
Elwood M. Tillson,
Nelson S. Tohey,

William G. Tomlinson,
Rockwell J. Townsend,
Hugh W. Turney,
Floyd A. Tusler,
Carroll L. Tyler,
Harold S. van Buren,
John P. Vetter,
Paul E. Voinot,
William H. Wallace,
Edward J. Walsh,
Chester L. Walton,
Benjamin N. Ward,
Benjamin P. Ward,
Robert C. Warrack,
John C. Webb,
Walter H. Weed, jr.,
Oscar A. Weller,
Augustus J. Wellings,
John E. Whelchel,
Morgan C. Wheyland,
Donald T. Whitmer,
Roland E. Wiens,
Richard C. Wiestling,
Charles Wilkes,
Darrell C. Williams,
Edward P. Wilson,
Harvey Wilson,
James D. Wilson,
Frank C. Winter,
Eugene Wintermantel,
Charles R. Woodson,
Edmund T. Wooldridge,
Charles T. Wootten,
Daniel F. Worth, jr.,
James L. Wyatt,
Levi D. York, and
Rupert M. Zimmerli.

The following-named midshipmen to be second lieutenants in the United States Marine Corps from the 7th day of June, 1919:

Clarence R. Wallace,
Sanford H. Casteel,
James E. Whitmire,
Maurice Van Cleave,
Harold Markell,
Donald E. Keyhoe,
Olin E. Gates,
Frederick S. Chappelle,
John G. Clausing,
John M. Greer,
Charles S. Finch,
William H. Armstrong,
Wilbur L. Davis,
Walter A. Wachtler,
Henry T. Nicholas,
Stuart W. King,
William E. Maxwell,
John H. Featherston, jr.,
Ronald A. Boone,
Glen M. Aron,
William B. Onley, and
Paul B. Watson.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 3, 1919.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Frank Davis, jr., to be Assistant Attorney General.

DISTRICT ATTORNEYS.

A. C. Hindman to be United States attorney, district of the Canal Zone.

Henry Mooney to be United States attorney, eastern district of Louisiana.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Thee following-named midshipmen to be ensigns:

Royal W. Abbott,
Laurence A. Abercrombie.
Charles M. Abson,
Jim T. Acree,
Albert W. Akers, jr.,
Eugene T. Aldridge,
Stephen T. Allen,
Harris C. Aller,
Charles C. Anderson,
Erik L. Anderson,
Marshall A. Anderson,
Warner W. Angerer,
Samuel H. Arthur,
Fred B. Avery,
Myron A. Baber,
Edwin C. Bain,
Felix L. Baker,
Leon J. Baker,
Ralph D. Baker,
Clarence J. Ballreich,
Frederick V. Barker,
Loyd K. Barry,
Melvin H. Bassett,
Turner W. Battle,
Ninian Beall,
Francis W. Beard,
Emanuel C. Beck,
Charles S. Beightler,
Alf Ole Ruh Bergesen,
Thomas H. Binford,
Henry T. Birmingham,
Allen D. Blackledge,
Victor F. Blakeslee,
Charles S. Boarman,
Robert W. Bockius,
Julian M. Boit,
Calvin M. Bolster,
Robert Bolton, jr.,
Carroll T. Bonney,
Harton I. Booker,
John T. Bottom, jr.,
Neill D. Brantly,
Edwin L. Brashears,
Kenneth E. Brimmer,
Thomas B. Brittain,
William B. Broadhurst,
Roger Brooks,
Maurice E. Browder,
Gilbert W. Brown,
Harold R. Brookman,
Ferguson B. Bryan,
Rene F. A. Buchholz,
Goold N. Bull,
Tighlman H. Bunch, jr.,
William H. Buracker,
George F. Burdick,
Julius A. Burgess,
Alfred W. Burket,
Eugene F. Burkett,
George H. Burnham,
Horace Burrough, 3d,
Frederick R. Buse,
William Butler, jr.,
George C. Calnan,
Samuel W. Canan,
James B. Carter,
Amariah B. Cartwright,
James H. Chadwick,
Henry G. Chalkley,
Carleton C. Champion, jr.,
Selden Chapin,
Hjalmar A. Christensen,
Walter F. Christmas,
Karl J. Christoph,
Campbell Cleave,
Harold Cline,
John S. Cohen, jr.,
Harold Coldwell,
Charles A. Collins,
Lucius P. Collins,
Thomas S. Combs,
Frank H. Conant, 2d,
Bailey Connelly,
Gyle D. Conrad,
Edwin F. Conway,
Harley F. Cope,
Orville G. Cope, jr.,
Harry Corman,
Lewis Corman,
Alexander J. Couble,
Roy T. Cowdrey,
Thomas G. Cox, jr.,
Wilmer T. Cox,
Thomas T. Craven,
Armon D. A. Crawford,

Marion E. Crist,
Mitchell P. Crist,
James A. Crocker,
Mark H. Crouter,
John F. Crowe, jr.,
Richard H. Cruzen,
Frederick J. Cunningham,
George B. Cunningham,
Robert P. Cunningham,
Winfield S. Cunningham,
Lawrence W. Curtin,
John P. Curtis,
Maurice E. Curts,
William R. Cushman, jr.,
Roswell B. Daggett,
George H. Dana,
Valentine M. Davis,
Michael D. Dearth,
Benton W. Decker,
Earl R. De Long,
Harry H. Deringer,
Frank C. L. Dettmann,
Wade De Weese,
Alexander J. Diepenbrock,
Wallace Dillman,
John A. Dillon,
William J. Dinneen,
Augustus H. Donaldson,
James B. Donnelly,
Jerome F. Donovan, jr.,
Edward H. Doolin,
Stephen C. Dougherty,
Jennings B. Dow,
Wallace R. Dowd,
Edwin H. Downes,
Willard M. Downes,
Austin K. Doyle,
James H. Doyle,
Henry S. Dunbar, jr.,
Marcy M. Dupre, jr.,
George M. Dusinberre,
William L. Eagleton,
Charles D. Edmunds,
Julian B. Edwards,
Robert P. Erdman,
Delmer S. Fahrney,
Bennett L. Falknor,
Raymond C. Ferris,
Harold F. Fick,
William W. Fife,
Herbert Finebaum,
Harold C. Fitz,
Carroll H. Fleming,
William D. Fletcher,
Emmett P. Forrestel,
Richard R. Foster,
Allen B. Fowler,
Oliver W. Gaines,
William H. Galbraith,
Charles B. Gary,
Thomas A. Gaylord,
Hilyer F. Gearing,
Martin J. Gillan, jr.,
John F. Gillon,
John E. Gingrich,
Richard P. Glass,
Cato D. Glover, jr.,
William B. Goggins,
Charles N. Goldenberg,
Milton D. Goldsmith,
Roscoe F. Good,
Jesse B. Goode,
John P. Graff,
Roy W. Montrose Graham,
George H. Gregory,
Marvin H. Grove,
Ignatius L. Guerin,
Darrough S. Gurney,
George C. Haeberle,
Theodore G. Haff,
Wesley M. Hague,
Hance C. Hamilton,
Siegfried Hannah,
Robert H. Hargrove,
Archibald O. Harrington,
Mark H. Harrington,
Mason D. Harris,
Drayton Harrison,
Lloyd Harrison,
Walter T. Hart, jr.,
Justin D. Hartford,
Charles C. Hartman,
Beverly A. Hartt,
Richard R. Hartung,
James D. Haselden, jr.,
Orin S. Haskell,
Maurice E. Hatch,
Lawrence T. Haugen,
Hugh E. Haven,
Kenneth C. Hawkins,
Clarence M. Head,
Paul R. Heineman,
John H. Heintz,
Elmer F. Helmkamp,
William P. Hepburn,
William Hibbs,
Raymond L. Higgins,
Wallace L. Higgins,
Richard Highleyman,
John W. Higley,
Harry H. Hill,
Rowlond D. Hill, jr.,
Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter,
Warner U. Hines,
Norman R. Hitchcock,
Allen Hobbs,
Raymond W. Holsinger,
Norman B. Hopkins,
Herbert G. Hopwood,
Royal A. Houghton,
Edgar B. Howell,
David A. Hughes,
Ralph Humphreys,
Peter F. Hunt,
Burton L. Hunter,
Charles M. Huntington,
Jack E. Hurff,
William H. Hutter,
Charles L. Hutton,
William A. Ingram,
William G. Ingram,
Clayton S. Isgrig,
Solomon S. Isquith,
Norman S. Ives,
Phillip N. Jackson,
David Jaffe,
Royal F. Jewett,
Douglass P. Johnson,
Felix L. Johnson,
Bascom S. Jones,
Warner E. Jones,
Frederick B. Kauffman,
Russell Keith,
Bernard J. Kelley,
George J. Kelley,
John N. Kelty,
Asel B. Kerr,
Dixwell Ketcham,
Eugene W. Kiefer,
Elmer Kiehl,
Philip R. Kinney,
Hugh P. Kirby,
Vilas R. Knope,
Virgil E. Korns,
George P. Kraker,
Edgar P. Kranzfelder,
Joseph U. Lademan, jr.,
Sam L. La Hache,
Oberlin C. Laird,
Paul W. Lambright,
La Rue C. Lawbaugh,
William I. Leahy,
Clarence V. Lee,
Philip Lemler,
Ericson Lewis,
Trevor Lewis,
Ernest W. Litch,
William G. Livingstone,
Fridthjof W. Londahl,
John B. Longstaff,

Ralph C. Lowes, jr.,
James A. Lusk,
John B. Lyon,
Hugh D. Lyttle,
Herbert L. MacBride,
Ford H. MacElvain,
William S. MacLaren, jr.,
Frank M. Maichle,
John B. Mallard,
Brook S. Mansfield,
Stanley E. Martin,
William A. P. Martin, jr.,
John W. Marts, jr.,
Lunsford Y. Mason, jr.,
Lisle J. Maxson,
John T. McDermott,
John A. McDonnell,
Ellsworth McEathron,
John V. McElduff,
James H. McKay,
Frederick W. McMahon,
Edward H. McMenemy,
Charles B. McVay, 3d,
George W. Mead, jr.,
Robert E. Melling,
Henry N. Mergen,
Stanley J. Michael,
Paul Miller,
Raleigh B. Miller,
William E. Miller,
Olin R. Miner,
Charles B. Momsen,
Jewett P. Moncure,
Maurice Montgomery,
William F. Moran,
Terry B. Morehouse,
George D. Morrison,
Richard S. Morse,
Moultrie Moses,
Reinhard C. Moureau,
William E. A. Mullan,
Allen P. Mullinnix,
Charles D. Murphy,
Charles H. Murphy,
Neil B. Musser,
Morris B. Myers,
Paul B. Nibecker,
Henry S. Nielson,
James E. Nolan,
Charles O. O'Donnell,
Francis P. Old,
Forrest M. O'Leary,
Donald R. Osborn, jr.,
Lemuel P. Padgett, jr.,
Harry E. Padley,
Dudley M. Page,
Khem W. Palmer,
Edward E. Pare,
Harold R. Parker,
Gordon A. Patterson,
Mead S. Pearson,
George H. L. Peay,
Howard D. Peeples,
Harold E. Peifer,
Perley E. Pendleton,
John Perry,
Lyman S. Perry,
Robert F. Perry,
James M. Plaskitt,
Edwin A. J. Poehlmann,
Charles D. Porter,
Raeburn P. Powell,
Harry D. Power,
George F. Prestwich,
Van F. Rathbun,
DeWitt C. Redgrave, jr.,
Kendall Sturtevant Reed,
John F. Rees,
Frederick O. Repplier,
William A. Rice,
Thomas H. Robbins, jr.,
Frederick W. Roberts,
Walter H. Roberts,
Wolcott Roberts,
Robert E. Robinson,
Frank Rorschach, jr.,
George E. Rosenberry,
Howard C. Rule, jr.,
Herbert C. Rust,
Abel C. J. Sabalot,
Frederick C. Sachse,
Earl L. Sackett,
George R. Sanner,
Thomas C. Scaffe,
Frank W. Schmidt,
Herbert P. Schubert,
Leo B. Schulten,
Sampson Scott,
Sumner T. Scott,
George A. Seitz,
Joseph H. Severyns,
Horatio C. Sexton, jr.,
John E. Shoemaker,
Horatio G. Sickel, 4th,
William Sinton,
Charles R. Skinner,
George C. Skinner, jr.,
Paul S. Slawson,
Alexander F. Smith, jr.,
Clyde W. Smith,
Robert H. Smith,
Walton W. Smith,
William M. Smith,
Raymond D. Sollars,
Edmund P. Speight,
Alva J. Spriggs,
Merrill F. Sproul,
Paul W. Steinhagen,
Morton B. Sterling,
Paul R. Sterling,
Ernest E. Stevens,
Francis B. Stoddert,
Elmer S. Stoker,
William J. Strother, jr.,
Charles L. Surran,
Chester A. Swafford,
Clarence F. Swanson,
William A. Swanston,
Evander W. Sylvester,
James R. Tague,
Joseph T. Talbert, 2d,
Barnett T. Talbott,
Francis Taylor,
Hugh M. Taylor,
John C. Ten Eyck, jr.,
Francis J. Thomas,
William A. P. Thompson,
Thomas S. Thorne,
John M. Thornton,
Robert D. Threshie,
Edwin H. Tillman, jr.,
Elwood M. Tillson,
Nelson S. Tohey,
William G. Tomlinson,
Rockwell J. Townsend,
Hugh W. Turney,
Floyd A. Tusler,
Carroll L. Tyler,
Harold S. van Buren,
John P. Vetter,
Paul E. Voinot,
William H. Wallace,
Edward J. Walsh,
Chester L. Walton,
Benjamin N. Ward,
Benjamin P. Ward,
Robert C. Warrack,
John C. Webb,
Walter H. Weed, jr.,
Oscar A. Weller,
Augustus J. Wellings,
John E. Whelchel,
Morgan C. Wheyland,
Donald T. Whitmer,
Roland E. Wiens,
Richard C. Wiestling,
Charles Wilkes,
Darrell C. Williams,
Edward P. Wilson,
Harvey Wilson,

James D. Wilson,
Frank C. Winter,
Eugene Wintermantel,
Charles R. Woodson,
Edmund T. Wooldridge,
Charles T. Wootten,
Daniel F. Worth, jr.,
James L. Wyatt,
Levi D. York, and
Rupert M. Zimmerli.

The following-named midshipmen to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps:

Clarence R. Wallace,
Sanford H. Casteel,
James E. Whitmire,
Maurice Van Cleave,
Harold Markell,
Donald E. Keyhoe,
Olin E. Gates,
Frederick S. Chappelle,
John G. Clausing,
John M. Greer,
Charles S. Finch,
William H. Armstrong,
Wilbur L. Davis,
Walter A. Wachtler,
Henry T. Nicholas,
Stuart W. King,
William E. Maxwell,
John H. Featherston, jr.,
Ronald A. Boone,
Glen M. Aron,
William B. Onley, and
Paul B. Watson.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *June 3, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we pray for a wider distribution of common sense versus unreason and wild speculations; freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religious convictions, based upon truth versus anarchy, Bolshevism, and the unreasonable demands of the uneducated.

The bomb thrower is not so much to blame as the unbridled tongue which arouses the worst passions of men and incites them to violence.

Strengthen, we beseech Thee, the arm of justice against license used to excite and encourage the ignorant to violence.

Grant that the laws passed by reasonable men may be prosecuted by the agents of justice to the last degree, that peace may come, and safety reign in our land and throughout the world. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state that the credentials of R. WALTON MOORE are on the Speaker's desk certifying to his election to the vacancy in the eighth Virginia district caused by the resignation of the Hon. Mr. Carlin. Mr. MOORE has been elected in that district to serve in this Congress. He is present, and I ask that he may have the oath of office administered to him.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia appeared at the bar of the House and the oath was administered by the Speaker.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I asked that the bill which I introduced to create a national park at Mammoth Cave, Ky., be taken from the Committee on Appropriations and referred to the Committee on the Public Lands. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] objected. I have since consulted with the gentleman from Wyoming, and he thinks it is proper that the bill should be referred to the Committee on the Public Lands, and I move that it be done.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky moves that the bill referred to be taken from the Committee on Appropriations and referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, very clearly the Committee on the Public Lands comes nearer having jurisdiction of a bill of this kind than any other committee of the House. Under the rules no committee of the House has a very clear jurisdiction over a matter of this kind.

Mr. DYER. I think the gentleman had better ask unanimous consent, as this is a little out of the ordinary.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a change of reference be made.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is entitled to make the motion, but he now asks unanimous consent. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. MADDEN in the chair.

The Clerk, continuing the reading of the bill, read as follows:

RENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Rent of buildings, Department of Agriculture: For rent of buildings and parts of buildings in the District of Columbia, for use of the various bureaus, divisions, and offices of the Department of Agriculture, $158,689.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to pass over this item and recur to it later. This matter was referred to a subcommittee, which has not yet reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that this paragraph be passed over to be returned to later. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

STATES RELATIONS SERVICE.

Salaries, States Relations Service: One director, $4,500; 1 chief clerk, $2,000; 1 clerk or chief accountant, $2,400; 1 financial clerk, $2,000; 1 clerk, $1,980; 1 clerk or proof reader, $1,800; 4 clerks, class 4, 11 clerks, class 3; 2 clerks, at $1,500 each; 13 clerks, class 2; 2 clerks, at $1,320 each; 1 clerk, $1,260; 36 clerks, class 1; 3 clerks, at $1,100 each; 39 clerks, at $1,000 each; 31 clerks, at $900 each; 1 clerk or lantern-slide colorist, $900; 3 clerks, at $840 each; 2 clerks, at $720 each; 5 messengers or laborers, at $720 each; 2 messengers or laborers, at $600 each; 3 messengers or laborers, at $480 each; 3 messenger boys, at $600 each; 13 messenger boys, at $480 each; 1 messenger boy, $360; 3 messenger boys, at $300 each; 1 skilled laborer, $900; 4 charwomen, at $480 each; 11 charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $203,840.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 67, to the item which was passed over temporarily for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 67, line 22, after the word "department," strike out the "$128,389" and insert "$100,000," and the following:
"*Provided*, That only such part of this sum shall be available to pay rent for space which can not be furnished by the public building commission of Government buildings located in the District of Columbia."

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this amendment come in after the word "agriculture."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was about to suggest that.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. This is a reduction which may please some Members on the Republican side of the House. The cause of the reduction is based on a survey which is being made by a commission now, finding space for the various departments, and they expect to furnish sufficient space to do away with many buildings which are being rented in the city at this time. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], chairman of that commission, informs me that he believes there will be plenty of space for all the departments in a short time. For that reason we are asking this reduction from the amount appropriated for rent in the District of Columbia be made at this time.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. As I caught the reading of the amendment, the reduction is about $58,000. What was the reason for the exact figures the gentleman put in his amendment?

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. I will confess that it is a plain guess. As a matter of fact, it is supposed there will not be any appropriation needed. The chairman of the commission informs me there will be plenty of space available for all departments which are now scattered around in different parts of the city that can be moved at this time, and there will be needed but very little extra rented space. I do not believe they will expend a dollar of the $100,000.

Mr. LEVER. Probably not; but it will be unfortunate if space should become necessary and no funds available for the

purpose. There is no doubt about that, judging from all the investigations that I can make. I am not going to oppose the amendment, but I throw out the suggestion that it might be wise to leave it as it is, with a limitation of language.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman will recall the statement that was made by Mr. Harrison, that it is very much desired by the department that certain activities of the department be transferred. It is possible that temporary quarters are more suitable and acceptable than are some that are now being used. I know a number of them are housed in what I would call firetraps. With the assurance we have from the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], this seems the proper and wise thing to do.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I might say just one word further. Mr. CLARK stated that by the 1st of July they would have this question settled, he thought, so that they would know all about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For cooperative agricultural extension work, to be allotted, paid, and expended in the same manner, upon the same terms and conditions, and under the same supervision as the additional appropriations made by the act of May 8, 1914 (33 Stat. L., p. 372), entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture," $1,500,000; and all sums appropriated by this act for use for demonstration or extension work within any State shall be used and expended in accordance with plans mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the proper officials of the college in such State which receives the benefits of said act of May 8, 1914.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HAUGEN: Page 70, line 24, strike out "thirty-third" and insert "thirty-eighth."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain agricultural experiment stations in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, the island of Guam, and the Virgin Islands of the United States, including the erection of buildings, the preparation, illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins, and all other necessary expenses, $215,000, as follows: Alaska, $75,000, of which $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be immediately available for the erection of barns, purchase of breeding live stock, and other expenses connected with the stock-breeding experiments on the island of Kodiak and at the Matanuska station; Hawaii, $50,000; Porto Rico, $50,000; Guam, $25,000, of which $5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be immediately available to repair damage due to typhoon; and the Virgin Islands of the United States, $15,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell such products as are obtained on the land belonging to the agricultural experiment stations in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, the island of Guam, and the Virgin Islands of the United States: *Provided*, That of the sum herein appropriated for the experiment station in Hawaii $10,000 may be used in agricultural extension work in Hawaii: *And provided further*, That hereafter employees of the Department of Agriculture assigned to permanent duty in the Virgin Islands shall be entitled to the same privileges as to leave of absence as are conferred upon employees assigned to Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Guam by the act of June 30, 1914 (38 Stat. L., p. 441), and if any employee of the agricultural experiment stations of the United States in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, Guam, or the Virgin Islands shall elect to postpone the taking of any or all of the annual leave to which he may be entitled under the said act of June 30, 1914, he may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, subject to the interests of the public service, be allowed to take at one time unused annual leave which may have accumulated within not to exceed four years, and be paid at the rate obtaining at the time the leave is granted.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the last proviso of the paragraph.

Mr. HAUGEN. The purpose of the proviso is to extend the same privilege to these people that is extended in the United States. I concede the point of order. It is new language.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the relative utility and economy of agricultural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the home, with special suggestions of plans and methods for the more effective utilization of such products for these purposes, with the cooperation of other bureaus of the department, and to disseminate useful information on this subject, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, supplies, and all other necessary expenses, $46,280.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out, in line 17, page 73, the figures "$46,280" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "$26,280."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. TREADWAY: Page 73, line 17, strike out the figures "$46,280" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$26,280."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by Mr. TREADWAY.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, my reason for offering this amendment is to call attention to the wide diversity of work being carried on in the Department of Agriculture.

I have read the testimony in the hearings before the committee, and I must confess that it seems to me pretty far-fetched to include an examination of cloth and that sort of thing in any agricultural activity that may exist. Further than that, there seems no good testimony given by anybody, so far as the hearing is concerned, as to the reason for increasing this appropriation from $26,280 to $46,280. In other words, my amendment simply removes the additional amount asked for in the appropriation, restoring the amount to that now carried, viz, $26,280.

In this connection I think it would be very acceptable, indeed, to the Committee of the Whole if we could have some explanation of what has been accomplished by this appropriation in previous years. I find no record of any such. The item is very plain, looking to the employment of more people in the city of Washington and elsewhere, to the extent of the additional $20,000 of the people's money. We are criticized by the members of the committee and our friends on the opposite side of the aisle for endeavoring to find some possible economies. I think that is an unfair criticism, so far as any points I may have raised during the past two days are concerned. They have been very few, but such as I have raised have been very largely for information. That is my reason at this time. I would like an explanation and a reason for this increased appropriation, and likewise information as to what has been done with the previous appropriation.

They are continually getting in little wedges here and little wedges there of small amounts, largely increased as the years roll by, and that accounts for such a bill as that before us to-day, carrying very large items, and for a very large aggregate amount in comparison to the needs of the department in previous years. All of the time some slight increases are made here and there, putting more and more men, as this item does, on the statutory rolls. I think the inquiry I am making is justifiable and fair. I also feel that unless the very best explanation can be given my amendment ought to be adopted, reducing the amount carried by this item to that which has been previously in the bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the estimate was $76,280, the committee has reported $46,280, a cut of $30,000. Here is the reason given by the department:

During the past two years the public demand for reliable information on the scientific and economic aspects of the home problems has increased greatly. This has been due to the increased cost of living and a shortage of many materials consumed in the home.

If the gentleman will refer to the hearings and the Book of Estimates, he will find that there is a very urgent request made for the $76,000. This work has been going on for a number of years. It is not new work. The committee believes that it has brought results, and in view of the high cost of living and of the number who are interested in that cost of living and the interest taken in the matter generally it seems proper that a small amount like $46,000 should be allowed at this time.

I think in view of the fact the committee cut the appropriation nearly 50 per cent it shows the committee has exercised great care, in its judgment, in recommending the $46,000.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will.

Mr. TREADWAY. I understood the chairman of the committee to say there is very great demand for this. Does that demand come simply from the man in charge of the bureau? There has been no great public acclaim for such an appropriation as this.

Mr. HAUGEN. I was reading from the statement contained in the Book of Estimates which comes from the department. That estimate was reduced to this amount.

Mr. TREADWAY. Can the chairman of the committee furnish any explanation of the work that has been done by the previous appropriation? There is nothing in the report, there is nothing in Dr. Langworth's testimony, and there is nothing in the committee's report.

Mr. HAUGEN. He says:

A primary purpose is to collect subject matter for use in the extension work under the Lever Act. This would also be of value for the work carried on under the Federal Board for Vocational Education and for other workers in home economics—

And so forth.

Mr. TREADWAY. Does not he say:

We wish to study problems which have to do with the wearing quality of textiles used for clothing—

And so forth?

What problems have been studied with the previous appropriations? They wish to study in the future some problems. That is the way our appropriations are being made, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAUGEN. I think that is a good problem to solve.

Mr. TREADWAY. But what results have been accomplished with the money that has been appropriated by the Congress?

Mr. HAUGEN. This is $46,000 out of $32,000,000. We can not expect a great deal for $46,000, if you cover the whole country; so with this item, in line with others, it is regrettable that we have no results.

Mr. TREADWAY. No results. I wanted to know that, Mr. Chairman. That is the information I wanted.

Mr. HAUGEN. Oh, the fact we have no results is no reason why we should discontinue the appropriation. If we are looking for results in every item in this bill we might as well cut much of the bill out.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I ask the chairman of the committee in all respect how long this item has been carried without any results?

Mr. HAUGEN. It started July 2, 1862, authorized under the act——

Mr. TREADWAY. No; it could not have been that long ago without any results.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. At any rate, it has been carried for a number of years.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, it was very hard to hear the statement made by the chairman of the committee when he was talking in the other direction unless you were very close to him. I did not hear the statement of the gentleman from Iowa, but I caught the reflection in the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts that there has been nothing accomplished under this item. I hope the gentleman from Iowa did not make that statement.

Mr. HAUGEN. I said we had not had the results we looked for.

Mr. LEVER. As a matter of fact——

Mr. TREADWAY. As a matter of fact, if I may be permitted, that is what the gentleman from Iowa did state—that there had been no results.

Mr. LEVER. Well, let me make this statement about it and let the committee judge for itself.

Mr. HAUGEN. I read from the hearings. They say:

We worked with new foods and also found new uses for well-known ones. These have included potato flour, sweet-potato flour, as well as soy bean and peanut flour, fruits and vegetables, dairy products, oils, and fats. We have also given much attention to the use of corn, grain, sorghums, rice, barley, and other cereals.

Mr. LEVER. Now, let me say this: This is one of the oldest items in this appropriation bill. This item covers the investigational work of the Department of Agriculture on food and diets, and so forth. I regard this item, while small, as one of the most important in this bill. I venture to assert there has been more interest in the bulletins issued, more bulletins read that have been issued by this work, than any other branch of the Government service. I could read the gentleman from Massachusetts a list of them dealing with the effect of certain foods upon the human body, dealing with the effects of foods canned, and information of that kind that is of immense interest and value to the general public, and that is especially true with the work under the Smith-Lever Act in home economics, which is constantly growing. There are some several thousand women employed under the provisions of this act whose business it is to teach home economics, and this item furnishes them an opportunity to disseminate the best information to the farming women of the country. I would dislike very much, indeed, to see the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts prevail, and I am speaking in very great earnestness about it, because I have followed this item very closely in my service on the committee, and the man in charge of it is one of the most earnest and indefatigable men I have ever seen. I think there is not a dollar being expended or has ever been expended under this item that has not brought a genuine return to the people of this country.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman refers to very interesting bulletins being issued under this appropriation.

Mr. LEVER. I say many of them have been issued.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I call the gentleman's attention and that of the committee to this interchange between the gentleman from Iowa [Mr HAUGEN] and Dr. Langworthy:

Mr. HAUGEN. Do not you think a bulletin on fashions would be more attractive than on the wearing qualities?

Dr. LANGWORTHY. Perhaps it would; and we will do our best to write good ones if the committee authorizes us to prepare them.

Is any of this extra $20,000 to go to the preparation of a bulletin on fashions?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Massachusetts this morning is not able to comprehend the witticism of the chairman of the committee, and the reply of Dr. Langworthy to it. Of course, we are not going to prepare a bulletin on fashions.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The statement made by the gentleman from South Carolina is extremely interesting, in which he suggests that under the Smith-Lever Act they have several thousand women employed. Am I right about that?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Several thousand women were employed to go about the country instructing those who are interested in home economics, and that they obtain most of their information through the operation of this paragraph. Am I right as to the statement made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER]?

Mr. LEVER. I will say that a great deal of the information which these people disseminate among the people of the country is fundamental and scientific information, and provided for by this paragraph.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then, if this paragraph should fail, we would probably throw out of employment 3,000 women who are teaching farmers' wives under the Smith-Lever Act?

Mr. LEVER. It would not affect them a particle.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman said they were relying on the information they obtained through the operation of this paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. I said that they could obtain technical and scientific information.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In other words, that this would set experts at work, theoretically and practically, to obtain information which these 3,000 women, employed under the Smith-Lever Act, could disseminate to the farmers' wives. That is about the situation, is it not? In other words, those 3,000 women are largely dependent on this $46,000 to get their primal ideas, so that they may go out into the farmers' homes and talk to the farmers' wives about the things they should do. I would like to know, because neither the gentleman from South Carolina——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Wait just a moment. I want to get this information. I would like to know what all of these 3,000 women who are employed under the Smith-Lever Act would say to a farmer's wife about the utilization and economy of agricultural products in the matter of clothing?

Mr. LEVER. Let me show the gentleman how inconsistent is his attack on this item.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am not attacking it. I want information.

Mr. LEVER. This is for increasing an appropriation under which women can obtain this technical and scientific information. Now, because somebody makes a funny remark, the gentleman would shut from these women the technical and scientific information that has been gathered in the department and is being gathered from day to day.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Why does the gentleman refuse me the information he seems to possess? I want to know what it is, in a practical way, that these women tell the farmers' wives about the utilization of agricultural products for the production of clothing?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman, of course, does not expect me to read all these bulletins myself.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Well, I do not want the gentleman to side-step, like some others do when they are brought face to face with a problem.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania expect those home-economic teachers to teach me? They might teach Mrs. Lever. I do not know about that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. He appropriates the money of the taxpayers to employ 3,000 women, and then he states that those 3,000 women, after we appropriate the million dollars he speaks about to pay their salaries, are reliant upon a $46,000 appropriation to get technical information that they are to give to the farmers' wives. I would like to know what information they give to the farmers' wives with regard to the manufacture of clothes from agricultural products.

Mr. LEVER. I will promise to send to the gentleman a list of bulletins, so that he may read them.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I see that the gentleman is getting further and further away from the subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question. What does his information about the subject he is discussing——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am seeking information. Up to date we have not much.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Has the gentleman ever attended what is known as the farmers' institutes?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is what this applies to.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not see that that has anything to do with the question I raise. That is provided for by a large fund under the Smith-Lever Act and is wholly educational. I want to know, and particularly from the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], what kind of information these 3,000 women are able to give the farmers' wives with respect to the utility and economy of agricultural products in the matter of clothing, and the gentleman from South Carolina has side-stepped that every time the suggestion is brought up. Here is $46,000 gone glimmering if we vote it for the purpose of hunting information. I do not see that we are helping these 3,000 women to help farmers' wives unless we know what they are going to teach. The gentleman from South Carolina does not say. Somebody may know whether we are teaching the farmers' wives how to make homespun garments out of alfalfa or sisal grass, or something of that kind. If that is it, it is a practical proposition. But all we know is that year after year we dump down in the department, for the purpose of spending the money with somebody there, a certain amount in order that they may study the utility and economy of agricultural products with respect to food and clothing.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not yield his time. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For general administrative expenses connected with the lines of work of the States Relations Service, including the offices of the director, the chief clerk, the officers in charge of publications, library, accounts, records, supplies, and property, and for miscellaneous expenses incident thereto, $14,180.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. ELSTON. I make the motion for the purpose of referring to the appropriation of $1,500,000 for cooperative agricultural extension work. In that connection I have received a statement from Prof. Thomas F. Hunt, dean of the department of agriculture of the University of California, bearing on this appropriation. He presents a very strong statement here in a few words, showing that this appropriation is entirely inadequate. He wishes to have it increased to the amount of $4,500,000, which I understood was the amount approved by the Senate committee at the close of the last session. I am informed that the amount named was the amount recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Dean Hunt may be included as a part of my remarks.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, yesterday a request was made by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] to print certain letters in the RECORD. This is not the same matter?

Mr. ELSTON. This is not the same matter. It is not a letter. It is in the nature of argument for the increased appropriation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am not going to object, but I want to know if it is a duplication of the matter already presented.

Mr. ELSTON. Not at all.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I shall not object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. ELSTON] asks unanimous consent to include in his remarks the paper he has referred to, and the Chair hears no objection.

Following is the statement referred to:

Cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics has been carried on in California and all the other States under the provisions of the act of Congress of May 8, 1914, known as the Smith-Lever Extension Act. This has been supplemented by a direct appropriation to the United States Department of Agriculture and during the past two years by war emergency appropriations under the food-production act.

The original intention of the Smith-Lever Act was to build up year by year an increasing organization until it should function in every agricultural county in the United States, reaching its maximum in 1922. The act did not, however, anticipate the large response of the farmers to the work nor their demands for an increasing number of men and women which have made the original provisions of the act inadequate to meet the demand.

During the war, under the food-production act, the number of county agricultural agents and home-demonstration agents has been greatly increased, and farmers' organizations known as farm bureaus have been formed in most of the agricultural counties of the United States. The question at issue is whether such of this organization which is of a permanent and necessary character shall be kept going or whether it shall be reduced to the original basis contemplated in the original Smith-Lever Act.

The Secretary of Agriculture recommended to Congress that in lieu of the last year's appropriation of $7,304,940 for farmers' cooperative demonstration work and emergency work an appropriation of $5,670,000 should be made at this session of Congress for farmers' cooperative demonstration work during the next fiscal year, which is a gross reduction of $1,634,940; but since the Smith-Lever Act will increase next year by $500,000, it is a net reduction of $1,134,940. This reduction had in view the elimination of temporary employees and those that had proved unsatisfactory and would result in the establishment of the extension work on a reasonable and permanent basis. The House Committee on Agriculture for the last Congress, however, reduced this amount in the bill by $2,973,680, making a total reduction of about $4,500,000 from that of the present year, and this reduction was accepted by the House.

When the bill reached the Senate, however, their committee on agriculture increased the item for cooperative extension work from $1,560,000 to $4,500,000, which, together with the amounts derived by the other items, practically brings the bill back to the amount recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture.

In addition to the regular Smith-Lever funds appropriated to all States in proportion to their rural population, California received for agriculture extension during the past year under the food-production act $148,560. This amount was allotted by the Secretary of Agriculture without apparent regard to the rural population of the State, but rather on its agricultural necessity. Since the new appropriation is proposed to be based on rural population and since California has only 1.8 per cent of the rural population of the United States, it will derive from the larger appropriation as recommended by the Senate and Secretary of Agriculture only an appropriation of $82,293 to take the place of the $148,560 which it received during the present fiscal year. To offset this expected reduction and in order to meet the Federal Government on a dollar-per-dollar basis as originally contemplated in the Smith-Lever Act, the State legislature has passed a bill appropriating $166,994 for two years, or $83,497 per year, which is now before the governor for signature. If the larger appropriation is passed by the Federal Government and the governor signs the bill of the last legislature, California would be able to derive about the same funds for agricultural-extension work which she has had during the past year.

If, however, the smaller appropriation as passed by the House were to be enacted, the appropriation for California would be reduced by $54,700 per year. The fact of the comparatively small rural population of California in propertion to its large agricultural area and the diversification of its crops is the particular reason why all Federal and State appropriations under this manner are urgently needed.

In California agricultural extension funds have been used exclusively for the three types of resident agent work, namely, farm advisers (county agents), home-demonstration agents, and boys' agricultural-club leaders. California has never had sufficient funds to build up a State organization of specialists and therefore can not lop off any of the work without directly affecting the resident agents in counties where they are immediately felt by the farmers. If the smaller appropriation before Congress were to be enacted, it would apparently require that at least six counties in California have their county agents discontinued as well as most of the home-demonstration agents and practically all the agricultural-club leaders.

Whereas at the beginning of the war under the regular Smith-Lever appropriation only about 6,000 farmers in California had joined the county farm bureaus and the work was only inaugurated in 15 counties of the State, the farm bureau organiaztion has now grown so that it covers 35 counties which cover 85 per cent of the farms of the State and there are about 25,000 farmers who pay annual dues to belong to this organization which is for the purpose of cooperating in agricultural-extension work and making it effective. These have become alarmed at the possibility of reduction of the Federal appropriation and the possibility that the service to them can not be maintained.

Last year over 19,000 different farmers sent for the farm adviser to visit their individual farms and give them specific advice on the growing of crops; a total of over 250,000 people attended 4,596 meetings held under the auspices of the resident farm advisers. The activities which have been conducted are almost too numerous to mention, but it may be said that the results have been of enormous advantage in enlarging agricultural knowledge and production in California.

Mr. BARBOUR rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD, as part of my remarks on the same paragraph just mentioned by my colleague from California [Mr. ELSTON], a telegram which I have received from George Feaver, jr., president of the Fresno County Farm Bureau, Calif. It is a matter of only a few lines, and I shall not take the time to read it if it is not objected to.

Mr. LEVER. I do not object, but I want to say that I shall object hereafter to printing letters on this subject, for the reason that I presume all other Members of Congress are flooded with letters as I am. I have got 50 of them myself. Those letters ask for a large increase of this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] asks unanimous consent to insert in his remarks a telegram as indicated by him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the telegram referred to:

FRESNO, CALIF., *May 28, 1919.*

Congressman H. E. BARBOUR,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Our board of directors, in session to-day, learned that House Committee on Agriculture has reported out Agriculture appropriation bill at smaller amount than that recommended by Secretary of Agriculture. We earnestly request your efforts in any way possible to secure amount originally recommended by Secretary for maintenance of agricultural extension in connection with Smith-Lever Act. We believe curtailment of the county agricultural agent system is false economy.

FRESNO COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
GEO. FEAVER, Jr., *President.*

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is due the House that it should have a little information on this item. Certain communications concerning this appropriation have gone into the RECORD. It is due the House to state that the estimate was cut considerably. The estimate on this item was cut about $3,000,000. Under the Smith-Lever Act $3,080,000 will be available, and this money will be matched by the States dollar for dollar, except for this $480,000. We also appropriated $645,040 to carry on the work with respect to the cotton-boll weevil, and $551,280 to be used outside of the cotton belt, making a total of $5,776,320. If you deduct from that $480,000 to be paid to the States, there will be available $5,296,320 to be matched by the States, which will bring the total amount up to $10,592,640, which will make available for 2,400 counties an average of over $4,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for States Relations Service, $4,705,820.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. RAKER. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I will say that I sort of anticipated the offering of an amendment by my friend from the other side this morning to increase this appropriation, to the end that we would get what was actually needed. I should have offered the amendment myself, but, the other side being in the majority. I felt it would come better if they made the motion, because they could then have secured its actual adoption, and I am a little disappointed that the motion to increase the item was not made. It is absolutely necessary, and it ought not to be passed over. The work is needed; the money is needed; the cooperation is needed; and the department is calling for this appropriation to carry out the actual work that is being done.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. RAKER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has reference to the item of $1,500,000 for extension work under the Smith-Lever Act?

Mr. RAKER. This goes to the entire item now; in all, for general expenses, $4,501,980.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thought the gentleman was talking about the Smith-Lever Act?

Mr. RAKER. No; I am getting right down to the real gist of the thing. This is the entire appropriation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That paragraph was passed some time ago.

Mr. RAKER. It is all in this paragraph, and it is all under this subdivision.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the gentleman had a letter read on the subject?

Mr. RAKER. No. You are right upon the subject now. You are hitting the nail right on the head. You are appropriating over $4,000,000. I am surprised that my friend from Pennsylvania did not offer this amendment, because he could have succeeded in the Committee of the Whole in having it adopted, and I was looking to him to raise an amendment, and I am disappointed that it was not raised as it should have been.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This paragraph carries $1,500,000, and the gentleman desires to raise it to $4,000,000. Do I so understand the gentleman?

Mr. RAKER. I would raise it to $5,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is, the gentleman from California would have no compunction of conscience if we moved this item up from $1,500,000 to $5,000,000?

Mr. RAKER. I surely would not have compunction in providing a service with necessary funds after we have provided the service. I believe in economy and in getting every dollar's worth from the money expended, but I do not believe it is extravagant to provide a sufficient amount for these useful things; and while we have provided in this bill for every conceivable kind of investigation and disease, when it comes down to providing proper education and assistance and advancement for the women and children through proper legislation to carry into effect this law that is now on the statute books, a failure to provide an adequate appropriation would be indefensible from every conceivable standpoint.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. How much money does the gentleman think we ought to appropriate?

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HAUGEN. What amount does the gentleman suggest to be made available for each county?

Mr. RAKER. That is a matter of division that you can not in a moment determine.

Mr. HAUGEN. How many agents would he suggest for each county? More than one?

Mr. RAKER. I think one agent would cover it.

Mr. HAUGEN. Would he be satisfied with one for each county; an average of one?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I ask an extension of time so that I may answer the question.

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. RAKER. I should like time enough to read this letter—10 minutes. I do not believe gentlemen will object to having a letter read that shows the necessity of this appropriation. I can not understand why they should.

Several Members objected.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I am sorry.

Mr. HAUGEN. If I may be recognized, I will ask the gentleman from California if he would be satisfied with one county agent for each county?

Mr. RAKER. I think that would be very good.

Mr. HAUGEN. Then for the expense of each county agent about $2,500, with $4,300 made available, there is enough here to go around. There are 2,400 counties throughout the United States where we are operating to-day, and in a number of counties, as the gentleman knows, they have held elections and have turned down the proposition, so the number will be reduced, and as the number is reduced the amount for each county can be increased.

Mr. RAKER. I am talking about the main appropriation provided for in this bill under this provision, where we fail to appropriate $2,000,000 necessary to carry the Smith-Lever Act into effect, and the Department of Agriculture says that the work will have to cease unless the appropriation is made.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] has the floor.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the gentleman from California know that the appropriation exceeds that provided for under the Smith-Lever Act?

Mr. RAKER. No, it does not.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, it does.

Mr. RAKER. No, it does not. It falls $2,000,000 short of carrying it out.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. RAKER. May I read this letter, Mr. Chairman, to show that I do know what I am talking about?

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman is laboring under a misapprehension, and I believe if he had the facts before him he would not contend for what he is now asking.

Mr. RAKER. I have the facts before me now, and I can not get time before the House to have them put in the RECORD or to read them to the committee. That is what is hurting me.

Mr. HAUGEN. I believe the facts should be stated, and I believe if the gentleman had the facts before him he would not argue as he is now doing.

Mr. RAKER. In view of the gentleman's statement, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 10 minutes to read this letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. I stated before that if the gentleman had the facts before him he would not argue as he is now doing. The appropriation has been increased more than one and a half million dollars more than the amount carried in the Smith-

Lever Act for the next fiscal year. Besides that, we have the $651,000 to meet the ravages of the cotton-boll weevil and $545,000 outside of the cotton belt. We have an increase then of $1,500,000 in excess of the amount which the Smith-Lever Act ordinarily would provide for the next fiscal year. Yet the gentleman is saying that we have cut this appropriation.

Mr. RAKER. In view of the statement of the gentleman from Iowa, I ask unanimous consent for 10 minutes in which to read this letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] has the floor.

Mr. HAUGEN. I demand the regular order.

Mr. RAKER. I ask unanimous consent that I may read the letter showing the facts upon which I have based my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. I object.

Mr. RAKER. You do not want the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made. The Clerk will read.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. EDMONDS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 79) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the city of Dawson, Ga., tents and cots for use of Confederate veterans in their State convention June 17 and 18, 1919.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following concurrent resolution:

House concurrent resolution 4.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That an edition of the Congressional Directory for the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress be prepared and published, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, as provided for in section 73 of the printing act approved January 12, 1895, and that the sum of $800 be paid for preparing, compiling, and indexing said edition, one-half of the said fund to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. FRANCE and Mr. WALSH of Montana members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Civil Service Commission.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS.

Salaries, Bureau of Public Roads: One chief of bureau, $6,000; 1 editor, $2,500; 1 draftsman or clerk, $1,920; 1 clerk, $1,900; 1 instrument maker, $1,800; 1 model maker, $1,800; 4 clerks, class 4; 6 clerks, class 3; 1 clerk or editorial clerk, $1,600; 2 clerks, at $1,500 each; 1 clerk or photographer, $1,440; 1 clerk or instrument maker, $1,440; 1 clerk or tabulator, $1,440; 1 clerk, class 2; 2 clerks, at $1,380 each; 2 clerks, at $1,320 each; 4 clerks, at $1,260 each; 6 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk or editorial clerk, $1,200; 1 draftsman, $1,320; 1 clerk or draftsman, $1,200; 1 clerk or draftsman, $900; 1 clerk or photographer, $1,200; 1 clerk or photographer, $1,000; 2 clerks, at $1,140 each; 1 clerk, $1,100; 2 clerks, at $1,080 each; 1 clerk, $1,020; 9 clerks, at $1,000 each; 1 clerk or skilled laborer, $1,000; 4 clerks, at $900 each; 1 mechanician, $1,680; 1 clerk or instrument maker, $1,200; 1 lantern-slide colorist, $1,320; 1 mechanic, $1,500; 1 mechanic, $1,200; 1 skilled laborer, $1,200; 1 laboratory aid, $960; 2 laborers, at $900 each; 2 messengers or laborers, at $840 each; 2 messengers, laborers, or laboratory helpers, at $720 each; 2 messengers or laborers, at $660 each; 4 messengers or laborers, at $600 each; 3 messenger boys, at $600 each; 1 fireman, $720; 8 messenger boys, at $480 each; 8 charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $113,640.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order.

Mr. WALSH. I make a point of order on the increase of the salary of the chief of the bureau from $4,500 to $6,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I will reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already decided the question. The Chair does not think the gentleman can reserve it after the Chair has decided it.

Mr. WALSH. The chairman of the committee was on his feet asking leave to make a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] is recognized.

Mr. HAUGEN. Two hundred and sixty-six million seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars of Federal funds will be available, and the States will spend an amount which will bring it up to $666,750,000. It seems that anyone in handling $666,750,000 is entitled to a small increase of $1,500 a year; or, in other words, that a $6,000 man will be required. For that reason the committee has recommended an increase of salary from $4,500 to $6,000. It is subject to a point of order if the gentleman insists upon it.

Mr. WALSH. We have been spending millions under the road act, under a director who has recently died, who received $4,500.

Mr. HAUGEN. And he was worth much more.

Mr. WALSH. He was worth much more, but we were getting very efficient work. Now, the title is changed. The other man was required to be a scientist. He got $4,500. Mr. Logan Waller Page, who had charge of this Federal road work, has conducted it very efficiently. Now, I do not know who his successor is, but I am opposed to increasing salaries of chiefs of bureaus in this bill, and have objected to it all the way through, and I do not think we ought to make this enormous increase to this particular bureau under these circumstances.

Mr. HAUGEN. The statement of the department is that a competent man can not be had for less than $6,000. It was even suggested that a salary of $12,000 be fixed. The gentleman referred to Dr. Page, who was paid $4,500, and probably was worth twice that amount; but Dr. Page is not here. It is necessary now to secure the services of a competent man to handle this $666,750,000 fund, and it would seem as if it would require a man of some business ability and capacity to conduct the work, and that $6,000 is a reasonable salary. It is with the gentleman whether he wants to make the point of order or not, and it is then for the House to determine whether this salary shall be increased. Shall we have a $6,000 man or a $4,500 man to take care of this office?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Massachusetts will permit, Secretary Houston called in the advice of the very best road engineers in this country and asked them to suggest three or four road engineers that they thought competent to handle this enormous sum of money available under the Federal road act. The fact is the late chief of this bureau did not administer that, because no work was done during the war out of this fund. These men submitted to the Secretary a list of names. He took the matter up in the order in which the names were submitted. He wrote to the first man, and I believe had him come on here. I do not mind saying that he was the road engineer of the State of California, who is at present drawing a salary of $12,000. The Secretary put the matter up to him as a matter of honor, said it was a great position, but the man said that he could not afford the sacrifice, that he had a family and no special means.

He put it up to the second man, who turned it down. It turned out that his salary was larger than the $6,000, and then he put it up to the third man, and finally after long persuasion he consented to come here at $6,000 a year, but he told the Secretary under any circumstances that he would not come for $4,500, because he could not afford it. He is a road engineer of the State of Iowa. I never met the gentleman and I had forgotten his name, but a Member suggests that it is Mr. McDonald. He is said to be a great road engineer in this country. It is a question of getting an able and a good man to distribute this tremendous fund.

Mr. WALSH. How much does this gentleman get in Iowa?

Mr. LEVER. The Secretary informed me that, including his place of residence and salary, it is about $6,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in accord with the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from South Carolina on this proposition, and I trust that the gentleman from Massachusetts may think the matter over carefully before he makes the point of order. If there is one instance in which a salary should be raised in this bill this probably is that instance, since the former salary of $4,500 is certainly not comparable with the services required of a man able to fill the position of chief of a Federal Bureau of the Public Roads.

In the various States which are looking out for their own roads, in New York, Massachusetts, Illinois, and Pennsylvania, with which I am more familiar, the salary of the road commissioners is double if not three times as much as that heretofore paid for the Bureau of Roads in the Federal Government. I believe that the salary paid to Waller Page was not commensurate with the dignity of the office nor the services performed.

Moreover, there is this to be said about the position of this chief: If it is true that that $660,000,000 for good roads which has finally been saddled on the Federal Government is to be spent through this Bureau of Good Roads, surely we should have a man in charge of that bureau who is above suspicion. There will be many contracts let and a tremendous amount of

the money spent in the various States. I would like to see at the head of the bureau a man such as the gentleman from South Carolina has described as being able to perform these duties with dignity and efficiency. I do not believe that we should put a man into this office because he has money enough to enable him to take a lower salary. I think the laborer is worthy of his hire. I do not want to see a dollar-a-year man there, because the temptations might be so great that he would fall by the wayside and bring disgrace on the Government.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman stated that if there was a $4,500 man here he might be under suspicion. Does the gentleman measure a man's honesty by $1,000 or $1,500?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; but I have heard of men in the great Empire State of New York who have been perfectly willing to serve the State for nothing, provided they could deal out the appropriations. [Laughter.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman is wrong in his geography; was not that Pennsylvania? [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; the reply of the gentleman from New York is too late. I trust the gentleman from Massachusetts will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to mention that recently a man was appointed to a position as supervisor of accounts in the State of Pennsylvania at a salary of $10,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Does the gentleman from Massachusetts insist on his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. No, Mr. Chairman; I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to that, so that we may again test the proposition before the House. I move to amend the amendment by striking out the figures "$4,500" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "$6,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 3, strike out the figures "$4,500" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$6,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Do I understand that the motion made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania was exactly upon the point of order that the Chair just ruled upon?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out certain figures which were inserted by an amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] and insert certain other figures. No point of order was made against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It was not the business of the Chair to refuse to recognize the gentleman or to refuse to entertain the motion that he made. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] slept upon his rights, that was not the business of the Chair. The matter is now disposed of.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York made the point of order against this very provision.

The CHAIRMAN. No; he made the point of order against the provision originally in the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, the provision against which the gentleman from New York made the point of order was to provide a chief of bureau at $6,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the point of order of the gentleman from Texas? He is not stating a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. The point of order that I am stating is that the Chair immediately thereafter, after sustaining the point of order of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], entertained a motion to insert the very provision which had been knocked out by the point of order of the gentleman from New York, and I submit the point of order that that is improper.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a statement of fact; it is not a point of order. In order that the matter may be clear, let the Chair state the situation. The Clerk read the paragraph, beginning on line 1, page 74. At the conclusion of the reading of the paragraph, which provides for one chief of bureau at $6,000, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] reserved the point of order against the figures "$6,000." The matter was discussed. The gentleman finally withdrew the point of order. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] then renewed the point of order, and the Chair sustained the point of order. Later on the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] offered an amendment to restore the position of chief of bureau at $4,500. That amendment was adopted. Then the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] later on moved to amend by striking out the figures "$4,500" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "$6,000." That amendment was adopted. The Chair could not refuse to entertain the motion. If any gentleman wished to make the point of order against it, the Chair would have entertained the point of order, and would have sustained the point of order; but no one did, and the result is that it is now too late to make it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Where a point of order is made against the item of $6,000, which was improperly in the bill, and then thereafter a gentleman attempted to place the amount back in the bill by an amendment, does the Chair hold that it could be properly done? Does not the point of order still lodge against the amendment just as long as the bill is under consideration by the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds that it is within the province of any Member of the House to rise in his place and offer an amendment to the bill, and it is the business of the Chair to entertain the motion.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Just one moment. Permit the Chair to make his own statement. It is the business of the Chair to entertain the motion, but if any gentleman on the floor of the House fails to make the point of order to the amendment, if it be subject to the point of order, then the matter is disposed of—he has lost his rights.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I raise the point of order that the amendment is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. It is too late. The amendment has already been agreed to. [Cries of "Regular order!"] The Clerk will read.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, before the Clerk begins to read, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question with regard to the road-building proposition. The statement has been made here by the chairman, or by somebody, that there is $666,000,000 available. I think that must be a mistake. It is only $266,000,000 available under the various appropriations.

Mr. HAUGEN. Two hundred and sixty-six million seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars of Federal funds. The aggregate expenditure of about $666,750,000 is proposed, of which the States will furnish about $400,000,000.

Mr. SNELL. How much of that fund is absolutely available now?

Mr. HAUGEN. Two hundred and sixty-six million dollars.

Mr. SNELL. Available to-day?

Mr. HAUGEN. Available to-day, and the States will be required to raise about $400,000,000.

Mr. SNELL. How many miles of roads has this bureau already constructed?

Mr. HAUGEN. I can not say. The Federal Government is not engaged in the building of roads, except a few experimental roads.

Mr. SNELL. How many miles have been constructed under the provisions of this act?

Mr. HAUGEN. As the gentleman will recall, I believe $200,000,000 were added on the Post Office bill last year, and other millions have been accumulated under the Shackleford bill.

Mr. SNELL. Well, I think the House ought to know at this time how much of the fund has been expended and to what extent they have succeeded in building roads under this fund.

Mr. HAUGEN. Available now, $80,000,000; available for the fiscal year 1920, $95,000,000; total, $175,000,000.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman has just stated that there are $266,000,000 available to-day.

Mr. HAUGEN. I was giving the items making up this fund of $266,000,000. Three per cent deducted for administration, $5,250,000; approved contracts, $41,970,000; balance to be met by the States up to and including the fiscal year of 1920, $127,000,790. Present indications are the above balance will be covered by approved contracts on July 1. There is yet to be apportioned for the fiscal year 1921, $100,000,000, and after deducting the 3 per cent allowed for administration there will be a total of $266,750,000. As I stated, $400,000,000 will be appropriated by the States.

Mr. SNELL. But the gentleman has not told me how much money has been already expended under the Federal act?

Mr. HAUGEN. That will take some time.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman has not the information at hand?

Mr. HAUGEN. I have not now, but I can get it.

Mr. SNELL. I did not know but what the gentleman had it here.

Mr. HAUGEN. I will put it in the RECORD.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman put it in the RECORD?

Mr. HAUGEN. The department has not been expending the money that was available.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman put the amount actually expended in the RECORD?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will.

Mr. SNELL. And also will he inform us whether the 3 per cent of the total funds for administration purposes is in addition to the $520,000 appropriated for the general expenses of the bureau?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; in addition, that is to be taken from the other fund.

Mr. SNELL. What I am desirous of finding out is how much it costs for administration expenses to build 1 mile of road under Federal aid. I am asking the gentleman if he can give some information along that line.

Mr. HAUGEN. I am not sure the committee has ever been furnished with that statement.

Mr. SNELL. Can the gentleman place in the RECORD the number of miles that have been made under Federal aid and the amount expended up to the present time, and the expense of the bureau up to the present time in building that road?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will take pleasure in doing it.

Mr. SNELL. All right; I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows :

For inquiries in regard to systems of road management throughout the United States and for giving expert advice on this subject, $38,240.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out "$38,240" and insert in lieu thereof "$38,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 75, line 22, strike out the figures "$38,240" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$38,000."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I have been following with great patience the debate on this bill. We have been reading this bill for the last four days, and I have also noticed my friends at the table here make objection after objection, and when they arrive at the point where the objection might be sustained the objection is withdrawn. Now, what I would like to know is, are they talking against time or talking simply to hear themselves talk. I have heard the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] talk about the farmer to a degree that it has become nauseating and disgusting. I would like to know what the farmer thinks about it. You have talked about the farmer as if you were doling out charity to him and three-fourths of the items here do not affect the farmer at all. I would like to know just how many champions of the farmer really ever come in contact with the farmer. I am afraid a good many of those farmers whose interests you have in heart reside in my city and the only part of his hand you will find calloused will be the forefinger and the thumb of the right hand from cutting coupons. The real farmer, the real producer, gets very little, if any, benefit out of this appropriation. Now, I do not know anything about the merit of this place of $4,500, but if the gentleman from Massachusetts was sincere in raising the point of order he should not have withdrawn it, and it certainly comes with astonishing surprise that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], who has been fighting every item in this bill, should put one over while I was talking with my colleague from Iowa. All I can see in this bill is jobs, jobs, jobs. I will join an opposition, but let it be sincere. If we are going to do anything about this bill let us quit talking, read the bill, and get through with it. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, well, I object to the gentleman withdrawing the amendment. Let it be voted down.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has a right to withdraw his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Not if objection is made.

Mr. DOWELL. I think he has a perfect right——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules that he has not.

Mr. DOWELL. Under the rules he has the right to withdraw his amendment unless some action has been taken on it.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman will consult the rules, he will find that in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union he can not do so if objection is made; in the House he can.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eight gentlemen are present, a quorum. The gentleman demands a division.

The committee again divided; and there were—ayes 3, noes 80.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the Chair has just ascertained the presence of a quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had just counted a quorum a few moments ago.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think the gentleman is entitled to tellers under the rules of the House, and the Clerk will read.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For conducting field experiments and various methods of road construction and maintenance, and investigations concerning various road materials and preparations; for investigating and developing equipment intended for the preparation and application of bituminous and other binders; for the purchase of materials and equipment; for the employment of assistants and labor; for the erection of buildings; such experimental work to be confined as nearly as possible to one point during the fiscal year, $60,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to suggest that some of these employees engaged by the Government to carry on road building and experiments in road building, and helping develop the great road-building plan of the United States, pay some attention to the railroad rates fixed by the administration on sand and gravel. The United States is going into a great cooperative plan with the States to build roads, and in nearly all sections the railroad rates on sand and gravel have been increased to a prohibitive point, one-half of that rate to be paid by the Government out of its own pocket. I merely make this suggestion. The road building can not go on unless a proper freight rate is granted on the basic material, such as sand, gravel, and crushed rock. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For general administrative expenses connected with the above-mentioned lines of investigations and experiments, $16,000.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Unfortunately a statement was made awhile ago in regard to my being mistaken relative to the amount of money necessary to carry on the work of farm advisers and also the other law, and I think, in justice to myself and to the distinguished chairman, whom I know would not under any circumstances attempt to do an injustice to me or to anyone else, I should say something. It was just one of those things that was not quite understood. To the end that I may correct it and put the matter in shape, I want to just make a statement in a few words and read in connection with that statement the following letter written in response to a letter that I inserted in the RECORD yesterday:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, May 31, 1919.

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. RAKER: I have your letter of May 22 and thank you for your courtesy in sending me a copy of the resolution adopted by the El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce. I have noted the resolution with much interest.

Cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics, as you know, has been carried on in all the States, including California, under the provisions of the act of Congress of May 8, 1914, known as the Smith-Lever Extension Act. The funds provided under this act have been supplemented by direct appropriations to this department for farmers' cooperative extension work, and during the past two years by war emergency appropriations under the food-production act. The funds available for this work during the current fiscal year are as follows:

Federal funds:		
Under the Smith-Lever Act	$2,580,000	
For farmers' cooperative demonstration work	1,204,910	
Under the food-production act	6,100,000	
		$9,884,940
State funds:		
Under the Smith-Lever Act	2,100,000	
Miscellaneous	4,000,000	
		6,100,000
Total available amount		15,984,940

The State funds are contributed by the legislatures, counties, farm bureaus, and other local organizations and individuals within the States. These funds are used for the employment of county agricultural agents, home demonstration agents, boys' and girls' club leaders, and specialists in various branches of agriculture and home economics, and the necessary administrative officers. At present about 2,400 counties

have agricultural agents and 1,700 counties have home-demonstration agents. The people on fully half the farms of the country were reached by these agents last year and given practical instruction and advice regarding agriculture and household matters. About 2,000,000 boys and girls were organized in clubs for the growing of plants or animals, canning or otherwise preserving the products of the farms and gardens, etc. Garden work was also done in many cities, and home-demonstration agents worked in about 200 cities.

The organization for this work was built up very rapidly after the United States entered the European War, with the aid of emergency funds. Now that the war is over the question has arisen as to how far this organization should be maintained on a permanent basis. After careful consideration I came to the conclusion that the educational work which the extension forces are doing is very important for the promotion of our agricultural interests in times of peace, and also for aiding the farm women in solving their household problems, and for encouraging the boys and girls to remain on the farms. I therefore recommend to Congress that, in lieu of the appropriations of $7,304,940 for farmers' cooperative demonstration work and emergency work, an appropriation of $5,670,000 should be made at this session of Congress for farmers' cooperative demonstration work during the next fiscal year. This is a gross reduction of $1,634,940, but since the Federal appropriation under the Smith-Lever Act will increase next year by $500,000, it is a net reduction of $1,134,940. This reduction had in view the elimination of temporary employees, and also of those who had proved unsatisfactory, and would result in the establishment of the extension work on a reasonably permanent basis. The House Committee on Agriculture decided, however, to reduce this amount by $2,973,680. The House accepted the reduction when the Agricultural bill was under consideration in that body at the last session. The bill was then referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, and this committee increased the amount carried in the House bill by $3,000,000. I recently renewed my recommendation to the House Committee on Agriculture and urged that the action of the Senate be accepted, but the committee in reporting the bill to the House on May 26 failed to increase the appropriation as suggested. The reduction that has been made will seriously affect the work throughout the country. It will be necessary to withdraw the agricultural agents from a large number of counties and the home-demonstration work, particularly in the Northern and Western States, where it is relatively new, will have to be largely discontinued. The boys' and girls' work also will be materially reduced. This would be unfortunate, to say the least, and I hope very much that the Congress will provide the requisite funds for the maintenance of this great educational system during the next fiscal year.

Very truly, yours,

D. F. HOUSTON, *Secretary.*

During the reading of the letter, the following occurred:

Mr. HAUGEN. I think the gentleman should say $2,500,000 for the current year, and there will be over $3,000,000 for the next year.

Mr. RAKER. I thank the gentleman for the explanation. It will be made clear in a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

Mr. RAKER. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy in the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may have five minutes additional. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The reading of the letter was concluded.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I will yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BAER. In regard to these 2,000,000 children that are in this garden movement, does the Secretary say that they are enlisted in the agricultural children's movement, or does he state it is in connection with some other movement?

Mr. RAKER. They have their garden and demonstration work going on, and they have this great body of boys and girls, 2,000,000 of them, that they are helping to educate in order to make them better farmers and farmers' wives, and to economize and help raise these products, which will add many millions of dollars to our produce in this country, instead of wasting it, and while we are providing the money for experimental matters in this legislation, ought we to forget to make the necessary appropriations for these things which will educate our children, which will make them better citizens, and will cause them to conserve and add to the products of our country? Why, there is no money that could be expended so wisely and so well and so economically as to educate our boys and girls in agricultural lines as well as generally. While the Committee of the Whole have not seen fit to include this on the bill, of course, we hope again the Senate will place it on, and that the House conferees will accept it and permit it to remain in our legislation because of its necessity.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I am a great believer in this school-garden movement, but I want to say that there is a great deal of duplication of effort and overlapping of duties in the work. The Bureau of Education now has a department called the "United States School Garden Army." Now, this is the army that includes the 2,000,000 children as members, and I think the Secretary of Agriculture in his letter to the gentleman from California, when he mentions these 2,000,000 children, must refer to the children in the United States School Garden Army and not to the Agricultural Department.

I read an article by Forest Crissey in the Country Gentleman recently, telling about the work of the department, and while we can compliment the Agricultural Department for the canning clubs and different organizations, he said it cost about 80 cents to enroll one child in the garden movement connected with the Department of Agriculture, while one of the officials of the Bureau of Education informed me it cost only 10 cents to enroll one pupil in the garden movement in the United States School Garden Army, as it is called. The point I want to make is, while I do not want to do away with it entirely, that I do not think that this school-garden movement should come under the Department of Agriculture. I believe it should be under the Bureau of Education. It is purely an educational matter. School gardening is being taken into the curriculum of our schools to-day. We are spending $200,000 in the Bureau of Education for this great work. It has literature which covers all the subjects about gardens being mailed out to all the teachers. The bureau in the Agricultural Department is sending out the same kind of literature. One can read paragraphs in both sets of pamphlets that are almost identical. I understand there is an independent school-garden movement in addition to the two departmental services. So we have three children-garden movements in the United States to-day. I think they ought to be coordinated under one department. Reports say the School Garden Army connected with the Bureau of Education has 2,000,000 children enrolled, and that they are carrying on educational work with the teachers, sending out lecturers and putting on pageants throughout the country, and are really getting somewhere. It is working in cities over 2,000 in population. This is where the work should be done, for it is in the congested centers that gardens are more necessary. The small towns under 2,000 and the farms usually have their truck gardens and sufficient supply of these foodstuffs.

I would like to have the chairman of the committee tell me how many members are enrolled in the school-garden movement connected with the Department of Agriculture, if he has that information at hand?

Mr. HAUGEN. I regret I do not have it at hand.

Mr. BAER. A great deal could be said on this particular subject, and I think it is time for this Congress, which is talking about economy, to coordinate these two or three different activities of school-garden movement under one head in one department, and make one appropriation to take care of it in one department.

Mr. HAUGEN. I might say to the gentleman that the trouble with the committee is that we have been criticized for not segregating items sufficiently heretofore. Now the gentleman is insisting upon merging the different items into one. The effort of the committee has been to segregate items, so that we might in that way check up the expenditures.

Mr. BAER. But that is aside from my point.

Mr. HAUGEN. I fully agree with the gentleman that some of these items might be merged——

Mr. BAER. In one department.

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; in one department; and there should be coordination and cooperation to prevent duplication and overlapping. The trouble is that when we make appropriations for the Department of Agriculture another committee comes in and makes appropriations for another department, and some of these activities overlap. But the Committee on Agriculture is only responsible for what is done in the Department of Agriculture. There is apparently in the department a duplication of work, and the best we can do is to compromise.

Mr. BAER. The gentleman understands that my criticism is not against the Department of Agriculture at all, or against the child-garden movement, but I am opposed to several departments carrying on the same work when their duties overlap and send out the same reports, thus cluttering up the wastebaskets of every school-teacher in the country.

Mr. HAUGEN. I agree with the gentleman, and I hope committees of Congress may confer hereafter, with a view to securing some improvement in this regard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Bureau of Public Roads, $594,320.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. DOWELL. This total of $594,320 includes what percentage for administrative purposes under the appropriation?

Mr. HAUGEN. None.

Mr. DOWELL. What does it cover of the expense?

Mr. HAUGEN. Three per cent. I think it amounts to about $5,000,000.

Mr. DOWELL. Then what does the total for the Bureau of Public Roads, $594,320, include above the expenses provided here in these items? This has no reference to the 3 per cent for administrative purposes, as the gentleman indicates. What I want to inquire about is what does this $594,320 include of the expenses before mentioned?

Mr. HAUGEN. The items are set out above in the bill.

Mr. DOWELL. In the items preceding?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. And that is in addition to the 3 per cent for administration, which is not included?

Mr. HAUGEN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF MARKETS.

Salaries, Bureau of Markets: One chief of bureau, $5,000; 1 chief clerk, $2,000; 1 administrative assistant, $3,000; 1 administrative assistant, $2,500; 1 clerk in charge of supplies and accounts, $2,250; 2 executive clerks, at $2,000 each; 1 clerk, $2,000; 1 executive assistant, $1,980; 1 administrative assistant, $1,980; 11 clerks, class 4; 1 clerk, $1,740; 14 clerks, class 3; 1 clerk, $1,440; 35 clerks, class 2; 1 clerk, $1,380; 5 clerks, at $1,320 each; 1 clerk, $1,300; 163 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk, $1,140; 40 clerks, at $1,100 each; 88 clerks, at $1,000 each; 13 clerks, at $1,080 each; 7 clerks, at $1,020 each; 2 clerks, at $960 each; 24 clerks, at $900 each; 3 clerks, at $840 each; 2 clerks, at $720 each; 1 laboratory helper, $900; 1 laboratory aid, $960; 3 laboratory aids, at $900 each; 1 laboratory aid, $840; 1 laboratory aid, $720; 1 photographer, $1,400; 1 photographer, $1,200; 1 superintendent of telegraph, $2,000; 1 supervising telegrapher, $1,620; 5 telegraph operators, at $1,600 each; 47 telegraph operators, at $1,400 each; 1 telegraph operator, $1,320; 7 telegraph operators, at $1,200 each; 1 telegraph operator, $1,080; 2 telephone operators, at $900 each; 1 telephone operator, $840; 1 draftsman, $1,400; 3 draftsmen, at $1,200 each; 1 draftsman, $900; 1 map tracer, $900; 1 map tracer, $720; 1 map tracer, $600; 4 machine operators, at $1,200 each; 2 machine operators, at $1,100 each; 1 machine operator, $1,000; 3 chauffeurs, at $900 each; 2 skilled laborers, at $900 each; 3 laborers, at $840 each; 6 laborers, at $720 each; 4 laborers, at $660 each; 5 laborers, at $600 each; 2 laborers, at $540 each; 1 messenger, $720; 10 messengers, at $540 each; 1 messenger, $480; 6 messenger boys, at $600 each; 5 messenger boys, at $540 each; 21 messenger boys, at $480 each; 3 messenger boys, at $420 each; 1 messenger boy, $360; 1 messenger boy, $300; 1 charwoman, $540; 6 charwomen, at $480 each; 6 charwomen, at $300 each; 9 charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $671,810.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order against the entire paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. SNELL. I notice, Mr. Chairman, that there is more increase in the general administrative expenses of this one bureau than in anything else carried in the whole bill. I looked through the hearings on this bill and I noticed from the questions that were asked by members of the committee themselves of the various experts of the department that the individual members of the committee feel about the same as I do in regard to this entire item. As far as I am able to learn, the people of the whole country look with very little favor upon continuing the war activities of the Bureau of Markets in time of peace.

I come from a rural district. There are no large cities in it, and the largest industry in my district is farming; and if I know the sentiment of my people at all they are absolutely opposed to a great many of the activities that are carried on by this Bureau of Markets.

I noticed in the report filed by the committee that 251 clerks are taken from the lump-sum amount and placed on the statutory list. As I understand, when you once take them and place them on the statutory list that means that it is the intention of the committee to carry these men along in the Agricultural Department. I would like to get some information from the chairman on that one line.

Mr. HAUGEN. I did not catch the gentleman's question.

Mr. SNELL. What is the intention of the committee when they transfer the 251 clerks from the lump-sum appropriation to the statutory list?

Mr. HAUGEN. That has been the practice heretofore. According to the interpretation of the law it is required to do so.

Mr. SNELL. That means that these additional clerks are fixed charges upon the United States Treasury as long as you and everybody else here lives?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is for Congress to determine. Congress passes upon the appropriation to be made and the number to be employed.

Mr. SNELL. Practically nobody is ever dropped from the statutory roll?

Mr. HAUGEN. Occasionally they are dropped, but we are expanding rather than contracting.

Mr. SNELL. We are expanding in this bureau by 251 clerks.

Mr. HAUGEN. It is a wonderful expansion.

Mr. SNELL. Does the gentleman himself think that we are getting dollar for dollar from the expenses of this department?

Mr. HAUGEN. I would not like to say positively that we are getting dollar for dollar from this department or any other department. Candidly speaking, I do not think we get 75 cents on the dollar from any department. Take it, if you will, in the Post Office Department. I think an individual could conduct that business at 50 per cent of its present cost.

Mr. SNELL. I think it is a good time now, in the beginning of peace times, to cut to the very marrowbones the activities of the Bureau of Markets.

Mr. HAUGEN. If the gentleman will permit——

Mr. SNELL. I will permit.

Mr. HAUGEN. Only a few years ago Congress reported a bill appropriating $50,000 for this service. It has grown by leaps and bounds. This year the department estimates $3,131,000. The committee reports $2,689,365. The amount appropriated last year was $4,027,863. So we have a decrease of $1,338,498.

Mr. SNELL. Increase?

Mr. HAUGEN. No; decrease.

Mr. SNELL. Last year was for war-time activities.

Mr. HAUGEN. The regular appropriation bill carried $2,023,225, and the food production bill $2,004,608, making a total of $4,027,863, which amount is $1,338,498 more than the amount reported by the committee in this bill.

Mr. SNELL. What does it mean when you say you have dropped six telegraph operators at $1,080, and have added some more at $1,400?

Mr. HAUGEN. It was requested. I do not recall this item exactly, but it is requested that the salaries be increased.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SNELL. I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. As the gentleman knows, an amendment to increase salaries has been held out of order, but an amendment to increase the number of employees is not subject to a point of order, and wherever we have found it necessary to increase a salary, under the rule of the House it is necessary to drop the employee at the lower salary and to increase the number at the higher salary.

Mr. SNELL. So that is the way it is done in this bill?

Mr. HAUGEN. That is the way it is done in this bill and in every other bill, and is the only way it can be done in any bill under the rules of the House.

Mr. SNELL. Do you not think it would be possible to cut $500,000 or $1,000,000 out of this general appropriation and get just as good service for the country as we will get this year?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will be perfectly frank with the gentleman. I have not been very enthusiastic over these appropriations.

Mr. SNELL. I know the gentleman has not.

Mr. HAUGEN. And especially these increases. But bear in mind the committee spent days and nights for weeks in the consideration of this bill, and succeeded in cutting the appropriation $442,000, and another item $3,000,000. We thought we had done well. We have cut these items. We did our best; we reported the bill; I trust the House will sustain the committee.

Mr. SNELL. Is it the intention of the gentleman next year to try to cut down the appropriation and the activities of this Bureau of Markets to a still greater degree?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is my purpose to scrutinize every item and to allow every dollar that I believe can be judiciously expended, but not one dollar more, and I am pleased to think that the committee and the House are in accord with that sentiment.

Mr. SNELL. I think the country at large is very much in accord with the sentiment of greatly reducing the war-time activities of the Government in time of peace.

Mr. HAUGEN. I fully agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SNELL. We were very generous in our appropriations before, because we were afraid it might interfere in some way with winning the war if we were not; but the war is over, and now I feel that we ought to look into each one of these appropriations and prune them as carefully as possible.

Mr. HAUGEN. I am heartily in accord with that sentiment.

Mr. SNELL. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I move to amend, on line 22, page 79, by striking out the figures "$671,810" and inserting in lieu thereof "$387,850."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Page 79, line 22, strike out "$671,810" and insert in lieu thereof "$387,850."

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Will this accomplish any reduction in the actual appropriation? Having made specific appropriations in the items on pages 78 and 79, will we not have the aggregate of those items anyway, whether you reduce the total or not?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If we gave the Secretary $387,000 instead of $671,000, and left with him the discretion he seems to have to change these salaries as he sees fit, he could cut the garment to fit the cloth.

Mr. DOWELL. That is true, except for the fact that we have made the specific appropriations and fixed the specific salaries in each item on these two pages, and this is merely a mathematical computation and does not affect the actual appropriation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think if the amendment is carried it will be up to the Secretary to readjust the force so that he can pay them out of the allowance we make. My point is that Congress ought to fix some limitation on the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. DOWELL. I agree with the gentleman's proposition, but I am calling attention to the position the gentleman is in, where we have made special appropriations, and then he attempts to cut down the aggregate.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will explain why I made this amendment. I do not care to be put in the position of clipping a little bit here and a little bit there off the salary of department employees. A point of order would lie against the salary of the chief of the bureau being raised from $4,500 to $5,000 in the bill. If I was so minded, I could make a point of order against the increase of salary, and it would be sustained by the Chair, but I do not like to resort to that method of regulation. I would prefer to have legislation enacted by this body so that the Secretary of Agriculture would have his limit fixed. I do not care to get the reputation in this House, on this bill or any other bill, of taking advantage of a technicality to cut down a man's salary. In fact, there would be no actual cutting down, because the salary of the chief of the bureau is $4,500 and it is proposed to give him $5,000. I could save that extra $500 by making the point of order, but I do not care in this instance to do so.

If the committee should adopt the amendment and cut this appropriation down from $671,000 to $387,000, the Secretary could adjust these clerks, draftsmen, and others and their salaries to fit the situation.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Do we not legislate for all the positions and the amounts payable for salaries; and, assuming that the gentleman's motion should carry and that he is making the motion in good faith, would not the Secretary be authorized to continue the employees and pay them these amounts and then come in under the deficiency bill?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. He might do it under a deficiency bill. Congress would then be better able to understand the peculiar privileges which the Secretary of Agriculture has and which no other Secretary has.

Mr. BAER. Would not the gentleman make another amendment adjusting these salaries according to the amounts mentioned in his amendment?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have offered the amendment because it is a proper place to do it. I propose to offer others as we go along. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Iowa, has given some figures which I think the committee did not hear. The Bureau of Markets was started about six years ago. It began on the same pretense that all of these other bureaus begin, of furnishing information to the people, helping out the farmer with information. One pretense was that it would help city people by giving them information as to the markets and help them cut down the food prices. After two or three years it developed so rapidly that the chief wanted larger appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. His activities, due very largely to propaganda and the issuing of bulletins for which we were contributing the money, have advanced to such an extent that last year this bureau, which started with $50,000 six years ago, had at its disposal upward of $4,000,000.

I want you gentlemen to understand how these things grow upon us and fasten themselves on Congress from year to year. You give the Secretary of Agriculture the power to yield to the requests of his chiefs of bureaus, who are directly interested in advancing their own influence and power; and so it goes, new positions, advanced salaries, and so forth.

Bear in mind what you have done. In six years you have permitted this bureau in the Department of Agriculture to jump from $50,000 to $4,000,000. It is a terrific advance. If other bureaus are permitted to have this recourse there will be no way of finding the money. I am speaking as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, which has to find the means to run the Government.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Does the gentleman think from what he has observed that in this sort of a thing we are getting anywhere near the value received for the expenditure?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not think so; and when we come to discuss other paragraphs I shall offer testimony from Chicago, from San Francisco, from New York, and Philadelphia indicating that the value of the publications sent out by the Bureau of Markets is negligible and becomes waste paper. It is charged that it is a duplicate of work already done by private agencies, without any expense to the Government. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] made reference to this yesterday and indicated that I was making a statement not in the interest of economy, but in the interest of boards of trade and chambers of commerce, which have an interest in not having the Government do the work. I am now calling attention to the fact, in view of what he said and what he may say, that the Bureau of Markets, which began with $50,000, has advanced and advanced until it now has $4,000,000, and is gradually absorbing war-trade industries and boards that did not want to go out of business.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Does the gentleman know how much additional expense has been entailed on account of this Bureau of Markets presumably as a war measure?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That I can not say; but this bill provides a total appropriation for the Bureau of Markets, on page 84, of $2,689,365. There are certain added activities which you will find as you read this bill—cotton futures, grain standards, and things of that kind—tacked on here and there as we go along, increasing the total appropriation enormously; but on page 84, although there are dozens of references to the Bureau of Markets elsewhere, you will find the total appropriation amounts to $2,689,365.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is that all the gentleman wants?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think it would be best to get rid of it now.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The law last year carried a little upward of $2,000,000, so that in this bill we are providing for $666,000 more than we provided last year.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct; but I just want to observe that that does not all represent a transfer of items, representing more activities in the food-production act. Some of that represents increases in the items for the enforcement of the grain-standards act and the cotton-standards act.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But there is no question about the increase of the appropriations for the Bureau of Markets this year over the appropriation made last year.

Mr. ANDERSON. Not in the regular bill; no.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. So far as this total on page 84 is concerned, the difference between this year and last year amounts to $666,000 more. One might ask how we are going to meet this situation. We tried to get at it by points of order, but the points of order are ruled out. We try to meet it by inquiring of the committee whether they have gone carefully into the matter, and they say they have and that they are all

in favor of economy but desire to increase the appropriation this year because of these new things that have been tacked onto the Bureau of Markets. I find that the Chicago Butter and Egg Board of Trade and certain institutions in New York and San Francisco say that the publications that are sent to them at the expense of the Government through the Bureau of Markets are a real hindrance to business and an unnecessary expense, since private sources cover all that information now, and cover it better than the bureau does. The Philadelphia Produce Exchange has been protesting for some time against the activities of the Bureau of Markets, and in the time I have left I desire that the following communication be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, *May 9, 1919.*

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
Crozer Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MR. MOORE: We are inclosing you a copy of our secretary's address before the members of the Chicago Butter and Egg Board on April 22, and editorial comment thereon by the two principal dairy papers of this country. We also inclose you copy of resolutions adopted by the Chicago Butter and Egg Board on April 30. The memorial to Congress by the Philadelphia Produce Exchange, which you presented to the House on January 31, has been indorsed by the exchanges of New York and Boston. Thus you will see that the four principal markets of the country are opposed to the activities of the Bureau of Markets and consider much of the work which it does pure waste.

The authority under which this wasteful work is performed is to be found in Public, No. 40, Sixty-fifth Congress, which is called "An act to provide further for the national security and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products." Under this authority the Bureau of Markets has expanded its work into useless channels, increasing enormously the expense which the taxpayer has to provide for. It is difficult to understand how the Secretary of Agriculture could have been deluded into the notion that much of the work of the Bureau of Markets is of any value to anybody.

The final section of the act provides that its provisions "shall cease to be in effect when the national emergency resulting from the existing state of war shall have passed, the date of which shall be ascertained and proclaimed by the President; but the date when this act shall cease to be in effect shall not be later than the beginning of the next fiscal year after the termination, as ascertained by the President, of the present war between the United States and Germany."

If much of the kind of work which the Bureau of Markets performs were necessary in time of war, it certainly now is not necessary, and its continuance is a sheer waste of time and money. And why should the treatment of butter, egg, and cheese distributors be an insult to their intelligence and a reflection upon their integrity?

* * * * * * *

We feel that we are entitled to more consideration in the premises, and trust that you will give your earnest attention to what is herein inclosed.

Sincerely, yours,

[SEAL.] THE PHILADELPHIA PRODUCE EXCHANGE,
JOHN S. MORRIS, *President.*
SAM'L S. DANIELS, *Secretary.*

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, in a great country like ours, with its diversified interests, with agriculture as one of the chief concerns of the Nation, the market becomes one of the interesting problems to every producer. The question of marketing farm products is not a question alone with the producer from the soil, but I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] that the extremely interesting concern as to proper distribution goes directly to the congested centers of the Nation. His people are crying out now with regard to the high cost of living. Oh, I do not wonder that the sole objection that you have to this appropriation comes from the produce exchanges, just as read from that desk. [Applause.] They are the men who have handled the produce from the farms and have reaped where they have not sown. It was a condition that confronted this great Nation, and Congress has never done anything to relieve the abuses by produce exchanges until we created the Bureau of Markets. The produce exchanges held up the farmer and they held up the consumer; they would like to go back to the old days. It is true that a bureau set up in the Agricultural Department that has to do with the entire agricultural conditions of the Nation is going to cost money if it properly functions; but I do not care what it costs, it will never reach the loss that the farmer and the consumer sustains if you go back to the old system and let these leeches on society handle the produce from the farms and hold up both the producer and consumer in congested centers. [Applause.] This department deals with every product of the farm. The great wheat belt of the West looks to this department; the great cotton belt of the South looks to this department; the corn belt, the people who grow truck crops—and in my State we have a great industry along this line—look to this department. I know what has happened in the district from which I come and the adjoining district, the great tomato-growing section of the country. One year they would prosper and the next year the produce exchanges would bankrupt them; but now it is a stable crop, because their markets are looked out for by the Government and information furnished from this department; and so with the fruit belts of the Nation; so with the great cattle industry and with the hog industry. It is true some blunders have been made, and others will be made. This is a new piece of machinery set up, but are we going to abandon it at the behest of the men who want to prosper as against the producer and the consumer because we are just now getting the machinery in operation? [Applause.]

For one, coming from a great agricultural State where we have got to furnish my friend's constituency with his meat supply, with his cheap clothing, I do not want to be in the hands of the produce exchange, but I want my Government to furnish me with impartial information to help me reach a market that is open to the produce we make. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, we have reached a point in this bill where the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and myself have come to the earnest stage of discussion. The Morrill Act was passed in 1862. It was the first act of Congress recognizing that the Government had any substantial interest in the agriculture of the country. Under that act were established your great agricultural and mechanical colleges throughout the country. They are educational institutions that will compare favorably with any institutions anywhere in the world. Then it was concluded in 1887 that you could not teach agriculture unless you had scientific investigation to develop the facts and furnish the information and then was passed the Hatch Act. Later we passed the Nelson amendment, later the Adams Act, and then as a climax to all the acts and upon the theory that information gathered and stored up could be of no value to anyone, and upon the theory that this information distributed to the farmers by bulletins and pamphlets was probably not getting the best results, Congress in 1914, I believe it was, enacted the agricultural extension act providing for a system of itinerant teaching of agriculture. Up to this time, gentlemen, we had been going on the theory that agriculture as a profession must confine itself entirely to the matter of production, that it was a wise thing to teach the farmers to produce two blades of grass where only one grew before, and then some one suddenly discovered that there were other sides of agriculture, chief among which was the matter of the marketing of that which we produced. The experts in various agricultural colleges, notably in Minnesota, had been making some inquiry as to the cost of distributing butter, I think it was, and they found that there was an enormous difference between the price that the producer got and the price that the consumer had to pay. The result of these investigations was that there came up a demand from the producers of the country as well as the consumers for the creation in the Department of Agriculture of a Bureau of Markets. Various and sundry bills were introduced and referred to the Committee on Agriculture, most of them carrying large appropriations and most of them in their very nature being unworkable, socialistic in their tendency, and the Committee on Agriculture studied those bills, studied the problem of marketing, and came to the conclusion to write into the Agricultural appropriation bill language almost identical with the language of the organic act and carry with it an appropriation of $50,000. That was some six or seven years ago. That was the beginning of the Bureau of Markets. It has grown, it has grown rapidly. The Congress itself has put burdens upon this department and it is necessary that in carrying out the will of Congress this bureau must have the funds and the means with which——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. For a question.

Mr. VAILE. Can the gentleman elucidate why, in view of the activities of this bureau, there is still such a discrepancy between the price the producer gets and the price the consumer has to pay?

Mr. LEVER. Well, that is a problem that will take many years to solve, many years to solve; but I will say this, the theory of the Bureau of Markets is to furnish information, and accurate information, to advise the consumer where he may buy his butter, to advise the producer of butter where the market for butter is not glutted, and so with eggs, so with vegetables, so with fruits, so with meat, so with cattle, and so with hogs. When I first came to Congress there was no Bureau of Statistics furnishing accurate and impartial statistics of cotton. There were a dozen or more agencies in New York which were sending out all kinds of reports about the condition of cotton, making all kinds of guesses about the size of

the crop of cotton, and whenever the bears were in control those agencies were influenced to send out bearish reports, and whenever there was a bull drive on you would find these agencies sending out bullish reports. There was no impartial person standing between the producer and those people who manipulated their reports and constituted the gambling element on the exchanges. Congress took the matter in hand and created a bureau which now furnishes accurate information, impartial information, the most accurate information that can be had as to the acreage, growing conditions of the crop, and finally the ultimate yield of the crop, with the result that these private agencies have been driven practically out of business. It costs money to do that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. In just a minute. It costs money to do that, and I venture the assertion that the appropriation that we make for this purpose from year to year is a mere bagatelle compared with the amount we save to the producer of cotton by having an impartial report, and there is not a man here from the South who does not know that. This is true in reference to wheat and the staple agricultural products. This Bureau of Markets proposes to furnish accurate information on perishable products, just as other bureaus are furnishing them on staple products. There has been no attack on this bureau except such as inserted here by the gentleman from Philadelphia, and that comes from a produce exchange. If the gentleman will insert in the RECORD one protest from a producer of watermelons in South Carolina or Georgia, of cantaloupes in Oregon, or from the producer of onions in Texas, or the producer of cabbages in South Carolina, I think, after I investigate his honesty and his decency and his sanity, that I will withdraw my opposition to the amendment of the gentleman. I know he can not do it. Do you know about these produce exchanges? I have been looking into them a little myself. The market opens. Four or five big fellows get together and they sneak off to one corner of the room and they hold a whispered conversation, while the little fellows are looking on, most of them in dread and in agony, and they say, "The price of butter to-day in the city of Philadelphia is to be 68 cents per pound, and the price of eggs is to be 80 cents per dozen."

And then they issue their reports. This Philadelphia Produce Exchange issues a paper, and the editor of that paper has been the most vigorous opponent that this bureau has had. [Applause.] The gentleman has traveled the country. He has been to Chicago, arousing sentiment against the Bureau of Markets, and inducing other produce exchanges, controlled by the "Big Four" or the "Big Five," to send in resolutions of protest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from South Carolina be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JUUL. I would like to ask the gentleman, if the bureau is functioning as the gentleman says, why it is that we in the cities are not deriving the benefit because of the control and from the information possessed by the bureau?

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman not know that, except for the bureau, the prices of these things might be 50 per cent higher? How can he tell? That is my answer to your question.

Mr. JUUL. They might be higher.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Did the gentleman receive support from this side as well as the other side in the destroying of iniquitous exchanges?

Mr. LEVER. There was no attempt to destroy them.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There was an effort made to do so.

Mr. LEVER. But it was not my effort.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The power was entirely on the other side of the House, and he had the cooperation of this side.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is trying to put me in the attitude of trying to wipe out these produce exchanges. I am trying to wipe out their iniquitous methods. I am not opposing the exchanges. I am not opposing the cotton exchange; I am not opposing the grain exchanges, but I simply say to you, You ought to regulate them; you ought to squeeze out of them those things that are not proper and right. And, my friend, if you find, after a limited period of experimentation with the proper kind of regulation, you can not regulate the evils out of them, then I will go one step further and say abolish them by law. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is exactly what some gentlemen on the other side undertook to do. They did not get very far with that. Will the gentleman harmonize what he said about the exchanges with the lamentations of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] when he spoke of the injustice to the cotton man, notwithstanding you had the power to effect all the reforms you desired?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is talking about cotton, and I am talking about the Philadelphia Produce Exchange.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I know. I am coming back home.

Mr. LEVER. Now, listen. The Bureau of Markets, I have had watermelon growers tell me, is doing more to stabilize the price of perishable products than it seemed possible when we started these small appropriations for it. Their purpose is to prevent glutted markets and glutted distributing points. Their purpose is to furnish to the producer information as to where he can send his goods and sell them at the best profit. Their purpose is to inform the consumer where he may look for the best products at the lowest price to himself. The whole theory is to strike out of the operation of distribution the wastefulness and corrupt practices that have grown up. There can not be, gentlemen of the committee, a more serious problem confronting the Congress than that. It is a neglected field. We have neglected it here since the foundation of the Government, and now we have begun it. The system is not perfect. There is a lot of waste, I have no doubt, though I do not know. I have not been able to discover it. They have made mistakes, and my friend from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] said that they were going to make more mistakes. But the business of Congress is to help these people overcome the mistakes, provide them with the money and the machinery, and tell them to go at this problem and solve it in the interest of the producing public as well as the consuming public.

Now, while I am on my feet, let me say that another feature of agriculture was neglected until a few years ago. That was the problem of finance. Agriculture, to my mind, is a tripod resting on three legs, one called production, the other finance, and the other distribution. And if you perform your duty to the public, consuming and producing, the Congress of the United States will look equally after all three of these legs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is not all debate on the amendment exhausted?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate is exhausted. The gentleman, of course, is recognized——

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is no last word.

Mr. BLANTON. There evidently is a last word, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is entitled to recognition.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, there is one thing that inclines me to vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and against the entire item, and that is to prevent these clerks from being placed on the permanent roll until there is a proper provision and restriction placed around them to prevent what I have called to the attention of Congress heretofore, and that is the vicious system which the Democratic administration has inherited from our friends the Republicans and which we have never yet been able to get rid of. I refer to the fact that we permit each year hundreds of clerks and employees of this Government presumably to work six or seven or eight hours for this Government on big salaries and at the same time be employed by big private concerns, firms, and corporations on big salaries, receiving double salaries at the same time. That is a system that we have inherited from the Republicans, and which both the Democrats and Republicans still permit to exist in this Nation.

You say, "Well, give us some names." I will give you a few names. Down here in the Bureau of Mines, for instance, we have a man, Mr. Charles L. Parsons, who is chief chemist of that department, and who is paid $4,800 a year by this Government and is presumed to be giving his time to the United States Government, and yet at the same time he is superintendent or manager for a private corporation—the American Chemical Association—which is housed in the Bureau of Mines, which

has its office in the Bureau of Mines, which has its corps of employees in the Bureau of Mines, and in which position he draws from that private corporation an additional salary of $3,500 a year, in an office furnished by this Government, a free office, with free janitor service, free electric lights and fans, free ice water, free everything, furnished by the Government. In this office in that very department last year from some 13,500 members of this corporation there was taken into the coffers of this private concern $137,000 in dues to a private business enterprise. We permit that system to exist, and our joint congressional committee in their questionnaires which they have submitted to the employees of this Government absolutely refused to ask them the question, "Do you work for any firm or person or corporation other than the United States?" "Are you employed by any private concern?" No; they will not ask it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I do.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. How long has this man Parsons had his office in the Bureau of Mines?

Mr. BLANTON. I am told, for years.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; but if you will get me time I will yield.

Mr. BAER. I will ask for five minutes more.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has not yet expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. I understand the gentleman is directing his remarks to the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. BLANTON. I am directing my remarks to the Congress of the United States, asking that we Democrats and you Republicans stop this practice. [Applause.]

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I do. I will give you a lot more names if you will get me more time.

Mr. RUCKER. A few moments ago the gentleman made a criticism of the joint committee of Congress which is investigating the clerkships, and said that that committee has refused to ask certain questions.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; and I reiterate that statement.

Mr. RUCKER. Has that committee had its attention called to it?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. I have sent a letter, with a copy of my proposed questionnaire, to every member of that committee and implored them to submit my questionnaire to bring out the facts that I want to know as a Member of this Congress in passing upon the qualifications of clerks and the proposed reclassification of their salaries.

Mr. RUCKER. What reason did they assign?

Mr. BLANTON. One said they did not care what a clerk did after 5 o'clock in the afternoon. If he wanted to work——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for more time, since I have been interrupted.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

Mr. BAER. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Texas be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. JUUL. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois objects. Is there objection to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] proceeding for five minutes?

Mr. ANDERSON. I object. I am perfectly willing that the gentleman shall proceed, but I want to have some agreement as to the limit of debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota objects.

Mr. BLANTON. I was going to give you the names of lots of them, but you do not want to hear.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to strike out the figures "$671,810," on line 22, page 79, and insert in lieu thereof "$387,850."

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing and distributing of farm and nonmanufactured food products and the purchasing of farm supplies, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the department, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the transportation, marketing, and distributing of farm and food products, $317,520.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, on page 80, line 11, by striking out "$317,520" and inserting in lieu thereof "$292,240."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Page 80, line 11, strike out the figures "$317,520" and insert in lieu thereof "$292,240."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this amendment can be voted on with a little more freedom by the Members who desire to promote economy, because it does not affect salaries and the places of clerks as the other amendment did. This paragraph is for acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information, and so forth. Last year we appropriated $292,240 for this purpose. This year, when we are supposed to be approaching a peace era, the appropriation is increased to $317,520. Now, this does not affect a salary except that it would provide for some new persons or some new publications. It can be stricken out, and very fairly so.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. JUUL. I would like to ask the gentleman if the item of $317,520 is not itemized somewhere?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is not itemized here, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. JUUL. I know; but can we not find out what consumes that difference between the item in the former bill and this one?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have no way of informing the gentleman. I am moving to strike it out because what we appropriated last year was sufficient for the purpose, and we have been asked to advance that amount for this year when we ought to practice economy. It is for diffusing information. It may be that some more people want information, or it may be that some more people want jobs in the department. It may be that some of these war bureaus are being turned over to this bureau and that they must be taken care of.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I can not yield further in the short time remaining. In the two or three minutes left I want to say to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] that I have no special interest in the Philadelphia Produce Exchange, or any other exchange in the country, except as they perform a useful purpose and are entitled to consideration on this floor if their business is legitimate. I want to say to the gentleman that this harangue against exchanges or against combinations intended to promote and advance the business interests does not go with me. I have been here while the gentleman's party was in power upon the other side, at least six years, while the gentleman was contending against exchanges, contending against combinations of capital in the name of the producer, but never in the name of the consumer, and I have observed that he still so contends, though he has had six years of opportunity to remedy the situation of which he complains. Witness, when the question of cotton arises, and I am not going to discuss it, except as I may very decently refer to a speech made on this floor the other day by a gentleman who has been contending in season and out of season against exchanges, against those combinations that are supposed to market the farmer's product, whether he is a planter in the South or whether he is a grain grower in the West. Listen to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], one of the chief exponents of cotton on this floor, and see whether what is sauce for the goose is also not sauce for the gander. The gentleman was complaining that the price of cotton was going down, complaining that the cotton grower was not getting his profit, and here is what he said, and think of "combinations" as you listen to him:

Now, gentlemen, let me ask you in all fairness and candor, what was the South to do under those circumstances? Would you have put your cotton on the market when it was going down like that and when to sell it meant the loss of all your profits?

He is speaking for the farmer now, who does not like combinations, who does not like boards of trade, who does not like means of exchange for distributing agricultural products.

No—

Said the gentleman from Alabama very emphatically—

You would not do that if you were a good business man.

What right has the gentleman to say what good business men would do, when he does not believe in business. The gentleman says:

We were forced to hold it and keep it off the market.

Yes; form a combination ourselves, as it were, and keep it off the market, so the price would go up and the consumer would have to pay more. The gentleman says:

If men by a combination in a gambling deal destroy the value of your property overnight, beating the price down and down, are you going to play into their hands and throw your produce on the market or are you going to say, "No; I will refuse to sell."

Cotton is not perishable. Cotton is not like the produce that comes from the West and from the farms of the North.

The law of supply and demand—

Says my friend from Alabama—

warrants a much better price, and I must have a better price or my year's work and investments are all lost.

Good sense and sound business judgment suggested to the cotton farmer to hold his cotton off the market.

Was there any combination in that? Was there any deal there? Was there any restraint of trade there that aggravated the feelings of the gentleman who stood by the farmer?

Now, what else was necessary? Concerted action.

Think of it! That may not be a combination, but it is getting together.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I would not have risen at all, except that the gentleman from Pennsylvania insists on undertaking to put me in the attitude of opposing exchanges. I have repeatedly said I did not, and that I would not until I was convinced that you could not squeeze out of them their evil practices. When that time comes, if I am fortunate or unfortunate enough to be in this House, or wherever I may be, you will find my voice raised against them. But at this time I believe we can regulate them.

Some years ago we went after the New York Cotton Exchange, which had a contract which was costing the South millions of dollars. We did not undertake to destroy them. We undertook to regulate them, and we did regulate that exchange and the New Orleans Exchange, with the result that we added from 20 to 50 points, or from $1 to $2.50, a bale to the value of every bale of cotton produced in the South.

Then it was concluded, in the closing days of the last session of Congress, that they were still employing a contract which did not represent the true value of cotton, and we proceeded by amendments to the law to give to the cotton trade a contract which did represent as nearly as possible the true value of cotton.

Now, what happened? During the months of April and March, for purposes of liquidation, and as a matter of fairness, the exchanges were permitted to deal in two contracts, the old contract which they had heretofore been dealing in and a new contract recognized by the amendment to the act. And it is very interesting to any of you gentlemen who are opposing the proposition of regulating exchanges to know what happened and what value the farmer got out of this change of law, this regulation of the exchanges.

Here are the contracts and their value. April 1 it was selling for 24 cents per pound. The new contract of the same date was selling for 30, a difference in the value of the bale of $4.15. The farmers at that time were holding 5,000,000 bales. Multiply 5,000,000 by $4 a bale and you get the saving to the farmer and likewise the producer which this regulation gave to them.

For a week it stood at about that same figure. Then, on the 8th of April the difference per bale in the value of the two contracts was $7.80. On the 10th it was $8.10. On the 11th it was $8. On the 14th it was $8.10. On the 17th it was $8, and it is now, the 30th of April, $7 difference. The average is here figured out at $7.50 a bale difference in the two contracts.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. The gentleman is making an interesting showing. If I understand the gentleman correctly he shows by his statement that he added $20,000,000 to the value of the bales of cotton involved.

Mr. LEVER. More than that.

Mr. JUUL. Does not that mean $20,000,000 put upon the shoulders of the consumers?

Mr. LEVER. Does not the gentleman know that we export two-thirds of the cotton produced in the United States? Does not the gentleman know that except for the export of cotton before the war the balance of trade would have been against us?

Mr. JUUL. But what I want to know is this, that in this Bureau of Markets it would seem to me——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina have five minutes more. I want to get this thing straightened out in my mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina be given five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUUL. The Bureau of Markets, in so far as I have been able to understand its activities, is a mighty good thing for the producer. The gentleman has shown that on these two little items in the matter of cotton it added $20,000,000 to the price paid cotton growers. I am glad they had it, and particularly so when the gentleman states that a great portion of the cotton is exported and sent abroad. But what I want to know is, can not the great men sitting in the committee utilize the Bureau of Markets so that the consumer can get something out of it? We are paying the same exorbitant prices for everything we buy. How does the Bureau of Markets help the teeming millions in the big cities?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will try and answer the gentleman's question. For four or five years men on the Philadelphia Produce Exchange, for example, get together in the morning and say that the price of eggs shall be 80 cents a dozen, when the producer in the country is selling them for 40 cents. Now, when that occurs there is something wrong. One of the chief activities of the Bureau of Markets is to furnish to the consuming public in the cities what the producers in other parts of the country are selling eggs for. So that the public itself will demand that these leeches disgorge. In other words, I am a believer in the great principle of light. I do not believe that evil can long exist if you turn sufficient light on it. The Bureau of Markets under the present activity is furnishing the light. But you can not expect it to correct all the evils within four or five years, but if you will give the bureau proper support and proper sympathy on the floor of the House and the Senate, I believe I can guarantee to you that you will have an organization that will do more for society and the human family in the way of furnishing products at their true value than by any other method of legislation of which I am capable of thinking at this time. That is all there is in the various items here that my friend from Pennsylvania opposes. It is simply for the purpose of gathering information, furnishing it to the public, and undertaking thereby to stabilize prices and to see to it that no man is gouging the public. If that is not a reputable, laudable proposition, I would like to know what is one.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print as a part of my remarks the prices on the old and new contracts that I have referred to.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The following is the list referred to:

Prices on old and new cotton contracts.

Date.	May, old.	May, new	Difference in points.	Per bale.
1919.				
Apr. 1	24.40	25.33	83	$4.15
2	24.75	25.63	88	4.40
3	24.90	25.85	95	4.75
4	24.80	25.70	90	4.50
5	24.60	26.25	165	8.25
7	24.95	26.28	133	7.65
8	24.94	26.50	156	7.80
10	24.30	25.92	162	8.10
11	24.55	26.15	160	8.00
14	25.03	26.65	162	8.10
15	25.30	26.85	155	7.75
16	25.18	26.78	160	8.00
17	25.90	27.39	149	7.45
21	26.07	27.60	153	7.65
22	26.10	27.52	142	7.10
23	26.35	27.75	140	7.00
26	27.05	28.45	140	7.00
29	27.05	28.65	160	8.00
30	26.65	28.05	140	7.00

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to this discussion, particularly so as I come from a fruit-producing section, where we are vitally interested in the market conditions. I do not believe that farmers' combinations put the price up to the consumer, as has just been stated. That has not been my experience. The raisin growers of San Joaquin County, in California, are producing four times as many raisins to-day, are getting three times as much as they got before, and still the consumers of this Nation to-day are paying less for raisins than they did 10 years ago. Farmers' combinations do not raise the price to the consumer. The combination that raises the price to the consumer is the combination of men that get together and handle the farmer's products after they leave his hands. I never could see any logic why the farmer should plant his orchard, intelligently take care of it for 10 years, use the best years of his life diligently cultivating the soil, and then, when his fruit is ready, when it should be most carefully guarded on its way to the consumer, to give it over into the hands of the speculator, whose only thought is to get as much out of it as possible. Why should the man who raises beans, sugar beets, strawberries, apples, cotton, and corn inform himself as to the best way of making his acres produce, and just when the most money is to be made from his labor turn his product over to the man who sits in his office waiting for the time for the good thing to be ready to pick? Will you tell me if it is necessary for capital and labor to organize, if every business finds its success dependent upon organization, why, I say, should not the farmer organize? He has got to organize to survive. It is for the best interests of the consumer and the best interests of the producer that he organize speedily, that he thoroughly inform himself as to the market conditions, and it is the duty of this Nation to aid the great producing sections and to get the proper market reports, by which he can intelligently judge of the world's supply and the Nation's supply in the particular line of crop that he is interested in.

Under the old system that prevailed a few years ago when no crop reports were available the individual orcharder had no way of knowing correctly as to market and crop conditions; adverse reports could be cleverly circulated causing him to feel uncertain as to future prices, and as a rule the crop was often secured by the speculator at prices far below what should have been realized. The speculator himself who had the best information at his hand could not always be sure of profit because he was dealing in uncertainties. Profits had to be large in proportion to the chances taken. Brokerage was large, the packing charge was large; the speculator would have to take chances, and often made great gains, and so did the wholesaler and retailer. As a consequence of uncertain conditions on the market and the lack of information, the speculator was forced to hammer the price down to the producer. The jobber was forced to buy at as low a price as possible for fear his competitors might buy still lower, and so with the wholesaler and retailer. Each one was fearful of the market and afraid to lay in a supply without the possibility of large profits. The old system of marketing was the worst form of speculation. It was a gamble pure and simple. The system paid the orchardist the lowest possible price for his product and gave him neither advertisement nor standardization in return for the vast amount of money that it cost. The old and faulty system of marketing charged the consumer the highest possible price to cover possible loss in future years. The "tax in transit" from grower to consumer was very great, often four times what the product of the soil brought the producer. Under the old and faulty system of marketing the man who did the work did not get the money. The orchardists of California have lost each year millions of dollars by early and unwise selling, because they had no way, individually, of telling as to the actual condition of the market. The Government of the United States should aid to the fullest this great producing class of its citizens to properly market their products, and this House should maintain the appropriation for supplying the Department of Agriculture with the necessary funds to inform all growers and consumers of our Nation as to the actual conditions of the world market.

When the Government fully cooperates with the farmer in his marketing associations the consumer will receive his goods at a very much lower figure than ever because the broker would be anxious to handle the product at a small profit where his profit was sure. The jobber would not hesitate to order a year's supply for fear of a decline in price; and so with the retailer. They would both be satisfied with fair profits because it was a sure one. The excessive "tax in transit" under the faulty system that has heretofore prevailed would be eliminated and, in my judgment, to a large extent the distrust and contention that has existed between the producing and consuming market would be eliminated.

The orange growers of California in connection with the Federal market director have to a large measure solved the questions of marketing the oranges. For many years it was difficult to secure the proper information, and while one market was glutted other markets would be depleted. While consumers in one section of the country were paying a high price for the oranges the consumers in a near-by city were paying a low price. One producer of oranges might have struck the market on a fortunate day while his neighbor might have been equally unfortunate in another market. There was no system, no cooperation, and no satisfaction to the great consuming cities of the East. The activities of the Federal market director have met with the approval of the producer and have saved money to the taxpayers of this Nation.

The market director of the State of California has shown his wisdom in advocating the combination of farmers, not for the sake of raising the price to the consumer but of cutting out the speculator who is a detriment not only to the consumer but to the producer. The West is leading the world in solving the question of marketing, and this item that is before the Committee of the Whole for discussion at this time should not be reduced but rather larger appropriations and broader scope should be given to the Federal market director to aid the farmers of this Nation in knowing fully and completely as to the crop conditions of the world, and I will say that as long as I remain as a Representative from the eighth district of California I will always raise my voice in behalf of the producer and that voice will carry the protection of the consumer as well.

In the limited time under the rules of the House that has been allotted to me for the discussion of this matter I will not go further at this time into an exhaustive discussion of the great advantages that the cooperative movement offers to the farmers of this Nation. Neither will I at this time point out in detail the immense amount of money that has been saved to the prune growers of Santa Clara County and of the State of California by the strong and ably directed company, the California Prune & Apricot Growers (Inc.), in their successful effort to solve the marketing problem of the prune and apricot growers of my State. But I am constrained in the few moments that are still remaining to me to make some general remarks that have been suggested to me by the discussions which have taken place on the floor of this House for the past three days on the Agricultural bill. While I have no desire or any expectation of bringing any new thought to the attention of you gentlemen, many of whom have for years been discussing the problems that affect the destinies of this Nation, still I feel, as one of the new Members in this House, that I wish to place myself squarely on record before this House and the people of the Nation in believing that the Agricultural bill which is before us to-day and which failed of passage in the Senate practically as it now stands is the most important bill that this Congress will have to consider, because it affects a greater number of our citizens than any other bill that will be presented in the Sixty-sixth Congress. In discussion from time to time by the Members in the Committee of the Whole it is apparent and gratifying to notice the large increase that in the past 10 years has been made by the Congress of the United States in the Agricultural appropriation bill.

And why have you made it? The farmers have not come here in a body, they have not had a powerful lobby to support their demands, there has been no great cry from the farmers for help. No; the farmer did not know that he needed any help. From the nature of the development of this country he found himself on the farm alone at great distances from his neighbors with no means of easy communication. All the questions that affected his destiny and the destiny of his family must be decided by him and by him alone. He had not the advantage that comes from interchange of ideas. He had not the advantage that cooperative effort could give him; he had not the advantage that association with his neighbor offered, and while it is true that this mode of life developed a wonderfully resourceful and independent people it is equally true that it took him away from safety. It made him a stranger to the education and achievements that can only come from mutual interchange of ideas. The nature and extent of his labor gave him no opportunity for development and developing his business methods. He became a lone hand player. He went along year in and year out, apparently reconciled to his lot. If his crops were poor or if pests destroyed them, he cursed his luck and hoped that his sons would be able to go to the city and that they would not have to work as he did. He skimped and saved, his wife wore the same sunbonnet and sold butter and eggs to get a little money ahead in order that the children might have a chance to go to boarding school, with the fond hope in view that peradventure they would become lawyers, doctors, preachers, or storekeepers. There was no thought of encouragement to them

to remain on the farm, because, apparently, there were no opportunities in the life of a tiller of the soil. Their great ambition was to give their children opportunities that were denied them.

As a result of this condition there was a great exodus from the farm to the city. And what then? You saw in this movement a danger to the country. Wise and far-sighted statesmen pressed on our State legislatures and on this body of lawgivers the necessity of changing this drift. You saw the danger to our country. You had information which a few men who have studied this question had given to you. You quickly realized that the Nation could not prosper when the agricultural interests of that Nation were in danger. You realized that this rich country was losing millions of dollars each year by wasteful methods in farming. You informed yourselves of the possibility of the soil where even a fair degree of thrift and intelligence was displayed. You increased the agricultural appropriation bill by millions each year. The State legislatures appropriated thousands and started agricultural schools, the realization was pressed home by neglected and abandoned farms, by the congestion of the population in our cities, by the danger that this exodus threatened to the proper balance of the Nation. You again appropriated, for you had before you the results of the experiments made by the Agricultural Department. You could see that the young man was no longer ashamed that he was going to the cow college. His father pointed with pride to the fact that his son would soon graduate from the agricultural college. The farmer was no longer ashamed of his calling. With wise legislation you had elevated him from the farmer to the agriculturist.

The corn lands of Illinois, Iowa, and Nebraska began to increase the yield per acre. The farmer, under the stimulating influence of experts, was selecting seed from the center of choice ears, and again a great increase was apparent. Our dairymen were cutting their herds in half and were still making more butter and cheese from one-half the cows they originally fed. The agricultural college graduates were feeding a balanced ration and scientifically applying fertilizer.

Last year the demonstrations of the Department of Agriculture attracted the attention of 3,000,000 farmers in our Nation. As a result of these demonstrations in the 15 Southern States and the enthusiasm that the farmer received from the possibility of greater increases in his crops you increased the production in a marvelous manner. When you compare the production of food supply in 1913 and in 1917 you will find that the number of bushels of corn increased from 658,252,000 to 682,643,000; the number of bushels of wheat increased from 51,009,000 to 74,857,000; the number of bushels of oats increased from 97,237,000 to 120,613,000; the number of tons of hay increased from 4,214,000 to 6,510,000; the number of bushels of white potatoes increased from 17,798,000 to 27,987,000; the number of bushels of sweet potatoes increased from 47,055,000 to 72,870,000. By the proper education and proper feeding methods in the North and Northwest the number of live stock of the farmers was increased by 43,405 head of cattle, 130,125 head of swine, 148,211 head of sheep, and 327,095 head of poultry.

The activity of the department was apparent not alone on the farm, but in the schools and the homes. They lent a helping hand in the kitchen, where the mothers and daughters learned to be more economical with their food, learned the proper method of canning and keeping food supplies. Eight hundred thousand boys and girls in the Northwestern States were enrolled in the industrial clubs in one year. The Department of Agriculture, when one gives even a cursory study, is found to lend its assistance and encouragement in the many and diversified fields that safeguard the Nation's health and wealth. In my opinion, it is the greatest organization of its kind in the world. Its activities cover the wide and extensive range that make for a greater and more contented people. It seems to me our thought should be how much of our money can we judiciously expend through this great organization and not how little. You have waved the magical wand through the instrumentality of the Agricultural Department and, lo, the Nation's wealth has increased by 50 per cent. Surely these activities deserve our most careful and continued encouragement.

To the uninitiated his success was magical. Now, this educated farmer is pressing you for larger and larger appropriations. He pleads his own cause because he knows that science is helping him each year and will continue to aid him in the years to come. And you know, or should realize, having before you the wonderful developments on the farm in the past 20 years that there is no money expended by this Nation that is bringing back to the people of this Nation a greater dividend than the money that has been spent in the Agricultural Department of our Nation. Men of wisdom know that the prosperity of this Nation is fundamentally based on the skill with which we till our soil, and we will agree quite unanimously that the kind of men that make all-around good citizens, that the kind of men who in the last analysis are the ideal American citizens, are the intelligent farmers, the man who owns and cultivates his small acreage. The average boy who makes up his mind to master the profession of agriculture has a better chance in life than the boy who selects the city in which to earn a livelihood. He has a better chance for success, for health, and for happiness; he has a better chance to transmit to posterity those virile and sterling traits that our farmer ancestors possessed. Those sterling qualities of courage, self-reliance, independence, love of liberty and justice, and love of country comes with greater ease from contact with the soil. They are the same qualities that our ancestors possessed; they are the same qualities that overcame the difficulties of the wilderness and the savage tribes. These are the qualities that gave to us our country and our freedom.

You have changed this drift; it is now moving from city to country. And as I see the future, and as I believe intelligent men all over this land of ours see the future, we are interested in seeing that our stream of sturdy young men move out from the crowded cities and take their chances on the great acres of undeveloped land that this Nation offers to them.

Let this body of men, who, if I may venture a guess, owe their preferment in life to that impulse given to them by their rugged and hardy forebears, see to it that no effort is left undone to bring as large a part of our citizenship as can be successfully accommodated to the great and wonderful out of doors.

I was greatly impressed when I came from the West to this eastern land. We have country and you have cities. As I saw the throngs of workers in your mills, the vast number who come to your magnificent office buildings, I knew that the great majority of these people of the East were going about at the beck and call of somebody else. I realized as never before that the few were doing the planning for the many, and I know, as you know, that while our cities have developed great and able men, and many of them, and that our commercial prosperity and preferment is their offering to the wealth of our Nation, still we realize that in comparison they are few in number to the great numbers of our urban population. And I will venture that we will again agree that the future strength of our Nation is in having every acre of our many acres of tillable soil owned and farmed by good American farmers. And I am not going to fail to say that this possibility is in our hands. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Chairman, this discussion has become very largely academic. It deals with nothing that is before the House at this time. To some remarks injected into the discussion by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], however, I want to reply. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has been taunting the gentleman from South Carolina with the fact that there were some persons on the Democratic side of the House who wanted to abolish the cotton exchanges. I plead guilty to being one who desires to abolish the cotton exchange. The figures the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] put into the RECORD a moment ago furnish an argument in favor of that. The old contract which originally permitted the exchanges to deal in 9 grades of cotton was expanded by the exchanges until they had 21 grades. The new contract, so called, reduced these to 10 grades. Selling under the old and the new contracts, as shown by these figures, shows a wide divergence—in fact, at times, more than is shown here, amounting to as much sometimes as $13.50 per bale. That is, if you let the man on the exchange gamble under the old contract, he would say cotton would be worth $13.50 per bale more than the same cotton in the same market the selfsame day was worth under the other contract. Let me repeat. For instance, my cotton on one contract was quoted $9.50 per bale higher than the same cotton in the same market the same day under another contract. It means that the reduction of 10 grades raised the price of cotton $13.50 a bale. That shows they were not dealing in cotton at all. They were betting, and if you let him bet under one contract he would bet that cotton would be worth, we will say, $150 a bale on the New York Exchange on the 1st day of May, and if you let him bet with you under another contract he would bet it would be worth $163.50. It is the same bale of cotton in the same market on the same day, weighing exactly the same number of pounds, but there is a difference of $13.50 a bale if you let him gamble

under one contract rather than under the other. It did go to a difference of $13.50, and the peculiar thing about it was that before the gamblers themselves could make up their minds which was the better contract for them the old contract sold higher than the new contract, and then the new contract sold higher than the old. If having a reduction of 10 imaginary grades of an imaginary cotton means a difference in wealth to the farmers of the country of $40,000,000, then I submit that if you will outlaw gambling under the other 10 grades you can make a difference of $80,000,000 just as well. It simply proves, which farmers have always contended, that gambling does influence the price of their products; does rob them of the fruits of their toil. No one can longer deny that future gambling does influence the price of cotton and does rob those who toil to enrich those who toil not. I am in favor of abolishing the cotton exchanges.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, agriculture is the corner stone upon which all other industries rest. It is the duty of the Government to encourage agriculture, to encourage the producer. It is the duty of the Government to see that the producer, upon whom we all depend for the food that we eat, is paid a fair and reasonable price for his produce.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] takes a fall out of the producers of cotton, a crop that brings into the United States annually more gold than the world's annual output, serves our country as no other product does or can. The cotton producers of the United States were confronted with a combination of certain foreign and domestic spinners and speculators who had driven the price of cotton down below the cost of production. Does any fair-minded man believe that the cotton producers of the United States should be forced into the market to sell their cotton at a price below the cost of production or a price that will not yield a fair profit? Do you gentlemen really want to force such a condition as that on the cotton producers of your country?

Yes, our cotton producers announced to the world that they could not afford to sell their cotton at the price fixed by speculators on the exchange—that the spinners had gone into a combination with certain speculators, foreign and domestic. My good friend from Pennsylvania complained about the cotton producers having concerted action in holding cotton in the effort to get a living profit, but when speculators broke the price $50 a bale in 60 days, which meant ruin to the cotton producer, I never heard his eloquent voice raised against them and in behalf of a fair deal for the cotton producer.

But when the producer comes up and says, "It cost me so much to produce this cotton, and I must have so much or I will not derive a profit, and in order to get a living profit I am going to hold my cotton until I can get a profit," would the gentleman have a law enacted to compel him to sell when it means ruination to his business?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. For a question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I stand as much against the speculator as the gentleman from Alabama, but I want to ask the gentleman whether he does not know that during the domination of power on the other side we passed a cotton-futures act and certain other cotton acts very largely at the suggestion of the gentleman from Alabama and covering the very points of which the gentleman complains?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes; we did pass an act to regulate cotton exchanges, and I did what I could to establish certain rules and regulations for the exchanges; but I want to say to my friend from Pennsylvania that the act containing those rules and regulations was perverted from the ends of its institution. We confined them to 9 grades and they used 21 grades. The fact is 7 grades will cover the grades of the cotton crop of the United States.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Suppose we agree with the gentleman as to that. Was not that the fault of the administration in enforcing the law?

Mr. HEFLIN. Well, the exchanges are hard to keep regulated. They are always devising ways and means for the evasion of the law; and I will say to the gentleman that if the grain exchanges and cotton exchanges can not be regulated I will vote to abolish them.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I submit to the gentleman——

Mr. HEFLIN. I want to say in reply to a gentleman here about unloading the burden on the consumer——

Mr. JUUL. There is a question which I desire to ask the gentleman.

Mr. HEFLIN. The time is limited and I fear——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has one minute remaining.

Mr. HEFLIN. Only a minute. I want to say that this particular burden is not laid upon the consumer. I have seen speculators beat down the price of cotton and then buy it from the producer at 10 cents a pound and later on sell it for 14 cents. The producer was robbed and the consumer was imposed upon. In this instance foreign spinners and foreign cotton merchants were in combination to buy cotton of the 1918 crop and sell it to Germany and Austria at a tremendous profit, and I said that the cotton producer was entitled to a fair price and a living profit. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, in response to the question propounded by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JUUL], I desire to state the following for the information of the gentleman. Fruit and vegetable interests generally have expressed considerable concern over the probable reduction in this line of effort, as producers, shippers, and distributors alike regard it as fundamentally necessary:

Improvement of refrigerator-car equipment, standard car: Important improvements in the character of such equipment have been made as a result of this work. Practically all the refrigerator cars built in the United States within the past year have been constructed according to the recommendations of the Bureau of Markets. This work should be continued if full benefits are to be gained.

Heater cars for protecting perishables from freezing damage in transit: This work has been developed to a point where, in two or three more seasons, it will be possible to specify standardized methods and equipment as a result of which practically all freezing losses in transit can be eliminated.

Loading cars efficiently: Very serious losses from breakage and deterioration constantly result from improper methods of loading, bracing, and stowing fruits and vegetables for shipment.

Motor transportation of farm products: The work, already begun by the Bureau of Markets, of investigating and demonstrating the possibilities of transporting farm products by motor truck can be continued on its present basis for approximately $25,000 a year.

A widespread popular interest is being manifested in the possibility of establishing a more intimate and direct transportation service to rural districts through a more complete utilization of our highways. An effort has been made to introduce the elements of stability into the rural motor industry as constituted at present through direct cooperation with owners and operators of existing motor-truck routes. An accounting system which will indicate costs of operation has been devised for the use of operators of motor routes and approved forms for shipping records have been suggested to them. Emphasis has been placed on the necessity for adequate insurance covering motor-truck cargoes.

Eight demonstration routes have been established and operated successfully, studies have been made of the operation of farmers' cooperative truck associations, and a preliminary survey of the marketing of live stock by motor truck has been conducted in certain live-stock centers.

Two bulletins have been issued as result of this work, the great demand for which indicates the active interest of the public in the subject. Fifty-five thousand copies of these bulletins have been distributed. It has been necessary to request a reprint of one of them in response to urgent demands.

So undoubtedly the department has made progress. It appears the money has been well expended.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For collecting and distributing, by telegraph, mail, and otherwise, timely information on the supply, commercial movement, disposition, and market prices of fruits and vegetables, $250,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, on page 80, line 15, by striking out "$250,000" and inserting "$196,660," the amount that was appropriated last year and which ought to be sufficient to carry along this work now that the war is practically at an end.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 80, line 15, strike out "$250,000" and insert "$196,660."

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 80, line 15, after the word "vegetables," strike out the figures "$250,000," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$309,660."

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this may seem a very substantial increase in the amount carried in the bill for this purpose, but when you look at the report of the committee you will see that it is a very substantial and material reduction in the amount which is available during this fiscal year for this purpose. With reference to this item in this bill and the three items subsequent to it, I have, upon the earnest solicitation of the people of my section of the country who are interested in fruits, vegetables, stock, grain, dairy and poultry products, and so forth, taken this matter up with the Department of Agriculture. I have obtained the information that the likely effect of the adoption of this appropriation as here outlined with reference to this year's market reports and the news service concerning vegetables, fruit, meat, stock, and so forth, will be practically to discontinue this service in the west-

ern half of the United States, to make fish of one and flesh of another; and here, it seems to me, is a very good opportunity to give sauce to the goose as well as to the gander. This amount of $369,660 appropriated by this amendment is the last amount asked of the committee by the department for this purpose. It seems to me that to pass this item as it here stands in the bill would be unjust discrimination in favor of one section and against another. And it is almost a matter, I may say, of exalting the field of speculation and debasing the field of production, because the western part of this country is to a very large extent and in very great measure the fruit growing, the grain cultivating, the vegetable producing, and the cattle-raising section of the United States. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes in which to conclude some remarks that I made a few minutes ago.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman withhold until we read another section?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I will be glad to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to gather from stockmen, live-stock associations, State live-stock and agricultural boards, common carriers, stockyards, commission firms, live-stock exchanges, slaughtering and meat-packing companies, and other information relative to the number of different classes and grades of marketable live stock, especially cattle, hogs, and sheep in the principal live-stock feeding districts and growing sections; prices, receipts, and shipments of the different classes and grades of cattle, hogs, and sheep at live-stock market centers; prices of meats and meat-food products and the amounts of such products in storage; to compile and publish such information at such frequent intervals as most effectively to guide producers, consumers, and distributors in the sale and purchase of live stock, meats, and other animal products; and to gather and publish any related information pertaining to marketing and distribution of live stock, meats, and animal by-products, the sum of $105,320.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order so as to conclude remarks I started to make a few minutes ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, there is one case in particular to which I would like to call the attention of Congress by reason of the fact that on the 9th day of June there will be held an examination affecting 2,500 employees of this Government. In the income-tax unit there is employed in the instruction department Mr. John T. Kennedy. I am informed that he draws a salary from this Government at this time of $4,500 per year. I understand—I do not know that the information is correct, but it comes to me from a good source—that this particular man in a large way has much to do with the selection of clerks in this particular division. I want to call your attention to the fact that in the little document which I hold in my hand, which is printed by Pace & Pace, conducting the Pace Institute of Washington ,D. C., accountancy and business administration, on page 4, it is shown that among the officers of administration and instruction in this Pace Institute appears the name of John T. Kennedy as one of the officers of instruction.

I am informed by reputable clerks of this District that this particular institute attempts to properly instruct and prepare for such examination hundreds of clerks. And I am informed by reputable clerks of this District that this particular District employee of this Government, who holds a position in the instruction department of the income-tax unit at a salary of $4,500 a year, and who at the same time is an administrative officer of this Pace Institute, largely determines who of these 2,500 clerks to be examined are to be promoted in this particular department of the Government.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In a moment.

Mr. JUUL. For a question.

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment, because my time is limited to five minutes and I wish to finish this particular thought.

This is one of the reasons I have asked Congress to adopt the resolution which I have introduced, to demand of the joint congressional committee that they must submit to the thousands of employees of this Government the questionnaire that shall bring from them what employment they are in on the outside of this Government.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will first yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JUUL].

Mr. JUUL. I was going to ask the gentleman from Texas whether or not he thinks it probably biases the judgment of the gentleman, who is instructor in a school, as to whether the clerks come from his school or some other school?

Mr. BLANTON. I do not see how he can help being influenced, wittingly or unwittingly, if he is an administrative officer of a school that prepares students specially for such positions.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not know that those employed in the income-tax division are certified by the Civil Service Commission and appointed from the civil-service record and not by Mr. Kennedy or any other employee of the Income Tax Bureau?

Mr. BLANTON. If my distinguished friend from Tennessee will get the particular examination papers which are to be used on the 9th day of June he will see that he is mistaken in that position, as the examination is not conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman mean to say that those papers are graded by the Income Tax Bureau and not by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. BLANTON. It is not one of the regular civil-service examinations, as shown by the examination papers I have here in my possession.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think the gentleman is entirely wrong. He will find they are not graded by the Income Tax Bureau.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not wrong. Anyway, if we want the facts concerning dual employment we can get them by having my questionnaire answered.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this paragraph has in it the provisions for ascertaining the variation of the prices of live stock and meat products at different points. All of us have been seriously concerned about the abnormally high prices of all necessaries of life. I was looking over the price current as furnished in the daily press. Meat is selling at a price never known before in the history of the country, and, at the same time, so far as we know, the product is not limited, but, rather, extended beyond the normal. So it would appear that the law of supply and demand, which has heretofore operated to control prices, does not operate, and all of us are anxious to know why it does not. It is pertinent to ask what influence is at work to interrupt this law.

I have made a little inquiry about the amount of meats held by the Government, purchased for the purpose of war, and I want to give you the figures. I would like to have the attention of the membership of the committee as to these figures, for I know they must carry some significance when considered in the light of the scaling high prices charged to the public.

Roast beef held by the Government on the 20th of May, 12,000,000 6-pound cans, which would be about 72,000,000 pounds; 17,330,000 2-pound cans, or over 34,000,000 pounds; 9,000,000 1-pound cans, in addition to a great number of 12-ounce cans, or a total of something approaching 120,000,000 pounds of roast beef.

Corned beef, 5,600,000 6-pound cans, or 33,000,000 pounds; 18,000,000 2-pound cans, or 36,000,000 pounds; 9,000,000 1-pound cans; and 4,500,000 12-ounce cans; corned beef hash, 20,820,000 1 and 2 pound cans; bacon, 47,219,620 pounds.

This represents about 282,000,000 pounds of meats held by the Government, which, according to a statement of the packers, represented five months of the activities of the packing interests which were operating to collect the meat products for the Government. In normal times it is stated by the same authority that this would represent about two years of activity.

I am not—and every Member will recognize this—criticizing the Government for purchasing these large amounts, because it was done in the midst of war for the purpose of feeding the soldiers of an army the duration of which nobody could estimate, and therefore the purchase is free of criticism. But here is my question: If the Government is holding to-day this vast number of pounds of meat with the country full of live stock, and the price of bacon, notwithstanding this tremendous supply, has reached the vanishing point of 60 cents, why is it that there is not a freedom of the operation of the law of supply and demand? And the question immediately comes to me, What is the policy of the Government in its action on price fixing?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, may I have one minute more?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may have two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. In reading a statement of the committee as to why this tremendous amount is not put on the market, so as to allow it to take its course under the law of supply and demand, which would, of course, most certainly make it come down if left free to operate, the reply was given in these words:

The committee of packers explains that this amount was the normal production of these plants for a period of two years, and to place this quantity of packed meats on the market at this time would seriously affect prices on both the canned and fresh meats.

In other words, the very purpose of not putting it on the market is to keep the price up, and I doubt very much the wisdom of doing that as a function of the Government. We should be called upon to find a way to reduce the price rather than keep it up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. FESS. I would like to have two minutes more.

Mr. RAKER. I want five minutes, Mr. Chairman, on an amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] be given one minute.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, we are getting light shed on a very important subject, and I hope the time will not be closed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. RAKER. I want five minutes and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] over here wants five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish to offer an amendment. I do not care to debate it, but I think the amendment ought to be offered now, so that there will be something before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The request is that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto shall close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. JUUL. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. JUUL. I would like to have the gentleman from Ohio finish his argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is 21 years old, and he can ask for himself. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reserve the right to offer an amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Strike out the figures "$105,329" and insert "$57,920."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Page 81, line 8, strike out the figures "$105,320" and insert "$57,920."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, last year the appropriation for this paragraph was $57,920. This year the bill carries $105,320, or about twice as much as the amount appropriated last year. The purpose of the amendment is to reduce the appropriation to the amount expended last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move you, sir, as an amendment, that the words "and fish" be added in line 1, on page 81, so that the section will read "and meat and fish food products." And upon that question, Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Just one moment; let the Clerk report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FITZGERALD: Page 81, line 1, after the word "meat," insert the words "and fish."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] a moment ago, when he gave figures of the surplus meat products, which I suppose he could have followed up with figures showing the surplus vegetable products, that have been in the control of the Government for some time and not put on the market for sale.

I referred to the matter last week in a speech that I made on the floor of the House, calling the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the packers said that to put those meats on the market would cause a glut and therefore a reduction in price. Well, if an ordinary citizen of the United States went to any meat store and complained against the high prices, he would be told that it was because of a scarcity of meat products. It seems to me that this situation should be corrected at once, else the people will have real reason to believe that Congress itself is under the thumb of the meat combination.

A few moments ago one of the Members of the House said while he favored the establishment of a Bureau of Markets and was willing it should be sustained by appropriations recommended by the committee, he asked what did the Bureau of Markets accomplish. That is a question I would like to ask the chairman and members of the committee. If this Government has expended hundreds of thousands of dollars for the organization and development of the Bureau of Markets, and one of the functions of the Bureau of Markets is to know the amount of meat and food products that fill the storage warehouses in the different sections of the country, how could millions of pounds of food products have accumulated, which apparently nobody knew anything about until the past few days, if the Bureau of Markets was functioning properly. It was by the merest chance that the existence of this supply came into my hands last week.

I called up the War Department and talked with the head of the bureau, Col. Quackenbush, and he told me that the meat was advertised for sale and that only the packers responded, and that the canned meats the Government had contracted and paid 30 and 45 cents a pound for a few months ago brought but a bid of 15 cents from the packers, and the Government refused the price. Within the last few minutes, over the telephone, I had a talk with Col. Quackenbush, and he said there were now on the way through the mails, through various agencies employed by the War Department, 20,000 circulars calling attention to the million pounds of meat products that were for sale.

The other day Mr. Armour, addressing me in an open letter, said that I had misrepresented the attitude of the packers on this question when I said that they were in combination with the Government to keep up the prices. I never charged that the Government was in collusion with the packers to keep up the prices, but I did say that the packers' agents, many of whom are on the pay roll of the Government at $1 a year, were anxious to keep this meat off the market, and it seems to me that it is the duty of Congress to take the control of the surplus meat away from the dollar-a-year men and to give it to the Bureau of Markets, so that the public will have the benefit of the fullest publicity concerning surplus supplies of food stocks. [Applause.]

Mr. UPSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. UPSHAW. Does the gentleman not think that, irrespective of party lines, it is the duty of all Congressmen to stand with the people instead of the packers?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Absolutely. And that is the reason that I want the control of the food products given over to representatives of the people rather than the packers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word in regard to the amendment I have submitted. The ocean is loaded with fish. They are there by millions, and it does not take the time to rear them that it does with cattle. They are out there in the sea by the billions, and yet there is a Fish Trust organized in the United States for the last two years that has been successful in inflating the price of fish 200 and 300 per cent above what would give them a good profit and be a decent price to the people. This situation has done untold injury to the public. Inasmuch as these fish which are so numerous in the ocean and so easily reached that they can be caught at a day's notice they are the best available food product that can successfully combat the Meat Trust. Therefore I think the House would be doing an act of justice by permitting fish to be supervised by the Bureau of Markets as well as meats. I can

not impress too strongly on my fellow Members the fact that the high cost of living is the great issue before the American people; and we must do everything in our power to curb the rapacity of the food profiteer and give the people the benefit of every law that can be framed for their protection. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 81, line 8, strike out the figures $105,320, and insert the figures $214,720.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, have we not passed that paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. No; we are on the paragraph.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it may be true, as stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]—and I know it is true, because he states it—that the amount suggested in the amendment offered by him was the appropriation last year for this item. Nevertheless, it was not the amount available last year for this purpose, as shown by the report of the committee: "The food-production act of November 21, 1918, carries an additional appropriation for this purpose of $300,000, so that the amount provided in the present bill represents an actual reduction of $200,000 below the amount available during 1919." The amount suggested in the amendment is the amount recommended in the last report of the Department of Agriculture as the amount necessary to carry on the service unimpaired. Apparently this amendment would raise the amount of the appropriation for this service, but, in fact, it is a very material decrease in the amount available in 1919.

Now, I am reliably informed that the effect of the adoption of the item as it stands in the committee report is going to be to deny to all the live-stock and meat markets west of Kansas City and Chicago the beneficent effects of this bill.

Out in my section of the country, the Southwest, and all along the Pacific coast, the people are very much interested in this legislation. I take it that it is unnecessary to discuss the item from the standpoint of whether or not it is meritorious. That fact seems to be generally conceded. If the service is good for Chicago, if it is good for Kansas City, which markets, in the opinion of the Agricultural Department, must be kept up and furnished with this information, why should not the beneficent results of the service be also extended to the people of the Southwest and to the markets of the Pacific coast?

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. VAILE. Is the gentleman sure that this will not be applied to the markets in the Southwest? It says to different live-stock market centers; there is no distinction made in the bill as to which centers it shall be applied to.

Mr. LANHAM. I will say in reply to the gentleman that on the face of the bill it is not apparent that any discrimination will be made in this service, but I have had this matter up with the Agricultural Department on the earnest solicitation of the people in the Southwest who are interested in live stock, and have been furnished the information that the probable effect will be to limit this service to Chicago and Kansas City. In regard to that I quote this from a letter that I have received from Mr. Brand, Chief of the Bureau of Markets:

Under the proposed reductions as contemplated by the pending Agricultural appropriation bill, it probably will be impracticable to maintain leased wires west of Kansas City, in which event the entire western half of the United States will be cut off from the bureau's telegraphic-report service.

It is for that reason, that there may not be any unjust sectional discrimination and that the people of the Pacific coast and the people of the Southwest may have the benefit of this service, that I offer this amendment. If it is a meritorious service it should not be restricted to any locality to the disparagement of another. If Kansas City and Chicago have to be supplied, it is just as much a principle of justice and equity that the Southwest and the markets of the Pacific coast ought to be supplied. And in behalf of the Southwest, and of the West and of the Pacific coast, the markets in that section, I, though a new Member, want to insist that this justice be accorded them. I place confidence in the statements made to me by the Department of Agriculture. I do not know how to do otherwise than to take their statements at par, and I want my voice to be heard, this the first time in the House of Representatives, in behalf of those sections of the country which are equally entitled to this service, but to which, according to the best opinion we can procure, it will not go unless we receive this added appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RAKER rose.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in seven minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] has clearly presented the statement from the Secretary of Agriculture to show that it requires the amount suggested in his amendment to carry on this service. The committee having reported it shows that the legislation is beneficial and has given good results. The statement further shows—and it is worthy of consideration—that the service from Kansas City west will be eliminated if the amount provided for in the amendment is not agreed to. I am satisfied many members of the committee are not familiar with the conditions. West of the Mississippi River, after you get over the plains, the people living in the intramountain States and in the Pacific Coast States are engaged in cattle and sheep raising. We raise the feeders. The Kansas City and Chicago markets buy our feeders and bring them east to feed. The more they can deceive the stock raiser, the less information they can get to him, the cheaper they buy the product. That has been one of the troubles in the West for 25 years. Those men have not been receiving what they honestly and legitimately are entitled to for their stock, because they have been misinformed and ill advised and could not get the information. In the last couple of years, however, by virtue of the splendid work done by this department, our stockmen have been in a position to get information and to know what the price is, to the end that they have not been deceived and practically robbed. This legislation as it now stands cuts off that service. Why give it at all to Chicago, why give it to Kansas City, when they have it already within their own grasp and maintain their own leased wires and their own business? They have the money to do it, but you provide for additional service by the $105,000, and the part of the country that actually needs it will not get the benefit of it, as it has been receiving it during the last two years. There is no need for our being penurious about our appropriations. Let us spend the money where it will give the most service. If the service will do good, why not grant it? If you spend $100,000 and get splendid results, if it benefits your people, you get twice that in return by virtue of taxation and other forms of revenue. I trust that the committee will not eliminate the service where it ought to be granted, and will permit the bill to be amended as offered by the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman from Ohio made a very clever statement to the House. This will eliminate that if you adopt it, and give them enough money to spend and enable the Secretary to give information regarding the price of meats and food products and the amount of such products in storage.

Now, they would be able to show the amount——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield me a minute to complete this thought?

Mr. HAUGEN. I have only two minutes.

Mr. RAKER. Then I will have to suppress that thought.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the amount carried in the appropriation for the current year is $57,920. The committee reports $105,320. It is true that $300,000 was used in the food-production act, all told, $357,920; but, gentlemen, if there was anything ever definitely determined, it was that the items carried in the food-production bill should not be continued in future appropriation bills. The food-production bill is a war measure. The amount has been increased from $57,000 to $105,000. We believe the committee's recommendation a very liberal increase. I trust that the amendment of the gentleman may be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the Chair stated that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I call for a division.

The committee again divided; and there were—ayes 27, noes 44.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: In line 25, at the bottom of page 80, I move to insert the word "fish" after the word "meats," and in line 5, page 81, the word "fish" following the word "meats," and in line 7, on page 81, the word "fish" following the word "meats."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 80, line 25, after the word "meats," insert the word "fish"; page 81, line 5, after the word "meats," insert the word "fish"; and page 81, line 7, after the word "meats," insert the word "fish."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet asking recognition on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not see the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. All time has been exhausted.

Mr. RAKER. No; I was on my feet.

The CHAIRMAN. But debate has been closed on this paragraph and all amendments thereto.

The Clerk read as follows:

For collecting and distributing, by telegraph, mail, and otherwise, timely information on the supply, demand, commercial movement, disposition, quality, and market prices of dairy and poultry products, $80,600.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the gentleman from Pennsylvania make it against?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Against the paragraph. This is not in existing law, not provided for.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is inclined to think that this is part of the function of the Bureau of Markets under the organic law and feels constrained to overrule the point of order.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, complaint is made from various large centers that this is an extension of the work of the Bureau of Markets which is unnecessary and a displacement of existing work already provided for by private agencies without expense to the Government. I quote from resolutions recently passed by the Chicago Butter and Egg Board:

Resolved, That we believe it to be our duty to call the attention of Congress to some of the activities of the Bureau of Markets, Department of Agriculture, which are unnecessary and wasteful, among which we cite the publication of daily market reports giving prices of butter and cheese in the various markets, as this work is more quickly and better done by private agencies at no expense to the taxpayer. In butter and eggs the sales on the street and on the exchanges establish a necessary trading basis early in the day. This is reported by private agencies and immediately distributed by wire wherever needed, and the work of the Bureau of Markets, which does not usually reach the trade until the next day, is superfluous and unnecessary and therefore a waste.

Mr. Chairman, there is much more in the resolutions which were passed by these business men in the city of Chicago. Similar resolutions have been passed in New York, in Philadelphia, and on the Pacific coast. It seems to me that as these gentlemen contend that they already have all the information desired, that they get it most speedily from private sources that do not have appropriations from the Government, and, as we are now entering peace times after the war, when economy should be the watchword, this paragraph should go out. It would mean not only a saving of $80,600, but it would mean a saving of time, trouble, and annoyance to the business men, who seem not to want the service. It seems to me this is a chance for the committee to economize if it sees fit to do so.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, when I rose a moment ago it was in regard to the amendment placed on the bill after an agreement had been made to close debate in regard to fish. I am very much in favor of that amendment, and I am glad that amendment went on. I want to call the attention of my friends on this side to the fact that they let it go on after debate had been closed without any opposition whatever, and yet they voted against an increase in the amount for looking after live stock, and so forth. My friends over here on this side all voted against it, and then they turn right around after that was done and let an amendment go on for the benefit of a few Eastern States, whereas Western States and in the intermountain States and Pacific Coast States, where we have been working for years to try to do something, will not get one dollar's worth of investigation, and this matter will be turned over to the Beef Trust. Why do not you give these men a chance? Yet you turn around and put on another amendment. Why do you refuse to give the Bureau of Markets an opportunity to investigate the trust and find out where the beef is and where the cattle are and——

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. VAILE. Is not the matter of fish of as much importance to us of the inland districts as of those on the coast, looking from the standpoint of the consumer?

Mr. RAKER. The great Agricultural Committee has come in and I say they put an amendment on after they had voted down the amendment which would give these cattle and stock men some opportunity for their white ally or a run for their lives. Without proper and sufficient appropriations they will have no opportunity to investigate the market. They have had a chance in the last two years since the Bureau of Markets has been investigating, and why do not you turn back now by unanimous consent to the paragraph and put on another $214,000, to the end that these people may have an opportunity of knowing what is going on in this country? We ought not to shut them off and shut them out of information so that the fellows in Chicago and in Boston and in Kansas City may take their profits. We want to protect the people in the West, leaving out Kansas City and that little section where they have feeders, and not let the trust run and control the whole thing.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I yield.

Mr. HAUGEN. Is it not a fact that the trust referred to as controlling the price of meat also controls the price of fish?

Mr. RAKER. I am in favor of putting on fish and giving us fish eaters a chance, too; but do not cut out the stock-raising interests; do not give the cattle and sheep men entirely over to the trust, but give them a chance and opportunity, that they may know what the markets are, that they may have a chance when the cattle buyer comes around to meet him with a telegram he has received on the same day, and not have a condition that I have seen for 25 years imposed on those men, when their cattle have been bought for a third less than the market price.

Mr. BAER. The trouble with most of these statistics of the weather bureaus and the markets is that the speculators and the gamblers are on the job and that these reports are laid on the table. The information has already been acquired by the speculators and gamblers.

Mr. RAKER. You are mistaken about that. Right from the Department of Agriculture, hot over the trail, within an hour and a half's time, our people in the West have received the information as to the market and they have been able to meet these stock brokers and gamblers on this Beef Trust proposition. They do not have control of the Department of Agriculture. That is run by honest men, who give these people good, first-hand information.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, this discussion——

The CHAIRMAN. All debate on this amendment has been exhausted.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, then I move to strike out the last word.

The discussion of the gentleman from California is in reference to the preceding paragraph. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] moves to strike out the second paragraph, page 81, from lines 9 to 12, being for collecting and distributing, by telegraph, mail, and otherwise, timely information on the supply, demand, commercial movement, disposition, quality, and market prices of dairy and poultry products, $80,600.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is the gentleman going to discuss my amendment? The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] was clearly out of order.

Mr. CANDLER. I am in order, because I am opposed to your amendment and propose to discuss it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is what I thought. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] was discussing a foreign matter.

Mr. CANDLER. That matter is passed and I do not yield to the gentleman further.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, in support of his amendment to strike out this very important and valuable provision in this bill, read some resolutions and statements from some produce exchange or from some business men, as he said, in the city of Chicago or some other city. Of course, they would like to have this provision stricken out, for the reason that they are at the center of trade and at one of the central markets, and they get this information every morning, afternoon, and evening, no doubt, while the producer, who is away from the central market and has the produce to sell, would not have the information, and in the absence of the authority conferred by this provision, giving the Bureau of Markets an opportunity to furnish this information to them, would be absolutely in the dark and at the mercy of the very gentlemen who passed the resolutions read by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I am not surprised that they desire this provision stricken out. They would like to keep these good people that produce these products in the interior and rural districts without avail-

able information so that they might get their products for less than they are worth, in order to profiteer out of them and secure the benefits to be derived from operations of that kind. This provision answers a very useful purpose, and the money authorized to be appropriated, of $80,600, is well spent when it furnishes these people the information from the Government of the United States that keeps them advised to the full, not only of the price at the point of production but the value of the products at the point where they are sold to the consumer, thereby giving the consumer the benefit of this same information that the producer obtains, and thus cutting out these "middlemen" that are between the two and who have often reaped unfair benefits by keeping somebody in the dark as to the real situation. The motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania should be defeated. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 81, line 12, after the word "products," strike out the figures "$80,600" and insert in lieu thereof "$100,600."

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment, and I hope the gentleman will give me five minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for 10 minutes, 5 for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JUUL] and 5 for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEVER. I may require three minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. I ask, then, Mr. Chairman, for 14 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has already been agreed upon at 10 minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say one word in reference to this item, cumulative of what I have said in reference to the two preceding items, and piling Ossa on Pelion in a desire to get justice for the western sections of the country. I want to call attention to the fact that the amount specified in the amendment which I have offered is that which is asked by the Department of Agriculture for this purpose.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the gentleman is mistaken there. This particular item covers the estimate made by the department.

Mr. LANHAM. I will say to the gentleman that my information is that two weeks ago an additional recommendation was made by the Department of Agriculture owing to the fact that the increased rates of telegraph tolls, and so forth, would make it impossible to carry on the service within the item as previously recommended; that is, $80,600. The amount now recommended by the department is $100,600. I wish to say that while this is an increase in that item as specified in the bill, made necessary by the increase in telegraph rates, it is a very substantial and material reduction in the amount which has been available for this purpose during the year 1919, and the same arguments obtain in reference to this item in justice to the Southwest and to the Pacific coast which could be urged in reference to the two preceding items.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, there was to be 10 minutes' debate on this by agreement of the House, of which 5 minutes was to be used by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JUUL].

The CHAIRMAN. He was to offer an amendment.

Mr. WALSH. He was to have 5 minutes' time. He should have it. You can not vote on an amendment and then go ahead under the agreement of the House for another five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the gentleman is mistaken. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] offered an amendment. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JUUL] does not propose to offer an amendment to that amendment. He proposes to offer a separate amendment. The Chair believes that the proper way to do this thing is first to vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas. The Chair submitted that vote to the House. Then the Chair proposes to recognize the gentleman from Illinois for his amendment, upon which he would have five minutes for debate. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JUUL] has the floor to offer an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to have the amendment inserted after line 12, on page 81.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUUL: Line 12, page 81, insert the following:

"It shall be the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture to publish monthly in the press of the 12 leading cities of the country what, in his opinion and according to the information gathered by virtue of the powers vested in him by this act, what should be the retail prices at which leading foodstuffs should be sold.

"He shall also publish at what price such foodstuffs are sold and the excess of such prices over fair cash market prices shall be noted in such advertisement."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman and gentleman, one of the gentlemen on the other side stated a few moments ago that the subject matter of this discussion is not political, and I agree with him that it is not political. We will absolutely secure nothing through the passage of the sections under the heading "Bureau of Markets"—I am speaking now of the consumers of the country—until we have publicity. All that my amendment provides for is that the Secretary of Agriculture shall publish in the newspapers of the 12 leading cities of the country what the prices of the leading foodstuffs are at the time. He has the information gathered by virtue of this act. Then he publishes what the retail prices should be in his advertisement, and then he notes the excess over what the full fair cash value of the leading foodstuffs is as sold.

I think you gentlemen can well afford to let this amendment go in, and I trust that no gentleman who wants to play fair with the consumers of this country will offer any objections or points of order to it. Let it go in, and let us learn from month to month what foodstuffs cost, what farmers get for their meat and hogs. Let us learn in the cities what bacon is sold for, and let the Secretary of Agriculture state in the press of the country what the excess charged over fair cash market value is.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUUL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Do we not get tons and tons of that kind of information now?

Mr. JUUL. No. There is not a publication coming from any official source that notes what the profiteers are doing.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We know in the cities, where we have to pay the highest prices for everything, that no matter where we go the prices are substantially the same. If we go outside 10 miles and try to buy direct from the farmer, the farmer knows what the city dealers are getting, and he charges exactly the same price. How will we remedy that situation? I want the farmer to get the highest price, but I want to get some relief for the consumer.

Mr. JUUL. It is not difficult to find out what a basket of fruit costs in Florida and in Michigan. It is not difficult to find out what the consumer in Chicago or San Francisco or New York pays for it. If the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to publish what is the excess over a fair cash profit the consumer will know to what extent he is being robbed and who is robbing him. Does the gentleman know that the other night in the city of Washington I paid $2.85 for three little dishes of ice cream? I was robbed in that way within a stone's throw of the White House.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman was undoubtedly robbed. But would any further publication remedy a situation like that?

Mr. JUUL. Yes; publication would catch the kind of man that runs that kind of an institution. Now, some of the men that are handling foodstuffs and dealing with the people direct are getting so bold that they do not even take the trouble that an ordinary highway robber would use. When the highwayman wants to rob you of your watch and chain he takes a piece of lead pipe or a club or something with which he stuns you for the time being. These people rob you while you have your eyes open. If publicity could be had by which the people would know how much they were robbed, the situation would largely be remedied. If I were to publish the fact that a hotel in the city of Washington had charged a soldier, his wife, and myself $2.85 for three plates of ice cream the further conduct of that hotel along such lines would be impossible. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. Does the gentleman from Minnesota make a point of order?

Mr. ANDERSON. I regret to have to make the point of order. The amendment is clearly not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For collecting and distributing, by telegraph, mail, and otherwise, timely information on the supply, demand, commercial movement, location, disposition, quality, and market prices of grain, hay, feeds, and seeds, $50,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment will be held until the disposition of the point of order. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. My point of order is that this is new legislation upon an appropriation bill and that it is not authorized by existing law.

Mr. LEVER. Which is the paragraph in question?

Mr. HAUGEN. Line 13, page 81.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph is clearly in order. I think several occupants of the chair have so held on several items. The organic act requires the Department of Agriculture to "procure and preserve all information concerning agriculture which he can obtain by means of books and correspondence and by practical and scientific experiments, accurate records of which experiments shall be kept in his office, by the collection of statistics, and by other appropriate means within his power." Then it goes on with further provisions. And then it goes on and says he shall collect dues, fees, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The organic law says:

The Commissioner of Agriculture shall procure and preserve all information concerning agriculture he can obtain by means of both correspondence and by any other appropriate means within his power.

That is exactly what this paragraph seeks to do, and the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DALLINGER: Page 81, line 16, after the figures "$50,000," insert "for furnishing to producers, newspapers, and consumers accurate information regarding supplies of fruits, vegetables, dairy and poultry products, meats, fish, and other food products received on farmers', municipal, and other city markets, and prices for which such products are sold; and information regarding such products when in abundance or oversupply, and other related matters, $42,880."

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that this amendment follows the exact wording of the estimate made by the Secretary of Agriculture for this purpose. This item was carried in one of the Agricultural appropriation bills, and the benefits of it to the consuming public in our large cities, as well as to the market gardeners, who are the only farmers and the agriculturists in the vicinity of our large cities, was very apparent. It was so apparent, Mr. Chairman, that this spring when the committee left this paragraph out of the bill a delegation of the market gardeners and small farmers came here to Washington from Boston and some of the other cities to plead with Congress to retain this paragraph in the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Now, there is nobody more interested in cutting down the expenses of the Government than I. I am opposed to any unnecessary expenditure of public money, but if there is one thing in which the people of this country are vitally concerned at the present moment it is the high cost of living. Every Member of this House ought to recognize that fact.

This amendment which I have offered, and which follows the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture, is in the interest of the small farmer and the consumer. A good deal has been said by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] in regard to private agencies furnishing this information, and that therefore the taxpayers should not be burdened with the expense. Who are these private agencies? They are apt to be run in the interest of the unscrupulous dealer who robs the farmer on the one hand and robs the consumer on the other. That is the whole story. It is about time that we woke up to the fact that when we have a Bureau of Markets instituted for the very purpose of protecting the small producer and the consumer, particularly in the large cities, we ought to support the bureau and give it the appropriation necessary to accomplish the purpose. And then if the bureau does not accomplish the purpose because of inefficiency or incompetency or mismanagement, it is up to us to investigate the matter and find out the remedy.

There is another object that will be accomplished by this appropriation. There is very often a glut in the supply of fruit and vegetables in the city markets, because the consumer, the housekeeper, does not know that there is a large supply in the market. I have been informed that in some instances this waste has been encouraged by some of the large dealers in order to keep the prices up. When this happens the farmer is frequently discouraged and does not market his fruit and vegetables. Now, if you could have this information given daily to the small farmer and market gardener, so that he would know where there was a market for his produce, and the consumer would know that there was a supply on hand at a reasonable price, you would bring the consumer and the producer together and prevent profiteering by the middlemen. I trust the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is local in character. The service, I think, when the item was in the bill, was extended to less than half a dozen cities. It would require thousands and millions of dollars to extend it throughout the country. It is a function that belongs to the States and municipalities to take care of. The work is no doubt a valuable work, but I doubt if Congress can afford to enter into an elaborate scheme like this suggested, which will amount to the expenditure of millions and millions of dollars before we get through.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DALLINGER) there were 19 ayes and 39 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee which section of this bill carries the appropriation that authorizes the Director of the Bureau of Markets to have men travel in foreign countries for the purpose, as he says in his own testimony, of "studying the type of banking arrangements that must be made, all of the things that are absolutely necessary for one desiring to start business in foreign countries."

Mr. HAUGEN. To what section does the gentleman refer?

Mr. SNELL. I ask the gentleman what section of the bill carries the provision authorizing the director to go into such things as studying banking and kindred activities in foreign countries. There are four men there at the present time, according to his testimony.

Mr. HAUGEN. My recollection is that the committee did not report that provision.

Mr. SNELL. I know; but they are there doing it now, and that is one of the activities of this bureau that I am opposed to. I am willing to appropriate for everything that goes to getting legitimate statistics that will be useful to the country at large, but I think that this bureau is branching out into all kinds of activities that are not intended under the law, and I would like to know what provision of this bill or any other bill provides for that kind of thing.

Mr. HAUGEN. There is no specific authority for it.

Mr. SNELL. Then, why does the director do such things?

Mr. ANDERSON. If the gentleman will permit me, if my recollection is correct, we eliminated from this bill the item which authorized the investigation into questions of rural credits and things of that kind.

Mr. SNELL. According to this testimony we have here, there are men abroad studying such things at the present time.

Mr. HAUGEN. It is true, I think, that four men are abroad studying the different questions.

Mr. SNELL. But they will be home by the 1st of July, will they, and not be appropriated for any further under this bill?

Mr. HAUGEN. I have no knowledge of any specific authorization.

Mr. SNELL. Have they a right to go into such outside activities as that without any authorization from Congress? I think these are the activities of the department that should be looked into carefully and stopped at once, and it is such activities as this that I am opposing in this bill and not any work or investigations that will bring real aid or improvements to the agricultural interests of the country.

Mr. HAUGEN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] a few moments ago made a statement which tends to reflect upon a great bureau and a high official of this Government which I think should be corrected. He stated in effect that Mr. John G. C. Kennedy is employed in the Internal Revenue Office at a salary of $4,800 and at the

same time is employed by a private concern, the accounting firm of Pace & Pace, I believe he stated, at an additional salary. I want to say to the gentleman from Texas and to the gentlemen of the House that he is entirely incorrect in his statement. I do not know from what source the gentleman got his information. He stated that he had receive it from some clerk in the bureau; but I suggest to him that he has been imposed upon, and that hereafter before making any such statements he ought to do the officials of this Government the justice to go to the telephone and take one-half minute in order to ascertain the truth of the statement before he gives it publicity on the floor of the House. I have just come from the telephone, and I am informed that Mr. Kennedy is positively not connected with any private concern, and that when he became connected with the Government at the salary named by the gentleman from Texas he surrendered all of his private employments, and that he is now solely employed by the Government.

The gentleman from Texas further made some reference to an examination which is being held of 2,500 employees. I interrupted him at the time, thinking that he was referring to original employment, and I suggested to him that those examinations were held by the Civil Service Commission. Since the gentleman left the floor he has informed me that he was referring to a test which was being applied by the Internal Revenue Commissioner. In other words, the Internal Revenue Commissioner is now conducting what he calls a test of employees who are already upon the rolls—civil-service employees—for the purpose of determining those best qualified to fill the positions of auditor and accountant, and he is bringing those men here and conducting this test, not by this private accounting firm but by the bureau itself, in order to determine their capacity to fill these places and for the purpose of instructing them as to their duties. He is not playing politics, but he is collecting the revenues of this Government and endeavoring to put the very best men he can get into these positions and to render the best service possible, and I predict that when the facts have been established it will be found that the present Internal Revenue Commissioner has collected the revenues of this Government at a far less cost, comparatively, than they were ever before collected. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I submit to the gentleman the booklet that is issued by Pace & Pace, with this gentleman's name as one of the officers of administration—John G. C. Kennedy, LL. B.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. When was that issued?

Mr. BLANTON. In 1918, and if this gentleman is not connected with this department he ought to require Pace & Pace to take his name off their literature.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Well, the statement of the gentleman himself shows that the booklet was issued in 1918, and I wish to say again to the gentleman, not being content to take the irresponsible statement made to him, that I went to the telephone and called up the Internal Revenue Commissioner, and he tells me that since Mr. Kennedy has been employed by the bureau he has had no connection with Pace & Pace or any private——

Mr. BLANTON. Did the gentleman call up Pace & Pace?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I did not. I called up the Internal Revenue Bureau, where Mr. Kennedy is employed, and I am sure everyone is willing to accept the word of the commissioner as to the matter.

Mr. BLANTON. Why did not the gentleman call up Pace & Pace?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, none of the remarks I have made cast any reflection upon the Internal Revenue Department or the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the commissioner being a splendid gentleman and my friend, and I have absolute confidence in him. He is not responsible for this condition that exists in our Nation's Capital to-day. You men on the Republican side and we men on the Democratic side are responsible for it, and we alone, and we are going to be responsible for it as long as we permit this pernicious practice to exist in our Capital—the fact that we let men stay here on the pay roll of this Government drawing $4,800 a year from one department, as I understand the case I mentioned in the Bureau of Mines, and at the same time drawing $3,500 from a private corporation. Why, they are not responsible for it; we Congressmen are responsible, and I called attention to the fact because I am going to ask in a few days, if I can get it before the Congress, for you to vote on this proposition to submit a proper questionnaire to every employee of this Government—every one of the 240,000 of them, if you please—requiring them to tell us who they are employed by, to tell us what they do with their time, tell us whether or not they are giving seven hours' good service to this Government and the outside salaries they receive; make them tell us who is getting the benefit of their brains for which we pay them, and to tell us who is getting the benefit of the total services they render.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I do.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to ask the gentleman if his information as to the Bureau of Mines is any better than that which he had in reference to the Internal Revenue Bureau?

Mr. BLANTON. All of it may be incorrect, I do not know, but it has been told to me on good authority that it is correct. If it is not correct the answers to the questionnaires I propose will develop that fact and ascertain it. If it is correct, we will know the facts, but we will not know it until those questions are answered by the 240,000 Government employees. The point I was trying to make was to get these 240,000 employees to answer the questions I have proposed to propound to them on behalf of this Congress that we may know when we reclassify the salaries what we are doing.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Did the gentleman ever call upon the Director of the Bureau of Mines and ask him whether the statement he has made in reference to the employee of that bureau is correct, or did he take the statement of some outside party?

Mr. BLANTON. I have ascertained the statement I made concerning the Bureau of Mines is correct.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Well, I have no information in regard to that.

Mr. BLANTON. It is correct.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Did he get it from the Bureau of Mines, or from what source?

Mr. BLANTON. I got it from parties in whom I have perfect confidence and know they would not mislead or give me incorrect information.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman had made the same inquiry of the Internal Revenue Bureau——

Mr. BLANTON. I did not go to the telephone and telephone somebody who had nothing to do with Pace & Pace.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. BLACK. I wanted to suggest a correction in the gentleman's statement. I saw a few days ago that Mr. Herbert D. Brown, who is chairman of the Efficiency Commission, estimated that there are only 105,000 Government employees here in Washington.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will get the record that the chairman of the committee made before us when we had the matter of the bonuses up for clerks he will find that there were 240,000 clerks affected by the $120 bonus which Congress gave to the clerks.

Mr. BLACK. That is because a good many lived elsewhere.

Mr. BLANTON. They lived elsewhere, but there are 240,000 clerks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments close in seven minutes.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman a question.

Mr. HAUGEN. I make it 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. LANHAM. Reserving the right to object, I want permission to offer an amendment before the close of that time.

The CHAIRMAN. There will be plenty of opportunity to offer an amendment. This is only to close debate. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to offer an amendment to perfect the text?

Mr. LANHAM. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will offer his amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 81, line 16, after the word "seeds," strike out the figures "$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$76,520."

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. Mr. Chairman, if that motion carries it will save $50,000 on this item, which is for collecting and distributing by telegraph, mail, and otherwise timely information on a variety of subjects. In that connection, Mr. Chairman, I wish to refer briefly to what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] said a little while ago about the exchanges of one kind and another. They have a great many of them in Massachusetts, particularly in Boston. I was a little surprised to hear him say that they were not fair to the consumers.

I have noticed one thing, however, in my peregrinations around about where I live, that though the city people have to pay the highest possible price for the products of the farm, whether there is a loss between the farmer and consumer or not, nevertheless information seems to percolate out into the farm territory so rapidly that if anyone goes out from the city for 10 miles into the country and asks a farmer the price of potatoes or New Jersey watermelons—which, of course, are far superior to those the gentleman from South Carolina referred to a moment ago—the price is the same as that in the city. The producer seems to know intuitively how much the city dealer is charging, and fixes his price accordingly. And if you go to Atlantic City and take an automobile and run up the road a little ways, or come down from Long Branch, where the farmers have produce displayed on the road, and where you may expect to get your corn and potatoes a little cheaper because you take them direct from the producer, you will find the producer has had his ear to the ground and has found out exactly the price they are charging for them in Atlantic City or Philadelphia or New York, and he charges you the same price.

The farmer in my section is no fool. I have admired him and patted him on the back, and I have wondered how he gets the information without reading all the bulletins and market reports we provide for here.

Gentlemen, I have wondered if any of the distinguished gentlemen from the lower section of the State of California can tell me about the Pacific Dairy Review. Will some gentleman from California tell me if he knows about this paper?

It is published on the Pacific coast, concerning which we have heard to-day that there is great injustice on the part of Congress because we do not increase appropriations from a million and a half to four or five millions for the benefit of southern California. Will any one of these gentlemen from southern California tell me whether they have ever heard of the Pacific Dairy Review? If they do not, I will quote from it briefly. It states:

No person or interests are known to have demanded this service.

It speaks of the services of the Bureau of Markets, for which the gentlemen from southern California have been so eloquently pleading to-day.

This editorial goes on and intimates that if this bureau is continued, "the soap-box orators" will have won the day; that there is no need for this service; that it is waste and extravagance. We have heard to-day time and again that we are unjust to the people out there in southern California, because we do not take more money out of the Treasury and send it in their particular direction. But here is this paper taking the other view.

I look upon the benign countenance of my distinguished friend from California [Mr. RAKER] now. I observe that I might inspire him to speak if I should continue this. Does the gentleman from California know whether the statement in the Pacific Dairy Review is correct or not? Will he repudiate this paper from his own section? Will he say that the paper's statements are false, or will the gentleman from California, with his usual prescience and care, say that he will take the whole matter under consideration? Inasmuch as the gentleman from California does not take the opportunity to answer, I yield to him the balance of my time. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has expired. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RHODES] has the floor.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I see the paragraph provides for the expenditure of $50,000 for the purpose of collecting and distributing, by telegraph and otherwise, information in regard to the supply of food products. I would like to inquire if there would be objections to amending this paragraph in such a way as to make it include minerals and mineral products?

Mr. HAUGEN. For the information of the gentleman, the department, in its estimates, proposes two lump-fund items to cover the work, one for $41,560, for collection and distribution of information as to grain, hay, and feed, and another one, $34,960, for seed. Now, the committee combined the two items and recommends $50,000 for that purpose. If we included minerals, as has been suggested, after having cut the appropriation about 33⅓ per cent, it would not leave much for the investigation and report on the items included in this paragraph. The investigation, and the matter referred to by the gentleman, would clearly be a function of the Bureau of Mines, and, in my opinion, should not be included here.

Mr. RHODES. Will the gentleman yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. RHODES. Does the gentleman know whether or not the Bureau of Mines and Mining is conducting any inquiry——

Mr. HAUGEN. I can not answer.

Mr. RHODES (continuing). At this time with regard to acquiring information on the subject of minerals and mineral products?

Mr. HAUGEN. Undoubtedly it is. I could not state positively, but undoubtedly it must be conducting some investigations.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield to some gentleman time sufficient to answer this question, if he knows, as to whether the Bureau of Mines and Mining is collecting data in reference to the minerals of the country.

Mr. HAUGEN. The appropriations made for the Bureau of Mines and Mining come through another committee.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think it is but fair that the gentleman from Missouri should be advised that this Congress appropriated last year $50,000,000 for the Department of the Interior, to be utilized for the purpose of prospecting for mines and minerals throughout the United States. From my view it was a Democratic protective-tariff measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To make investigation relating to the transportation, storage, preparation, marketing, manufacture, and distribution of agricultural food products, including the extent, manner, and methods of any manipulation of the markets or control of the visible supply of such food products or any of them by any individuals, groups, associations, combinations, or corporations, $48,800.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, this item, which refers, among other things, to the storage of agricultural products, brings up a problem that we are going to be compelled to face in the very near future in regard to wheat.

In view of the fact that the Government has in its possession a large amount of meat products that are not going on the market, I raise the question as to what will be our disposition of this wheat product that the Government is under contract to take over at a price fixed by law, namely, $2.26? I understand that the present prospects of wheat, both of winter and summer, are that the yield will be the largest crop that we have ever had in the history of the Government. It is estimated to be beyond the billion bushel mark. That will represent a contract obligation that will go beyond $2,000,000,000 for this product alone. The contract is a moral as well as a legal one, and we will have to respect it. The Government will become the monopolistic buyer of this article, and what I am concerned about is, Will the products of wheat, as represented in the bakeries of the country, be sold in the market on the abnormal basis of the war-fixed price on a needed article which heretofore has recognized a rate of something like $26 per barrel for flour?

To be specific, the products of the bakeries have been sold at prices which would range to a figure of $26 per barrel of flour. That is abnormal, as everyone recognizes, and while nobody would hesitate a moment as to the Government's obligation to make good the price that is fixed by law for the wheat product, what is the Government going to do with it? Will the Government, in order to avoid losing upon wheat, undertake to stabilize the price and sell it for at least as much as it cost? And if it does it would appear to me to be abnormal and carrying the war-fixed price in time of peace, which is not the law of supply and demand.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Does the gentleman pretend that $2.26 will bring the price of flour up to $26 a barrel?

Mr. FESS. No. I contend that bakery products have been sold on the basis of $26 per barrel of flour.

Mr. HAUGEN. I know; but flour is selling for $13.50.

Mr. FESS. While that is true, I mean that the intermediary agencies are getting abnormal prices for the articles made out of the flour.

Mr. HAUGEN. That is being generally charged up to the farmer. The consumer is being robbed, and the robbery is charged up to the farmer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. My suggestion is this, that in view of the fact that in war times there is an inevitable waste, which we must charge up to loss, it is the proper function of the Government, since it must take over the wheat, to put it on the market for what it will bring, and make up the difference by charging it off to war loss, and thus let the consumer, whether he be on the farm or in the city, get the products at such a price as would range under the law of supply and demand.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman is aware of the fact that the Government representatives to-day and in the past have been doing everything in their power to hammer down the price of wheat. They did not succeed, and, as the gentleman knows, wheat is selling not for $2.26 but for $2.95, and the gentleman knows that if it had not been for the congressional action the price of wheat would have gone to $3 or $4 per bushel.

Mr. FESS. The fact is that with the largest crop in prospect that the country has ever known, we ought not to see the prices range so high, which are so abnormal; and if the law of supply and demand will not regulate it, then it is the business of the Government, if it fixes the price, to fix it on the basis of the cost of production.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, speaking of the law of supply and demand, the law of supply and demand is operating in nearly everything that is produced in the United States except wheat.

The gentleman has referred to pork. The price of hogs was fixed at $14 per hundred pounds. When the ban was lifted it went to $19 and $20 a hundred. There is where the discrimination comes. The Government laid its heavy hand upon the producers of wheat and kept the price of wheat down to $2.26, and yet certain gentlemen in the East, as, for instance, the Steel Trust, increased their profits from $47,000,000 to $278,000,000, and four packers increased their profits $121,000,000 in excess of prewar profits.

There is discrimination, gentlemen. Why are we concerned about the price of wheat? Suppose the price of wheat should go below $2.20. It is now selling at a premium of more than 70 cents a bushel, and the consumer has to pay for it.

Suppose the Government does lose a few dollars; what of it? The consumers of this country and the consumers of the world get the benefit of it. Why are we concerned about a few pennies that we may lose in the transaction?

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. FESS. My concern is that a staple article like wheat, with a price fixed, will suggest the range of most prices of other things; it is a sort of barometer.

Mr. HAUGEN. It serves as a barometer, but takes the increased profit of one hundred and twenty million from the farmers which I have spoken of. He gets only one-half of what he was entitled to.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph on page 81, lines 17 to 23, inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 81, strike out the paragraph from lines 17 to 23, inclusive.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, this item calls for an appropriation of $48,800. The report of the committee, on page 23, says, in explaining it in Committee of the Whole, that the word "production" has been omitted. That is the entire information furnished by the committee report. I referred to the hearings on this item before the Committee on Agriculture, and the result of my inquiry there has led me to make this motion.

The present chairman of the committee [Mr. HAUGEN] asked Mr. Brand, pages 639, 640, and 641, many interesting questions, and among other things Mr. HAUGEN said:

Mr. Brand, after all you have to confess that we are not getting very much information.

In other words, the present chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has been unable to secure information from the representative of the Department of Agriculture, who was a witness before the committee.

Further on Mr. Brand said, in reference to cars being moved:

You have got to have a sufficient number in order to arrive at accurate conclusions. You can not base your conclusion on two or a dozen or they will surely turn out wrong.

He was asked how much he had spent in getting this information, and his reply was that "this particular item calls for $48,000 or something in that neighborhood."

Immaterial, more or less, to the gentlemen representing the Department of Agriculture! Then Mr. HAUGEN said:

Then we can tell Congress and the country you have prescribed bookkeeping and you are investigating as to the number of the cars moving, and that is the extent of your work, is it?

Later on, on the same subject matter, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], a member of the committee, asked numerous illuminating questions that appear on pages 644 and 645. Mr. ANDERSON asked:

What, if anything, is being done under the language "including the extent, manner, and methods of any manipulation of the markets or control of the visible supply of such food products, or any of them"?

Mr. Brand replied:

In the arrangement that we made in order that there might be no duplication in this work, these phases of the work are handled by the Federal Trade Commission.

Anything that comes to light under the inquiry of Mr. ANDERSON is turned over to the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. ANDERSON's questions continue on for two or three pages, and I think they are extremely interesting, and one of his final statements is:

I do not wish to be understood as saying the work you are doing is not covered by the language in the appropriation, and I am simply saying I am personally disappointed in the work that is being done.

So the fact is that when these hearings were being had the members of the Committee on Agriculture themselves were not satisfied with the testimony presented and could not secure information from the representatives of the Department of Agriculture as they appeared before them. Then, why are we asked, as members of the Committee of the Whole, to agree to the appropriations asked for by the committee? I therefore hope that my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, as stated by the gentleman, it requires a good deal of effort to get information at times from certain representatives of the bureau. But I think it indicates persistent effort and is rather a credit to the members of the committee for their industry. After all, we think that upon investigation the appropriations of the money have been well expended. It seems that there are thousands of people in this country who have forgotten to remit the amounts due to certain people in this country. This department has discovered a number of items and is now distributing several hundred thousand dollars to the rightful shippers of this country. They have simply been robbed. We are asking for this appropriation for the investigation, for the audit of the books, that the money may be paid over where it actually belongs. After all, these expenditures are not so bad, and I trust that this amendment will be defeated. The section is one of the most important, and you will have to line up either with the fellow who is robbing or with the fellow who is entitled to his pay.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. BAER. I want to quote from a reliable newspaper, the Leader, printed at St. Paul, April 28, 1919, in which edition it says that in the Bureau of Markets appropriation there is included this item, and then it gives this very paragraph with the $48,800 appropriation and says that is wonderful work, that out of the $2,000,000 for the Bureau of Markets almost $50,000, or one-fortieth, is devoted to the investigation of the actual facts as to the markets in which the farmers and the consumers are robbed. According to this paper this is the most important paragraph in the whole bill, and I hope this will not be stricken out.

Mr. HAUGEN. I have an idea that there are people in South St. Paul to-day who would like to see this item struck from the bill.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, this item provides for an appropriation of $48,800 for investigation relating to transportation, storage, preparation, marketing, and so forth. This investigation has been made by the Federal Trade Commission on a memorandum from the Department of Agriculture, it is true. These facts which they have collected up to the present time have

been confined to live stock and meats and the principal grains entering into food. The information has been obtained, but has not up to the present date been given to the people for the reason that they have not yet reached the stage where the information was available for distribution.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is that the reason that the representative of the Department of Agriculture failed to give the information to the committee when requested by Mr. HAUGEN and Mr. ANDERSON?

Mr. CANDLER. I do not know anything about why he failed to give the information, or whether he gave it in full or not. I am giving the gentleman some information with reference to it that is correct. As soon as this information can be fully obtained and is ready for distribution it will be given out. This provision as it appears in the bill was offered on the floor of the House by your previous distinguished leader, Mr. MANN, and was adopted upon his motion, and has been in the bill from that time until now. He believed it was very important, and if the results which it produced can ever be obtained I have no doubt they will prove a benefit to the people of the country. As the investigation has been undertaken and the facts have been obtained, certainly it would be advisable to let this provision continue until those facts can be furnished to the people for their benefit. I hope the amendment to strike out this provision will be defeated. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of the United States grain-standards act: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the United States grain-standards act, including such rent and the employment of such persons and means as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $598,600: *Provided*, That section 6 of the said act is hereby amended, effective on and after the passage of this act, by striking out of the last sentence the words "Made after the parties in interest have had opportunity to be heard.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the proviso.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will reserve the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. I reserve it for a minute.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want to say to the gentleman that at the time of the passage of the grain-standards act, that act provided that in case of appeal a decision could not be rendered until after the parties had had an opportunity to be heard. I was opposed to the provision at the time the act was passed, because, knowing something about the actual operation of the grading of grains, I knew that that particular provision was absolutely unworkable because in the determination of an appeal upon the grade of grain the only question is one of quality; there is no question of argument which enters into it at all. It is a question for the inspector without argument, and the only effect of this provision is to require a notice to be given and an opportunity to be heard on the part of the parties, of which nobody ever avails himself. It requires a great deal of work, involves the department in a great deal of expense, and it is entirely proper and it comports not only with efficiency but with economy in the operation of the grain-standards act to eliminate this particular provision. For that reason I hope the gentleman will not insist on his point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Section 66 of the grain-standards act gives the right of appeal, and by eliminating that it would empower the authority on whom is imposed the duty of enforcing the act to make their decisions, to go ahead and impose the penalty without giving the parties on who the penalty may rest an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no penalty involved at all. It is simply a question of what is the grade of a specific sample of grain.

Mr. WALSH. There is a penalty, is there not, for marketing a grain in violation of the grade fixed?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true; but that has no relation to this particular provision.

Mr. WALSH. This is the section that fixes the grades.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. This gives authority to fix the grade without anybody having an opportunity to be heard?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; the section which fixes the grade requires a notice be given and hearings to be had. This refers not to appeal taken either by the buyer or seller from the original inspection to the Secretary of Agriculture, but simply involves a question of the grade of the grain itself. That is all. This is not a question susceptible of argument at all.

Mr. WALSH. There is a right of appeal given?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. What is the purpose of that appeal; is it not to produce further facts in support of it?

Mr. ANDERSON. You could not make the grade any different.

Mr. WALSH. Why is the right of appeal given; why do not you let the man who fixes the grade in the first instance enter the final decree or order fixing that standard? Now, if there is a right of appeal given, it seems to me it is for the Secretary or to whomever the appeal lies to further consider the matter and hear further facts in relation to the same.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; the facts are submitted in the first place, and the only thing that is submitted to the inspector is the samples of grain, upon which he determines the grade. When that test is taken that sample goes up to the appealing authority, whoever that is; it may be the supervisor or the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WALSH. And, of course, the original grade is fixed by the appellate authority?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. And it is never reversed—the grade is never changed or the decision of the first inspector is never changed?

Mr. ANDERSON. Very frequently it is changed on appeal.

Mr. WALSH. I think we ought to have this safeguard in here.

Mr. RUBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I will yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Minnesota had the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. If I have the floor, I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RUBEY. I just wanted to add to what the gentleman from Minnesota has so well said and say this, that out of some 3,000 or 4,000 appeals made up to the time this bill was first reported not a single party has taken advantage of the provision of this act and asked for a hearing.

Mr. WALSH. I assume there is nothing to prevent——

Mr. RUBEY. No. Here is the point: When an appeal is taken it is necessary to notify these parties, and that takes up time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make a point of order on the paragraph or the proviso or both?

Mr. WALSH. I said I made the point of order to the proviso, and I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HAUGEN. The point of order is conceded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Administration of the United States warehouse act: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the United States warehouse act, including the payment of such rent and the employment of such persons and means as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $35,000.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 84, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following paragraph: "Completion of work of domestic wool section of War Industries Board: To enable the Bureau of Markets to complete the work of the domestic wool section of the War Industries Board and to enforce the Government regulations for handling the wool clip of 1918 as established by the wool division of said board, pursuant to the Executive order dated December 31, 1918, transferring such work to the Bureau of Markets, $35,000. The activities to be undertaken under this appropriation shall include the securing and auditing of accounts and records of all dealers; the further collection of excess profits, as provided in the regulations for handling the wool clip of 1918, and, so far as practicable, the distribution of such excess profits to the individual growers of the wool upon which such profits were made; necessary printing, and the publication of the results of this work, including the names and addresses of dealers who have complied or who have failed or refused to comply with the rules and regulations for handling the wool clip of 1918."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, under regulations issued by the wool section, War Industries Board, approximately 3,600 country dealers were granted permits. The regulations limited the profits of the dealers and provided that all profits in excess of those prescribed were to be distributed to the growers. It is estimated that between $1,000,000 and $2,000,000 of excess profits were secured from the 1918 wool transactions. This money must be located and collected from both classes of dealers, which they propose to distribute to the growers of wool from

whom the profits resulted. Its work is taken over from the War Industries Board. There is something like $2,000,000 belonging to the wool growers. It is proposed to check up the books that the $2,000,000 may be allocated and restored to its rightful owners.

I trust the gentleman will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. WALSH. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the performance of the duties required of the Bureau of Markets in the administration or enforcement of provisions of acts (U. S. cotton-futures act, 39 Stat. L., 476; U. S. grain-standards act, 39 Stat. L., 482; U. S. warehouse act, 39 Stat. L., 486; standard container act, 39 Stat. L., 673; and the acts making annual appropriations for the Department of Agriculture) relating to the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture, or any representative authorized by him for the purpose, shall have power to administer oaths, examine witnesses, and call for the production of books and papers, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. WALSH. I make the point of order on the paragraph. It is new legislation. There is no authority for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act of April 26, 1910, entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded Paris greens, lead arsenates, and other insecticides, and also fungicides, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," $94,790.

Mr. HAUGEN. I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HAUGEN: Page 86, line 12, strike out the word "and" at the beginning of the line.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act of August 20, 1912, as amended, entitled "An act to regulate the importation of nursery stock and other plants and plant products; to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain quarantine districts for plant diseases and insect pests; to permit and regulate the movement of fruits, plants, and vegetables therefrom, and for other purposes," $47,700.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TREADWAY: Page 87, line 11, after the figures "$47,700," insert:

"*Provided*, That no portion of this appropriation shall be available for enforcement of quarantine regulation No. 37 or rules and regulations thereunder as promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture."

Mr. ANDERSON. I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota reserves a point of order.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, quarantine regulation No. 37 is an embargo that has been issued by the Secretary of Agriculture preventing the importation into this country of a large variety of plants, shrubs, and bulbs which are very generally used throughout the country on large estates and for general horticultural purposes. The regulations seem to be extremely severe, and, as I stated a few days ago on the floor, numerous constituents of mine have protested very strongly against the enforcement of this embargo. It is detrimental to a large number of my constituents, and I am informed on the most practical and the very best of authority that it is absolutely unnecessary. There can be regulations made and methods carried out for preventing the spread of the various diseases referred to without absolutely prohibiting the importation of this kind of nursery stock. On the testimony that has been submitted to me it does not seem to me that the embargo is necessary; and, further than that, I am credibly informed that this board which has established these regulations does not contain a practical horticulturist. It seems that the horticultural interests of the country should be represented on such a board if authority is to be given to them to establish a regulation which will absolutely put a very large number of people out of business and seriously inconvenience many persons desirous of purchasing the importations. It is in order to protect such interests as those to which I refer that I have offered the amendment, to see if it is not possible to obtain some concession from the Department of Agriculture before a positive embargo is established against this large industry, so as to permit the introduction of plants, bulbs, and so forth, to which it refers, and not give the positive authority to prevent their importation. I am told that for some reason or other the Horticultural Board has taken serious offense at one large importer, and that, to a certain extent, this embargo is aimed at that one importer.

Whether or not that is true, I am not at all sure, but I trust it is not true, in that it hardly seems that the large nursery industries of our country ought to suffer if there is some disagreement between the Horticultural Board and this one particular person. If this embargo is aimed at this particular person, there is all the more reason for the adoption of my amendment, in order that an effort may be made to see if we can not reach an equitable understanding whereby the plants and shrubs and bulbs can be properly fumigated, so as to allow a continuation of this very important industry and the importations to which the embargo refers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Does the gentleman from Minnesota insist on the point of order?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is subject to a point of order. While it is in the form of a limitation its purposes and its actual result would be to repeal a rule of the Federal Horticultural Board which has the effect of law. It is not a limitation of appropriation, in a sense, in refusing to appropriate money for a certain purpose. Its purpose and effect is to actually repeal a rule that has the effect of law. Therefore it is a change of existing law and effectuates that purpose.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the amendment is subject to a point of order, because under the act of August 20, 1912, the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Horticultural Board, has issued some 40 quarantine orders.

Now, quarantine order No. 37 is confined particularly to what is known as nursery stock. It does not interfere with the expenditure of this money in enforcing the provisions of this act under the various quarantine orders that have been issued, but it simply limits the expenditure of this money, as Congress certainly has the right to do in passing an appropriation, and to say that of the sum appropriated it shall not be used for the enforcement of a certain order which has been issued under the law authorizing the expenditure. If we should have said that no portion of this money would be available for the enforcement of the provisions of the act of August 20, 1912, it clearly would have been subject to a point of order. But that is not the purport of the amendment. It is restricted to a certain order issued under that act, and the money is applicable to enforce all the other orders that the Secretary has promulgated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair believes this is clearly a limitation on the enforcement of part of the quarantine regulations and that the exercise of the power granted by the limitation would result in the reduction of the appropriation, and therefore this amendment would be in order under the Holman rule. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to simply direct the attention of the committee to the importance of this order, which, as my colleague has said, is most drastic and which it is seriously contended not only by nurserymen who are selling stock but by men who are purchasing it throughout the country—farmers, if you please, and gentlemen of means who desire to purchase trees and ornamental shrubs—is entirely different in its import and in its phraseology from any of the other quarantine orders which have been issued.

Mr. RAKER. Will the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts yield for a question?

Mr. WALSH. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. RAKER. Has my friend looked over the hearings of some four years ago, taken on this matter before the Committee on Agriculture and a special committee down at the Agricultural Department——

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER (continuing). When this law was enacted, showing that all of this imported nursery stock was infected? And on this bill now we are spending almost $600,000 to stop the spread of the very disease that has been brought over here by this nursery stock.

Mr. WALSH. I looked over the hearings, and there is no such statement in the hearings, and the Federal Horticultural Board itself has only pointed out four instances in the last four years where stock has been brought into this country where they can prove that disease or pests have been found in the bundles when they have been inspected by the authorities. They have pointed out two instances within the last two years.

Now, I appreciate the interest of the gentleman from California, because there are two large firms in that section, one of which has recently gone into bankruptcy, which have been most urgent in seeking to prohibit the importation of stock into this country. Why, gentlemen, during the year 1918 there were 3,455,000 fruit trees imported from England, France, and Holland. There were 989,000 roses; there were 917,000 forest and ornamental deciduous trees from the same countries; there were 1,190,836 ornamental shrubs.

Now, out of all that vast number there have been, according to the hearings and according to the contentions made, which I understand are not shared by Mr. Marlatt, one of the members of the Federal Horticultural Board, but four instances where beyond a doubt they can prove that pests or diseases have been brought in. Furthermore, they permit rose stock on the wild or natural root to come into this country, and it is not within the terms of the quarantine order; but if that rose root should have been budded with a rose variety upon the stock, it is prohibited.

As I say, the terms of this order are entirely different from those of any other quarantine order issued, and the term of the quarantine is to go into effect very soon, if it has not already done so. It will have a very serious effect upon those who desire to beautify their homes or their estates, and it is not detrimental alone to the nurseryman or the dealer, because, as gentlemen well know, people of means import directly from foreign countries, and when this war is over there will be thousands and thousands of our citizens who will be visiting foreign countries and traveling through the war-swept regions, and on their way home they will visit some of those countries where they can procure some of this nursery stock.

Unless this is done, our own people here, by reason of not having been able to import stock during the last three or four years on account of war conditions, will find the market here depleted; and I submit, in all fairness and candor to the gentlemen of the committee, that this is in the interest of horticulture in this country, because the stock that is brought in, whether the quarantine order is enforced or not, will still be subject to the quarantine regulations of the several States, and, if it is found to be diseased, it can be condemned under the other provisions of the law.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragaraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the last statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], it seems to me, makes it necessary that there shall be a very strict enforcement of the plant-quarantine act. That statement was to the effect that many people are visiting Europe now and will be coming back, and that they will desire to bring with them ornamental shrubs, roses, and things of that kind. If that is true the plant-quarantine act ought to be tightened up just as much as possible, because I doubt if gentlemen in this House realize the tremendous importance to the country of this act of Congress.

I was informed by the secretary of the American Plant Pest Committee, which consists, I think, as I was told, of four horticulturists in each State, including either their secretary or commissioner of agriculture—I was informed by this gentleman the other day that the people of the country are losing now the enormous sum of $1,500,000 per day because of pests imported into this country. Now, multiply that by 365, and it will give you some slight idea of the importance of keeping a very close watch upon everything that is imported.

I also asked this gentleman, whose name is Harris A. Reynolds, No. 4 Joy Street, Boston, Mass., about Regulation No. 37 the pointed question whether or not he thought it was in the interest of the country. I told him that I desired to quote his statement on the floor of the House, and he made the very emphatic reply that it was absolutely necessary, he thought, in the interest of the country, and he felt that the regulation as to the importation of these prohibitive things should stand.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not think I quite catch the point of the gentleman's remarks, that it would be even more dangerous to import such things from Europe now than heretofore.

Mr. LEVER. No. I said there was likelihood that many more visitors in Europe would come back with these things than before the war, and that therefore the danger would be greater.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is it not possible—and the testimony I have had is to the effect that it is possible—to prevent the importation of the disease without establishing a positive embargo against the importation of the stock?

Mr. LEVER. As a matter of fact, in this bill we are carrying a proposition that provides for what you might call a plant-quarantine hospital in the District of Columbia, where these imported stocks may be taken and tried out, to see whether or not they are diseased. But we ought not to let down the bars here and open up this country to a flood of plant pests.

Mr. RAKER. Is it not a fact that four years ago, when the committee held hearings, Dr. Marlatt and, I think, Dr. Howard appeared before the committee and it was shown by them and others that the foreign people were not cleaning up their stocks, that they were infected with these diseases, and we had to take some drastic measures to save our own country or we would have been thoroughly infected and could not have stopped the ravages of these plant diseases?

Mr. LEVER. That was the testimony on which this Federal plant-quarantine act was based.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. WALSH) there were—ayes 15, noes 53.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the establishment of the potato wart in eastern Pennsylvania, and to provide means for the extermination of this disease in Pennsylvania or elsewhere in the United States in cooperation with the State or States concerned, including rent outside the District of Columbia, employment of labor in the city of Washington or elsewhere, and all other necessary expenses, $50,000, which shall be immediately available.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the words "which shall be immediately available."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee if it is his intention to try to finish this bill before we adjourn?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes, indeed. I think we can get along very nicely now.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he thinks it will be practicable to finish the bill within a reasonable time?

Mr. HAUGEN. I think we can finish it within a short time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There are 12 pages yet.

Mr. HAUGEN. There are 12 pages, but I think we have gotten over the rough places.

Mr. WINGO. Why not take a recess and then come back to-night?

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Oh, no!

Mr. HAUGEN. We have been considering this bill for four days, and I think we ought to go right on and finish it.

Mr. WINGO. With the progress you are making you can not finish to-night, and if you go on much longer you will have to have a quorum here.

Mr. BLANTON. I move to strike out the last word, just for the purpose of asking the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] whether he is going to sit idly by and let the gentleman from Massachusetts knock out this $50,000 appropriation, which proposes to exterminate the potato wart in eastern Pennsylvania?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would say to my energetic friend from Texas that I have no knowledge of the importance of this paragraph, and am unable to inform him whether it ought to stay in the bill or go out. I will tell him, however, that we raise a great many potatoes in eastern Pennsylvania. Sometimes these Government investigations are a good thing and sometimes they are not. If the potato wart exists there, I am frank to say I have not heard of it. Sometimes the department gets onto these things quicker than Members of Congress do. There may be some other Members from eastern Pennsylvania who know about it. It is entirely up to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 15. That in order further to control and eradicate and to prevent the dissemination of dangerous plant diseases and insect infections and infestations no plant or plant products for or capable of propagation, including nursery stock, hereinafter referred to as plants and plant products, shall be moved or allowed to be moved, shipped, transported or carried by any means whatever into or out of the District of Columbia except in compliance with such rules and regulations as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture as hereinafter provided. Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture, after investigation, shall

determine that any plants and plant products in the District of Columbia are infested or infected with insect pests and diseases and that any place, articles, and substances used or connected therewith are so infested or infected written notice thereof shall be given by him to the owner or person in possession or control thereof, and such owner or person shall forthwith control or eradicate and prevent the dissemination of such insect pest or disease and shall remove, cut, or destroy such infested and infected plants, plant products, and articles and substances used or connected therewith, which are hereby declared to be nuisances, within the time and in the manner required in said notice or by the rules and regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture. Whenever such owner or person can not be found, or shall fail, neglect, or refuse to comply with the foregoing provisions of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and required to control and eradicate, and prevent dissemination of such insect pest or disease and to remove, cut, or destroy infested or infected plants and plant products and articles and substances used or connected therewith, and the United States shall have an action of debt against such owner or persons for expenses incurred by the Secretary of Agriculture in that behalf. Employees of the Federal Horticultural Board are hereby authorized and required to inspect places, plants, and plant products and articles and substances used or connected therewith whenever the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine that such inspections are necessary for the purposes of this section. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions and requirements of this section and of the rules and regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture made hereunder, and the notices given pursuant thereto, employees of the Federal Horticulture Board shall have power with a warrant to enter into or upon any place and open any bundle, package, or other container of plants or plant products whenever they shall have cause to believe that infections or infestations of plant pests and diseases exist therein or thereon, and when such infections or infestations are found to exist, after notice by the Secretary of Agriculture to the owner or person in possession or control thereof and an opportunity by said owner or person to be heard, to destroy the infected or infested plants or plant products contained therein. The police court or municipal court of the District of Columbia shall have power, upon information supported by oath or affirmation showing probable cause for believing that there exists in any place, bundle, package, or other container in the District of Columbia any plant or plant product which is infected or infested with plant pests or disease, to issue warrants for the search for and seizure of all such plants and plant products. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture, and he is hereby required, from time to time, to make and promulgate such rules and regulations as shall be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, and any person who shall move or allow to be moved, or shall ship, transport, or carry, by any means whatever, any plant or plant products from or into the District of Columbia except in compliance with the rules and regulations prescribed under this section, shall be punished as is provided in section 10 of this act.

Mr. WALSH. I make a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. HAUGEN. I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 91, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

"Section 3 of the act entitled 'An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States,' approved March 19, 1918, is hereby repealed, effective at 2 o'clock antemeridian of the second Sunday after the approval of this act, when by the retarding of one hour the standard time of each zone shall be returned to, and thereafter be, the mean astronomical time of the degree of longitude governing each zone as defined in section 1 of said act approved March 19, 1918."

Mr. DYER. I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I make the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. PELL. I make the point of order on this amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone want to be heard on the point of order? [After a pause.] The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. May I inquire of the gentleman from Wyoming—I am doing this for the benefit of some of my associates—whether it is his intention to force a quorum to be present, and remain for a vote, if a roll call shall be demanded on this bill?

Mr. MONDELL. My understanding is that it is the purpose of the gentleman in charge of the bill to conclude consideration of the bill in the committee this evening.

Mr. LEVER. And there will not be a roll call to-night?

Mr. MONDELL. Not unless a roll call is necessary in order to secure a quorum. I do not understand that the gentleman from Iowa intends to ask for a vote on the bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. I suggest that we finish the reading of the bill this evening and report it back to the House.

Mr. RAGSDALE. And there will be no effort to pass the bill to-night?

Mr. HAUGEN. No; not as far as I am concerned.

The Clerk read as follows:

To prevent the movement of cotton and cotton seed from Mexico into the United States, including the regulation of the entry into the United States of railway cars and other vehicles, and freight, express, baggage, or other materials from Mexico, and the inspection, cleaning, and disinfection thereof, $148,500, which shall be immediately available; any moneys received in payment of charges fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture on account of such cleaning and disinfection at plants constructed therefor out of any appropriation made on account of the pink bollworm of cotton to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

That hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion and under such conditions as he may prescribe, supply to any municipality or public institution not more than one American bison from any surplus which may exist in any herd under the control of the Department of Agriculture; and, in order to aid in the propagation of the species, animals may be loaned to or exchanged with other owners of American bison.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 96, after line 23, insert the following:

"To enable the Secretary to make suitable agricultural exhibits at State, interstate, and international fairs held within the United States, including the National Dairy Show to be held at Chicago, Ill., during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, $100,000: *Provided*, That not more than $25,000 shall be used in connection with the National Dairy Show to be held at Chicago, Ill., and that not more than $5,000 shall be used in connection with any other one fair."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whenever, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the Secretary of Agriculture shall find that the expenses of travel can be reduced thereby, he may, in lieu of actual traveling expenses, under such regulations as he may prescribe, authorize the payment of not to exceed 2½ cents per mile for a motorcycle or 7 cents per mile for an automobile, used for necessary travel on official business.

Mr. WALSH. I make a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 97, at the top of the page insert:

"Whenever, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the Secretary of Agriculture shall find that the expenses of travel can be reduced thereby, he may, in lieu of actual traveling expenses, under such regulations as he may prescribe, authorize the payment of not to exceed 2 cents per mile for a motorcycle or 6 cents per mile for an automobile, used for necessary travel on official business."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

That hereafter in carrying on the activities of the Department of Agriculture involving cooperation with State, county, and municipal agencies, associations of farmers, individual farmers, universities, colleges, boards of trade, chambers of commerce, or other local associations of business men, business organizations, and individuals within the State, Territory, District, or insular possession in which such activities are to be carried on, moneys contributed from such outside sources, except in the case of the authorized activities of the Forest Service, shall be paid only through the Secretary of Agriculture or through State, county, or municipal agencies, or local farm bureaus or like organizations, cooperating for the purpose with the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, I have here a letter from the dean of the State Teachers' College in Colorado, of May 30, and other educators of that State, referring to cooperation of the departments of the Government and certain bureaus in Denver, particularly the Women's Division of the Bureau of the United States Department of Labor. This letter is signed also by Hon. Roady Kenehan, director of the Department of Labor at Denver. It was not received until the provisions for maintenance of that office were stricken out of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill on a point of order. When that happened, the patriotic women of Denver raised the funds to pay office expenses through this month. This letter gives a very interesting review of the work of that office, and I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD by printing it. The Women's Division of the Department of Labor has rendered a very patriotic service.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the letter referred to. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has generally taken care of these things of inserting letters and newspaper stories and matters of that kind in the RECORD. I think it is an extremely bad practice. I do not like to object, as my friend is a new Member of Congress.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that this contains matter of very great interest to the House in regard to the placing of agricultural laborers, and in respect to matters of interest to agriculture and education all over the country.

Mr. LEVER. Well, nobody will ever read the letter; but I have no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE,
WOMEN'S DIVISION FOR COLORADO,
Denver, Colo., May 14, 1919.

Congressman WILLIAM VAILE,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Is the United States Employment Service to live or is the United States to lose the best institution resulting from the war?

Feeling that this issue is so vital, we want you to know the importance of our work and what we have accomplished.

First as to what we have done. The Women's Division for Colorado was started September 1, 1918. In the eight months of our existence we know we have accomplished certain definite results.

(1) We have given immediate aid to hundreds of women who did not know where to look for work. Perhaps you do not realize how helpless a woman thrown upon her own resources for the first time can be, nor the danger that attends her seeking for work, especially if she is a stranger in the city. A man can walk into any building in any part of the city and ask for work without being insulted. This is impossible for a woman, who must be assured of getting work with the right kind of persons and in the decent parts of the city, if she is to have a good chance in the business world. If she gets into the wrong place of business her next placement will be doubly difficult.

(2) Not only do we aid women new to Denver in getting positions, but we help them in various other ways. Women from other States do not hesitate to come to Colorado when they learn that there is a United States Employment Service here. Two girls from Iowa came into the office not long ago, saying that they were not a bit afraid to come to Denver, because they learned in their State that there was a Women's Division here and they knew they would receive good care. Both of those girls were told where to go for rooms and both have been placed in suitable positions. This has happened a number of times. Sometimes we find that girls have been told by persons on the train to go to the wrong kind of boarding places. We always call up good houses and see that these girls get rooms there. We try to make the women feel that this is their service and that they can come to us for any kind of advice.

(3) As to our actual accomplishment in placement, the appended report will give you an idea of the size of the work. It does not tell you anything concerning the scope. We have women registered with us for all kinds of work, from embalming to bee culture; from the scrub woman to the best paid matron's position. Some of the most interesting lines are: Advertising; assistant buyer; bacteriology; bee culture; cafeteria and lunch-room manager; chemistry; civil engineering; costume designing; dramatic coach; demonstration; dietetics; doctor's assistant; farm management; farm work; governess; institutional work; interior decorating; interpreting; journalism; laboratory; library; music; pastor's assistant; pharmacy; prison reform; public speaking; railroad; research; Red Cross and other war work; salesmanship; social service; stock ranch; story telling; summer work of many kinds; teaching, all kinds; translating; tutoring. Besides the ordinary positions, such as domestic service, factory, clerical, stenographic, bookkeeping, etc., we have placed women in unusual lines, some of these being: Nurse at a large State institution for girls; girls for work in France; managing housekeeper in private family with entire charge of children; secretaries, both for firms and individuals; Government workers of various kinds; superintendent large children's home in Utah; assistant secretary, Y. W. C. A.; matrons various girls' schools; nurses on staff Visiting Nurse Association; nurses to take charge of community nursing; organizers for civilian relief of the American Red Cross; teachers; statisticians for private firms and for Government surveys; chemists; office managers.

Not only do we fill Colorado needs, but we have received calls from States ranging from Massachusetts to California, and from Texas to Minnesota.

(4) We have allied ourselves with every patriotic, National, State, or city movement, furnishing both paid and volunteer helpers.

(5) We are becoming a storehouse of information concerning women's activities in Colorado. Letters from East, West, North, and South recognizing this are coming to the office asking for this or that information pertaining to women's work. Women's organizations of the city and individual women come to us with all kinds of questions. Thus we are gathering statistics that some day will be valuable to the Government.

(6) Our teachers' department is well organized, with a former dean of women of one of our universities in charge. For the first time, all the colleges and normal schools of the State are united and are cooperating with us, one member from each school having been appointed as part of our teachers' department by the United States Labor Department, Washington, salary $1 per year. This is the first time in the history of the United States that all State and sectarian schools have united in this great work. We have sent 6,000 circular letters to county superintendents and school boards, and are daily receiving many calls for teachers in rural, grade, private, and high schools, with salaries ranging from $70 to $200 per month. We are also in communication with teachers' departments in other States with whom we exchange lists of unfilled positions. Thus we are in a position to help the teaching situation all over the United States.

(7) The work of such a bureau does not consist alone in filling positions. Perhaps the most useful thing we did in war time was in helping women find themselves. Hundreds of women feeling the restlessness pervading all things, at that time, or compelled to work for the first time, came into the office asking what there was to be done and what could they do. It is no easy task to find out what a woman with no experience and no business training is best fitted for; but many hours were spent in doing this very thing. Wherever possible, training for special lines of work was advised and the woman was placed where she could obtain this. If wages must be made immediately she was placed where she could learn a useful trade and at the same time make expenses. College and high-school girls come to the office for the same kind of advice, always with the question, "What am I best fitted for?" So a great deal of vocational guidance is given and must be given in any placement work dealing with women.

The above gives you an idea of the importance of such work as ours. This class of work was not done under United States plan with the Immigration Board, and is not being done now in the State labor offices. No State office can have the scope that a Government office has, as the former necessarily limits itself by the boundaries of its State, while a United States office is national in scope. Only a very few agencies charging high fees are attempting this kind of work now being done by the United States Employment Service free of charge. Do we want to force women who need work to pay for the opportunity for service? Then, too, girls come to our office who refuse to go to the usual agencies, because they feel a greater confidence in anything the Government establishes.

It would be a detriment to business and to labor to permit the employment work so well organized over the country to be disbanded. Thousands of dollars have been spent in starting these offices, but it will take much more to reorganize them later if we do away with them now. And sooner or later we will have Government employment offices, the same as other countries—England, France, Scotland, Italy—have to-day.

It is our desire that you vote for and use your influence in creating and maintaining the United States Employment Service.

Department of Labor—Colorado—Women.

	Registrations.	Help wanted.	Referred.	Placed.
September	1,334	1,469	684	615
October	1,786	1,134	696	581
November	1,183	836	592	494
December	815	941	575	491
January	854	912	727	581
February	662	637	627	436
March	491	644	487	354

"Spencer Geltz, secretary teachers' appointments office, University of Colorado; E. A. Cross, dean State Teachers' College; C. T. Sargent, professor of education, State Agricultural College; J. V. Breitweiser, head of department of psychology and education, Colorado College; Eva Carpenter, secretary State Normal School; D. E. Phillips, head department of psychology and education, Denver University; J. W. Bailey, president Colorado Woman's College; Martha Hoag Clifford, president Colorado Branch, Association of Collegiate Alumnæ; Amy Gordon Bruce, executive secretary Young Woman's Christian Association, west central field; Anna C. McClintock, president Denver Young Woman's Christian Association; Jennie H. Baker, chairman Denver County Council of Defense; Guy T. Justis, director Denver Federated Charities; Garnet Isabel Pelton, ex-secretary Denver Antituberculosis Society; Mrs. R. E. Babcock, president Vassar Club; Marian E. Pulsifer, president Colorado Wellesley Club; Mrs. W. J. Pelmounter, president University of Colorado Alumnæ Club; Adrianna Hungerford, president Colorado Woman's Christian Temperance Union; Mathilde H. Handy, president Colorado Woman's Auxiliary of United States Army; Carrie O. Kistler, president former Woman's Council of Defense for Colorado; H. B. Smith, secretary Colorado Education Association; Sallie Hill, president National League of Teachers' Associations; Gertie N. Ross, president State Federation of Colored Women's Clubs; Sarah Rechnitz, president Council of Jewish Women; Adella Bailey, president Federation of Women's Clubs; Mrs. Frederick R. Ross, acting vice president University of Denver Alumnæ; Mrs. Herbert Munroe, chairman Industrial Committee, Colorado Federated Women's Clubs; Katherine T. Hosmer, president Equal Suffrage Club; Mrs. Charles H. Jacobson, president Colorado Federation of Women's Clubs; Madelyn Keezer, president Colorado Smith Club; Edith H. Summers, president Colorado College Club; Minnie Lorena Weiss, president Woman's Club of Denver; Edith Adams Ramsey, president Mothers' Congress and Parent-Teachers' Association; Mary McKay, superintendent Visiting Nurses' Association; Theodosia E. Raines, superintendent women's division; Roady Kenehan, Federal director.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the gentleman from Iowa ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be directed to correct the details.

The CHAIRMAN. That has already been done.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to different places in the bill for the purpose of offering various amendments to correct typographical errors, to strike out commas, and things of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk reported the following amendments, which were severally read and severally agreed to:

Page 27, line 25, change the word "amounts" to "amount."
Page 30, line 2, after the word "paper," insert a comma.
Page 32, line 9, at the end of the line fill in the type dropped, completing the word "purchase."
Page 51, line 23, after the word "electric," strike out the comma.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: On page 71——

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has not concluded the reading of the other amendments.

Mr. RAKER. Oh, this matter has been opened up. I have been waiting for this. The section has been opened up and an amendment has been adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not recognize the gentleman for the purpose of offering such an amendment. The com-

mittee did not return to these pages for the purpose of general amendments.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAKER. The Chair recognized the gentleman to return and open up the bill. This subdivision is opened up, and it was not stated for these particular amendments. An amendment has been offered to this subdivision and has been agreed to by the committee, and there was no limitation upon the opening up.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] very clearly stated that his request was to return to various pages for the correction of certain typographical errors. He made that statement very clearly and very distinctly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order of the gentleman from California upon the grounds stated by the gentleman from Wyoming. The Clerk will proceed.

The Clerk read the following amendments, which were severally read and severally agreed to:

Page 59, line 12, omit the comma at the end of the line.
Page 60, line 12, omit the comma after the word "entitled."
Page 76, line 16, at the end of the line complete the word by adding the letter "f."

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will go back to page 27, line 21, which we passed over temporarily. A point of order was pending against the paragraph, beginning line 21, on page 27, and ending with line 13, page 28. Unless the point of order is withdrawn, the Chair will sustain the point of order. The point of order is sustained. Now, on page 50 we have another point of order pending which we agreed to pass over temporarily for the purpose of giving gentlemen on the floor an opportunity to decide whether they wished to press the point of order or whether they could find authority to sustain the contention against the point of order. I believe the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] made the request.

Mr. LEVER. I made the request that we pass it over temporarily on the theory that I recalled authority to overrule the point of order, and I have investigated the matter and I confess I have not been able to put my hands on that authority, and, as far as I can judge the matter, if I were chairman of the committee I would sustain the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. If no other gentleman wishes to be heard on the point of order, the Chair has already made up his mind, from looking up the authorities to substitute the point of order, and the point of order is sustained. That finishes the bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill, with amendments, to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MADDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3157, and had directed him to report the same to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to demand a separate vote on several amendments, but it is understood we are not to take a vote to-night.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the business of Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with to-morrow.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman wait until to-morrow?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman from California there is only one matter of legislation on the calendar.

Mr. RAKER. Let it go over until to-morrow morning. Last year we were deprived of legislation by agreeing to dispense with Calendar Wednesday one Wednesday after another, and I just think the gentleman ought to wait until to-morrow.

Mr. MONDELL. There is only one bill on the calendar.

Mr. RAKER. All right.

Mr. DYER. What is that bill?

The SPEAKER. It is the commission to provide for water facilities for the city of Washington. Is there objection that Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with?

Mr. DYER. I suggest that the gentleman withdraw his request until to-morrow morning, so we may know about the bill on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri object?

Mr. DYER. I will if the gentleman insists upon it.

Mr. HAUGEN. I think we all appreciate we should go on with the business of the appropriation bills and transact business in a business way. We will have a number of Wednesdays before we get through, and there is nothing on the calendar but one bill, and I see no reason——

Mr. DYER. There is a bill on the calendar.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the practice has been here ever since Calendar Wednesday rule was established that if the previous question was ordered, then the matter came up the next day.

Mr. HAUGEN. This is not for the purpose of expediting the passage of this bill but to expedite the passage of other appropriation bills that should be passed by the 1st of July.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have got nothing to do with that. I was just trying to straighten out the other matter.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is under the impression this bill comes up Thursday instead of Wednesday.

Mr. MADDEN. It comes up unless the previous question is ordered, but it has been invariably ruled by the Speaker of the House since Calendar Wednesday was established that whenever the previous question would operate upon a bill, even though it was the night before Calendar Wednesday, it would be in order the first thing the next morning.

Mr. LEVER. Automatically.

Mr. MADDEN. Automatically.

The SPEAKER. The question will be decided when it arises to-morrow.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, without any regard to that matter, it is very important that the House go on to-morrow with its program of appropriation bills. The District bill has been reported, and we were in hopes we could take it up in the morning. The bill now on the Wednesday Calendar is with regard to the water supply for the District of Columbia, and it is not important that it should be considered at this time, but it is important that the District appropriation bill be considered. So I trust there will be no objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa that the business of Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with to-morrow?

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, if it is insisted on to-day, I will object; if to-morrow morning, I will not.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks made last Saturday on the bill then pending.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

Mr. MCKEOWN (at the request of Mr. CARTER) was granted leave of absence, for three days, on account of meeting of returning Oklahoma soldiers of the Thirty-sixth Division.

Mr. FERRIS, Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. MCCLINTIC (at the request of Mr. CARTER), by unanimous consent, were granted leave of absence, for one day, on account of meeting returning Oklahoma soldiers of the Thirty-sixth Division.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Wednesday, June 4, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a tentative draft of a bill to provide for the reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the Naval Service of the United States for property lost or destroyed in such service (H. Doc. No. 75); to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting notice for contest of a seat in the House of Representatives for the Sixty-sixth Congress for the fifth district of the State of Wisconsin, Joseph P. Carney against Victor Berger, and transmitting original testimony, papers, and documents relating thereto (H. Doc. No. 76); to the Committee on Elections No. 1 and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GOULD, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1199) to prohibit the purchase, sale, or possession for the purpose of sale of certain wild birds in the District of Columbia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 19), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EVANS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 4571) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the county of Stanton, State of Nebraska, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4572) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the county of Thurston, State of Nebraska, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4573) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the county of Pierce, State of Nebraska, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4574) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the county of Nance, State of Nebraska, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4575) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the county of Merrick, State of Nebraska, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4576) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the county of Madison, State of Nebraska, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4577) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the county of Knox, State of Nebraska, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4578) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the county of Dixon, State of Nebraska, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4579) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the county of Wayne, Nebr., one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4580) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the county of Dakota, Nebr., one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4581) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the county of Cuming, Nebr., one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4582) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the county of Colfax, Nebr., one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4583) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the county of Cedar, Nebr., one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4584) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the county of Boone, Nebr., one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4585) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the county of Antelope, Nebr., one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4586) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the county of Burt, Nebr., one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 4587) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Paoli, in the county of Orange, in the State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4588) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Orleans, in the county of Orange, in the State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4589) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bedford, in the county of Lawrence, in the State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4590) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Jasper, in the county of Dubois, in the State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4591) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Scottsburg, in the county of Scott, in the State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4592) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Tell City, in the county of Perry, in the State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4593) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Milltown, in the county of Crawford, in the State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4594) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of English, in the county of Crawford, in the State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4595) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Marengo, in the county of Crawford, in the State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4596) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Huntingburg, in the county of Dubois, in the State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4597) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Cannelton, in the county of Perry, in the State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4598) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Corydon, in the county of Harrison, in the State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4599) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of New Albany, in the county of Floyd, in the State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4600) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Jeffersonville, in the county of Clark, in the State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURRIE of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 4601) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Mecosta, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4602) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of West Branch, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4603) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Harrisville, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 4604) authorizing the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Philippi, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4605) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the town of Franklin, Pendleton County, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4606) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Martinsburg, Berkeley County, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4607) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Keyser, Mineral County, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4608) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the town of Kingwood, Preston County, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4609) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the town of Harpers Ferry, Jefferson County, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4610) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Charles Town, Jefferson County, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4611) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Belington, Barbour County, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4612) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the town of Berkeley Springs, Morgan County, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4613) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Elkins, Randolph County, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4614) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the town of Davis, Tucker County, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4615) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the town of Parsons, Tucker County, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4616) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the town of Thomas, Tucker County, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4617) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Morgantown, Monongalia, County, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4618) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the town of Moorefield, Hardy County, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4619) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the town of Petersburg, Grant County, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4620) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Piedmont, Mineral County, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4621) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Shepherdstown, Jefferson County, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4622) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the town of Romney, Hampshire County, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4623) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the town of Terra Alta, Preston County, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 4624) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Victory Park Association of Buffalo, Wyo., one piece of artillery, or like trophy, captured or obtained from the enemy during or at the close of the war with Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 4625) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 4626) to donate one captured cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Casstown and Lost Creek Township, Miami County, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4627) to provide for the appointment of district judge in the middle and eastern judicial districts in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 4628) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Corning, in the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4629) providing for the purchase of a site for a public building at Osceola, in the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 4630) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Miller, State of Arkansas, to construct a bridge across Sulphur River near the Texas & Pacific Railroad bridge in said county and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4631) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Miller, State of Arkansas, to construct a bridge across Sulphur River near Blackmans Point, in said county and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 4632) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Wellsville, in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4633) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at East Palestine, in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4634) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Richmond, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4635) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Amsterdam, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUFKIN: A bill (H. R. 4636) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Georgetown, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4637) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Essex, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4638) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Danvers, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4639) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Beverly, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4640) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Amesbury, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4641) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Newburyport, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4642) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a post-office building at Gloucester, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4643) prohibiting the issuance of papers of declaration of intention to become citizens or final papers of citizenship to certain aliens who claimed exemption from military service in the present war; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4644) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Gloucester, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4645) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Groveland, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4646) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hamilton, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4647) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Haverhill, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4648) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Ipswich, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4649) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Manchester, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4650) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Marblehead, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4651) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Merrimac, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4652) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Newbury, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4653) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Newburyport, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4654) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Rockport, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4655) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Rowley, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4656) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Salem, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4657) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Salisbury, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4658) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Swampscott, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4659) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Topsfield, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4660) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wenham, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4661) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of West Newbury, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOMINICK: A bill (H. R. 4662) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Pickens, S. C., one German cannon or fieldpiece with carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4663) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Walhalla, S. C., one German cannon or fieldpiece with carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4664) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Seneca, S. C., one German cannon or fieldpiece with carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4665) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Newberry, S. C., one German cannon or fieldpiece with carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4666) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of McCormick, S. C., one German cannon or fieldpiece with carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4667) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Greenwood, S. C., one German cannon or fieldpiece with carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4668) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Honea Path, S. C., one German cannon or fieldpiece with carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4669) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Belton, S. C., one German cannon or fieldpiece with carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4670) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Anderson, S. C., one German cannon or fieldpiece with carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4671) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Abbeville, S. C., one German cannon or fieldpiece with carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4672) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department, approved September 2, 1914, as amended"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 4673) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of New Canton, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 4674) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 4675) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 4676) to establish the international exposition of the United States of America; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. BRAND: A bill (H. R. 4677) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Eatonton, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 4678) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Shawano, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4679) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Manawa, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4680) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Stevens Point, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4681) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wausau, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4682) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Grand Rapids, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4683) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Waupaca, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4684) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Marshfield, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4685) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of New London, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4686) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Marion, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 4687) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Benton, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4688) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Mound City, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4689) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Carbondale, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4690) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Duquoin, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4691) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Anna, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4692) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Chester, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4693) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Pinckneyville, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4694) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Sparta, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4695) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Marion, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4696) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Herrin, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4697) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Murphysboro, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4698) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Cairo, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULINGS: A bill (H. R. 4699) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Wheatland, county of Mercer, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece, to be placed in the public park as a soldiers' memorial; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4700) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Herington, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4701) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Junction City, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4702) to regulate dealing in leaf tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALLINGER: Resolution (H. Res. 94) to provide for the expenses incurred by the special committee on the case of Victor H. Berger; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. MASON: Resolution (H. Res. 95) requesting information from the Secretary of the Treasury relative to articles manufactured in the United States affected by existing embargoes upon importation of the same; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Resolution (H. Res. 97) authorizing the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to sit during sessions of the House and the recess of the Congress, to compel the attendance of witnesses, to send for persons and papers, and to administer oaths to witnesses; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DOMINICK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 95) granting to certain persons in the military or naval forces an extension of automatic insurance provided for in section 401 of the war-risk insurance act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PORTER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) in reference to massacres in eastern Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 4703) for the appointment of Sergt. Maj. Edgar Hayes, United States Marine Corps, as a first lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4704) granting a pension to Edward L. Clemmons; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 4705) granting an increase of pension to Silas Taggart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 4706) granting an increase of pension to Emery H. Bancroft; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4707) granting a pension to Esther F. Fiken; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4708) granting a pension to Abigail Merriman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULINGS: A bill (H. R. 4709) granting a pension to Priscilla Allison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4710) granting a pension to James Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 4711) prohibiting the issuance of patent under lieu selection serial 2904, Seattle 03476, Washington; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 4712) authorizing the President to appoint Henry S. Kiersted, late a captain in the Medical Corps of the United States Army, a major in the Medical Corps on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4713) for the relief of Charles Hellyer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4714) for the relief of Peter Boragni; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 4715) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4716) granting a pension to Wilbert Massena; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 4717) granting a pension to Sadie Wesley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4718) granting a pension to Winfield H. Handley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4719) granting a pension to Nancy A. Lawther; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 4720) granting a pension to Walter Zogg; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4721) granting a pension to William A. Zinn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4722) granting a pension to Bertha Margaret Watkins, Helen L. Watkins, James O. Watkins, and Dortha G. Watkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4723) granting a pension to Mary C. Wykoff; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4724) granting a pension to George W. Sampson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4725) granting a pension to Isabel Burge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4726) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Sycks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4727) granting an increase of pension to Woodman S. Sample; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4728) granting an increase of pension to William J. Shreve; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4729) granting an increase of pension to John Trenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4730) granting an increase of pension to George M. Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4731) granting an increase of pension to Frank L. Youst; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4732) granting an increase of pension to George W. Shrader; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 4733) granting an increase of pension to E. Anna McGrath; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 4734) granting a pension to William Mendenhall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 4735) granting an increase of pension to Amanda L. Sevier; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4736) granting an increase of pension to John McCormick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 4737) authorizing the President to reinstate Milton Marion Fenner as a lieutenant in the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROWAN: A bill (H. R. 4738) for the adjudication and determination of the claims arising under joint resolution of July 14, 1870 (16 Stat. L., p. 670), authorizing the Postmaster General to continue to use in the Postal Service Marcus P. Norton's combined postmarking and stamp-canceling hand-stamp patents, and directing him to "determine upon a fair, just, and equitable compensation for the use of said inventions," or arising otherwise; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 4739) granting a pension to Joseph R. Owens; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4740) granting a pension to Isabel McGee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4741) granting an increase of pension to Louisa C. Chesney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 4742) granting an increase of pension to Gilbert W. Potter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 4743) to place Cecil Stewart on the retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VAILE: A bill (H. R. 4744) for the relief of Sarah T. Chamberlain; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 4745) granting a pension to Louisa Rose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Dixie Council, No. 13, Junior Order United American Mechanics, Woodmen of the World Hall, New Orleans, La., relating to the death of Hon. John L. Burnett, Representative from the seventh district of Alabama; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), petition of American citizens of Polish extraction, Holyoke, Mass., relating to affairs in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of Slovenska Delavsko Association, of Akron, Mich., relating to Jugo-Slav affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), miscellaneous petitions for repeal of luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of American citizens of Polish descent, requesting the Government of the United States to curb slanderous propaganda relating to affairs in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), resolutions by C. Lewandowsky, against anti-Polish propaganda; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), resolutions adopted under auspices of Y. M. H. A. and other Jewish organizations representing 6,000 Jews in the city of Camden, N. J., relative to the persecution of Jews in European countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of Jugo-Slav population of United States relating to justice and consideration of Jugo-Slavs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Bristol, Pa. (75 women), and the city commission of Pasadena, Calif., urging strict enforcement of war-prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: Petition of 14 members of Fidelity Grange, No. 300, South Hampton, N. H., submitted by Miss Mary N. Currier, worthy master, advocating the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 28 residents of Laconia, N. H., and vicinity, advocating the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, letter from Mr. Oscar J. Chase, R. F. D. No. 1, Raymond, N. H., setting forth reasons from the standpoint of a farmer

for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, telegram signed by Arthur W. Phinney, secretary, setting forth the unanimous vote of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, Manchester, N. H., by its directors, in opposition to the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, telegram sent by Frank A. French, secretary New Hampshire Manufacturers' Association, in favor of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Edward L. Clemmons, formerly a member of Company F, Fourth Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLE: Petition of 37 members of Orange Township Grange, of Hancock County, Ohio, asking for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COPLEY: Petition of F. A. Beamish and other residents of Richardson, Ill., and vicinity, urging a tariff of 6 cents per bushel on corn; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Slovenian Young Men's Society, of Aurora, Ill., relating to Jugo-Slav affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of residents of Joliet, Ill., urging repeal of luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER: Petition of sundry citizens of Guysville, Ohio, earnestly opposing the repeal of prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Glouster, Ohio, protesting against the repeal of the war-prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of John H. Camlin, president of Rockford Chamber of Commerce; Oscar Nebleing, of Rockford; and W. F. Raetz, of Ottawa, all in the State of Illinois, protesting against repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the National Retail Dry Goods Association; Fred Raymond, of Sycamore; A. S. Johnson Motor Co., of Streator, all of the State of Illinois, for repeal of revenue taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of Jugo-Slavs of the United States, asking for consideration and justice and urging against the creation of a dangerous status; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Petition of Byrd Henderson and others, requesting repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream when served at soda fountains and ice cream parlors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of merchants and citizens of New York City, opposing repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of California Gold and Silversmiths' Association, urging repeal of 5 per cent tax on their merchandise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Spanish War veterans, urging change in pension laws making same provision for their veterans as Civil and Indian War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of San Francisco Labor Council, in support of repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the congregation of Calvary Presbyterian Church, San Francisco, Calif., urging against any change in prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of San Francisco Labor Council, urging adoption of land-for-soldiers plan, with appropriation for same; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. KINKAID: Petitions of G. M. Lacy and 79 residents of Harrison, D. H. Moulton and 136 residents of Atkinson, George A. Anthony and 223 others of Lexington, Fannie Stubbert and 110 residents of Shebasta, C. B. Meader and 119 residents of Dannebrog, T. H. Doran and 174 residents of Burwell, and G. C. Roby and others of Crawford, all in the State of Nebraska, requesting the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Slatersville Finishing Co., Slatersville, R. I., protesting against proposed repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KRAUS: Petition of sundry citizens of Miami County, Ind., favoring repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petitions of Baltimore City Woman's Christian Temperance Union (1,421 women), against repeal of war prohibition, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Maryland, numbering 5,000 members, asking the enforcement of the prohibition law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Carr-Lowrey Glass Co., Baltimore, Md., against Department of Labor Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Chicago Post Office Clerks' Union No. 1, for increase in wages paid postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry Jewish citizens of Baltimore, Md., by A. Rothenberg, relating to persecution of Jews in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Pitcock Bros., proprietors of Susquehanna Garage, against tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Baltimore Kindergarten Club, of Baltimore, Md., favoring passage of House bill 7; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Read Drug & Chemical Co., Baltimore, Md., asking for repeal of luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the Sea Gull Specialty Co.; John G. Barrett; Henry M. Hurd; J. Bolgiano & Son., seed growers and importers; Nicholas G. Penniman; executive committee of the Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association; William F. Broening, mayor; McCormick & Co. (Inc.); the home-garden committee of the Municipal Art Society and Women's Civic League; the Kiwanis Club, of Baltimore, of more than 200 business houses; A. Schlussler; F. J. Brilbeck, superintendent Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., all of Baltimore, Md., against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of William M. Burgan, wholesale lumber dealer, Baltimore, Md., against passage of Senate bill 313; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, New York, urging return of railroads to their owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: Petition of sundry citizens of Saline County, Nebr., asking for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Naval Camp No. 1, of Philadelphia, for retention of rank and pay for retired commissioned or warrant officers of the Navy or Marine Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of R. J. McKay, president of the United States Chain & Forging Co., of Pittsburgh, with the signature of 30 employees, protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Mr. J. H. Immel and 50 other citizens, of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NOLAN: Petition of San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, protesting against an amendment being attached to the railroad bill depriving the Interstate Commerce Commission of their authority to authorize changes from long-and-short-haul clause; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, papers regarding an increase in pensions for the Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of D. Auerbach & Sons, New York City, protesting against the continuance of Department of Labor Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of employees of B. T. Babbitt (Inc.), New York, asking support of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Ukrainian National Committee of the United States, relating to freedom of Lithuania, Ukraine, Latvia, and Esthonia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Jugo-Slavs, of Brooklyn, N. Y., asking that all means be used to prevent a dangerous status and plead for justice and consideration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Hasting Asphalt Pavement Co., the R. R. Appleton Co., G. Levar & Co. (Inc.), and over 300 employees, urging against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PAIGE: Petition of citizens of Gardner and members of First Methodist Episcopal Church, of Winchendon, all in the State of Massachusetts, protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Founders and Employers' Association of Los Angeles, Calif., urging the retention of the zone advance; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Red Bluff, Calif., urging the enforcement of the war-time prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, letter of Frank B. Durkee, secretary Chamber of Commerce, Chico, Calif., urging the early enactment of the Mondell soldier settlement bill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolution passed by the California Federation of Women's Clubs, of Los Angeles, Calif., relative to alcoholic liquor traffic; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, resolution passed by the California Federation of Women's Clubs, of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring more stringent legislation affecting child labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, resolution passed by the California Federation of Women's Clubs, of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring a change in the citizenship laws as they affect women; to the Committee on Immigration.

Also, petition of Napa County Viticultural Protective Association, St. Helena, Calif., urging repeal of the war-time prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution passed by the California Federation of Women's Clubs, Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the Army nurse bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution favoring the establishment of a department of education, by California Federation of Women's Clubs, Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Education.

Also, resolution favoring the league of nations by California Federation of Women's Clubs, Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: Petition of city commission of Pasadena; Normandie Avenue Methodist Church, Los Angeles; Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ceres; Southern California District Lodge Good Templars, Los Angeles; Friends' Temperance Committee, Pasadena, all in the State of California, protesting against repeal of war-prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Federation of Women's Clubs of California, in favor of enforcement of national prohibition, and protesting against invasion of China by American brewers and distillers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of California Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring change in citizenship laws in favor of women, so they will not be secondary to their husbands; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of California Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring legislation for prevention of child labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Federation of Women's Clubs of California, favoring league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of California Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring creation of Federal department of education; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of California Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring granting recognition and rank to nurses in the military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Friendly Circle of Pasadena; Boyle Heights Methodist Church, Los Angeles; Methodist Preachers' Association of southern California; Bethany Baptist Church, Long Beach; Inglewood Methodist Church; Lincoln Avenue Methodist Church, Pasadena; Highland Park Baptist Church; Pilgrim Congregational Church, Pasadena; 27 missionary societies of Long Beach, all in the State of California, against repeal of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REBER: Petition of East Susquehanna Classis, Gowen City, Pa., representing 15,000 people, urging against the repeal of war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Pottsville (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce, opposing repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petitions of Allen & Nugent Co.; H. Jacquin & Co.; Paul L. Phelan; G. Levor & Co. (Inc.); M. Phillips, 1138 Bryant Avenue; M. McClure; E. Leap, 1321 Second Avenue; Daniel Currie, 232 West One hundred and thirty-second Street; A. von Kilch, 224 West One hundred and thirtieth Street; P. J. Dinan, 2194 Valentine Avenue; Edward M. Hanley, 601 West One hundred and seventy-fourth Street; Ed. M. Hanley, 601 West One hundred and seventy-fourth Street; Leo D. Fox, 1048 Kelly Street; G. Megroz, 222 Fourth Avenue; Mack Wolf, 313 West One hundred and twenty-first Street; J. A. Guillaume, 50 West Forty-fifth Street; and H. T. Kramer, 913 Jackson Avenue, all of New York City; and A. V. Wahlberg, 627 Madison Street; S. Williams, 111 Ninety-second Street; V. W. Knutsen, 663 Quincy Street; Elbert Butts, 939 Bushwick Avenue; Philippe Lambert, 7205 Tenth Avenue; and Leo C. Lucke, 1355 Park Place, all of Brooklyn, and all in the State of New York, against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Julius Jorgenson & Son, New York City, asking for repeal of section 905 of revenue act of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Woman's Trade Union League of America, for the continuation of the Woman in Industry Service of the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of D. Auerbach & Sons, New York City, against continuance of Department of Labor Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Goodfriend Bros., New York, engineers and contractors, and F. C. Barlau, protesting against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of sundry residents of Marcy, N. Y., for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of members of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Herkimer, N. Y., for the repeal of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Slovanian Lodge, No. 282, and St. Joseph's Society, No. 53, of Little Falls, N. Y., for recognition and justice for the Jugo-Slavs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: Petition of Lyman Shedd and other residents of Bolsters Mills, Me., asking for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of George O. Hill and others residing in the towns of Oxford and Norway, Me., asking for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Cecil H. Mitchell and others residing in the town of Byron, Me., asking for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *June 4, 1919.*

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 3, 1919.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harding	McLean	Smith, Md.
Ball	Harris	McNary	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Harrison	Moses	Smoot
Borah	Henderson	Nelson	Spencer
Brandegee	Hitchcock	New	Stanley
Calder	Johnson, Calif.	Newberry	Sterling
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Swanson
Cummins	Kellogg	Overman	Trammell
Curtis	Kendrick	Page	Underwood
Dial	Kenyon	Phelan	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Keyes	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	King	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Elkins	Kirby	Poindexter	Warren
Fall	Knox	Ransdell	Watson
Fernald	Lenroot	Reed	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Sheppard	Wolcott
Gay	McCormick	Sherman	
Gronna	McCumber	Simmons	
Hale	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. MCKELLAR. The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] is absent on important business.

Mr. KIRBY. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] on public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 79) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the city of Dawson, Ga., tents and cots for use of Confederate veterans in their State convention, June 17 and 18, 1919, and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. WADSWORTH obtained the floor.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I should like to have the amendment read.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let the amendment be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 6, strike out the words "the legislatures of" and in lieu thereof insert the words "conventions in," so that the paragraph will read:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the several States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, like the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], I represent in part a State which has extended the franchise to women residing within its borders. In view of that fact and my decision to vote against the proposed amendment to the Constitution, as I have done upon two prior occasions, I desire to make my attitude clear before the Senate.

No vote of mine cast upon this amendment will deprive any of the electors of the State of New York of any privilege which they now enjoy. The people of that State, as the people of several other States, have decided for themselves, in an orderly and constitutional manner, to extend the franchise to the women. I feel so strongly on this question that the people of the several States should be permitted to decide this matter for themselves that I desire to say that were this amendment, instead of being drafted for the purpose of extending woman suffrage all over the country, drafted for the purpose of forbidding the extension of the franchise to women, I would vote against it.

The Senator from Idaho yesterday discussed the right of the people to settle their own affairs, particularly in matters which were local and intimate. My feelings upon that question are somewhat like his. The people of the several States when they organized their governments and adopted their constitutions delegated certain powers to their legislatures and to their executives. Then they set up their judiciary to see to it that both their legislative and executive departments should keep faith and should not transgress the limits set by the people.

When a society organizes itself to do business, about the first thing it does is to prescribe the qualifications of its voting members, and it is the usual procedure for an organization in the process of formation to prescribe in its constitution that the voting membership shall not be extended or restricted except by a vote of the members of the society. And so the regulation of the franchise in the States, and I think I can say in every State, when they were organizing their governments, was left to the voting members; in other words, the people of those States.

Acting upon that theory and in accordance with that principle, which I believe lies at the bottom of a truly democratic government, several of the States have voted from time to time by popular referendum and have decided to extend the franchise to the women. Many other States have voted in popular referendums and have decided against the extension of the franchise.

Even though one might be opposed on general principles to the extension of the franchise to women, one can not logically object to the people of a great Commonwealth voting upon that question, settling it for themselves, and if they settle it in the affirmative with respect to woman suffrage one can not then logically object, even though one may have voted against it as a citizen of the State. Nor can I see how one can logically object to the application of the principle, even though in its application the people, voting freely and openly, decide that they shall not extend the franchise in this way.

Something has been said in the debate which has thus far taken place upon this amendment as to the popular demand in favor of it all over the country. Some criticism has been uttered by one or more of its advocates against Senators who are opposing it and who have consistently opposed it in times past. An examination of the record of the different States which have voted upon this question does not, I venture to say, indicate that there is any overwhelming popular demand thus far evidenced in the elections.

If my computation is correct, there are at least 30 States of the Union which have either refrained from voting on the question at all or have voted upon it and rejected it. In the States which have voted upon it, if a computation is made of the majorities in favor of the proposition and the majorities opposed to the proposition, we find that the aggregate majorities opposed to the proposition is about 1,300,000 votes, whereas the aggregate majority in favor of the proposition in these referendums amounts to 254,000. So from the standpoint of popular demand it would not seem that the Senate or the Congress should feel itself driven to adopt an amendment to the Constitution which revolutionizes the rule and practice of the American people in regulating the franchise.

Mr. President, it may seem somewhat old-fashioned for a Senator to express his reverence for the Constitution of the United States, his reverence and his devotion not only to its letter but to its spirit. When one views modern tendencies and the influences that are at work in this country to-day, one is tempted to suggest that now is an appropriate time to rededicate and reconsecrate ourselves to a proper understanding of the letter and the spirit of our Constitution and to a better understanding of its meaning. The tendencies of the day, without any question, are traveling fast along the road which, if followed to its ultimate goal, will mean its destruction or its alteration to such a degree in spirit, if not in letter, that it will be scarcely recognizable. It is now proposed in this amendment, as a part of this tendency which has been so evident in recent years, to take away from the people some of that sense of responsibility the exercise of which is the only safeguard for the intelligent conduct of a democracy and to assume that responsibility at the seat of government.

The central Government is remote, comparatively, and eventually, if this tendency continues, that responsibility will be borne in such a way that the individual citizen will not be able to understand what is going on in the maze and confusion of a great centralized Government.

I assume that a Senator, when discussing this matter, should endeavor to remember that he is a Senator of the United States and not confined in his functions to representing merely the State, and only the State, that sends him to Congress. I assume that it is the function of a Senator to take into consideration the Nation as a whole, to have some concern and to give some consideration to the condition of public contentment and the wishes of the people as a whole.

It is very true, of course, that a Senator elected from a State should exert every influence and power that he can wield to protect his State from injury by Federal legislation, if in his judgment the legislation proposed is unjust and discriminatory against the people of his State. That question does not arise in the discussion or consideration of this amendment, for no Senator who may desire to vote against this amendment is depriving the people of his State of anything which they already possess.

If the people of his State have already voted to extend this franchise, no vote of his, no vote of mine, can take it away; but a vote in favor of this proposal does in several instances impose upon the people of certain States things which they have said they do not want. When that side of the question is presented it seems to me that it is incumbent upon a Senator to regard the Nation as a whole and to give his consideration to the wishes of the people of the States that have expressed themselves freely upon the question at issue.

Mr. President, the conduct of government of a great Commonwealth is of concern to us all, for it is from the governments of the Commonwealths and their constituent parts that this Federal Government derives its inspiration, and which, as the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] said yesterday, provide our schools of political education.

Let us take the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as an example. The people of Massachusetts in their own way, in conformance with their constitution, in the exercise of their undoubted right and privilege, held a referendum on the question of suffrage, and the proposal to extend the franchise to the women of the State of Massachusetts was defeated. It was defeated in every city of the State, in every county of the State, and in every town of the State, and had three votes in the aggregate been changed it would have been defeated in every ward. The people of the State of Maine, by a vote of nearly two to one, defeated woman suffrage; the people of the State of New Jersey, in spite of the interposition of the President of the United States, who is a resident of the State, defeated it by 50,000 majority; the people of Pennsylvania defeated it by a similar majority; the people of West Virginia defeated it in a popular referendum in the approximate proportion of three to one; the people of Ohio have three times defeated it within six years, the last defeat being registered only last year, if my memory is correct, and the last majority against it was over 140,000 votes. The people of Iowa have defeated it; the people of Louisiana have defeated it; and only the other day the people of Texas defeated it. The people of Wisconsin have defeated it, as was referred to yesterday, and there may be some other States which have defeated it which I do not at this moment recall.

Now, the question is, were the people of Massachusetts, the people of Pennsylvania, and the people of Ohio competent to settle that question for themselves or not? There is nothing to prevent them under their form of government from securing the franchise of women if they want it.

There is no tremendous emergency facing the country, no revolution or rebellion threatened which would seem to make it necessary to impose upon the people of these States which have given their verdict upon it something which they have

said, as free citizens, they do not require or desire. Is it unreasonable to ask that they be permitted to continue to govern their own affairs in this respect? Is it contrary to the spirit of American institutions that they shall be left free to decide these things for themselves?

Other States besides those I have named have voted to extend the franchise. The State of Michigan did it but a few months ago; the State of South Dakota did it but a few months ago. No man can logically complain against a system which permits such a practice.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. I do not want to interrupt the Senator, but he has named a number of States where in the not remote past a direct vote has been taken and the people have repudiated this proposition. I wish he would include in that list the State of Missouri, which in 1914 repudiated the proposition by 140,000 votes. I merely want Missouri included.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I stated at the time that my recollection was imperfect and that there might be other States besides the ones I mentioned which had repudiated the proposition; and I now remember, of course, that the State of Missouri is in that category.

Now, without discussing the merits of woman suffrage as such, the question is simply this: Why is it that this power, resting in the people of this country in their several States, is to be taken away from them and lodged elsewhere? What is the reason? Is the principle faulty? Is it undemocratic? Is it un-American? Does it fail to satisfy the people themselves? I think not. No such contention has thus far been made.

Let us speak frankly. The advocates of this movement—and I do not criticize them for exercising whatever power or influence they may bring to bear or for resorting to whatever device they may find ready at their hand to bring about their purpose—the advocates of this proposal for the extension of the franchise all over the United States through a Federal amendment believe that that is the easiest way for them to achieve their purpose. To them it has become a purely practical question. Regard for the spirit of our institutions does not enter into their discussions. The Constitution of the United States means nothing more to them than that it shall be used as a vehicle to achieve a set purpose; and, being intent upon the purpose, they pick up the instrument and use it. They do not want referendums. They have said so in many of their public utterances.

I am not reflecting upon their intelligence when I describe their reasons. As a matter of fact, I rather admire their skill and resourcefulness in carrying this movement up to this point. They were skillful, and have been skillful, in using the mechanics of the situation, but they have not gone to the people of the country. They have believed—and I think most men in their honest second judgment will agree—that it is easier to persuade a legislature to ratify a proposal of this sort than it is to get the people of a State to do the same thing in a popular referendum. It can be done more quickly and with less expense in the matter of propaganda, and, as was said here yesterday on the floor, the members of legislative bodies—and I do not except the Congress of the United States—are peculiarly susceptible to pressure, to insistent and persistent agitation and propaganda.

There have been instances in this very matter of the extension of the franchise which illustrate that very thing. The people of Ohio on two separate occasions voted down the proposal for the extension of the franchise to women. The year following the second defeat by the people of Ohio the legislature of that State, in the face of the mandate of the people, promptly passed a statute to extend the presidential franchise to women—an exact illustration of how much easier it is to persuade or cajole a legislature to do something that the people have refused to do. It became necessary for the people of Ohio to repeal that act of the legislature within a few months after it had been put upon the statute books, and they repealed it by popular vote.

My contention has always been with respect to amendments to the Federal Constitution that if an amendment be placed in the Constitution it should command the reverence and devotion of all the people of the country. The discussion here upon the floor yesterday makes it perfectly apparent that in part at least, in a certain section of this country, this proposed amendment will be a dead letter. No pretense is made that it will be lived up to in spirit, and it is the spirit of our Constitution which we, it seems to me, should have some reverence for at this hour.

I have discussed this matter with people from different portions of the country, and I have been surprised upon occasion to note the frivolous and casual way in which so many people discuss the Constitution of the United States and what it means, and to hear the suggestion made, "Oh, well, you must not take it so seriously as all that; things can be arranged here and there in such a way that it will not be strictly enforced." That is a spirit which is abroad in the United States to-day. That same spirit has been made manifest in the recent discussion of the last amendment to the Constitution which was ratified last winter. To-day there are thousands of people all over the United States who are attempting to contrive ways and means by which the prohibition amendment to the Constitution can be evaded, showing an utter lack of regard for the instrument itself, showing an utter failure to understand that if that instrument is not held sacred by the people of this country, then there is no use of our endeavoring to continue our experiment in self-government.

Unlike the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], I voted against the prohibition amendment to the Constitution, because I believed that such a proposal had no place in the Constitution, and, second, because I believed that the people in great and important communities of this country were competent to decide that matter for themselves; and I feared the very thing that is making itself so apparent to-day—a settled determination upon the part of hundreds of thousands of people living in those communities which were not consulted, to evade it, to urge some act of Congress or State legislature under that peculiar provision for concurrent jurisdiction, which in part at least would make a laughing stock of that particular amendment to the Constitution. The danger is, if we go on in this way and deprive the people of important communities of their right to decide these questions which they are competent to decide, which in dozens of instances they have decided to their own satisfaction, that a contempt for the Constitution of the United States will gradually and inevitably spread all over this country. It will be regarded by hundreds of thousands of people as merely a vehicle for the exercise of a will to power upon the part of some group of people who desire to impose their ideas upon another group of people.

Mr. President, I can not blind myself to the fact that this is the tendency of the day; I do not blind myself to the fact that slowly, but surely, not so much by constitutional amendment perhaps, although this is a glaring instance of it, but by statutes passed by the Congress and by statutes passed by the State legislatures, we are whittling away the sense of responsibility of the individual citizen. We are teaching more people every year that the Government owes them a living; we are teaching more people every year that the Government should and can do things which they as individual citizens can do for themselves; we are urging the "easiest way." Scarcely a year goes by but what that tendency becomes more marked, and when we whittle away that sense of responsibility which should live in the breast of the individual citizen and teach him that the Government at Washington, remote as it is and rapidly becoming top-heavy with a bureaucracy, the intricacies of which I challenge any Senator to understand to-day, when we teach him that the Government at Washington, with its so-called bottomless Treasury, can take over, and should take over, all of these functions and duties and that the people of the communities of this country need not be expected to do those things for themselves, that they shall not even be expected to decide as to who shall vote for sheriff or district attorney or county judge, then I say that step by step we are building in this country a paternalistic system such as was the curse of Germany. There was a people, as we all know to-day, 70,000,000 of them, who were educated, one might say, almost from the cradle by the teachers in the schools, educated by the professors in the universities, educated by all their public men, at the inspiration of the autocracy that topped that Government, educated, drilled, coached, guided out of all sense of individual responsibility until they reached the condition where they lost their very souls.

I frankly confess, Mr. President, that I fear this tendency in the United States. I do not want to see it go any further. I know, of course, that there are some things that only a government can do. I know, of course, that every man and every woman who calls himself or herself human wants the burden of the overladen members of society lightened; and if members of society as individuals, or as volunteers organized in a reasonable way, can not perform that function then it is the duty of government, the protector of society, to perform it. But it seems to me that we might well call a halt. It is not that any one of the statutes or amendments to the Constitution which are proposed is fatal. It is the fact that we pile one upon another, year after year. Some say, "Let us enact the second one because we have enacted the first, and the two proceed along

parallel lines, and therefore the second, the third, the fourth, the fifth, and the sixth are justifiable." But the trouble is, Mr. President, that as we proceed in taking away the sense of responsibility from the people in their communities year after year and decade after decade we do not proceed along parallel lines. The lines of those pieces of legislation slowly converge, and when they reach the point of convergence the citizen will have become the servant and dependent of government instead of being its master; and it is exactly along one of those converging lines that this amendment of the Constitution is proceeding. The people of some 30 States, if this constitutional amendment is ratified, cease being the masters of their government in so far as the franchise is concerned. And that, according to my way of thinking, is contrary to the spirit of our institutions.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, the historical reference which my distinguished colleague [Mr. REED] made to the action of Missouri is true. It was some years old. Perhaps it might be fair to add that the vote of Missouri taken some years ago is hardly a fair indication of to-day, because in the legislature just adjourned both houses were in accord with the granting of suffrage to women in Missouri. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the statement which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] has made is correct; and it exactly illustrates the vice to which I alluded and to which the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has so fittingly addressed himself.

The last time the people of the State of Missouri had an opportunity to vote on this question was in 1914. They defeated suffrage by over 140,000 majority. Since that time they have elected legislatures without any regard to the suffrage question. It never has been made an issue to the people. The last legislature of Missouri, in disregard of the last mandate of the people of Missouri and in defiance of it, passed a statute authorizing votes by women at presidential elections. That exactly proves the case. It demonstrates that legislatures can be handled when the people can not be. It was because of the notorious incompetency of legislatures, and because of the fact that they could be reached by influence and often by sinister means, that the people took from legislatures the right to elect United States Senators and declared that the people alone should exercise that high right. It is because of the fact that legislative bodies very frequently do not represent the sense of the people, that they are very often composed of men grossly incompetent, that protest is now being made against taking away from the people of the State of Missouri the right of settling this question for themselves.

Since my distinguished colleague has seen fit to challenge me to this question, I want to ask him if he is willing by his vote to deprive the people of the State of Missouri of a right to themselves fix the qualifications of the voters within the State which they expressly reserved to themselves in their constitution—to take that power from the people of the State of Missouri and confer it upon a legislature?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, as others have said before me, nothing that I can say, perhaps, can change a vote; but in view of the pending amendment and the vital issues that are now at stake, I should be derelict to duty if I did not enter my protest against the passage of this amendment, which to all intents and purposes is exactly similar to one that has already been passed, the result of which is an illustration of the point that has been made so splendidly by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and emphasized this morning by the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

In our dual form of government the principle of its duality is the one that makes it possible for every part of this vast domain of ours to progress as conditions justify. Were we a homogeneous people, were the local conditions, both social, commercial, and industrial, the same, it might be less destructive of the spirit of democracy for us to take the principle that underlies democracy and emasculate it as this will emasculate it. But when the conditions are so divergent, when local conditions throughout the United States are so different, the splendid principle incorporated into the Constitution finds its sanction.

I referred a moment ago to another amendment, incorporating exactly the same principle as this, that was made into our organic law. The fifteenth amendment—but who does not know and realize that the fifteenth amendment, when it was passed, was passed in a moment of heat, passion, sectional strife, and bitterness? There is not a man in America to-day capable of exercising the functions of citizenship but that recognizes that that amendment, passed when and how it was passed, jeopardized the civilization that you and I represent in a section of our country. The alien population amongst us was not like it was in other States. Even if the franchise had been granted to them in other States, their fewness of number made it possible for those States to absorb them without danger to their civilization.

But unlimited franchise in certain other States would have deluged and destroyed with a horde of ignorance and incompetency the civilization that it had taken all of these years to build up and perfect. It placed a burden upon those States that has eclipsed every other, and that has been the main cause of the retardation of the progress of the South. It has caused that section, in every line of endeavor and in every line of work, to be retarded, because unless there was a united front to this menace the absolute submergence and destruction of our social and political edifice was threatened. So that the work of the South for years has been not one of the unified attention of the people to constructive work but one of unified operation to avoid the greater danger.

Now, I want to appeal to some of my southern colleagues. We contended that the passage of the fifteenth amendment was a crime against the civilization of the white men of America. Those on the other side, when sanity reassumed its dominion over the minds of men, recognized that fact. We busied ourselves with the passage of such laws as would minimize the disastrous effect of unlimited suffrage to the Negro in the South. Be it said to the honor of those who were in position to enforce it that, recognizing the evils that would grow out of the unlimited franchise as provided in the fifteenth amendment, they acquiesced in silence to such laws as we passed to minimize its evil effects; and be it said to their honor that they did so because they recognized, as we recognize and as the world recognizes, that local conditions there have to be met by such laws and such acts as will protect and preserve the civilization that characterizes the white man.

That was your reason, founded as it was in justice and in righteousness. Those men from the South who are sitting here to-day, who are going to vote for the ratification of this amendment or vote to submit this amendment to the people, by that vote ratify and confirm the fifteenth amendment, because I maintain to-day that there is no difference whatever between the fifteenth amendment and the proposed Susan B. Anthony amendment. The Susan B. Anthony amendment is the fifteenth amendment with the insertion of one word alone, namely:

> The right of a citizen of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, previous condition of servitude, or sex.

Those of us from the South, where the preponderance of the Negro vote jeopardized our civilization, have maintained that the fifteenth amendment was a crime against our civilization. Now, when a southern man votes for the Susan B. Anthony amendment he votes to enfranchise the other half of that race, and ratifies, not in a moment of heat and passion, what we have claimed was a crime, but in a moment of profound calmness and sectional amity he votes to ratify the fifteenth amendment and give the lie to every protestation that we heretofore have made that the enfranchisement of the Negro men, unlimited, was a crime against white civilization. When Senators and others of the North, East, and West viewed conditions calmly the fifteenth amendment did become a dead letter, and infinitely better that it should become a dead letter than that the civilization of the South should be destroyed and in its destruction jeopardize the civilization of America.

Here is exactly the identical same amendment applied to the other half of the Negro race. The southern man who votes for the Susan B. Anthony amendment votes to ratify the fifteenth amendment. Senators on the other side have acquiesced in silence when in desperation we passed such laws as would nullify the disastrous effect of the fifteenth amendment. Southern Senators voting for this amendment puts them without excuse to still further withhold their hands.

I can understand how a man from the West or a man from the East, viewing it strictly from his own local impression, might get the idea that we ought to extend it to all, but those of us from the South who have seen the evil effect upon our section of country from this menace—worse than poverty, worse than retarded commercial and industrial growth—those of us who have seen the very sanctity of the fireside and the sacredness of womanhood jeopardized, can not vote for this amendment without once again making possible all these evils that we have for weary years combated and overcome. How southern Senators can vote to turn loose upon the South another era similar to that through which we have passed I can not understand.

Not only that, Mr. President, but I have heard it flippantly remarked by those who propose to vote for this amendment, "You found a way to keep the Negro man from voting and you will find a way to keep the unworthy Negro woman from voting"

We found the way because of the recognition on the part of our colleagues on the other side that it was their blunder, perhaps, that had deluged the South or made it possible for the South to be deluged by an alien and unfit race.

We had their moral support in maintaining the civilization of the white man of the South. Can we appeal to them after to-day if southern men vote to ratify the fifteenth amendment? When the clamor comes to you now from that race, that they demand that they shall be recognized, what excuse will you have when southern men vote to ratify it? You of the other sections have said, and said rightly, that in spite of the fifteenth amendment, let the South work out its own salvation and we will give our brethren of the white race our support. Now, if your brethren of the white race of the South vote for an amendment which ratifies the previous amendment, what support can we hope from these other sections? I warn every man here to-day that when the test comes, as it will come, when the clamor for Negro rights shall have come, that you Senators of the South voting for it have started it here this day for reasons it is not necessary for me to try to state.

The other features of this proposed infraction and destruction of the Constitution of the United States have been given ably. No man would attempt to gainsay or deny that democracy means the vote of the people under the sensible restrictions that the people themselves in their local statutes see fit to impose. The very conditions that might arise in the State of Utah might make it impossible for Utah to rise and progress with a certain condition of franchise enforced upon her by Washington. Left alone to adjust her own internal affairs through her franchise, she might rise to a point where it would be perfectly proper for that franchise to be extended. The splendid principle of our dual form of government was never better illustrated than in the condition of the South and the condition of the East and the West.

I say, when we have taken from the several States the right to modify, qualify, and determine their franchise, the sovereignty of the State in every other particular has ceased to be; we shall all be living in a centralized Government; there will be nothing else left.

Local self-government presupposes the right to meet local conditions by peculiar local franchise law. If there were no other remedies, there might be an argument for us to come to the Federal Government to extend this franchise; but where each State has the right to extend the franchise in whatever manner it deems best, for my State to come and ask that Massachusetts, Montana, and California shall take charge of the affairs in my State, because the voters in my State are incompetent to determine what is best for them, is to make a statement that is proof that democracy has passed.

Mr. President, I am not going to take up the time of the Senate any further on this question. All the legal phases of it, and all the democratic phases of it, have been discussed; but I felt that I would not do my duty if I did not warn southern Democrats—southern white men—that this day they solemnly ratify what they have for the last 50 years denounced as the crime of the century. We protested against the act that incorporated into our organic law the right of an alien and ignorant race to be turned loose upon us, and it numerically in the majority. When you vote for this amendment to-day, you vote to ratify it, and say to those who enacted that amendment that they did not make a mistake but that you are now ratifying it.

Let me repeat, the Susan B. Anthony amendment provides that the franchise shall not be denied on account of race, color, previous condition of servitude, or sex, and if it was a crime to pass the fifteenth amendment, why is it right to pass this amendment? If it was a crime to enfranchise the male half of that race, why is it not a crime to enfranchise the other half? You have put yourselves in the category of standing for both amendments, and when the time comes, as it will come, when you are to meet the result of this act, you can not charge that it was a crime to pass the fifteenth amendment.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I have been listening to the very positive statement made by the Senator from South Carolina, and I have felt like not making any interruption, even for the purpose of asking a question. However, I have finally concluded that unless something be said at this juncture it will go to the people of the State of South Carolina and other Southern States that the remarks just made by the Senator from South Carolina have been universally accepted here in the Senate.

I do not want to provoke any discussion of the subject, but I do want at this time to protest most earnestly against the construction which the Senator from South Carolina has placed upon this proposed constitutional amendment. If I am able to read the English language, the amendment does absolutely nothing more than to prevent discrimination in the franchise on account of sex. I think it requires an extreme imagination for one to draw any inference or to fabricate any argument to the effect that the passage of the amendment is a reaffirmation or readoption of the fifteenth amendment.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Does it not extend suffrage to female Negroes?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That is true; but the Senator knows that the fifteenth amendment was directed to a class of people only, and this amendment is intended to liberate the women of the entire country, the millions of white women of the country. It is to operate upon them and is not confined to the black women of the South.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. But it includes them.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Yes; it includes them.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Certainly. I said it did not differ from the other. You went specifically after the Negro men in the fifteenth amendment. Now you go specifically after the Negro and white women in this amendment. By thus adding the word "sex" to the fifteenth amendment you have just amended it to liberate them all, when it was perfectly competent for the legislatures of the several States to so frame their laws as to preserve our civilization without entangling legislation involving the women of the black race. You simply have amended the fifteenth amendment by adding the Negro women. When we could have had all the white women vote by State action, you want to add the Negro women by Federal action. That is what you have done, and that is what I am protesting against.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That, I take it, is the Senator's construction, and, of course, I do not expect to convince him, but I want the statement to go into the RECORD that in my judgment this amendment is entitled to no such interpretation.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. There is no use to quibble about what is the language of the amendment. When it says that there shall be no restriction of the suffrage on account of sex, it means the female sex, and means the millions upon millions of Negro women in the South.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, may I ask my colleague if it is not true that the legislature of our State meets every year?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. DIAL. Is it not also true that at the last session of the legislature no request was made to submit this question of woman suffrage to a vote of the people of the State?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the Senators representing the South and the splendid advocates of our dual form of Government representing other States on the other side can see their way clear to vote for the Underwood amendment and let this matter be submitted to the people. If South Carolina, the State that I in part represent, shall be given the privilege of calling a convention to elect delegates for that convention specifically charged with the purpose of deciding this question there will be no mistake made. It will be put squarely before the people of the State of South Carolina. I really have no fear of what my legislature would do. I know the women of my State pretty well, and I am quite sure that if they had wanted suffrage, with all the dangers and evils that it would entail, they would have said so. But they have resolutely refused to be stampeded by a few hysterical propagandists or propagooses, I do not know which is the proper term. They have refused to be stampeded, and a vast majority of our women are opposed to opening this Pandora's box of evils and threatening once again the civilization of that State and other States with similar conditions.

I sincerely hope, Mr. President, that those of the South who for some reason or other have committed themselves to this destructive proposition will at least have the grace, in the moment of our passage into the unknown, to vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief in the statement that I make to the Senate upon this question. I heard quite a large portion of the speech made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] yesterday. I was then called from the floor on business, and I did not hear the latter part. I see that it is withheld from publication in the RECORD, so that I am unable to read it, but, so far as I heard it, I entirely agree with his views upon this matter.

The Senator from Idaho comes from a State that has for years had woman suffrage. I come from a State which has never had it. The legislature of my State has just declined to submit to the people of the State a constitutional amendment providing for it in that State. There is no way of ascertaining, so far as I have been informed, what the sentiment of the

voters of my State is upon that question other than the individual opinions that people may entertain upon the question. From information that I have received—and I think I have been in pretty close touch with the sentiment of the State—I believe that a vast majority of the present voters of the State who are men are opposed to woman suffrage in the State of Connecticut. I believe that a vast majority of the women of the State are opposed to woman suffrage in the State of Connecticut. I am absolutely certain that a vast majority of both the women and the men of Connecticut are opposed to Congress and three-quarters of the other States of the Union telling them what the qualifications of the electors of the State of Connecticut shall be.

However that may be—and that, of course, I admit is a question of opinion about which I have stated mine, and others are welcome to theirs—I am opposed to putting in the Constitution of the United States a provision which will force the ideas of Congress and three-quarters of the States, if three-quarters of the States concur with the ideas of Congress, upon that State and their ideas of what the qualifications of the electors of the other quarter of the States shall be. I believe that this country has become prosperous and great and strong by the exercise of home rule and the people of the different localities in this country minding their own business and, by minding it, developing a capacity to manage it. I may be wrong about that. It may be that the various localities of this country should transfer all the powers which the States which formed this Union reserved to themselves to the Federal Government here in Washington, but it is contrary to the biological and physiological laws of the world that we will get stronger by abandoning the exercise of these functions than we would be by exercising them. It contradicts the laws of history and experience.

Mr. President, in my judgment the framers of the Constitution designed that instrument to be the broad charter of our liberties and the definition of our form of government. They never expected the use of the process of amending the Constitution to be prostituted to putting a lot of police regulations, ordinances, and laws into the Constitution of the United States. They left the police power and the rules which should govern the inhabitants of this country in their respective subdivisions in the hands of the people who were to be affected by those rules. They wisely thought that the people in a country differing in climate, population, habits, and historical traditions could better administer their own affairs in the far-removed sections of the country in accordance with their local traditions and ideas than they could be administered by the fiat of a body sitting in the city of Washington. They wisely thought that the Senator from South Carolina and his colleague were better adapted to say what was for the best interests of the people who elected them, and to whom they are responsible, than the Senator from Connecticut or the Senator from New York, and vice versa. I think the Senators from South Carolina will agree that the Senator from New York and myself from my State are better qualified to state to this body what sort of laws are best adapted for our section of the country than the Senators from South Carolina would be. If that were not so, there would be no sense in having Senators of the United States required to be residents of the States which they pretend to represent here.

Now, Mr. President, we have come upon this situation in this country: Our southern brethren suddenly, owing largely to a local condition, go crazy about prohibition, largely because they do not want the Negroes in their States to indulge in alcoholic drinks. Not satisfied with passing their own laws upon that subject, they come here and vote to jam a prohibition amendment into the Constitution of the United States and make other States——

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POINDEXTER in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KIRBY. Does the Senator from Connecticut regard the adoption of the prohibition amendment by 45 States as conclusive evidence that it is a local and southern proposition?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I regard it as a violation of the principle about which I am talking, and I say that you Senators voted to perpetrate that which I regard as an outrage upon the States that do not want it. It does not make any difference whether 45 or 47 States wanted it. The great Empire State of New York, with about 10,000,000 people, does not want it; it never had a chance to say so; but because your States want it and certain other States want it for their States, you think that you ought, in the Constitution of the United States, the fundamental law of the land, to force your views upon the Empire State of New York without its consent, except by the consent of the legislature, which is managed by the prohibition lobby.

You may think that is democracy. I do not. I think it is tyranny. I think it is tyranny, because I do not think that class of subjects was ever designed by the framers of the Constitution to be put into the Constitution of the United States. I think they regarded them as rules and local laws to govern the people in their respective localities as they wanted to be governed. Having established that principle, however, you find it rather difficult to refuse to put this woman suffrage amendment into the Constitution of the United States, and because certain States have adopted woman suffrage and desire it you think it is your duty to impose your notions upon that question upon States which do not desire it and to which it is not adapted, provided you can get three-fourths of the States to concur.

Mr. President, if this process is to be continued, if the people of this country want to be governed in their local customs, to be told what they are to eat and what they are to drink and how much, and when they are to go to bed, and what language they are to use, and to be regulated in every move they make in their daily lives and in their personal habits by a constitutional amendment in the United States Constitution that can never be got out except by a two-thirds vote of each branch of Congress and then a vote of three-fourths of all the State legislatures in addition, you have made a set of police regulations of the Constitution of the United States, and, as the Senator from New York has wisely warned you, it is a process that is calculated beyond all others to drag the Constitution of the United States into the mire and to destroy all respect for it, because you can not enforce a law or even a constitutional amendment against people who do not believe in it.

If the arguments against this process will not prevail in the case of two such shining abuses of the exercise of this power, simply because you have the power, as are furnished by this woman suffrage amendment and by the prohibition amendment, they will not prevail in other cases where the clamor is sufficiently strong to intimidate people to violate their traditional policies and the historical traditions of their party.

Mr. President, the last expression in national convention of both the Republican and Democratic Parties was opposed to this constitutional amendment. Both political parties declared in solemn national convention, after due consideration, that it was a matter that ought to be left to the several States; while they approved the principle of woman suffrage, they said, if it came, it ought to come through the action of the States. The President of the United States was the first one to say so, but, of course, like every other issue with which he deals, he says the other way, too; and there has not been a single issue of importance before the country, and there will not be during his administration, upon which he would not with equal facility and sincerity take either or both sides. Now, having resided for the last six months in a foreign country, he cables to his subservient idolators here how they shall vote on this constitutional amendment, and they will "come to heel" with duo humility, I have no doubt.

Mr. President, if this process goes on of governing this country by constitutional amendment on questions that are not at all of constitutional size or of constitutional quality, I for one say that if the people are to be governed by constitutional amendment in their daily habits and life then it becomes necessary that the people themselves should be consulted about what shall be the constitutional amendments to which they are to bend the knee and have the yoke adjusted to them. Is there anything unfair or unreasonable about that? We know perfectly well that after Congress by a two-thirds majority of both branches has submitted a proposed amendment to the legislatures of the States that, although it has been extorted from Congress on the theory that we need not commit ourselves to it, but simply not obstruct it and pass it along to the legislatures for their action, that immediately we have taken them at their word and dignified ourselves into the honorable function of being a funnel, and funneling things through without responsibility on to the various legislatures of the States which are of so much superior ability and knowledge to us, and then they immediately turn around and say, "Congress, by a two-thirds majority, has set the seal of its approval on this and demands that we act, and is any one State legislature to set its judgment up above that of the great United States Senate and House of Representatives?" Then they use us as the argument in favor of the very thing that we were doubtful about.

It is not a pleasant thing to contemplate that a Senator of the United States, having walked up to that desk before that starry banner, Mr. President, which, thank God, still waves and sparkles back of your chair, and holds up his right hand and takes a solemn oath to support and sustain the Constitution of the United States without equivocation or mental reservation, that the minute an embarrassing question is presented to him

he runs like a dog away from it and says, "I do not know anything about it; but there is a cry in my district that I shall not stand in the way of it; and while I do not believe in it, while I regret it, still it is coming anyway; I do not want to have anybody say that I did not vote for it, and therefore I will sluice it along on to somebody else."

The Senate of the United States was not always composed of men of that backbone and caliber and virility. In the days of Calhoun and Webster and Clay, Senators of the United States were not too proud to think nor too cowardly to stand for their convictions, Mr. President; and there are a few left here to-day, I think, who, mistaken and old-fashioned as they may be, are actuated by the same motives which moved those gentlemen, and sit in the same Chamber, breathe the same air, and have been nurtured upon the same doctrine.

So if we are going on with this sort of thing, putting all kinds of police regulations and ordinances into the Constitution of the United States, for God's sake let us amend the Constitution of the United States so that we can submit to the electors of the States the amendments which we propose to the Constitution. Then we will not have so many propositions for constitutional amendments; but if we do, and they are approved, the people, then, will have no cause of complaint. They have a cause of complaint now, Mr. President, when we are prostituting the Constitution of the United States and using it as a vehicle to accomplish indirectly the destruction of home rule and local self-government and the exercise of the functions which have made free men in this country. When we now initiate a series of acts and constitutional amendments which deal with the things that we men of New England have been used to dealing with in our town meetings, where we carry our sovereignty under our own hats and take orders from nobody—when we put such provisions into the Constitution at the behest of the legislatures of our States, dominated and controlled by a clerical lobby and other kinds of lobbies, highly financed by charitable and mistaken people all over the country, then we are going to kill the American spirit in this country unless we submit these questions to the people themselves.

This is a Government of the people, for the people, and by the people, and they have a right to say what is going into the Constitution of the United States. As I said the other day when I introduced the proposed constitutional amendment which I have pending now, I have provided that whenever Congress in the future shall think it wise it may submit proposed amendments to the electors of the States as well as to the legislatures of the States or conventions to be called therein. Although that proposed amendment has no relation either to the prohibition amendment or to the woman-suffrage amendment, and would not affect them, because, if adopted, it will not be adopted until after they have been acted upon, I hope that the Senate will see the consistency and the logic of the position I take. If we are going to dabble in these local affairs, let us submit them to the people of the localities, and then we will have a contented, submissive, and loyal support of such amendments instead of having them the cause of dissension and disunion in this country.

There is another feature, Mr. President, that was called to our attention by the great Senator from New York when he was a Member of this body—Senator Elihu Root—and that is this: It is easy to conceive that by the process of amending the Constitution three-quarters of the State legislatures might approve an amendment, while the other quarter of the States that are to be governed by it are opposed to it. The other quarter to be governed by it against their will may contain the majority of the wealth and the majority of the people of this country, and so under the boasted democracy and home rule and independent Government in this country you have a situation wherein the minority of the voters and the minority of the wealth of the country are imposing their will upon the majority of the people and the majority of the wealth; and a minority of the people and a minority of the wealth represented under that system can control the financial policy of this country, levy taxes all upon one section of the country, and arrange the bills so that one section shall pay all of the taxes practically. It can be done by scientific jugglery. I do not say that it will work out in that way in every case, but it works nearly enough that way to make it, as the then Senator from New York suggested, the most terrifying portent that is now in the sky against the perpetuity of the Union of American States, for one-quarter of the States of this country will not continue to be governed in that way. It was never the intention of the framers of the Constitution that they should. They were supposed to be governed by a majority of Congress, of course, but they were not supposed to have the process of amendment of the Constitution, which was supposed to be only amendable as to the fundamental matters of which it treats—it never was supposed that that process would be resorted to to accomplish these ulterior purposes.

Now, to be brief, and in conclusion, I am simply opposed to this amendment because it deprives the States of this Union of the power to fix the qualifications of their own electors who are to vote for their own officers. I think they can do it, and do it better than the Congress can do it. I am opposed to this amendment because it is not demanded by my State. I do not take the view that suffrage, whatever may be its merits, can be better determined by this Congress than it can be by the local States.

I believe that the great majority of the women of this country are opposed to it. When it comes, of course, I know they will exercise the franchise to the best of their ability. I do not think it will make much difference politically. I suppose the women will probably divide as their husbands and fathers and brothers do, and they will divide upon the issues that are presented to them probably about as the men do.

I have deplored from the beginning the dragging of politics into this question. I have regretted the unseemly and undignified haste of political managers to get themselves in front of this woman movement, to claim the credit of getting suffrage for the women. I believe the women will vote as honestly as the men and as intelligently as they can; perhaps they will vote more intelligently than the men do now. I do not look for additional uplifting and purity and the hastening of the millenium by their participation in politics. I think very likely the better of them will soon become disgusted with their associates at the polls, and the practical administration of political affairs, so far as the women are concerned, will be left in the hands of those who are less desirable to manage them; but that is simply my opinion, and I hope I will be a false prophet in that respect.

Mr. President, I have said all I care to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. WATSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Gronna	McLean	Smoot
Beckham	Hale	McNary	Spencer
Brandegee	Harding	Moses	Stanley
Calder	Harris	Myers	Sterling
Capper	Harrison	Nelson	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Henderson	New	Swanson
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Newberry	Thomas
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Trammell
Curtis	Kellogg	Nugent	Underwood
Dial	Kendrick	Phelan	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Kenyon	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	Keyes	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Elkins	King	Poindexter	Warren
Fall	Kirby	Ransdell	Watson
Fernald	Knox	Reed	Williams
Fletcher	La Follette	Sheppard	Wolcott
France	Lenroot	Sherman	
Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Smith, Ariz.	
Gay	McKellar	Smith, S. C.	

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. BANKHEAD] on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, until the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] made his very interesting speech yesterday, it had not been my purpose to take any part in this discussion; for I am as anxious as any one to reach a vote, and thus finally dispose of the subject, as it undoubtedly will be disposed of on this occasion. I think, however, in view of the argument submitted by the senior Senator from Idaho, which unquestionably impressed his audience as it did myself, something should be said in reply to one or two of its features.

During its delivery I asked the Senator how he differentiated between his position at this time and that taken by him on the occasion of his vote upon the prohibition amendment; and his explanation, if I correctly comprehended him, was that inasmuch as a number of the States had adopted prohibition, and inasmuch as it could not be made effective so long as other States not having adopted it were permitted to manufacture and import alcoholic liquors therein, which neutralized prohibition, it being necessary to enable the States to enforce their laws, and, in the interest of local self-government, that the constitutional amendment providing for general prohibition should be submitted to the States for ratification or rejection, the Senator voted for the amendment.

I have no doubt that this reason was conclusive and controlling with the Senator from Idaho; but I am unable to perceive the

force of that logic which justifies the enactment of a prohibition amendment to the Constitution but which rejects the proposed suffrage amendment. Each of them deals with a subject which was reserved to the States at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. Were it not so, these amendments would be unnecessary. That it is so is most obvious by reference to the general proposition that powers not expressly or by necessary implication delegated to the Federal Government are reserved to the States, or to the people.

If the argument be a substantial one, it could be made, as I think it has been made, against every amendment hitherto proposed to the Constitution, whether adopted or rejected. Fundamentally, the people of the United States, when conforming to the machinery and the requirements of the Constitution in their action, may incorporate into the Constitution of the United States anything they please. It is a matter of judgment—a matter, if you please, of necessity—in the opinion of that majority which is required to make the fundamental change. Whether it encroaches upon the rights of the States or interferes with local self-government, or abolishes local self-government, is entirely a practical question, and, in my judgment, has nothing to do with the constitutional right and power of the people to amend their organic act as they may see fit.

Prohibition and the suffrage are both matters of local concern; and they will be matters of local concern, subject, of course, to national legislation within the purview of our powers, until constitutional amendments are not only proposed by the Senate and House of Representatives but actually ratified and enforced by a two-thirds majority of the States voting thereon.

Mr. President, when the prohibition amendment was before Congress for its consideration Congress had already solved the problem of interference by legislation—I refer, of course, to the Webb-Kenyon bill, under whose provisions the invasion by one State with its prohibited goods of another State where the prohibition was in effect had been effectually provided against; and I think that at that time the Supreme Court of the United States had sustained the constitutionality of the law. Therefore, conceding the argument of the Senator from Idaho to be perfectly sound, its application in this instance fails, because under the powers of the National Government whereby and in pursuance whereof it could make this regulation, no constitutional amendment to that end was essential. So it would be just as pertinent to offer the same objection to the consideration of that amendment as is offered to this.

I can readily understand, Mr. President, how a Senator who had cast his vote against the prohibition amendment could consistently oppose this amendment upon the ground that it interfered with local self-government; but I am unable to understand the logic which justifies a favorable vote for the one and an unfavorable vote for the other.

I am as much concerned for the integrity of local self-government as any lover of his country can be. I concede all that was said in its favor yesterday by the Senator from Idaho. I am glad that he has become so fervent and capable a champion of that great principle; and I freely admit that never in this country did it stand in as much jeopardy as at present and in the recent past. The right of the people to meet in their separate and several communities and legislate in their own interest and for their own welfare may be said to lie at the very foundation of Anglo-Saxon liberty—a right which should be safeguarded at all times and respected everywhere; a right the disregard or lowering or abandonment of which will, in my judgment, be inevitably followed by all the consequences so eloquently pictured by the Senator from Idaho. But, Mr. President, I am unable to perceive how this amendment, should it become effective through ratification, can affect the principle of local self-government, while that regarding prohibition certainly will; for the right of a man to eat or to drink or to conduct his personal affairs as he sees fit, provided only that he pays the same respect for the right of others to do the same thing, is infinitely more of a subject for local self-government than the right of suffrage.

I do not refer to the moral or police aspect of the subject. This is not the time or place for that, but I assert fundamentally that the one affects local self-government much more than the other.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. In just a moment. If I had been present when the vote was taken upon the prohibition amendment I should have voted for it, not because I believe it is the best thing for the people, but because I was instructed by the people of my State to do it, and I would have respected that instruction. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I agree with what the Senator has said that the support of the prohibition amendment to the Constitution, if a man acted logically, ought to call for a vote in favor of amending the Constitution with respect to suffrage. And yet, does not the Senator think that this amendment is more of an assault upon the States than the other, because one of the inevitable characteristics and indispensable qualities of a sovereign State is the right to determine who shall hold office within the State, determine the qualifications of electors, and this amendment is a restriction upon the right of a sovereign State to exercise their sovereign power.

Mr. THOMAS. No, Mr. President, I do not. It is unquestionably an invasion, an absorption, if you please, of a right which the States may now, subject to another amendment regarding suffrage, exercise without national interference, except in so far as national elections are concerned. We had at one time a law upon the statute books enacted by Congress and enforced for many years under which at all elections where any national officer was chosen the entire machinery of the election was in the hands of the Federal authorities represented by United States marshals and supervisors. It was a deliberate and unwarranted intrusion into the affairs of the States, but it was a law, nevertheless, within the power of Congress, if it saw fit to do so, to enact. Inasmuch as State elections are constantly narrowing or decreasing in number, so that State officials and presidential electors and Members of Congress are chosen at the same time, there is no reason in the world why, if Congress saw fit to do so, it might not independently of this proposed amendment take charge of and control those elections.

But, Mr. President, whether that be so or not, the time for applying that argument has gone, for there can be no question that in spite of the obstructive tactics of the so-called National Woman's Party, which has prevented the successful submission of this amendment heretofore, the overwhelming majority of the people of the United States are in favor of the amendment. There can be no more significant evidence of the fact than that the vote about to be taken will be confined to no particular section of the country.

Mr. President, a word about local self-government and the dangers which menace it, and I am done. I do not believe local self-government is being directly assailed anywhere. I do not think it will be directly assailed under the provisions of this amendment, which after all only serves to double the vote. I believe that is the only practical consequence of the adoption of the amendment, and those who regard this matter as a subject for political influence will find to their sorrow before they are very much older, for women like men will cast their vote according to their convictions upon political questions and issues as they shall from time to time arise and be considered. Frankly, if I felt that half the people of the country would cast a vote for one particular party, locally or generally, simply because that party happened to be in power at the time the right was conferred, I should vote against the amendment. Such a conclusion is a reflection upon the intelligence and patriotism of womankind. As Democrats and as Republicans, as dissidents from both of the great parties, they will act hereafter precisely as they have acted heretofore, and in national affairs precisely as they have acted in State affairs where the franchise has prevailed.

Mr. President, what is it that is jeopardizing the fundamental principle of local self-government in America? It is largely the indifference of the average citizen to his public duty, largely the desire of the people to escape obligations by transferring them to the National Government, and largely because the States have themselves with regard to certain fundamentals broken down, either in their efforts to enforce the local laws, preserve peace and order, or have been unable to do so. If these conditions continue, as I am afraid they will, then it will make no difference whether this amendment be defeated or whether it be ratified. We must change fundamentally in some things or the old institution of local self-government, of community government, will become a tradition in this country instead of a living fact, as it has been and ought to be.

Mr. President, for the last quarter of a century and more every State in the Union has not only been willing but anxious to exchange its obligations and its powers of local self-government for Federal appropriations; and it would seem that as long as appropriations can be secured for the exercise by the Government of the United States in whole or in part of those duties which rest upon the States fundamentally and primarily, the exchange will continue. I shall not detain the Senate by attempting to enumerate a list of the various duties and powers which the States have passed on to the shoulders of the Federal Government and now feel free to insist that the Government itself shall observe them if they are observed at all. Great combinations of capital in the past have laughed at State laws and restrictions. The enforcement to-day of law and order for the pro-

tection of the individual in his fundamental rights in the States can only be secured, and sometimes not then, by Federal interference.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if it will not interrupt the Senator, does he think the Federal Government has afforded any better protection against the great aggregations of capital than the States?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think it has done so; but that does not affect the soundness of my proposition.

Mr. REED. I am not questioning that at all.

Mr. THOMAS. My proposition is that the States are passing on this duty to the Federal Government, which I think they could more effectively perform if they would do it themselves.

Mr. REED. I agree with the Senator in that.

Mr. THOMAS. To-day, Mr. President, we are confronted with a measure which clamored for recognition at the last Congress, which proposes that the States shall release themselves from still another burden and require the Government of the United States to assume the duty and bear the expense of educating the people of the country. If there is a phase of the duty of local self-government more obligatory than any other, it is that of the State to educate its citizens and to assume the financial obligations necessary to effectuate that great obligation. Yet Members of this body during the expiring days of the last session and since the commencement of this one have been deluged with letters and petitions from associations and individuals from one end of the country to the other urging them to support the measure creating a new cabinet department and clothing the Federal Government with the duty and authority of educating the children of the country.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS. I have no doubt it will pass, because it brings Federal money into the various districts of the country, and that is unfortunately regarded as a cure-all for every subject of public discontent.

I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Has it not been the experience of the Senator from Colorado that many of the movements which look to the extension of the activities of the Federal Government into the States, and to that extent a destruction of the States, emanate from Federal employees who want to extend their authority and aggrandize the Federal Government increase their compensation, and extend their opportunities into the States, and to that extent diminish the powers of the States?

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, Mr. President, there is no question that Federal employees, who are now organized, seem to indicate a desire to encourage every movement that increases the number of Federal employees and extends the activities of the Federal Government. That is one of the beauties of civil service in its ultimate stages of development.

But, Mr. President, I do not think it would be fair to place all these measures upon one class of people. Every city in the United States, every community, incorporated or unincorporated, so far as I know, sooner or later comes clamoring to Congress for appropriations for the accomplishment of things that ought to be done at home, and to say that a Federal amendment striking out the distinction of sex in the matter of suffrage is a fundamental blow at local self-government in the face of these conditions is to assume a position which I do not believe can be sustained either by reason or by logic, as it certainly can not be by precedent.

I hope and believe that the good women of this country, who in my State study and therefore understand political questions quite as well as, if not better than, the average man, who regard their enfranchisement not as the grant of a privilege, but as the imposition of a public duty, will be a powerful aid in the restoration as well as the preservation of local self-government and not become a mere numerical addition to our electoral franchise whose influence and whose power will be extended in some other and less laudable direction.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak on this question, and shall do so but briefly. My remarks are chiefly provoked by the statements of the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] that the action of this Congress and the action of the people of the 45 States in the adoption of the prohibition amendment has a tendency to bring the Congress into disrepute has a tendency to make the people have less regard and respect for the Constitution.

When I heard the statement of the Senator from New York that there were many men in the United States who already now feel aggrieved because of the prohibition amendment to the Constitution, and that they are proceeding to avoid or evade the effect of this amendment, and that such action would have the effect to bring the Constitution into disrepute with the people of this country, I could not help but think of an instance I remembered from away back yonder in the days of my youth when I used to read the Scriptures more than I do now. I want to read it here now. This has reference to the time when Paul was in Asia, and had preached over there, and his preaching had caused the people of that country to quit worshipping idols. Here is the Biblical account of it:

> For a certain man named Demetrius, a silversmith, which made silver shrines for Diana, brought no small gain unto the craftsmen;
> Whom he called together with the workmen of like occupation, and said, Sirs, ye know that by this craft we have our wealth.
> Moreover ye see and hear, that not alone at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia, this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people, saying that they be no gods, which are made by hand:
> So that not only this our craft is in danger to be set at nought, but also that the temple of the great goddess Diana should be despised, and her magnificence should be destroyed, whom all Asia and the world worshippeth.
> And when they heard these sayings, they were full of wrath, and cried out, saying, Great is Diana of the Ephesians.
> And the whole city was filled with confusion—

And so on.

The adoption of the amendment to the Constitution, complained of by the Senator from New York, interfered with the business of those engaged in this prohibited traffic, as did the preaching of Paul in ancient days with the sale of images of the idol by Demetrius and his fellow craftsmen.

There existed in this country a kind of business that had Government support, a kind of business that had debauched the people of the United States of America; that was entrenched with special privileges; that the people of this country said had existed too long; that such business should be destroyed. The sentiment began to grow in the States, in the counties, in the towns, in the cities, and finally it impressed the Congress of the United States. The people said, "We want the Constitution amended to abolish and destroy this system that has grown up, this special privilege, in which the Government had given the privilege to certain people to debauch with the liquor traffic the other people of the country and call it business. We want it destroyed. We want it destroyed forever, effectually and finally, and it must be done by writing an amendment into the Constitution of our Nation." How did the people proceed to do this?

Sentiment crystallized. It spread and extended throughout the country, and it demanded to be voiced here, and that the opportunity be given for the States to ratify the amendment that should be proposed. They proceeded with the amendment through the Congress of the United States, according to the rules laid down by the Constitution. It came here from these representatives of the people everywhere. Then it was proposed by Congress, two-thirds of the Members voting for it. It was submitted to the States of the Union, and 45 of the 48 States of the Union voted for it overwhelmingly, according to the rules laid down for adopting amendments to the Constitution.

And now the Senator from Connecticut comes upon the floor and says it was in effect a willful interference with the rights of the people of the other States, due to the desire and preference of the South. That is the sort of idea he has about it. The Senator from New York, because the liquor interests' gain has been taken from them, because they have stirred up this confusion or attempted to, because they have attempted to bring the Constitution of the United States into disrepute on account of their gain having been affected, says now you ought to be careful about adopting this proposed amendment lest you increase that sort of feeling, lest you cause it to spread throughout the country. The saloon people and the liquor traffic do not appear to recognize that the world has progressed. They seem to be in the attitude of the man who stood still; and yet they have learned a little, I judge, from the procedure heretofore of people who have been opposed to the traffic.

The other day in Baltimore they attempted to have a great parade, and the papers announced that the antiprohibition committee would regard all keepers of saloons as traitors to the cause who refused to close their saloons during the three or four hours in which the parade was expected to march. They learned that they themselves could not even have a parade and demonstration without closing the saloons, the agencies that all the people have insisted shall be closed for all time.

The Senator from New York thinks we will bring the Constitution into disrepute by adopting an amendment as provided in the Constitution.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has offered this amendment, and he has offered it not to improve the condition but in the hope of defeating the resolution. He is an enemy to the cause. He is not in favor of the proposition of permitting women to vote. He makes no concealment of that fact. He

has not been in favor of it. He is not in favor of it now. He offers this amendment to injure the cause and not to help it. Why should his amendment be adopted? No other amendment of the 17 amendments to the Constitution of the United States has ever been submitted to conventions in the States. It has never been attempted to be done before. It is permitted under the Constitution, yes; but it has never been availed of. It has never been done heretofore, and why should it be employed now on this question, and why should it be proposed by an enemy of the resolution and expected to be indorsed by those who are its friends? I say it should not be done.

Is there any reason to fear that in the United States of America in the adoption of this amendment the people will not have a fair expression of their views about it? Women only vote in comparatively a very few States. The men in all the States vote. They vote to elect members of the legislature, they vote to elect Members of Congress, they vote to elect United States Senators, and they will vote yonder upon this proposition of the ratification of this amendment, which is proposed in accordance with the rules laid down for amending the Constitution.

Can you say it is wrong to amend the Constitution according to the rules laid down for the purpose. If all the people of the country can not be trusted to amend the Constitution according to the rules provided in the Constitution, then is it not time that we have no further amendments? Some of these gentlemen, I believe from the arguments they have made, would be willing and think it better for the interest of the country in future that we have no further amendments to the Constitution, that the people can not be trusted to amend their own Constitution in the way they laid down when the Constitution was made for amending and changing it. That seems to be the idea some of them have.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] inveighed against the degeneracy of the times. He talked about those ancient Senators of great ability and great courage who stood here and took the same oath that these Senators in these degenerate days take. He said they were courageous, that they were patriotic, that they regarded their oath when it was taken. I do not know whether the Senator thinks he is more loyal and more patriotic and more courageous than the Senators who are supporting this amendment or not. He may be more able, but I will not even make any concession on that point.

That is the condition we are confronted with here to-day. No other amendment to the Constitution has ever been proposed in such a way as it is attempted to propose this. It never has been done. All the legislatures in the States are elected by the people. They are sent to their different assemblies representing their people. They will vote on this question, and if you had a convention and elected these representatives for this particular purpose they would be no more representative of the people than they are now. You are attempting here an innovation, so far as that practice is concerned.

As to what the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] has said, the Senator still seems to be in the unreconstructed period. I live in the South. I have lived under the fifteenth amendment since I was born, practically. It is the law of the land, and what is the use in discussing conditions under which it became so? Where is the harm that shall come to us if hereafter as to one-half of our people who have been denied the right to vote we shall utilize their ability and their judgment in the settlement of questions that affect local conditions and affect national interests? There has been, so far as I am concerned, no good reason urged here to-day at all why this amendment should not be adopted. I did not expect to say anything to-day and would not have done so except for those remarks from the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] that provoked it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, only a few words. I have listened with interest to what the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] has just said. Of course, I am opposed to the pending joint resolution, and have been from the beginning, but that does not affect the question of the amendment to it, as to which is the better way to reflect popular sentiment in its adoption or rejection.

The Senator says that this is an innovation; that he desires to have this amendment adopted along the lines of the Constitution. It is no more an innovation if my amendment is adopted than the joint resolution would be as it stands as originally drafted, because the Constitution itself provides two modes of ratification, and it is left entirely optional with the Congress as to which mode shall be adopted. The Congress can determine that it shall go to the legislatures for adoption or the Congress can determine that State conventions called for this sole purpose shall pass upon the ratification or the rejection of the amendment.

The Senator from Arkansas says that this amendment of mine is introduced for the purpose of defeating the joint resolution. That is a very candid confession by one of the proponents of the measure. In itself it could not defeat the measure. There can be no question that every State in the Union would call a convention for the ratification or rejection of the amendment if we adopt this method. More than that, if they did not call it, the Federal Congress could call a convention.

But it narrows itself to this, that if a legislature is elected, this, being one of the issues, may become subordinated in many States to other issues. It may become subordinate to the personal equation of the candidates, and men may be elected to vote on this issue who will not directly reflect the mature judgment of their constituents. But if a convention is called for the sole purpose of ratifying or rejecting this measure, then the delegates to that convention will be merely the instrument of the popular will, as the Electoral College is the instrument of the popular will in the election of a President of the United States. When the Senator advances the argument that the adoption of this amendment would defeat the woman-suffrage amendment he concedes in that moment that the popular sentiment in the States is not for the Susan B. Anthony amendment, and that the proponents of the measure dare not submit it to the popular will of the people of America.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I simply want to add a word in connection with the statement just made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. We are already informed through the press that the purpose has taken shape of immediately convening legislatures in extraordinary session to ratify this amendment. Those legislatures were not elected upon the issue of suffrage or nonsuffrage; they were elected upon totally different issues; and now it is proposed that men who were not selected by the people for the purpose of passing upon this issue shall pass upon it before the people even have the opportunity to again elect a legislature.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KIRBY. The Senator suggests that there is a purpose to call the legislatures of the different States to get immediate ratification. Where does the Senator get any such idea? Where is there anything upon which to base such a statement as a fact?

Mr. REED. I will answer the Senator. I have already stated it, if the Senator had been listening. I said it had been repeatedly stated in the press that that is the purpose of the leaders of this movement. I have seen what professed to be quotations by those who have been leaders of the movement. I have generally found that the newspapers have been pretty able to prognosticate the movements to a reasonable extent in the future of the suffrage program. I have just been informed by a citizen of the State of Texas that two of the great papers of Texas are already advocating the calling of the legislature in extraordinary session for the purpose of ratifying this amendment, although the State of Texas by popular vote held within the last few days has defeated suffrage, I understand, the majority amounting to nearly 30,000.

So we may as well understand that it is the purpose of the proponents of this measure to do everything within their power to keep from submitting it in any way to the popular will and to obtain ratification in any manner possible. I expect to hear all of these proponents within the next few months loudly proclaiming their belief in the doctrine that the great people of the country shall in all respects rule. I wish they could bring themselves to an adherence to that doctrine to-day.

The amendment which is proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] does give the people of the States, at least, the opportunity to have a vote on the selection of men to constitute the members of the convention. It will not work necessarily any delay, unless the delay is merely the vote to be attained by the extraordinary methods I have spoken of; that is, extra sessions of the legislatures called to ratify, the members of those legislatures having been elected for entirely different purposes. Why is it that men who claim to be in favor of government by the popular will are not willing to accept this amendment which will afford the people some chance to express themselves? It seems to me there ought to be some Senators here, even from the suffrage States, who are willing to let the people of the States of this Union have the opportunity to cast a vote at least for delegates to a convention that will debate and consider this important amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. KING. I have not been privileged to hear all of the debate upon the resolution under discussion, and the question I am about to ask may have been fully answered in the debate. The question which I desire to submit to the Senator is this: Is there any valid reason why the question of amending the Constitution of the United States, as contemplated in the resolution now before the Senate, should not be submitted to a vote of the people of the States? For myself, if the Constitution is to be amended, I see no reason for denying the people the right to vote upon the proposed amendment. There is no question but what the proposed amendment to the Constitution materially changes the framework of our organic law and commits to the Federal Government authority which now belongs to the States. The proposed amendment is a limitation upon the powers and rights of the States, and likewise is a restriction upon the rights of the people within the States. To deprive them and the sovereign States in which they reside of rights now enjoyed by the States and the people is a very serious matter. If I may be pardoned for further occupying the time of the Senator, I would like to state, because I do not intend to discuss this question, that I can not bring my judgment to approve of the plan to amend the Constitution of the United States to grant woman suffrage through the Federal Government. While I have for many years been a believer in woman suffrage, and earnestly advocated within my State the right of women to vote, and urged that in the State constitution they should have the same political rights as men, I have always entertained the view that the question was one for the States to determine for themselves. This has been the view of all Democrats and those who believed in our form of government: The proposition now is to overturn the principles held sacred for so many years, and to further intrench upon the prerogatives of the States and the reserved rights of the people. Under our form of Government the States alone have the right to determine the qualifications of electors. If States may not ordain their own constitutions and determine their own domestic and internal affairs, this Republic will soon be destroyed. We often speak of the "sovereign States of the Union," and the Supreme Court of the United States has referred to the States as "indestructible." One of the indispensable attributes of State sovereignty is the power to determine who shall hold office within the State. An elector is an official, and therefore an elector holds an office within the State. To deprive the States of the right to say who shall vote and who shall hold office is an abridgment of the rights of the State. It seems to me that this proposed amendment is along the lines of centralization, which, if persisted in, will lead to disastrous consequences. However, I am in the unfortunate situation of being unable to vote in harmony with my convictions. I represent, in part, a sovereign State; and the mandate of my party and the people of my State requires that I vote for the submission of an amendment to the Constitution providing for woman suffrage. It is a matter of sincere regret to me that I am compelled to support a proposition by my vote which is so repugnant to my conceptions of the rights of the States, and, indeed, the rights of the people themselves, and which will prove to be a dangerous precedent and a continuing menace to the peace and welfare of this Nation. However, I rose merely to propound the question which I have submitted to the Senator, and not to argue the question so ably discussed by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. The only reason I have heard was the one advanced by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY], who, as I understood him——

Mr. KIRBY. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. REED. I was trying——

Mr. KIRBY. The Senator stated he could not understand why the proponents of this measure insisted on the amendment being adopted regularly, as all other amendments to the Constitution have been adopted.

Mr. REED. I did not make any such statement.

Mr. KIRBY. The Senator made a statement practically to that effect.

Mr. REED. No; I did not make any such statement in effect.

Mr. KIRBY. The question I want to ask is, Is it not a fact that all of the other 17 amendments to the Constitution have been adopted by being submitted to the State legislatures? Is it not true that a single amendment has never been proposed otherwise? If that is true—and it is—then why does the Senator wish to oppose it in this case and insist on an innovation?

Mr. REED. Now, Mr. President——

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. STANLEY. I shall vote for the amendment to the Constitution permitting women to vote. I do not think, however, that the statement of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] is entirely warranted—that it necessarily follows that I shall vote to deprive the people of my State or of any other State of the right to express their opinion on the subject. I shall therefore vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. REED. Mr. President, there are now pending two questions which have been propounded to me. I want to answer them in the order in which they were asked. The question was propounded by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] what reason has been advanced for denying to the people of the States an opportunity to express their desires with reference to this amendment? In answering that I have to say that the only reason I have heard advanced—but I have not been here during the entire debate—was the one brought forward by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY], which was that it would work delay, and his further reason that the method now proposed to be pursued is the method that has been pursued in adopting all other constitutional amendments.

The other questions propounded to me were those just asked by the Senator from Arkansas, which embraced the idea I have already expressed as coming from him, namely, Is it not true that all other amendments to the Constitution have been submitted in the same manner in which it is proposed to submit this pending amendment? All of the late amendments to the Constitution have been so submitted; but whether always that has been the rule I am not prepared to say. I confess to some little embarrassment when I must say that I can not answer with certainty.

Mr. KIRBY. They all have been.

Mr. REED. I think they all have been.

Now, Mr. President, the Senator asked me a third question—Why should there be a different method followed here?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves that point will he yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I want to say to the Senator from Missouri that we have been admonished by him and by other Senators to remember the teachings of the fathers and to guide and govern our actions by their practices and their teachings. Immediately upon the adoption of the Constitution there were at least 10 amendments submitted when the method was new. Those amendments might very properly have been submitted to a convention called in each State, for there was a large number of them; but my recollection is that the fathers chose the other system. We have followed that system invariably down to this time. Does not the Senator think that that is a good reason why we should continue to do so?

Mr. REED. Well, Mr. President, first let me answer the Senator's statement. I have frequently said in this Chamber that I have great regard for the wisdom of the framers of our Constitution and that I did not believe that those policies of government which they had inaugurated and under which we had lived and by virtue of which we have become the greatest nation of the world ought to be disregarded and treated lightly or set aside without mature deliberation, and all of that I reaffirm. But as to questions of policy of government, such questions as the Monroe doctrine, such questions as the United States keeping herself free from entangling alliances, to all of these ancient doctrines my distinguished friend and those who are with him have turned aside their faces. Now, the Senator comes to me and asks me, on a mere matter of procedure, not a matter involving the principle itself, that we should be bound by the procedure they took.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri again yield?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I do not understand that that is the position taken by the Senator from Missouri. I understand his argument is that it is a fundamental right of the people of the States in a referendum to decide this matter, rather than that it should be decided by the legislatures of the States. I

do not understand that the Senator has heretofore argued that this is a mere matter of choice between two procedures. I understand his argument to be that it is a question of substantive right of the people to pass upon these questions. I called his attention to the fact that we are pursuing the policy that was pursued by the fathers, for obviously they thought it was the better policy. Now, the Senator seems to think that at the present time, at least, the policy of the fathers is not the one we ought to follow.

Mr. REED. Oh, I do not think anything of the sort in the sense that the Senator puts it. There are really two questions presented here: One is, Shall the people of the States be deprived of the right, which they have reserved in their constitutions, to determine the qualifications of the voters of their respective States—shall that right be taken away from them by a Federal amendment? Upon that I answer that it ought not to be taken away, first, because to take it away is violative of the very genius of our dual system of government, a government by independent States and by a central nation at the same time. Upon that we have the wisdom of the fathers, for they so wrote the law. We have the experience of the country and we have the principle of government that the people of every State ought to have the power to name their own electorate, especially when that electorate is voting only on local affairs, and that when the Federal Government comes in, contrary to the wisdom of the fathers—to which the Senator from Montana now appeals for the first time in many months and which he has been assiduously denying all along—and proposes to deprive the people of the States of the right they have reserved in their constitutions to themselves to change the qualification of voters, that is an impingement and an impairment of the very structure of our Government. Now, that is the first question. But when you come to the question how that Constitution shall be amended, the particular form to be followed is a matter of procedure and is not a matter of principle, except that you may follow a procedure which will be calculated to deny the people a right or calculated to extend to them a right.

It is true, I believe, that in the past we have followed the method of submission to the legislatures, but it is also true that when the fathers wrote the Constitution they provided two methods.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I am calling the attention of the Senator to the fact that, when they were called upon to make a choice between the two methods, they chose the one we propose to follow while you propose another one.

Mr. REED. They proposed two methods.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes; but when they were obliged to make a choice between the two methods, they chose the one that you propose to cast aside.

Mr. REED. They proposed two methods, and when they came to submit their amendments it is true they submitted those amendments to the legislatures of the States. Very well; let the precedent stand for whatever value there is to it; but let me call attention to the difference in conditions. In those days the smaller population all over the country, the fact that every man was closer to the public questions of the day, the fact that every one of these questions had been discussed for years and that the principles of government which were involved in the constitutional amendments upon which the vote was about to be taken had been the subject of debate, and political alignments had been made, so that a legislature elected might be well said to go there instructed and with a full understanding of what the people wanted, may have been very great factors in determining the question.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I think the Senator is quite right about that. The very subject before us, however, has been debated before the people of this country for 75 years or more.

Mr. REED. Now, I will answer that. The very subject before us has been debated by the people of the United States—by a few of the people of the United States—for a good while; it has been debated by a few agitators——

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Does not the Senator think that as many have participated in that debate as participated in the debate of the fundamental principles expressed in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution?

Mr. REED. Not in the same proportion, nor anything like it. I will tell you how the debate has been conducted in my State. I know something about what has gone on there. It has been the subject of laughter and jest more than of any serious consideration. Ladies have come, as I said the other day, and asked to address audiences that were called together by Democrats or Republicans. They have been accorded the platform and have spoken their little piece, bowed themselves out, and the business of the evening went on. Nobody regarded it in a very serious way. We had a vote on it. There was not any debate during that campaign on woman suffrage, except on one side. Some of the ladies turned out and spoke for it. I believe I state the truth when I say that the great mass of the women of Missouri were totally indifferent to it, and when they got through the people voted it down by 140,000 majority.

In the days when the Constitution was first amended, when the Bill of Rights was added, when Thomas Jefferson was gathering in his two hands, figuratively speaking, the lovers of human liberty and molding them into a tremendous force for the perpetuation of liberty, the burning issues of liberty were flaming in the hearts of all the people.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. And he submitted them to the legislatures of the States.

Mr. REED. Yes; he submitted them to the legislatures. Take the full benefit of that. Now, I am going to show you a reason that ought to appeal—and would appeal to anybody but a suffragist—why this ought to be distinguished from the ordinary method of submission. Several States of the Union had the original right to fix the qualifications of their voters, and they proceeded in nearly every instance to write those qualifications into their constitutions. They did so for the purpose of depriving the legislatures of any power or right ever to change those qualifications. Now it is proposed to take an action by which three-fourths of the States of the Union may change the fundamental law of this country so as to change the qualifications of the voters of a State against the will of the people of that State. Upon such a question as that, where the people have reserved to themselves in their constitution the right to fix the qualifications, the least that this body can do is to preserve to the people in the form and manner of submission the right to express their opinions. That is what distinguishes this amendment from every other amendment, and the line of demarcation and of distinction is so plain that any man, except a suffragist, can see it; and a suffragist can see it, but will not admit it. That is the reason.

I will take a concrete case. I went over it yesterday, but I venture to repeat it in substance. My own State, with 3,500,000 people, has an electorate of many hundred thousand. Those people have written a constitution and said, "We will not again change the qualifications of voters; the legislature shall not do it." Now, we propose to say to those people, "The legislature shall or may do it; and not only your legislature, but, if your legislature should vote against it, the legislatures of other States can change the qualifications of the voter, which you expressly reserved to yourselves." We ask at least that you give our people in some manner and form the opportunity to vote on this amendment; that if you pass it you will at least give us the privilege of having an election and of selecting our delegates to a convention to pass upon this particular question, and to that extent you will save to them a portion of the rights they sought to reserve in their constitution. Why is not that fair? Why is not that reasonable, and why should not Democrats here grant it?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. REED. I am quite content to stop, but I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. KING. Apropos of the discussion which was provoked by the statement of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY], with respect to the manner of submitting the first 10 amendments and other amendments, my recollection of the historical circumstances attending the first 10 amendments is this: Patrick Henry, particularly, and some other Virginians, tendered some 13 or 14 amendments to the Constitution of the United States, 10 of which constitute the first 10 amendments to that instrument. Those amendments were submitted to the people for discussion, and were earnestly discussed from the North to the South, many of those who were afterwards followers of Hamilton and the Federalist Party opposing the amendments and the followers of Mr. Jefferson and others supporting them. The legislatures chosen to pass upon the amendments were selected with reference to their views upon the amendments, so that in effect they constituted conventions selected by the people to vote upon the ratification of the amendments. The same can be said with respect to the eleventh amendment; the same can be said with respect to the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, because they were live issues; they were presented to the people, all eyes were focused upon the same, and the members of the legislatures were largely, if not entirely, selected because of their support of or their opposition to those amendments.

Now, with respect to the legislatures that are at present in existence, some of which have been recently elected and some of which were elected two years ago, with half of the Senators

holding over for four years—many of them were selected with reference to local issues, with reference to questions not involving woman suffrage at all; so that in submitting to the legislatures in many of the States the proposed amendment it will be found that a portion or all of their members were elected upon other issues. The question of amending the Constitution of the United States, as contemplated in the resolution under consideration, was not an issue when they were elected, and they were chosen without reference to their views upon this question.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator for his statement; it is very clear. That is not all, Mr. President. In ordinary elections in the States, when there is no matter of special importance, it is frequently the case that you have great difficulty in getting anybody to go to the legislature who amounts to very much. I do not think that I would be guilty of a breach of courtesy even if I stated the plain fact that there have been times in this country when a man who was a member of the legislature of some State would apologize when he announced the fact; and, as was said the other day, it was because legislatures were so susceptible to influence, because so many scandals broke out in them, that the important matter of the election of United States Senators was taken away from the legislatures altogether. In the Senator's own State of Montana one conspicuous case arose in which I know that the Senator and his colleague took a distinguished part in favor of purity and decency; but it was one of those cases that contributed materially to the sentiment in favor of a direct vote of the people. I do not know whether we improved the personnel of the Senate; I do not know, if we keep on having these expensive elections, whether we will have improved the moral tone of the method of election. That is a question to be determined in the future.

Mr. President, there are some Senators here from the South. I want to talk to them for a minute, not on the lines pursued by my friend Mr. SMITH this morning. I leave that argument to Senators from distinctly Southern States. Missouri is in the twilight zone, in a way, between the North and the South. We have the virtues of both, and the vices of neither. I do not know in how many Southern States this question has been submitted to a popular vote in any form. It has just been submitted in Texas, the great Empire State of the Southwest, that came into this country as an organized and independent government, that has always proudly asserted its independence as a State, and whose people have always justly exhibited a pride in their great Commonwealth. The people have just voted in that State, and in a very decisive vote have repudiated woman suffrage. Now the Senators from that State, both of whom I esteem very highly, have this question to answer by their vote on this amendment; and I hope they will understand that I am not trying to make this unpleasantly personal, because that is not my object.

This is the question: Would you now cast a vote the effect of which may be, so far as Texas is concerned, to have the present legislature, elected upon a different issue, convened and have it declare for the ratification of this amendment, in the face of the decision of the people at the election just held? Or will you, at least, say this to the people of Texas, "While I voted to submit this proposed amendment to the Constitution, I also voted for the Underwood amendment, which reserved to the people of the State of Texas the right to elect delegates to a convention and to give them the instructions of the people of Texas"?

That is the question that is presented there. Of course Senators will answer that as they ought to answer it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. Oh, yes; I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Before the Senator takes his seat, a very interesting question was precipitated yesterday by the discussion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] in respect to which I should like to have the views of the Senator from Missouri. If this amendment should prevail, what is the Senator's view as to the machinery for conducting the election under which the delegates to the conventions in the various States should be selected? Is it his view that it should be provided by the State legislatures, or that Congress should provide it?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to answer that question in a moment, and let me pursue for the present the theme I was on?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I shall be very glad then to answer it; and if I start to take my seat without answering it, I hope somebody will call my attention to it, because I think the answer is very simple, plain, and easy.

Now I address myself to other Members from Southern States.

We all know that it has been the commonly understood situation that in the South the women have not desired the right of suffrage and that the sentiment has been strongly against suffrage. There have been more reasons than one for that. One of those reasons undoubtedly arises out of the race question. Another reason is probably found in the fact that for the most part the ladies of the South are intensely wedded to their home life, and are but little inclined to thrust themselves into public affairs; and I think I can say, without at all disparaging the women of other parts of the country, that at least it is true that one of the most glorious types of womanhood that ever beautified and rendered sweet and lovely this old earth is the women of the South. Down in the South you have taught State rights—a doctrine which was originally fundamentally right, if properly understood, but to which I have always thought the South gave too extreme a construction, that resulted in the endeavor of the South to withdraw from the Union, for I do not believe that right ever existed; but I do say, as I ought to say in passing, that the man who would harshly judge the South to-day for the position that it took would be a most ungenerous man.

The doctrine that the State of Georgia or the State of Mississippi or the State of South Carolina was a little republic in itself, whose people controlled its own affairs, and which in all local matters was a sovereign, with only the limitation that certain rights that had been yielded to the Federal Government should, of course, be subtracted from the sum total of the powers that the State otherwise would have had as a complete sovereignty—that doctrine was a splendid doctrine. It has been close to the hearts of the people of the South. It has, sir, been very close to the hearts of all men who have understood the dangers of centralized government. How can men from the South be found who will vote to take away the very thing that constitutes the control of the destiny of every State, that thing being the electorate itself? How can you, who have sought to retain as large a measure of power and control in your own States as possible, go back to your people and justify this surrender of that right which lies at the very foundation of all your rights, and which, when legislation follows, may be found to constitute the means by which the entire election machinery of your State will go into the hands of Federal agents?

We might just as well look this question in the face. When politics run high, as they will again, and when passion rides in its chariots of fire across this land, as it will again, and when the clamors go up from the dark sisters of the South that they are not being permitted to vote, and the sisters of the North who belong to the political party that feels that it is losing votes down South get aroused, I want to say to you, Senators, you are very likely to get some legislation compared with which the force bill will be a gentle and merely persuasive measure. So I say that men of the South ought at least to give their people a chance to vote on this question.

There was something said here in the argument to-day—and I am occupying the floor when I did not expect to stand here more than a moment—to which I want to allude, because of the fact that people of the different parts of this country know their own affairs, and that they may be misled by judging the entire country by the conditions of their own States or people.

I readily confess—I not only readily confess, but I gladly insist—that the people of the State of Montana, with its not very large population, with its boundless opportunities, its undeveloped resources, may properly decide a question in favor of women voting, when under the conditions in other States it might be highly unwise. I know—any man who has visited the great West knows—that the people of these Western States that are sparsely settled are closer to their government and know more about their public men and public affairs than the people of the great congested States. An entirely different proposition is presented. I do not know what the vote of Nevada is to-day, but, if I recall aright, a few years ago, when I was serving on the executive committee of the national committee, I think they had a total vote of about 25,000 in the State. That vote is not as large as the votes of some wards of some cities.

In a population of that kind, if a man is a candidate for Senator or governor, every man, woman, and child in the State knows him and knows all about him. It is an intimate and close relationship that exists. They know his public life; they know his private character; and not only the men, women, and children know him, but every well-bred dog recognizes him. So I sometimes think that it is a greater compliment to be elected from one of those States than it is to be elected from a great, big State, where they do not know the men so well.

The women in those Western States, with their environment and their surroundings, are closer to public affairs than they

are in the great, congested centers. I suppose there is not a lady of any intelligence in the State of New Mexico who does not know all about the distinguished Senators from that State. They know about their past and their present and, as nearly as anything human can judge, they know about what their future is going to be. They know who are the members of the legislature. They know the questions that are arising out there that affect them and affect their State. They have all been talked over. I do not mean to say that they have not anything else to do, but the life of the whole State is close to them.

Let us take New York City. I do not pick it out as a place of ignorance, but as a place of great numbers. The average lady in New York City does not know her Congressman or what his name is. There are a good many men who do not know. A good many hardly know where the capital of their State is, and they are not intensely ignorant at that. The problem is afar off. There are too many theaters and moving pictures and cabarets, and there are too many matters of interest happening every day, tens of thousands of events where there is one happening out in these Western States; and that is not a disparagement of the Western States. Nobody ever heard me disparage the Western States. If I had my life to live over again, I would rather go in a place like that than in any other place in the world. So that it is so outrageously unjust for the people of one State to try to force a law upon the people of another State.

What right have I as a citizen of Missouri, or what right have the people of Missouri, or what right has the Legislature of Missouri, to say who shall vote in the sovereign State of Texas, when the people of Texas by their vote have just decided that question? And what right has Texas to say who shall vote in Missouri, when the people of Missouri are capable of deciding that question for themselves, and have decided it in recent years? What right have I to go down into Mississippi—a State where I have never had the privilege of visiting, but a State which I respect, and whose people I respect—and try to tell those people down there whom they ought to allow to vote? What right have I to insist that the question shall be submitted to a legislature composed in most of the States of the Union, when they are picked up at ordinary by-elections, of men who have very little to do, and who are sent to the legislature to fill out a ticket?

Why, I tell you, sirs, that I have attended many political conventions in my State—and I cite it because it is as good a State as there is anywhere—and I have attended many political conventions where, when we got through making up the rest of the ticket, we would have to canvass the convention to find men who would let us put their names on the ticket for the legislature. Now, why not give the people of these States a chance to elect delegates to a convention, at least? Why not give to the people of the State of Texas the right, before their privilege of fixing the qualifications of their voters shall be taken away from them, at least the right to express their opinions through delegates elected by the people and sent to a convention? How can any man justify a denial of that?

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] asked me a question, which was——

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, let me remark that the Senator apparently felt that I was endeavoring to ask him a hard question. I am sure that it was a very easy one for the Senator to answer. I did not intend to put it as a poser to the Senator at all.

Mr. REED. Oh, I know the Senator did not, and I did not mean to make any reply that would give the impression that the Senator had. I am unfortunate when I talk in doing it in a sort of a brutal way, I guess. I do not mean it.

My opinion is that the problem is very easy of solution. All that is necessary in the world is for the legislatures of the various States, when they meet, to pass a simple statute providing for the selection of delegates to a convention, to be held at a certain time, to consider and pass upon the amendment. That machinery may be easily called into play by simply employing the ordinary machinery of elections for the purpose of taking the ballot. Of course, I would say, as a matter of preference, just my opinion that comes to me on my feet, that probably could be done best at some general election when the people would turn out.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly.

Mr. REED. But, of course, the elections could be held before that, if the legislatures of the States should meet in time, or, if we are to have extra sessions, they could be convened for that purpose as well as the other.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, the legislature could or could not call a convention, as it saw fit.

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. And, of course, legislatures that were against woman suffrage would not call a convention.

Mr. REED. I do not think that would follow.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That would be the natural political tendency, would it not?

Mr. REED. I would not say so. I do not think that would follow.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Is it not a fact that it would result, first, in a contest before the legislature over the question as to whether a convention should be called, then a contest would occur before the people over the election of delegates to the convention, and finally a contest would ensue before the convention as to whether it should be adopted or not; and does it not mean there would be three fights over this matter, and that is the reason why the Senator desires to pursue that method?

Mr. REED. No; that is not the reason, not as the Senator puts it. It is true there might be a contest as to whether the convention should be called, but if there was any large sentiment in favor of the proposition I have not the slightest doubt of its being called even by a legislature that upon a vote on the main question might be against it, and for this reason——

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But, Mr. President——

Mr. REED. Permit me to complete the sentence. The argument that the people have the right to express their opinion, and this is a means provided for the expression of that opinion, would be a very potential argument.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I agree with the Senator, but he will bear in mind that is exactly what we are now asking and what he is resisting.

Mr. REED. Oh, no.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. We are asking that the people be given an opportunity, and he is objecting even to the submission of it. If he were a member of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, how could he consistently, with his record here, vote to call a convention?

Mr. REED. The Senator does not state my position with the fairness he usually manifests. You are not asking that the people be given a chance to vote. You are asking that the legislatures be given a chance to vote, and we, by this amendment, are asking that the people should be given a chance to vote.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should like to ask the Senator just one further question. If this joint resolution had been originally introduced with a proposition to submit it to conventions called in each of the States, would the Senator have voted for it?

Mr. REED. I would have declined to vote for it and for the reason——

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly.

Mr. REED. I say it is a question that belongs exclusively to the people of each State. That is well known to be my position. But if I was a member of my State legislature and the question was presented as to whether the people of the State should have the right to vote on suffrage, and there was any considerable sentiment in favor of it, I would vote to give the people a chance to have that vote and decide that question. Now, I follow the Senator along in his objection. I do not think there would be any difficulty in getting the legislature to pass a law for submission; at least, there would not be any difficulty if there was any considerable sentiment in favor of the measure. At least there would be no difficulty in getting a convention called by any legislature that would ratify this amendment.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. REED. Therefore you will not lose an hour or a second there.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The question would be presented in exactly the same way. Those legislatures that are in favor of the amendment would call conventions, and those that were against it would not call the convention.

Mr. REED. Very well. If you had three-fourths of the legislatures of the States in favor of suffrage, you would get your conventions in three-fourths of the States.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly.

Mr. REED. And if you did not have three-fourths of the legislatures or could not get them ultimately, you never could pass your amendment.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly, and you would have three fights to make instead of one.

Mr. REED. Let us discuss the fights as a separate proposition. The point I am making now is that there is no foundation whatever in your claim that you would be delayed because the legislatures would not act by calling the conventions, because every legislature that would vote for suffrage, that would

vote to ratify this amendment outright, would certainly vote to call a convention. So you do not lose a minute. You do have to go and ask the legislatures to cast that vote, and if you do, that affords a little time while that law is being passed, and it may be passed at any session of the legislature for the people to discuss and understand the question.

There would be a little delay in calling this convention. How much delay? Just enough delay so that there could be fair discussion by the people. Do you want this thing or do you not want it? Do you want to change your fundamental law or do you want to retain it as it is? Before you change a fundamental law that has been a part of the Constitution of the United States since the foundation of the Government, that has been engraven in the constitutions of the several States from the first, there ought to be a little period of discussion when the people have that issue segregated out and presented to them sharply for their consideration, and two months' time or three months' time and a debate before the people will do no harm.

There would be three fights, says the Senator. There never ought to be a change in the fundamental laws of this country without discussion, and that is what the Senator means by a fight. If this measure is so sacred and so holy and if it carries so much of good as is contended, then the proponents of it can well afford to argue its blessings to their people and let their people become wise and advised.

Now, we have elected a convention of delegates. We have proceeded to that point. How much time does it take for them to act? Just a reasonable time to debate and discuss this one question and vote upon it. Such a convention as that ought to meet, organize, debate the proposition, and adjourn in less than five days' time. Probably if there was a decisive vote it would meet, organize, and adjourn on the same day. So there is nothing in the claim that this works an endless delay. The truth is that those who stand here crying for suffrage in the name of democracy are afraid to submit this question to a general vote. They are fleeing from a general vote. Those who stand here pronouncing encomiums upon the rights of the citizens of the Republic to vote regardless of sex are trying to deny the right to vote to the great electorate of this country upon this important question. There is no escape from that. That is all there is in it. The thing we are appealing for now is that the people shall have the right to vote at least to the extent that is provided by the Underwood amendment. How can you deny it to us?

I know some people think this is a political question that ought to be settled so that we can play a little politics. Witness the ambitious rivalry of Democratic and Republican leaders. Democrats got together in the last days of the last session saying if we do not put this through the Republicans will put it through at the next session. So we will put it through regardless of the merits, in order that we may get the votes of the women.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President——

Mr. REED. And when this session is convened, behold the spectacle! Before the new committees were organized the Democratic chairman rushed forward with this bill, without a report from a committee, standing here like another Ajax, not defying but inviting the lightning, and declaring "here is the Democratic Party ready to give you suffrage," all in the hope of getting the votes of the women.

Then upon the other side there is the little filibustering tactics to delay action by the Democrats, so that committees may be organized and the Republicans can bring in the bill and they can coddle the ladies and deceive them by the ardor of their advances. Although there is business of the most pressing character, and although appeal after appeal has come for hearings, they have set aside all that, and the manly form of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], stretched to its fullest height, is visible upon the floor demanding instantaneous action, by attitude and manner at least declaring to all these ladies, "behold, I alone am the true lover of women. The Republican Party has always opened its hearts and its arms and its embraces to your cause, and we are the real champions of this measure."

Why this performance? For the cheap clap-trap political purpose of trying to get some votes, not because of the merits of the case. Let me tell these valorous and knightly gentlemen upon both side that they reckon without the intelligence of women. If the women of this country are fit to exercise the sacred privilege of citizenship and voting then they will never vote the Democratic ticket or the Republican ticket because of the performances of either of these champions of their cause. They will see and have seen through the thin veneer of your pretenses and have understood your motives from the first, and know as well what you are up to as your wife knows when you tell her you are going down town on business and she knows you are going for a game of poker. [Laughter.] Well, looking for a game of pinochle, then.

It may be that women are not by reason of mental attitude, not from lack of mentality, as well qualified for suffrage as men, but when it comes to the question of knowing what you are up to and seeing clear through you, they can see through the little shams and pretenses of a man in the dark of the moon without a star shining when you could not see through them if you had a microscope that magnified a thousand times. They know exactly what you are trying to do here to-day. They understand all about it, and in their hearts they despise you for it, and they play upon you one against the other just as women have played with foolish men since Eve and Adam met in the Garden of Eden.

How thrilling it was yesterday when the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], standing at his full height and speaking in a round rich tone, said as he waved his finger in the air in true dramatic style, "I shall insist that the Senate remain in session to-morrow until this great measure is passed." Did he see the women flocking to the polls in Indiana and demanding ballots for WATSON for anything he wanted? But I warn him that the women in Indiana if they come to vote will have "other fish to fry," and other attachments to follow, and other questions to determine. The glorious vision of yesterday will have departed from their recollection. The inspiring scene will be lost in the limbo of time, the days of forgetfulness will have covered the great event, and in the silence of the grave it will be lost with many other celebrated and wonderful events.

You Democrats who talked about initiative and referendum; who went up and down your States declaring that it was the God-given right of the American citizen to cast a vote on every question; who insisted that legislatures acted so improvidently and so thoughtlessly that it was not safe to trust them with the final enactment of a law; who declared that in every instance the people of the State should have the right to demand a reference to them of every act passed by the legislature; and who, when you secured the enactment of such a statute in the Western States, impressed upon your people that you had brought to them a new charter of liberty, a new Declaration of Independence, a new and splendid guaranty of the rights of man—we ask you for a referendum of this constitutional question, and we point out the way for that referendum under the Constitution of the United States, and you propose to sit here with your speeches in favor of referendum votes in the one hand and a denial of a referendum vote in the other. How are you going to justify it?

Let me tell you something you will have to reckon with, you gentlemen who are forcing this measure. You will have to reckon with that large class of women who do not want the vote at all, who have never asked for it, who do not want to be equal to men, because they have always held themselves to be superior to men. You have got to reckon with that large class of women who are not so vocal in their desires, who stay by the fireside and in the homes, and who are not taking orders from anybody; who are not repudiating old policies because they are told to do so. I venture the prediction that, whereas you may gain somewhat of the force of some who may advocate this cause, you may lose some on the other side.

Why not let the voters in the States have a vote on it? Texas has just voted. Why not let her have another vote? My State voted three years ago. I am willing to have a vote to-morrow; and if the people of the State of Missouri vote for woman suffrage, it is all right with me. So far as I am concerned, I do not think I would lift my voice about it. We ask for a referendum vote. I want to keep on repeating it to you referendum men who insist that the people have a right to a referendum vote on everything: What are you going to say when we ask for a mere referendum vote? Consistency is a rare jewel. I would like to see that jewel set firmly in the crown of glory and greatness that adorns the brows of some of my distinguished Democratic initiative and referendum friends.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator kindly yield to me for a moment?

Mr. REED. I will.

Mr. ASHURST. I merely wish to say that my view of the situation is that jewelry is vulgar.

Mr. REED. That depends entirely on who wears it and how it is worn. Of course, a diamond on a dirty shirt front does not look well, but I have seen diamonds so worn that they adorned the beauty, while beauty in turn graced them. So I think we might hang jewels all over the distinguished Senator and the jewels and he alike would be more resplendent.

How many States have the initiative and the referendum? Has Iowa a referendum vote? I thought progressive Iowa had all the new things. I know Montana has the referendum vote

and Wyoming has the referendum vote and Texas has the referendum vote. It is impossible that the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] should have overlooked the referendum. Missouri has a referendum vote, and every time the people have voted they have rejected what the legislature did that was submitted to them, that without the least variation or shadow of turning, and I think generally to the benefit of the State. I think California is progressive enough to have the referendum vote.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President——

Mr. REED. I will gladly yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. PHELAN. I was about to interrupt the Senator a moment ago, Mr. President, to ask him if it is not true that Congress could provide for the calling of conventions in order to secure an expression from the people of the States. The Senator seemed to assume in his argument, in answer to the Senator from Montana, that it would be necessary for the legislatures to call the conventions.

Mr. REED. I did not so intend. I said it was the way it could be done. I did not mean to say that Congress could not provide it.

Mr. PHELAN. That would defeat your purpose if it was only possible for the legislature to call the convention?

Mr. REED. Oh, no; it would not defeat it.

Mr. PHELAN. You seem to have a poor opinion of the legislatures.

Mr. REED. I have not a very exalted opinion of them. There was a time when men like Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson sat in the assemblies of their States, but really and candidly I do not know of anybody of that caliber who is running for the legislature in any State just now.

Mr. PHELAN. The Senator seems to have interrogated me on the question of the referendum. I want to assure him that I am in favor of the referendum and will probably support the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama. California is the home of the referendum. We have perfect confidence in our people and we consult them; and in this amendment before the Senate I have no question of doubt as to the response which California will make, because it is already a suffrage State. I believe in the principle of the referendum and therefore shall support the amendment.

Mr. REED. I am delighted to find the Senator of that opinion.

Mr. PHELAN. May I be permitted to finish my statement?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. PHELAN. I wish it were incorporated in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama that Congress should provide for the calling of the conventions. I would not like to leave it to the legislatures, because you first have to secure the legislature before you can secure the convention.

Mr. REED. Would you think, if we may just converse a moment about it, that there would be any question of your legislature in California calling a convention?

Mr. PHELAN. The people instructed our legislature—that is to say, by referendum—against prohibition, and the legislature the other day voted for prohibition. There seems to be no communication between the several parties. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. So much the more reason then for submitting this question and any other question of importance to the people.

Mr. PHELAN. The people are always right.

Mr. REED. The people are not always right. Of course, they make mistakes, but the people have the right to say. I think we should agree on that, and if the people make a mistake they can correct it.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator from Missouri seems to be rather severe on legislatures. Did not the legislature of Missouri once elect the Senator to the United States Senate?

Mr. REED. Is that the end of the question?

Mr. MYERS. No; I have another question. Do you think any better result would have been obtained if there had been a direct vote of the people?

Mr. REED. I will answer both questions. First, the legislature elected me to the Senate after the people had a primary that instructed them to elect me—a State-wide primary, where we had a general vote.

Mr. MYERS. A primary of your party only?

Mr. REED. Yes; a primary of my party held under the law under which every man running on the ticket that I was on would vote for me in the legislature and every Republican would vote for the Republican candidate. I got a majority of the votes of the State, and I likewise got a majority of the votes in the legislature.

The Senator asks me whether a better result could have been obtained if the people had had a direct vote. I can only answer that by saying that the people ratified and confirmed the action of the legislature by afterwards electing me by a direct vote. I do not know but both of them made a mistake. [Laughter.]

I do not claim infallibility for either of them. I do not claim the legislatures always are wrong. I would not be so understood. Many splendid and very patriotic men get into legislatures; very stupid men get into legislatures; many men who act from improper motives get into legislatures. The Senator, along with me, voted to take the right away from the legislatures to elect Members of the Senate. I believe he voted with me on it; I know if he did not he stood with me on it, for legislatures have been found wanting.

Now, I am delighted to find what the Senator from California says, and if I was understood as meaning that Congress could not provide the means, I was misunderstood. I directed myself to the question of the Senator from Montana, and I answered him in part merely and answered otherwise, and thank the Senator for his correction.

Mr. President, if we could get one or two more votes of men who believe in the initiative and referendum, we would be all right here to-day.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon me for an interruption?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. ASHURST. I want to point out to the Senator that, even should the Senate adopt the amendment, it would be of no utility. I think I can demonstrate that to him in a moment. I am not without sympathy for the amendment of the Senator from Alabama, but there is no use to waste time in trying to do that which will not be done. Suppose the Senate should to-day adopt this amendment. It would go to conference, and under the present make-up of the committees of conference the conferees would recede in five minutes from the Senate's amendment, because both the committee of the House and the committee of the Senate are opposed to this amendment or to any other amendment. The Senator from Missouri knows that as well as I know it.

Mr. REED. Well, now the Senator——

Mr. ASHURST. Let me finish.

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. ASHURST. What I say here is as well known as any fact can be to anybody, that both the committees are opposed to any amendment of any character whatever; that the conferees would recede in three minutes; the report would come back to this body; and the conference committee's report would not be rejected, but would be accepted. We would simply have lost a week's time; we would have been fooling ourselves and other people in attempting to do a vain and useless thing.

I repeat, I am not without sympathy for the amendment, but it is of no practical utility whatever to urge it now.

Mr. REED. Has the Senator from Arizona concluded?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes.

Mr. REED. Now, the Senator brings me some information which he says I know as well as he knows it—well, I did not know it. I did not know that the committee of either House of Congress would deliberately betray its instructions.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator pardon me there?

Mr. REED. Let me finish the statement, and then I will yield. Whenever the conferees go out from this body with their minds made up in advance that they will not endeavor to carry out the action of this body, they go out to betray the body——

Mr. ASHURST. Now, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. And I am not prepared to say that that is the situation.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator is uniformly courteous, although at times he uses, as I myself do—I am a very frequent sinner in that regard—a word now and then that has a little sting to it. The conferees on the part of the Senate who would be appointed would not betray the Senate. Conferences are nearly a thousand years old; they go back to the days of the ancient Witenagemote. It has been the rule for centuries that when a matter is committed to conferees, when one house passes a bill in one form and the other house passes it in another form, the house that recedes does not betray.

Mr. REED. No; but the man who goes out intending not even to try to carry out the instructions he receives—the Senator has objected to my term, so I will not again use it—goes very far from fulfilling the obligations of his position. I will put it in that way.

Mr. ASHURST. That might be true; but I will ask the Senator if he does not believe that what I have related would be exactly the thing that would take place? If we put this amendment on, does not the Senator believe that that would take place?

Mr. REED. No; I am not prepared to think that, because I think it would be discreditable on the part of the Senate conferees to do a thing of that kind. I would think it very discourteous on the part of the House conferees not to give due and proper and serious consideration to any action of the coordinate legislative branch. To my mind, when the House of Representatives acts it speaks, so far as one branch of the legislature can, for the great American people, for no matter what may have been said, no matter how efforts may have been made to belittle it, it is the branch closest to the people, and it is the only way the great American people have to express their voice, except as they may now and always have had that right in this body.

Therefore, when the House of Representatives meets and, after due deliberation, passes upon a measure and sends it here, I think it is worthy of the most serious consideration, and in any conference I have ever sat upon—though they have not been numerous—I have felt that the representatives of the House of Representatives had the right to be heard, their opinions to be weighed, and I never found them unwilling to hear and to weigh the opinions of the Members of the Senate. Upon the other hand, when this body speaks in the name of the American people, so far as one branch of the legislature can so speak, and when, after debate of days, it adds an amendment of this kind to a measure, I believe, first, that our conferees, as loyal Members of the Senate, will endeavor to have it accepted. I do not see why a question so well grounded in justice as this would not receive the cordial consideration and mayhap the support of the other House. So I hope my friend will at least give us his vote; for, if he does give us his vote, and this matter is treated so summarily that it is disposed of in three minutes, there will be very little time lost, and he will at least have the satisfaction of saying to some of us that he gave the people of our States an opportunity to vote and the people of his own State an opportunity to vote.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, in response to the interrogatory propounded by the Senator as to whether or not I would vote for the amendment, let me say that there is not a man in the Senate Chamber who feels more than do I the necessity for an amendment to the Federal Constitution to sweep away the present archaic, reactionary manner of ratifying and passing on referred amendments. Indeed, Mr. President, as I said the other day, under the present situation 431 men compose Congress; if they were of a mind to do so—they would not do so, I apprehend—but if they were of a mind to do so, they could pass a joint resolution providing for kingly government or for a government directed by the apostles of socialism. Then, 3,500 men composing the legislatures of the States could ratify the amendment. So, I repeat, as I said the other day, that under the present archaic reactionary method of submitting amendments to be passed upon by the legislatures, and not by the people of the States, 4,000 men constitutionally and legally could sweep away every vestige of liberty which the American people possess; and likewise these 4,000 could transform this Government into a Bolshevik government, into a soviet, into a kingly government. But the American people are not going to do that, for their particular virtue is the virtue of knowing how to govern themselves and other people.

I am in the near future going to urge with what poor capacity I have the proposed constitutional amendment which has been introduced by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] to provide that hereafter when constitutional amendments are submitted to the States they shall be ratified by the votes of the people of each State. The reason, however, why I shall not vote for this particular amendment at this particular time to be submitted to a convention is the following: No constitutional amendment, except the prohibition amendment, has been more widely discussed, more thoroughly understood, than has this amendment. All the American people who can read, all the American people who receive mail and receive dispatches of any kind, know that Congress is submitting this amendment. They know that the legislatures will be in session, and the people will not be taken unawares. They can petition their legislatures.

Then, again, Mr. President, I hardly think it would be fair to what I would call the cause of woman suffrage to make an exception in this instance, after having amended the Constitution eighteen times since 1789, and upon each occasion the amendment having been submitted to the State legislatures. The first 12 amendments were all submitted at one time, and two, I think, the first and second amendments which were submitted, are still pending. The eleventh amendment was submitted to the legislatures; the twelfth was submitted to the legislatures; the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth were submitted to the legislatures, and the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth were submitted to the legislatures.

I hope the Senator will pardon me when I say—and I want to say here that what he says on any question, whether I agree with him or not, carries with me great weight—I somewhat question the source from which the amendment comes. No man has a higher regard for the ability and the stalwart statesmanship of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] than have I, but I rather suspect—no; I can not use that word—I dread, rather, that this may defeat, delay, and hinder the celerity with which I would like to see this amendment adopted.

I think the Senator from Alabama is correct in his philosophy as to how amendments should be ratified, yet I do not wish to see this particular one singled out and have it ratified in this way. I trust, however, that we shall pass a joint resolution submitting an amendment to the Constitution providing that hereafter no amendment shall be ratified by a State except by the vote of the people.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, if the Sentor from Missouri [Mr. REED] will allow me, I should like to suggest to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] that the fathers some 128 years ago in writing this Constitution provided a method by which the voice of the people might be heard. I listened with deliberation and care to the proponents of this measure for many months favoring the opportunity of the American electorate to pass on this grave question. Of course, we all know that the constitutional provision directly gives the opportunity if Congress avails itself of it. I did not rush into offering this amendment, because I agree with the Senator that it would come stronger from the proponents of the measure, but when no one on that side, after advocating the submission of this question to the people, proposed the method, and the only constitutional method by which the voice of the people might really be heard, I felt that it was not rushing in; that with due modesty I might myself propose it.

Mr. ASHURST. I am speaking in the time of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], but I want to say again that for the statesmanship of the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Alabama I have the highest regard. Indeed, so far from finding fault with their spirit of independence, I am inclined to overpraise it at times.

Now, another thing—and I hope I am not offensive when I say it—I am very certain that, even if we should attach this method, which provides for ratification by conventions instead of by the legislatures of the proposed constitutional amendment, neither the distinguished Senator from Missouri nor the able Senator from Alabama would vote for the joint resolution.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; but the Senator overlooks the fact that the position the Senator from Missouri and I occupy is not the proposition of favoring the establishment of the right of suffrage by the Federal Government and taking it away from the States, but the challenge has been repeatedly hurled on the floor of the Senate by the proponents of this measure that the people of the several States had a right to grant this privilege to the women of the country, and we have merely accepted the challenge which has been thrown at our feet. We challenge you to go to the hustings; we challenge you to submit this question to the people and not to the legislatures of the States.

If the Senator from Missouri will pardon me for occupying his time a moment longer, let us analyze the situation. The Senator from Arizona thinks that because some 17 or 18 amendments have been adopted by the legislatures of the States that forecloses the other method provided in the Constitution. Let us see as to that. Ten of the amendments constituted the Bill of Rights, which it was understood would be adopted in the beginning when the original instrument was agreed to. Three of the amendments grew out of the Civil War, settling a great contest between the people of the sections of this country. Necessarily there was no issue made as to the right of the people to vote on the adoption of those amendments. In the case of the first 10 amendments all of the States were for them, the people were for them; and in the case of the 3 amendments growing out of the Civil War the South was on its back and the North was determined to ratify them and put them in the Constitution.

As to some of the later amendments—for instance, the one changing the decision of the Supreme Court in reference to an income tax—almost every man on this floor, every man in the State legislatures, and the people themselves recognized that the power of the Federal Government in the beginning carried the right to levy an income tax, and that only by a divided court had that power been taken away from them.

As to the amendment providing for the election of Senators by the people there was no real opposition. Why delay the situation in that case when everybody was for it? But when you come to an amendment of this kind, the second direct attempt to invade the sovereign rights of the States and give their power to the Federal Government, it is not such a question as was

involved in the original amendments; it is a question that involves the very fundamental principles of our Government, a question that the people of the United States and the people of the sovereign States alone have the right to pass upon; and I insist that, if the gentlemen who are proponents of this measure claim that this proposal should be submitted to the people in order to give them an opportunity to be heard and to pass upon it, then they can not deny the propriety and justice of adopting the only way by which the people of the sovereign States can reflect their direct will in the acceptance or rejection of this proposal.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona makes the argument that because we have in the past adopted constitutional amendments by votes of the legislatures, therefore we ought not to change the method of ratification in this instance; yet he stands here telling us that the method of ratification by legislatures is so bad that he proposes to support an amendment to the Constitution which permanently takes away from them the right of ratification of amendments to the Constitution and confer that power upon the people. When the Senator comes forward with his amendment he will be met with the antiquity argument just as completely then as he can now summon it to his aid, for the argument will then be made, "You are trying to change something that has existed all these years." If it be true that the State legislatures and Congress together might pervert the very form of our Government, if that danger is great enough so that the Senator is willing to support a constitutional amendment to change it; and if that method is, as he described it, archaic and unfair, then why not embrace the chance which is now afforded in the submission of the proposed pending constitutional amendment? Let us submit this proposed amendment in a fair way. Why submit it in an unfair and archaic way? Why not submit it in a fair and modern way? The argument goes too far, but it is adroitly made.

I know the Senator from Arizona is distressed. He does not like to deny the people of his State a right to vote on any question that concerns them. He is that kind of a Democrat. Give them a chance to vote on this matter. Give the people of my State a chance to vote on it. I am begging for that; I am asking it in the name of over three and one-half million people. If you are going to amend the Constitution and force that amendment upon the people of my State, at least give those people a chance to express their opinion. They are a great people—not greater than the people of other States, but as great. They represent the best there is in education, intelligence, patriotism, independence, and love of country. Let them have a chance to have a vote to select delegates to do the thing that you say ought to be reserved to the people always. Let us have that chance now, not to-morrow. If it is good and righteous and fair to change the Constitution so that the people of the States will always have the right—if that is a good thing to do to-morrow or next week, why not do that good thing to-day? Why not deal with the question that is before us?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri is one of the ablest lawyers I have ever seen, and he is aware that there is running all through our law the well-known principle that the rule of procedure shall not be changed nor the statute of limitations shortened while the cause is pending.

Mr. REED. Ah; but the cause is not pending until the vote is taken here.

Mr. ASHURST. It has been pending, I think, if not technically at least practically for four years. One of the reasons why I would not at this time vote for the amendment of the Senator from Alabama is that I think it would be a change of the remedy while the case is pending. It would be unusual; it would be analogous to shortening the period of the limitation right in the middle of a trial.

Mr. REED. Oh, no; when the trial is on and rights have been fixed under the law then existing, of course, you can not change it; but this is a question that has not yet arrived at a point that it can be said to be "a cause." When the Congress shall submit it to the people, then it may be said to be in that shape; and if after it had been submitted we were to undertake to change the method of submission, there might be something in the Senator's argument; but it is more specious than it is persuasive.

But, Mr. President, because the question has been discussed surely does not justify the Senator's position, for there is not a question that will be brought forward involving an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in the next 50 years that will not have been discussed in some form or other at some time by somebody. No; the Senator is without a reason; he has to go back on a referendum or else support the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama. I hope he will support it; I am begging him to support it; I am asking it in the name of the people of a great State who will not be given any chance to express their opinion unless the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama is adopted. If they are for it, they ought to be allowed to register their will; and if they are against it, no one ought to deny them the right to protest effectively.

There is another reason that I want to offer. I have often wanted to go to the Senator's State—I have heard so much about it—and I have been so pleased with the people of that State whom I have met; but I do not know anything about the Senator's State except as I hear about it and read about it. The Senator knows more about Arizona in a moment than I could learn by reading and studying for 5 years or 10 years, for he has lived there, and he is a part of the people of that State, and has the spirit of Arizona—the spirit that is born on the broad plains, the spirit that sweeps across Arizona's glorious face upon the wings of the morning. He knows Arizona, but he does not know my State, and I do not know his. I would not deny him the right to have the people of his State vote on a question involving their fundamental rights.

You ask me my position on this question. If we had the votes to pass an amendment to the Constitution providing that women could not vote in the State of Arizona, taking that question out of the hands of the people of the State of Arizona, or Montana, or Colorado, or Wyoming, I would not vote for such a proposition, no matter who told me to, because I would say, "It is for the people of those States to regulate their own affairs." But if such a proposition were brought forward—and it may be brought forward some day, for the tides run in and the tides run out, and opinions change with time—if it ever is offered and I am sitting here I pledge the Senator now that I will vote against it; and if an amendment is offered which reserves to the people of the Senator's State the right to vote and the Senator wants my vote in favor of that he will get it, because it would only be the fair thing to do.

There is not anything about this question that need lead us into doing things that are unfair and unjust. I repeat, so that my position never will be misunderstood, that if an amendment were offered here to-morrow that would deny the people of any of these States where suffrage exists the right to permit their women to vote I would fight it as hard as I am fighting this, because it is the State's business; and I have no right, as a citizen of Missouri, to interfere with the rights of the people of Wyoming or Arizona. Surely if the Representatives of those States asked that their people might vote I would give them that poor privilege, at least.

Mr. President, I beg pardon for speaking so long.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of Montana in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. REED. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	McLean	Smith, Md.
Ball	Hale	McNary	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Harding	Moses	Smoot
Beckham	Harris	Myers	Spencer
Borah	Harrison	Nelson	Stanley
Brandegee	Henderson	New	Sterling
Calder	Hitchcock	Newberry	Sutherland
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Norris	Swanson
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Thomas
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Trammell
Cummins	Kellogg	Page	Underwood
Curtis	Kendrick	Phelan	Wadsworth
Dial	Kenyon	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	Keyes	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Edge	Kirby	Poindexter	Warren
Elkins	Knox	Ransdell	Watson
Fall	La Follette	Reed	Williams
Fernald	Lenroot	Sheppard	Wolcott
France	Lodge	Sherman	
Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Simmons	
Gay	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore resumed the chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, the objection which has been made to the amendment by the proponents of woman suffrage is that it may delay the final adoption of the suffrage amendment. I plan to hasten consideration. The reason why a delay might be caused is that the House has passed the amendment in one form, and it would facilitate matters to have concurrence by the Senate; but, of course, the Senate is an independent body, and that is no reason which should be advanced to us.

Those of us who are in favor of national suffrage, and also in favor of the determination of all questions affecting the amendment of the Constitution by a vote of the people, desire to see that an opportunity shall be given to the people to vote; and to that end I have prepared an amendment to the amendment, with a view of facilitating the early determination by the people of their will upon this subject, so that there will be no needless delay.

I will read the amendment in order to comment upon it.

The amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama reads as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following article be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the several States.

The Constitution, as the Senate is aware, provides for ratification by three-fourths of the several States "by the legislatures or by conventions, as one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress." Therefore the Congress can propose, as the exclusive method of ratification, ratification by conventions; and I take it that the Congress can also propose the method by which these conventions may be called.

I would oppose leaving it to the legislatures for the very reason that the legislatures might, if unduly influenced, delay the ratification by delaying the calling of the conventions. So an amendment to the Underwood amendment might read as follows, which I will presently propose:

The conventions shall consist of 100 members, being qualified electors of the several States, and shall be voted for at large—

That brings the question fairly before all of the people of the States, not by congressional districts, but at large. It is the one issue before them.

Shall be elected at large by electors having qualifications to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature. Such conventions shall be called to meet by the governors of the several States on the first Tuesday after the first Monday of September, 1919.

That is an arbitrary date, but it serves the purpose of speedily determining what is the will of the electors, and allows ample opportunity for the campaign of education.

I therefore submit that as an amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama. As the legislatures will not all meet for several years, this plan will, I believe, bring about an earlier ratification.

While I am on my feet, I happen to have here a very eloquent testimonial of the wisdom of submitting all matters to a vote of the people. I do not know that it is entirely relevant; but it is doubtless interesting, and especially to Senators on the other side of the Chamber.

In California, the referendum has been frequently used. California was among the very first States that resorted to the referendum, and, in most instances, it has expressed very fairly the will of the people. Sometimes, where the educational campaign has not been sufficiently extensive or intense, there may be a doubt as to the fair expression of the people. Anyhow, it is the expression of the men who participate in these elections, and the women, because both the men and the women vote in California. Therefore it is fair to say that the expression of opinion by the voters, with or without an educational campaign, is exactly what the voters want; and, as the Senator from Missouri said, if the people make a mistake, it is very easy to remedy it by an appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober.

What I have in mind is that on May 17 of this year a Member of this body holding a high and distinguished position undertook to instruct the people of my State in the political subdivision—and a very important one—of Los Angeles city as to how to vote. Of course, we resented it as an intrusion, because the occasion to which I refer was a municipal election; and all our chartered cities sacredly hold to the right to determine their local affairs by and for themselves. I will read the instruction which was sent out to the city of Los Angeles. I quote from the Los Angeles Times of May 18, 1919, a stand-pat Republican paper of general circulation. It is headed:

SENATORS FOR WOODMAN—REPUBLICAN NATIONAL ORGANIZATION IN THE FIGHT TO SAVE LOS ANGELES.

Dr. A. J. Scott, of Mayor Woodman's campaign committee, yesterday received the following telegram from United States Senator REED SMOOT:

WASHINGTON, *May 17.*

Dr. A. J. SCOTT,
Los Angeles:

Senator LODGE joins me in the hope that every Republican will support the Republican candidate for mayor in the coming city election. Don't let this administration point to Los Angeles as a Democratic city a year hence, when the national campaign is on. The Nation is Republican. We hope Los Angeles will be.

REED SMOOT.

I received just now, from the secretary of the Democratic county committee, this telegram:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 4, 1919.*

Hon. JAMES D. PHELAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

M. P. Snyder elected mayor of Los Angeles. All papers concede his election by 15,000 majority. Snyder now leading by 10,000. City clerk estimates total vote cast 75,000.

F. RAY GROVES,
Secretary Democratic County Committee.

I merely introduce that now to show that California is strong for the referendum, and that her judgment is generally right.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President——

Mr. ASHURST. Who was elected?

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. M. P. Snyder, mentioned in the telegram, is a Democrat, and has served that city before, conspicuously and well, as its mayor. Mr. Woodman is a Republican. Los Angeles is normally Republican.

I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I merely wanted to ask what the response of the city was; and in view of that I wanted to ask the politics of the successful candidate.

Mr. PHELAN. I have already anticipated that question.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator before he takes his seat will offer a resolution extending our thanks to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] for his services in behalf of the Democratic Party in Los Angeles.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama the following:

The conventions shall consist of 100 members, being qualified electors of the several States, and shall be elected at large by electors having qualifications to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature. Such conventions shall be called to meet by the governors of the several States on the first Tuesday after the first Monday of September, 1919.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from California to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment submitted by myself.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SWANSON (when Mr. MARTIN'S name was called). My colleague [Mr. MARTIN] is detained from the Senate on account of sickness. He is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] to the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "yea."

Mr. HARRIS. I wish to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], is absent from the Senate on account of illness.

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 28, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—28.

Bankhead	Gay	McLean	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Harris	Moses	Stanley
Borah	Harrison	Overman	Swanson
Brandegee	Hitchcock	Phelan	Underwood
Dial	King	Reed	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Knox	Simmons	Williams
Fletcher	Lodge	Smith, Md.	Wolcott

NAYS—55.

Ashurst	Gronna	McCormick	Sheppard
Ball	Hale	McKellar	Sherman
Calder	Harding	McNary	Smith, Ariz.
Capper	Henderson	Myers	Smoot
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	Nelson	Spencer
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Sterling
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Newberry	Sutherland
Curtis	Kellogg	Norris	Thomas
Edge	Kendrick	Nugent	Trammell
Elkins	Kenyon	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Fall	Keyes	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Fernald	Kirby	Pittman	Warren
France	La Follette	Poindexter	Watson
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Ransdell	

NOT VOTING—13.

Brandegee	McCumber	Pomerene	Townsend
Colt	Martin	Robinson	
Gerry	Owen	Shields	
Gore	Penrose	Smith, Ga.	

So Mr. UNDERWOOD's amendment was rejected.

Mr. GAY. Mr. President, in February last, when the vote was taken on the woman suffrage question, I explained my position briefly at that time. My position to-day, Mr. President, is the same as it was then. There is no doubt in my mind that women should be given the right to vote. There is doubt, however, that they will ever receive the privilege they are now asking by the methods which some of their supposed friends have adopted. It is a well-known fact that they have finally secured the necessary two-thirds vote of the Senate of the United States to pass the Susan B. Anthony amendment and to submit that amendment to the legislatures of the various States of the Union. The advocates of the Susan B. Anthony amendment have won a great victory and are justly entitled to all the praise and honor which comes with the winning of a battle which has been fought for so long a time. It is not my intention to attempt to delay this legislation, but I do desire to present here and now an amendment which I believe would be ratified by the necessary 36 States at the next meeting of their legislatures. I present this as a substitute for the amendment which is now before you. The amendment which I am about to present was drafted by the former first assistant attorney general of Louisiana and by the Democratic national committeemen from that State when this matter was under discussion during the last session of Congress. It meets the objection that many have to the Susan B. Anthony amendment and is more liberal perhaps than the amendment which I have already presented for your consideration.

Section 2 reads that the several States shall have the authority to enforce this article by necessary legislation, but if any State shall enforce or enact any law in conflict therewith, then Congress shall not be excluded from enacting appropriate legislation to enforce it.

This, Mr. President, gives to the various States the right to enact and enforce laws giving women the right to vote. It does not leave all questions to Congress, but puts the matter where those who believe in State rights consider the power should be vested.

Mr. President, it only requires 13 States to prevent the adoption of the Susan B. Anthony amendment, and I predict that there are 13 States that will never ratify the amendment which the Congress of the United States is about to present to the American people. The last vote in the State of Texas shows full well how the wind is blowing.

With the passage of the amendment which I am now presenting to you as a substitute for the other amendments which have been offered, the objection would be removed and the required number of States would soon pass it and thus give the right of suffrage to those noble, patriotic, and splendid women of our country who have so long fought for this right and who so richly deserve the privilege.

I offer the amendment which I ask the Secretary to read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The SECRETARY. The amendment is in the nature of a substitute:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely:

ARTICLE —.

SECTION 1. That the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

SEC. 2. That the several States shall have the authority to enforce this article by necessary legislation, but if any State shall enforce or enact any laws in conflict therewith, then Congress shall not be excluded from enacting appropriate legislation to enforce it.

Mr. GAY. I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. REED. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I make the same announcement of the transfer of my pair as on the previous vote, and I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement made upon the last vote concerning my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HARRIS. I wish to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], is detained from the Senate by illness.

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 62, as follows:

YEAS—19.

Bankhead	Harris	Ransdell	Thomas
Beckham	Harrison	Reed	Trammell
Dial	King	Simmons	Underwood
Fletcher	Myers	Stanley	Wolcott
Gay	Overman	Swanson	

NAYS—62.

Ashurst	Gronna	McCormick	Sheppard
Ball	Hale	McCumber	Sherman
Brandegee	Harding	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Henderson	McLean	Smith, S. C.
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	McNary	Smoot
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Moses	Spencer
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Sterling
Cummins	Kellogg	New	Sutherland
Curtis	Kendrick	Newberry	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Kenyon	Norris	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	Keyes	Nugent	Walsh, Mont.
Elkins	Kirby	Page	Warren
Fall	Knox	Phelan	Watson
Fernald	La Follette	Phipps	Williams
France	Lenroot	Pittman	
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Poindexter	

NOT VOTING—15.

Borah	Hitchcock	Penrose	Smith, Ga.
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pomerene	Smith, Md.
Gerry	Martin	Robinson	Townsend
Gore	Owen	Shields	

So Mr. GAY's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendment as in Committee of the Whole, the joint resolution will be reported to the Senate.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution is in the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment, the question is, Shall the joint resolution be read a third time?

The joint resolution was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is, Shall the joint resolution pass? The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BALL (when his name was called). By a special agreement, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] and I are paired with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS]. The senior Senator from Tennessee is absent on account of illness in his family. If he were present, I would vote "yea."

Mr. CALDER (when his name was called). On this question the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] is paired with me in the affirmative against the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] in the negative. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. KING (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL]. If I were permitted to vote, I should vote in the affirmative, but owing to the pair I withhold my vote.

Mr. McLEAN (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE]. I therefore withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SWANSON (when Mr. MARTIN's name was called). My colleague [Mr. MARTIN], as previously stated, is detained from the Senate on account of illness. He is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay" and the two Senators with whom he is paired would vote "yea."

Mr. KNOX (when Mr. PENROSE's name was called). As already announced by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], my colleague [Mr. PENROSE] is paired with the junior Senator from New York and also with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND]. My colleague has requested me to state that if he were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. McKELLAR (when Mr. SHIELDS's name was called). The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] is unavoidably detained on business and is paired with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] and the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL].

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Georgia was called). The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] wired me and asked that a pair be arranged for him on this question, which has been done. He also asked me to announce that if he were present he would vote against the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. HARRIS. My colleague [Mr. SMITH of Georgia] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. My colleague is detained by illness.

Mr. NEWBERRY (when Mr. TOWNSEND's name was called). My colleague [Mr. TOWNSEND] is detained at home by illness in

his family. He is paired as previously announced. He desired me to state that if present he would vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. Understanding, however, that if he were present he would vote just as I am about to do, I am at liberty to disregard the pair for the nonce. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. KIRBY. I announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], who would have voted for the joint resolution if present. He is paired and his pair has been announced.

Mr. McLEAN. I find that I can transfer the pair which I heretofore announced to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], which I do and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], for whom a pair has been arranged, is unavoidably detained outside the Capitol and unable to be here. I wish to announce that if present he would vote against the passage of the joint resolution.

The roll call resulted—yeas 56, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—56.

Ashurst	Harding	McCumber	Ransdell
Capper	Harris	McKellar	Sheppard
Chamberlain	Henderson	McNary	Sherman
Culberson	Johnson, Calif.	Myers	Smith, Ariz.
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Smoot
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	New	Spencer
Edge	Kellogg	Newberry	Stanley
Elkins	Kendrick	Norris	Sterling
Fall	Kenyon	Nugent	Sutherland
Fernald	Keyes	Page	Thomas
France	Kirby	Phelan	Walsh, Mass.
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Gronna	Lenroot	Pittman	Warren
Hale	McCormick	Poindexter	Watson

NAYS—25.

Bankhead	Gay	Overman	Underwood
Beckham	Harrison	Reed	Wadsworth
Borah	Hitchcock	Simmons	Williams
Brandegee	Knox	Smith, Md.	Wolcott
Dial	Lodge	Smith, S. C.	
Dillingham	McLean	Swanson	
Fletcher	Moses	Trammell	

NOT VOTING—15.

Ball	Gore	Owen	Shields
Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Smith, Ga.
Colt	King	Pomerene	Townsend
Gerry	Martin	Robinson	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas are 56 and the nays are 25. A quorum being present and the joint resolution having received the affirmative vote of more than two-thirds of the Senators present and voting is declared to have passed the Senate in accordance with the Constitution of the United States. [Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

TREATY OF PEACE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, being Senate resolution 12, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Senate resolution No. 12, submitted by Mr. JOHNSON of California May 20, as follows:

Whereas the peace treaty has been completed and has been delivered to the representatives of Germany; and

Whereas a synopsis only of the treaty has been given publicity in the United States, and our people are entitled to know its full contents, and to what, if any, engagements they may have been committed; and

Whereas it is reported in the press that the entire treaty has been cabled to the State Department and is now in the possession of the State Department: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested forthwith to transmit to the Senate the full text of the treaty of peace completed at the Paris conference and delivered to the representatives of Germany.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from California whether he will be willing to have his resolution temporarily laid aside in order that a little routine business may be transacted?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. My intention was not to press the resolution this evening, but to ask to have it go over until to-morrow.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I thought that was the Senator's intention.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes; it was.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the resolution can temporarily be laid aside we can transact some minor business.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, the suggestion is made by the Senator from Nebraska that the resolution be temporarily laid aside in order that some business which he has in hand may be transacted. As I understand the rule, in order that the resolution shall not be displaced it is necessary to secure unanimous consent to have that done. I am very agreeable to the request. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be laid aside temporarily to be taken up to-morrow as the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside to be taken up to-morrow at 2 o'clock. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I would not want to exclude taking it up before 2 o'clock if other business before then is disposed of.

Mr. SWANSON. That would have to be done by motion. It comes up as the unfinished business at 2 o'clock. If it is taken up before 2 o'clock, it must be taken up on motion.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; but if we agree to the unanimous consent that it can not come up until 2 o'clock, it could not be taken up prior to that time, even by motion.

Mr. SWANSON. It would come up at 2 o'clock at any rate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests that anything in the nature of morning business can be done by unanimous consent without laying aside the unfinished business.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Then it is not necessary to ask unanimous consent.

Mr. LODGE. I suggest that the Senator ask unanimous consent.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think if the Senator simply makes the request to lay the unfinished business aside temporarily, to hold its place, it will retain its place and then come up automatically.

Mr. LODGE. Then it can be taken up at any time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Then it may be taken up after the conclusion of morning business to-morrow or at 2 o'clock, if the morning business continues that long. Then it comes up automatically. Is that understood?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Undoubtedly.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask the Senator to withhold that motion for a moment.

Mr. LODGE. Very well; I withhold the motion.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask to have read the resolution which I send to the desk, and that it lie over under the rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 64), as follows:

Whereas the Senator from Idaho, Mr. BORAH, has stated in the Senate that certain interests in the city of New York have secured copies of the peace treaty with Germany, while the American people have been unable to secure one; and

Whereas the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. LODGE, has stated in the Senate that he knows of four such copies of said treaty of peace with Germany now in New York, and that the only place where it is not allowed to come is the United States Senate; and

Whereas the Senator from Idaho, Mr. BORAH, has stated that the interests now having possession of said copies of said treaty are peculiarly interested in the treaty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be, and it hereby is, authorized and directed to investigate the matter with the view to ascertaining the facts, and particularly to ascertain and report to the Senate the names of the persons, corporations, or interests which have secured copies of said treaty, and from whom they were secured, and by what methods; and also to ascertain and report to the Senate in what manner and to what extent said interests are "particularly" interested in said treaty. For these purposes the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and it is, authorized to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with the same, the expenses thereof, including the cost of travel, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to remind the Senator that the request of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has not been disposed of.

Mr. KING. I understood that it had been disposed of.

Mr. LODGE. I thought the request of the Senator from California had been agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not so understand.

Mr. LODGE. I understood there was no objection.

SEVERAL SENATORS. There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I ask that my request may be disposed of, that the resolution which is the unfinished business, may be temporarily laid aside, to be taken up to-morrow at the conclusion of the morning business, or automatically, at any rate, at 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate hears the request of the Senator from California. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, what disposition was made of the resolution offered by the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LODGE. As I understand, the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska goes, under the rule, to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate under the rule.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does the Senator from Massachusetts think it should first go to the Committee on Foreign Relations or to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate?

Mr. LODGE. I presume it goes to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. We have discussed that many times.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask that the resolution lie over until to-morrow, if that is agreeable.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will lie over under the rule and be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts presented petitions of sundry citizens of Worcester, Mass., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Branford, Conn., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Local Branch Connecticut State Grange Patrons of Husbandry, of Suffield, Conn., and a petition of sundry citizens of Guilford, Conn., praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry employees of the Oakville Co., of Waterbury, Conn., remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented memorials of the congregations of the Congregational Church of Wauregan, the Baptist Church of Plantsville, the Methodist Episcopal Church of South Manchester, the Methodist Episcopal Church of Stratford, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South Farms, Middletown, and the Mary Taylor Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church of Milford; of the North Methodist Episcopal Church Society of Manchester, of the Christian Endeavor Society of the First Congregational Church of Norwich, and of sundry citizens of Ridgefield, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HARDING presented petitions of Local Lodge No. 158, S. N. P. J., of Nottingham; of Local Lodge No. 153, S. N. P. J., of Youngstown; of Local Lodge No. 5, S. N. P. J., of Cleveland; of Local Lodge No. 20, S. S. P. Z., of Cleveland; of Local Lodge No. 79, H. Z. J., of Cleveland; of the Jugo-Slav Republican Alliance, No. 8, of Cleveland; of the Jugo-Slav Republican Alliance, No. 9, of Cleveland; of the Jugo-Slav Republican Alliance, No. 21, of Cleveland; of the St. Nikola Society, No. 22, N. C. S., of Cleveland; of Local Lodge No. 275, S. N. P. J., of Maynard; of Local Lodge No. 358, S. N. P. J., of Power Point; of the Slovenian Benefit Society, of Barberton; of Local Lodge No. 279, S. N. P. J., of Ramsey; of Local Lodge No. 17, S. N. P. J., of Lorain; of Local Lodge No. 62, S. S. P. Z., of Lorain; of Local Lodge No. 104, S. N. P. J., of Lorain; of the South Slavic Catholic Union of East Palestine; of the St. Barbara Society of East Palestine; of the Slovenian Progressive Benefit Society of East Palestine; of the Slovenian National Benefit Society, No. 55, of East Palestine; of Local Lodge No. 355, S. N. P. J., of Fairport Harbor; and of sundry citizens of Bridgeport, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the independence of the Jugo-Slavs and for justice and fair dealing in connection with peace deliberations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. KELLOGG, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 120) to repeal chapter 154 of the act of the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, being the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 4) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 641) to amend section 10 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 5) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 1373) to amend the Articles of War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 1374) for the relief of Stephen A. Winchell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 1375) for the relief of Catherine Grace; to the Committee on Claims.

REGISTERS AND RECEIVERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Mr. HENDERSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1339) to amend sections 2237 and 2240 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 63), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the cost of reporting hearings held on Costa Rican matters by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the last session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, upon voucher to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, said payment to be at the rate of $1 per printed page, and not to exceed the sum of $33.

COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 65), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Manufactures, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. KELLOGG submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 66), which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the Committee on Printing be, and it is hereby, authorized and directed to order and have printed 5,000 copies of the revised covenant for a league of nations, as it is now embodied, together with the original draft, in Senate Document No. 7, presented by Mr. PITTMAN under date of May 20, 1919.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

DEVELOPMENT OF COMMERCE WITH PANAMA.

The following treaty was ratified by the Senate and the injunction of secrecy was removed therefrom June 4, 1919:

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND PANAMA, SIGNED FEBRUARY 8, 1919, FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMERCE BETWEEN THE TWO COUNTRIES AND TO INCREASE THE EXCHANGE OF COMMODITIES BY FACILITATING THE WORK OF TRAVELING SALESMEN.

The Senate:

I transmit herewith, to receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, a convention between the United States and Panama, signed February 8, 1919, for the development of commerce between them and to increase the exchange of commodities by facilitating the work of traveling salesmen.

Respectfully submitted.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 1, 1919.

—

The PRESIDENT:

The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate, if his judgment approve thereof, to receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, a convention signed February 8, 1919, between the United States and Panama,

for the development of commerce between them and to increase the exchange of commodities by facilitating the work of traveling salesmen.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANK L. POLK.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 27, 1919.

The United States of America and the Republic of Panama being desirous to foster the development of commerce between them and to increase the exchange of commodities by facilitating the work of traveling salesmen have agreed to conclude a convention for that purpose and have to that end appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America, Frank L. Polk, Acting Secretary of State of the United States of America, and

The President of the Republic of Panama, Señor José Edgardo Lefèvre, chargé d'affaires of the Republic of Panama near the Government of the United States of America,

Who, having communicated to each other their full powers, which were found to be in due form, have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE I.

Manufacturers, merchants, and traders domiciled within the jurisdiction of one of the high contracting parties may operate as commercial travelers either personally or by means of agents or employees within the jurisdiction of the other high contracting party on obtaining from the latter, upon payment of a single fee, a license which shall be valid throughout its entire territorial jurisdiction.

In case either of the high contracting parties shall be engaged in war, it reserves to itself the right to prevent from operating within its jurisdiction under the provisions of this treaty, or otherwise, enemy nationals or other aliens whose presence it may consider prejudicial to public order and national safety.

ARTICLE II.

In order to secure the license above mentioned the applicant must obtain from the country of domicile of the manufacturers, merchants, and traders represented a certificate attesting his character as a commercial traveler. This certificate, which shall be issued by the authority to be designated in each country for the purpose, shall be viséed by the consul of the country in which the applicant proposes to operate, and the authorities of the latter shall, upon the presentation of such certificate, issue to the applicant the national license as provided in Article I.

ARTICLE III.

A commercial traveler may sell his samples without obtaining a special license as an importer.

ARTICLE IV.

Samples without commercial value shall be admitted to entry free of duty.

Samples marked, stamped, or defaced in such manner that they can not be put to other uses shall be considered as objects without commercial value.

ARTICLE V.

Samples having commercial value shall be provisionally admitted upon giving bond for the payment of lawful duties if they shall not have been withdrawn from the country within a period of six months.

Duties shall be paid on such portion of the samples as shall not have been so withdrawn.

ARTICLE VI.

All customs formalities shall be simplified as much as possible with a view to avoid delay in the dispatch of samples.

ARTICLE VII.

Peddlers and other salesmen who vend directly to the consumer, even though they have not an established place of business in the country in which they operate, shall not be considered as commercial travelers, but shall be subject to the license fees levied on business of the kind which they carry on.

ARTICLE VIII.

No license shall be required of:

(a) Persons traveling only to study trade and its needs, even though they initiate commercial relations, provided they do not make sales of merchandise.

(b) Persons operating through local agents which pay the license fee or other imposts to which their business is subject.

(c) Travelers who are exclusively buyers.

ARTICLE IX.

Any concessions affecting any of the provisions of the present treaty that may hereafter be granted by either high contracting party, either by law or by treaty or convention, shall immediately be extended to the other party.

ARTICLE X.

This convention shall be ratified; and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington or Panama within two years, or sooner if possible.

The present convention shall remain in force until the end of six months after either of the high contracting parties shall have given notice to the other of its intention to terminate the same, each of them reserving to itself the right of giving such notice to the other at any time. And it is hereby agreed between the parties that, on the expiration of six months after such notice shall have been received by either of them from the other party as above mentioned, this convention shall altogether cease and terminate.

In testimony whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed these articles and have thereunder affixed their seals.

Done in duplicate, at Washington, this 8th day of February, 1919.

[SEAL.] FRANK L. POLK.
[SEAL.] J. E. LEFÈVRE.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, June 5, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 4 (legislative day of June 3), 1919.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

D. E. Simmons to be United States attorney, southern district of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *June 4, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite Spirit, never far from any of us, we call upon Thee out of the deeps of the soul for courage, strength, faith, and grace to sustain us through the obligations of this day, that we may be the better prepared for whatever Thou dost lay upon us to-morrow.

Now is the day of salvation. If we live up to the high-water mark of Christian manhood to-day, now, in this world, we need have no fears for the morrow nor for the world that is to come.

To live, to act, to progress is the psalm of life in this world and the world to come.

Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. Protect, guide, and strengthen us for the present moment, and all praise and gratitude shall be Thine. In the Great Exemplar's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

Mr. SEARS rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Florida rise?

Mr. SEARS. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will wait a moment. Any Members who desire to take the oath of office will present themselves.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

Mr. GLYNN, Mr. HUDDLESTON, and Mr. LEE of Georgia appeared before the Speaker's desk and took the oath of office.

PROPOSED SOLDIERS' HOME AT ST. CLOUD, FLA.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I introduced a bill (H. R. 3468) to establish an old soldiers' home at St. Cloud, Fla. I am going to send to the Speaker's desk some petitions that I received in support of that bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not yet obtained consent.

Mr. SEARS. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is the subject?

Mr. SEARS. An old soldiers' home.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, we expect to take up appropriation bills in a very short time, and the gentleman will have an opportunity to address the House, I am sure, in connection with the consideration of one of those bills.

Mr. SEARS. I simply want to ask the Speaker to refer these petitions to the Committee on Appropriations. It will not take over a minute. I can not do that in the other time.

Mr. MONDELL. The rule in regard to matters of that kind is that they shall be placed in the basket.

Mr. SEARS. If the gentleman objects, of course I can not help it; I do not care to take up the time of the House. These petitions are signed by old soldiers. I have presented them as the son of a Confederate soldier. Does the gentleman object?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming objects.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman can take it up on one of the appropriation bills.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the city of Dawson, Ga., tents and cots for use of Confederate veterans in their State convention, June 17 and 18, 1919.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House dispense with business in order under paragraph 4, Rule XXIV, as to Calendar Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the House dispense with the business of Calendar Wednesday. Is there objection?

Mr. DYER. Reserving the right to object—which I do not intend to do, but probably shall hereafter, unless it is a matter of great importance—I hate to see Calendar Wednesday dispensed with at the beginning of a Congress for fear of the precedent. I would like the gentleman from Wyoming to tell us the situation as to these appropriation bills which it is necessary to have enacted and passed before July 1. What appropriation bills are there that went over from the last session that must be considered and passed before July 1?

Mr. MONDELL. There are four of the larger supply bills—the District of Columbia bill, the sundry civil bill, and the Army and Navy bills—and in addition to those is the railroad appropriation bill. It is highly important, in my opinion, that this program of legislation or appropriation which came to us as a heritage from the last Congress be disposed of in the House, if possible, by the 15th or, at the furthest, the 16th of this month.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman realizes that that can not be done unless the Members of the House, and particularly those upon our side of the Chamber, refrain from a great deal of what, in my judgment, I consider unnecessary debate. If we are to pass these bills by that time, I hope the gentleman, the leader of the majority, will try to use his influence upon the Members upon this side of the House not to engage in unnecessary delay by debate and motions and things of that kind.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman will do that.

Mr. GARRETT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we should have a ruling. I submit a parliamentary inquiry or I will make the point of order that the unfinished business should be disposed of, and that the unfinished business is a vote upon the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order. That has been decided. It was decided last by the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Speaker CLARK, holding that that should go over until Thursday instead of Wednesday. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Wyoming that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kansas rise?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I want to make an announcement to the membership of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for one minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Immediately following the action of the House on the Agricultural appropriation bill I shall call up or submit a resolution from the Committee on Rules, House resolution 78, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM], providing for a general investigation of the War Department.

The SPEAKER. The business before the House is the Agricultural appropriation bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the Agricultural appropriation bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The Agricultural appropriation bill is before the House, and the previous question has been ordered. The question arises as to the amendments on that bill. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to that bill? If not, the Chair will put the amendments en gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The question being taken, the amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the bill to be engrossed and read a third time.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BLACK. I am not.

The SPEAKER. Is there any gentleman who is opposed to the bill who desires to offer a motion to recommit?

Mr. ANDERSON. I desire to offer a motion to recommit, and am a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. BLACK. I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture, and, of course, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, who is a member of that committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will first recognize a member of the committee on the minority side. If no such gentleman desires to offer a motion, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], who offers the following motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDERSON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report the same back forthwith with an amendment striking out, on page 71, line 4, the figures "$1,500,000," and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "$2,500,000."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. WINGO. I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph of the bill to which this motion applies be reported, so that we may know what it is about.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the paragraph referred to be reported. If there be no objection, it will be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

For cooperative agricultural extension work, to be allotted, paid, and expended in the same manner, upon the same terms and conditions, and under the same supervision as the additional appropriations made by the act of May 8, 1914 (38 Stat. L., 372), entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture," $1,500,000; and all sums appropriated by this act for use for demonstration or extension work within any State shall be used and expended in accordance with plans mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the proper officials of the college in such State which receives the benefits of said act of May 8, 1914.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; on a division (demanded by Mr. WINGO) there were—ayes 33, noes 100.

Accordingly the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. LEVER. Upon that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 346, nays 1, answered "present" 2, not voting 80, as follows:

YEAS—346.

Ackerman	Ayres	Benson	Brand
Alexander	Babka	Black	Britten
Almon	Bacharach	Bland, Ind.	Brooks, Ill.
Anderson	Bankhead	Bland, Mo.	Brooks, Pa.
Andrews, Md.	Barbour	Bland, Va.	Browne
Andrews, Nebr.	Barkley	Blanton	Browning
Anthony	Bee	Booher	Buchanan
Ashbrook	Begg	Bowers	Burdick
Aswell	Bell	Box	Burroughs

Butler	Graham, Ill.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sanders, N. Y.
Byrnes, S. C.	Green, Iowa	McPherson	Sanders, La.
Byrns, Tenn.	Greene, Mass.	MacCrate	Scott
Caldwell	Greene, Vt.	MacGregor	Scars
Campbell, Kans.	Griest	Madden	Sells
Campbell, Pa.	Hadley	Magee	Shreve
Candler	Hardy, Colo.	Maher	Sims
Cannon	Hardy, Tex.	Major	Sinclair
Cantrill	Harrison	Mansfield	Sisson
Caraway	Haskell	Mapes	Slemp
Carss	Haugen	Martin	Small
Carter	Hawley	Mays	Smith, Mich.
Chindblom	Hayden	Mead	Smith, N. Y.
Clark, Fla.	Hays	Merritt	Smithwick
Clark, Mo.	Heflin	Michener	Snell
Classon	Hernandez	Miller	Snyder
Cleary	Hersey	Minahan, N. J.	Steagall
Coady	Hersman	Monahan, Wis.	Stedman
Cole	Hickey	Mondell	Steele
Collier	Hicks	Moon	Stephens, Miss.
Connally	Hoch	Moore, Ohio	Stephens, Ohio
Cooper	Holland	Moore, Pa.	Stevenson
Copley	Houghton	Moores, Ind.	Stiness
Costello	Huddleston	Morgan	Strong, Kans.
Crago	Hudspeth	Mott	Strong, Pa.
Cramton	Hulings	Murphy	Summers, Wash.
Crowther	Hull, Tenn.	Neely	Sweet
Cullen	Husted	Nelson, Mo.	Taylor, Ark.
Currie, Mich.	Igoe	Nelson, Wis.	Taylor, Colo.
Curry, Calif.	Jacoway	Newton, Minn.	Taylor, Tenn.
Dallinger	Jefferis	Newton, Mo.	Thomas
Darrow	Johnson, Ky.	Nicholls, S. C.	Thompson, Okla.
Davis, Minn.	Johnson, Miss.	Nichols, Mich.	Tillman
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Wash.	Nolan	Timberlake
Denison	Johnston, N. Y.	O'Connell	Tincher
Dent	Jones, Pa.	Ogden	Tinkham
Dewalt	Jones, Tex.	Oldfield	Towner
Dickinson, Iowa	Juul	Oliver	Treadway
Dickinson, Mo.	Kelley, Mich.	Olney	Upshaw
Dominick	Kendall	Osborne	Vaile
Doremus	Kennedy, Iowa	Overstreet	Vare
Dowell	Kettner	Padgett	Venable
Drane	Kincheloe	Paige	Vestal
Dunbar	King	Park	Vinson
Dunn	Kinkaid	Parker	Voigt
Dupré	Kitchin	Parrish	Volstead
Dyer	Kleczka	Pell	Walters
Eagle	Knutson	Platt	Ward
Echols	Kraus	Pou	Wason
Edmonds	LaGuardia	Purnell	Watkins
Elliott	Lampert	Quin	Watson, Pa.
Elston	Langley	Radcliffe	Watson, Va.
Emerson	Lanham	Ragsdale	Weaver
Esch	Lankford	Rainey, H. T.	Webb
Evans, Mont.	Layton	Rainey, J. W.	Webster
Evans, Nebr.	Lazaro	Raker	Welling
Evans, Nev.	Lea, Calif.	Ramsey	Welty
Fairfield	Lee, Ga.	Ramseyer	Whaley
Fess	Lehlbach	Randall, Calif.	Wheeler
Fitzgerald	Lesher	Randall, Wis.	White, Kans.
Flood	Lever	Rayburn	White, Me.
Fordney	Linthicum	Reavis	Williams
Foster.	Little	Reed, N. Y.	Wilson, Ill.
Frear	Lonergan	Reed, W. Va.	Wilson, La.
French	Longworth	Rhodes	Wilson, Pa.
Fuller, Ill.	Lufkin	Ricketts	Wingo
Gallagher	Luhring	Riddick	Winslow
Gallivan	McAndrews	Robsion, Ky.	Wise
Gandy	McArthur	Rodenberg	Wood, Ind.
Ganly	McCulloch	Rogers	Woods, Va.
Gard	McDuffie	Romjue	Woodyard
Garland	McFadden	Rose	Wright
Garner	McGlennon	Rouse	Yates
Garrett	McKenzie	Rowe	Young, N. Dak.
Glynn	McKiniry	Rubey	Young, Tex.
Good	McKinley	Rucker	Zihlman
Goodykoontz	McLane	Sabath	
Gould	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sanders, Ind.	

NAYS—1.

Walsh

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Blackmon Sinnott

NOT VOTING—80.

Baer	Fields	James	Phelan
Benham	Fisher	Johnson, S. Dak.	Porter
Boies	Focht	Kahn	Reber
Briggs	Freeman	Kearns	Riordan
Brinson	Fuller, Mass.	Kelly, Pa.	Robinson, N. C.
Brumbaugh	Godwin, N. C.	Kennedy, R. I.	Rowan
Burke	Goldfogle	Kiess	Sanford
Carew	Goodall	Kreider	Saunders, Va.
Casey	Goodwin, Ark.	Larsen	Schall
Christopherson	Graham, Pa.	Luce	Scully
Crisp	Griffin	McClintic	Sherwood
Dale	Hamill	McKeown	Siegel
Davey	Hamilton	Mann	Smith, Idaho
Dempsey	Hastings	Mason	Smith, Ill.
Donovan	Hill	Montague	Steenerson
Dooling	Howard	Mooney	Sullivan
Doughton	Hull, Iowa	Moore, Va.	Sumners, Tex.
Eagan	Humphreys	Morin	Temple
Ellsworth	Hutchinson	Mudd	Thompson, Ohio
Ferris	Ireland	Peters	Tilson

So the bill was passed.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. STEENERSON with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. WHALEY.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. MCKEOWN.

Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. RIORDAN.

Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. FERRIS.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. MONTAGUE.

Mr. MANN with Mr. BLACKMON.

Mr. BOIES with Mr. BRIGGS.

Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. BRINSON.

Mr. FOCHT with Mr. CAREW.

Mr. FREEMAN with Mr. CRISP.

Mr. GOODALL with Mr. DAVEY.

Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. DONOVAN.

Mr. HULL of Iowa with Mr. DOOLING.

Mr. IRELAND with Mr. DOUGHTON.

Mr. JAMES with Mr. EAGAN.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota with Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. KEARNS with Mr. FISHER.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. KIESS with Mr. GRIFFIN.

Mr. KREIDER with Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. LEHLBACH with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. MASON with Mr. MCCLINTIC.

Mr. MORIN with Mr. MOONEY.

Mr. PETERS with Mr. PHELAN.

Mr. PORTER with Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD with Mr. ROWAN.

Mr. SCHALL with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia.

Mr. SIEGEL with Mr. SCULLY.

Mr. TEMPLE with Mr. SHERWOOD.

Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. TILSON with Mr. SUMNERS of Texas.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to vote "aye."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. LUCE. I was not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not be recorded.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I vote "aye."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall and listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. HAMILTON. I was just at the door of the cloakroom and had a man stationed to notify me when my name was reached, but the Clerk got by.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Speaker, did the bells ring twice?

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not inform the gentleman.

Mr. BAER. I was called from the room by a constituent, but if I had been present I would have voted "aye."

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I vote "aye."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall and listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. KEARNS. I was in the Hall, but I did not hear my name called.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to say that the rule does not contemplate that a Member can vote simply because he did not hear his name called. It is on the theory that the gentleman's name was not called at all, and therefore the only way that a Member can properly qualify is that he was present and listening, did not hear his name called, and therefore is allowed to vote on the theory that his name was not called. Unless gentlemen can state that they were present and listening when their names should have been called, they do not qualify.

Mr. KEARNS. I could not have heard my name if it had been called, there was so much confusion in the room. I was present.

The SPEAKER. Unless the gentleman will state that he was present and listening to hear his name called, the gentleman can not qualify.

Mr. KEARNS. I think I was; I was doing nothing but watching the roll call, and did not hear my name called. There was much confusion in the Hall.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think the gentleman has qualified.

Mr. BLACKMON. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MANN, and I desire to be recorded "present."

The name of Mr. BLACKMON was called, and he answered "Present," as above recorded.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I just came in; I was at the far end of the Hall, but before I got down here I heard other names called right after mine.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; but I did not hear it.

The Clerk called Mr. SABATH's name, and he answered "Aye," as above recorded.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I understood the Chair to state that I could only vote "present." I wish to vote "present."

The SPEAKER. The rule does not allow the gentleman to vote "present."

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. HAUGEN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON WAR EXPENDITURES.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 78.

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, directed to appoint from the membership of this House a select committee of 15 members, for the Sixty-sixth Congress, and which said committee is hereby authorized to fully investigate all contracts and expenditudes made by the War Department, or under its directions, during the present war; and, in addition to the powers herein conferred, shall have the same powers and authority as are now conferred by the rules of this House upon the standing Committee on Expenditures in the War Department; said committee is hereby authorized to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths and affirmations, to take testimony, to sit during the sessions of the House and during any recess which may occur during its sessions, and may meet at such places as said committee deems advisable. Said committee is also hereby authorized and empowered to appoint such subcommittees as it may deem advisable, and such subcommittees, when so appointed, are hereby authorized to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths and take testimony, and to meet at such times and places as said committee shall from time to time direct.

Resolved further, That said select committee shall report to the House, in one or more reports, as it may deem advisable, the result of its investigations, with such recommendations as it may care to make.

Resolved further, That the Speaker of the House is hereby authorized to issue subpœnas to witnesses, upon the request of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, during any recess of Congress during the sessions.

Resolved further, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be directed to serve all subpœnas and other process put into his hands by said committee or any subcommittee thereof.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct the spelling of the word "expenditures," in line 6.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on the resolution be limited to 40 minutes on a side; that 40 minutes be controlled by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] and 40 minutes by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the time for debate on the resolution be limited to 40 minutes on a side; that the gentleman from Kansas control 40 minutes and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] 40 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the resolution as to its purpose and scope speaks for itself. The Committee on Expenditures in the War Department found itself confronted with a very great work, and believing the work should be thoroughly done did not feel like undertaking it with the standing Committee on Expenditures in the War Department. So it is proposed that a special committee of 15 members provided for in this resolution shall undertake this great work.

During the period that the United States has been engaged in war the War Department has expended to May 1, 1919, $16,300,000,000.

Expenditures for aircraft, $948,000,000.

Expenditures for ordnance, $4,323,000,000.

Expenditures for camps, cantonments, and manufacturing establishment, $974,000,000.

Res., $105,000,000.

Average expenditures of the War Department for three years prior to the beginning of the war:

Fiscal year 1914	$123,500,000
Fiscal year 1915	126,000,000
Fiscal year 1916	132,000,000

The people of the United States are entitled to know just how that money was expended, and in order to advise the country as to the manner in which it was expended it will be necessary for a committee of this House to make such an investigation as is contemplated in this resolution.

The Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, through their chairman [Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois], stated to the Committee on Rules this morning that in making a preliminary survey of the work to be done it was discovered that it would probably be necessary to appoint a number of subcommittees, probably five in all, one to undertake the investigation of the aircraft production, another of ordnance, another of the camps and cantonments, another of the Quartermaster Department, and so forth. The resolution provides that these subcommittees may report at any time any conclusion that they have reached.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield for a question.

Mr. CALDWELL. Does not the gentleman feel that the investigation of aircraft expenditures by Mr. Justice Hughes has been taken by the American people as having been very thorough and a complete vindication?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. There has been a thorough investigation made of that, but it comes to the knowledge of Members of the House and to the country that since that investigation was made there have been activities by the Aircraft Division and large sums of money spent.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And, as a matter of fact, has not more been expended since that investigation than was expended up to that time?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I was about to follow what I had already said with that statement. It is also true, I will say in further answer to the gentleman from New York, that the Aircraft Division of the War Department is probably now expending large sums of money for aviation fields. The country would like to know the necessity for that expenditure of money, in view of the fact that we are raising money from the people in every way that we can devise.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. For a question.

Mr. CALDWELL. Does not the gentleman know that before any expenditure was made for aviation fields the Secretary of War came before the Committee on Military Affairs and laid all the cards on the table and explained what he was going to do and the prices he was going to pay for them, and did he not get an authorization of this Congress to do it?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The question as to whether or not the money is being wisely expended for aviation fields at this time is a matter that may well be inquired into by a committee of this House.

Mr. MCARTHUR rose.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further, and I shall not bother him any more?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MCARTHUR. Is it not true that in the report of Mr. Justice Hughes he specifically stated that he made no investigation of the spruce production of the Northwest and admitted that it ought to be investigated?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. His report indicated it was a somewhat limited investigation. Indeed the appointment of Mr. Justice Hughes carried a limitation upon his activities.

Mr. LITTLE. And I would like to ask the gentleman from New York if there is any objection from the Committee on Military Affairs to an examination of these expenditures?

Mr. CALDWELL. Oh, no; and I do not want the gentleman to misunderstand my question. I propose to vote for this resolution, not because I believe they are going to find anything but because I am sure they will not.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have not yielded for this colloquy. The country expects a thorough investigation of all the expenditures. It expects the committee making this investigation to be thorough and impartial. It is not intended, it could not be the intention of this House, that any innocent person shall be punished. It is not intended that anybody should be embarrassed who has not placed himself in a position to be embarrassed, but it should not be the intention of anyone that a guilty person should go unpunished or unexposed. If anyone has misspent or unwisely expended public money through the activities of the War Department, the country should know who that person is and the extent of the expenditures.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, there is certainly no objection to the purpose of this resolution on the part of the minority of this House. If there has been extravagance, the minority party wishes that extravagance exposed. If there has been rascality, no one is more earnestly in favor of exposing the rascal than the Democratic minority on this floor. So far as the purpose of the resolution is concerned there is no controversy, but there is a division of opinion upon this point. The introducer of this resolution stated before the Committee on Rules this morning that the desire was to have a nonpartisan investigation, and in the next breath we were informed that the purpose of the majority is to put 10 Republican Members on this investigating committee and 5 Democratic Members. In all

fairness I submit that the preponderance is too great. The committee should be divided at least in the proportion of 9 and 6. Think what sort of an arrangement you will have. This committee will be divided into subcommittees of three, of course, made up of two Democrats and one Republican—no; of two Republicans and one Democrat. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is hard to get over the habit, is it not?

Mr. POU. I wish it were as I first stated [laughter], and if the people of this country had not been deceived it would have been that way. Now, this subcommittee goes to Europe. You have two Republicans and one Democrat. As man to man, is that fair? Is that a nonpartisan committee? Men who have served on these investigating committees have some idea of how arduous their duties are. It is impossible for one man to properly represent the side of the minority, if there is such a side. For my part, I can not understand why you gentlemen want to divide this committee in the proportion of 10 to 5 if you really intend to have a nonpartisan investigation. If you intend to have a partisan investigation, if you intend to put things over as you want to put them over, with no proper regard for the rights of the minority, then take your 10 and give us 5; but if you mean what you say, that this investigation is to be fair, is to be judicial, is to be nonpartisan, in the language of the gentleman who introduced the resolution, you will be willing to divide in the proportion of 9 and 6.

I do not know, but I venture the assertion that never in the history of Congress will you find one single great investigating committee where the preponderance was 2 to 1 in favor of the majority. You have got your majority; you can do whatever you wish. In the name of fair play, why is it you are not willing to give the minority one more vote on this great committee, which is to do this great work and which is to conduct, according to you, a nonpartisan investigation? Now, Mr. Speaker, that is about all I have to say. I have an amendment which I would like to introduce and have pending, and which I send to the Clerk's desk to have read. I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered as pending, to be voted on at the proper time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object to that request for unanimous consent. I do not object that it shall be read for information and be pending, but I object to unanimous consent that it be voted upon.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment——

The SPEAKER. The time has not come for the offering of an amendment.

Mr. POU. Then I ask to have it read for the information of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment will be read for the information of the House.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. POU: In line 4, after the word "Congress," insert the words "of whom not less than six shall be taken from the minority party."

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used six minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that there will be no opposition to the creation of this committee as expressed by the speaker who has just left the floor and has been expressed by different persons unofficially when the matter was talked about. The country not only expects but demands the facts concerning the expenditures of the War Department. It is not a new thing. It follows the procedure after at least two great wars in which our country was engaged.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FESS. Not now. The country demands it and for that reason no one ought to resist it. If in this riot of expenditure induced by the war there has been extravagance and if the extravagance was such that could not be avoided, the country will properly excuse it. If it could have been avoided, there is no reason why the country should not know it. Men have said, "What do you expect to do with these facts; we all expected mistakes to to be made, and to get this information after the war is over would be conceding that the water is over the wheel and nothing to be gained by it." I have heard that from some quarters. But there is something to be gained by it in the suggestion that mistakes made unnecessarily should be avoided if under the exigencies of the future we shall be called upon to do anything like what we have done. But that is not the great thing in my mind. It is not simply to show the facts of the great war in expenditures and to give the information to the public which it has the right to possess, but it is to look into present expenditures because, unless the facts are brought to the public, there will continue future expenses that the public ought not to suffer. That is the main reason for this investigation, and I think that the people in responsible positions would be glad to have the facts brought out with a view of immediate relief.

The Federal Reserve Board in the May report makes the astonishing statement that the monthly expenditure of the Government is $1,400,000,000. This is seven months after the war is over, and if that rate continues to the end of the year it will use up all the available funds either from the borrowing or the taxing source and leave the Nation by the 1st of January with a deficit of over $2,000,000,000 and a half of a year yet to be accounted for. The people have the right to know what these expenditures are, and where there is unnecessary continuance it should be pried away from the Government if we have got to use, figuratively speaking, a 40-foot pole to do it. Everyone knows——

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. FESS (continuing). That there is now existing a determination and elaborate effort to maintain agencies that were purely war agencies on the basis that those war agencies have become peace agencies and the country will suffer if we do not continue them. What we want—I can not yield to the gentleman now—are the facts, not only to show what was done unnecessarily—and if nothing unnecessarily was done nobody is harmed—but the facts as a groundwork for needed relief legislation in the immediate future.

Now, as to the make-up of the committee, I can see how my friend POU, the gentleman from North Carolina, might say he would prefer 9 to 6 instead of 10 to 5. The reason it was put at 10 to 5 is that this committee will almost certainly divide itself into five subcommittees, and the five subcommittees could not be represented on a basis of 9 to 6 without putting some one on two subcommittees, and the easy way to effect it would be to make your five subcommittees, 3 for each subcommittee. It would be unwise to make it unduly large, say 25 instead of 15, for the reason that this committee must sit constantly. The work is simply tremendous; you can not now see the limit of the range, and to call 25 men out of this body to sit permanently, to be almost permanently absent from the session while the investigations are going on, would take more of the membership from the House than it is wise to do. It seems to me that if 9 to 6 would be satisfactory to friend POU, the gentleman from North Carolina, that 10 to 5 would not be unsatisfactory to him. What he said about the ability of one person to sit as a permanent representative, that it would physically fatigue him, probably is true, but 9 to 6 will not remedy that. You will increase the fatigue. I believe that the majority party, which is responsible for the investigation, should be given the power to make it effective.

My friend who just left the floor conceded that and expressed the wish that it were two Democrats to one Republican instead of two Republicans to one Democrat. If that was an honest expression, as it was, then his objection can not be serious, I am sure.

Mr. POU. If my friend will permit, I merely meant that if it had to be two to one, that it should be two Democrats and one Republican.

Mr. FESS. And I will be just as frank with my friend and say that since it can not be Democratic it must be Republican.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. REAVIS. I recall the gentleman from North Carolina saying that if the people had not been deceived in the late election it would have been two Democrats.

Mr. FESS. I do not want to comment on that statement. It was an amusing one to me at the time, especially when viewed in the light of the campaign slogan, "He kept us out of war." But, in spite of what some Members may insist, this investigation is designed to get the facts and to get them primarily for the benefit of the public rather than the benefit of any political party. If it were true that it was for the benefit of some political party, then I would confess my doubts of the wisdom of the proposed legislation. But it is for the benefit of future legislation to get at the unnecessary expenditures that will continue unless we expose the extravagance as it has existed. And I am sure the resolution will pass.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield nine minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL].

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the country is to be congratulated that upon this proposition there is absolutely no division of sentiment in the Rules Committee or upon the floor of this House. I am sure that the membership of this House, at least, understands thoroughly the purpose of this resolution and of this investigation. Now, of course, our Republican friends will not publicly make the admission that they are going into this investigation for the purpose of digging up campaign material for the presidential election next year. Of course, confidentially, we here all know that that is their purpose. Now, so far as the Democratic members of this Rules Committee are concerned, and so far as the Democratic side of the House in this Congress is concerned, so far as the War Department is concerned, we welcome this investigation. [Applause on the Democratic side.] My hope and my prayer is that this great Republic of ours will never be drawn into another war. But, gentlemen on that side of the House, if we are, when you have completed this investigation and it becomes a part of the files and of the records of this Government, and if you happen to be in power when the next war comes, you can go back to this record and see how a real and the greatest war in all history was successfully conducted by a Democratic administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I congratulate the Committee on Rules in finally being able to get into the House with a report from the Committee on Rules, and I want to absolve from that criticism entirely the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], who is the chairman of the committee, because he has been present at every meeting of that committee. But it is a fact, which the record of the Rules Committee will show, that although you have eight members to our four on that committee, you have never been able to get a quorum of the Rules Committee of this Congress without the presence of the Democratic members of the committee. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And you bring this resolution in here to-day because of the fact that three out of four Democratic members of the Rules Committee were there this morning to make a quorum and voted for this report and to bring it before the House, when there were but four members of the Rules Committee present out of eight that the Republicans have on that committee. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You would not be here on the floor with the resolution to-day if it were not for that fact. And to show that we are not playing any partisan politics in the matter in the votes that were supposed to come before the Rules Committee this morning, I went so far as to pair with a Republican member of the committee in order to give him an opportunity to be associated with the members of his regiment to-day that are having a meeting over in New York.

Now, gentlemen, the Democratic Party on the floor of this House and the War Department welcome this investigation, and we believe that when you have finished it you will find yourselves exactly in the same attitude as you did when you spent three or four months investigating other members of the administration in the so-called leak investigation, when every Republican member of that investigating committee had to sign a report exonerating in full every branch of the Democratic administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Ah, this is a wonderful procedure, but we welcome you to go to it. Investigate what? Investigate the proceedings of an administration that has turned the tide of battle, that has crushed Prussianism, that has brought the greatest victory to American arms in all the history of the Nation? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Investigate what? Why, you tried it in the last Congress. You had military officers who had been discharged from the service coming before the Rules Committee to investigate the Argonne Forest Battle, the greatest battle in all history, and yet if you had heard these gentlemen talk before that committee you would have believed that the American arms had suffered disgrace and defeat in that battle, when, upon the other hand, they had stamped themselves the greatest soldiers in the history of the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Ah, gentlemen, we have no objection to this. The sensible people of this country understand the purpose of it. Why do you not come in here—the people have put you in control—why do you not come in here and bring in legislation to meet the problems of the day and not look into the water that has already gone over the wheel? [Applause on the Democratic side.] There are great problems here for this Congress to solve, and you admit it. You talk about efficiency in running the Government! The American people have not forgotten that the Democratic Party ran the Government successfully in all of its phases during the greatest war in history. And now you say that the Democratic Party is not efficient, and you are so inefficient that you would not be here on this floor to-day with this resolution if the Democratic members had not given you a quorum in your committee this morning. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I am not criticizing the chairman of the committee. He is entitled to the high position which he holds in his party's service. No member of this committee is criticizing the chairman of the committee for any unfair treatment of the Democratic members of that committee, but the point to which I call the attention of the country here to-day is that you are wasting and frittering away time in investigation of things that are passed, when there are great problems to be solved. And the business of this House, and especially the business of the majority side, since you are charged with power, should be not put to the investigations of the past, but in solving the problems of the present and of the future.

I commend to my Republican friends on that side of the House the action of the Republican Party recently taken in Kentucky. The Republican Party in Kentucny recently had a platform convention; but, gentlemen, not one word in that platform, from start to finish, though it was a long platform, dared to criticize the national administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] use some of his time?

Mr. POU. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WELTY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WELTY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, a year ago to-day the First and Second Divisions were engaged at the front south of Soissons, with a hope that they would stop the retreat of the French. The marines were a part of this organization, and they were sent near Bois de Belleau, a short distance northwest of Chateau-Thierry. They arrived there about June 1, 8,000 strong, and it was estimated that these lads did not only hold back but repulsed, time and again, four times their weight. On June 6 an advance was made, and this part of the battle ended June 18, at which time it was learned that these two divisions did not only check but defeated the Germans by driving them out of the woods and for a number of miles beyond; but when the roll was called some of the companies had no commissioned or noncommissioned officers left, and out of the 8,000 marines who went in 6,200 were either killed or wounded. Col. Catlin, who was in command of one of these regiments, told me that 60 per cent of the rank and file of these boys were college men, and that in one regiment 93 per cent of its men were either marksmen, sharpshooters, or expert riflemen.

A year ago to-day the Germans knew for the first time how Americans can fight. Our soldiers had looked forward to this day for months, and now they were permitted to demonstrate the difference in a man when he fights for an ideal and one who fights for property and because he is told to fight. They were not only ready but willing to hold up the traditions of American soldiers. Heretofore he fought on his own soil and near his front door, that others might enjoy freedom and equality of rights, but it was the first time that he crossed the seas and planted the American banner on foreign soil, demonstrating that the spirit of freedom was a growing and continuing spirit. It was a new spirit planted, and when Europe saw how gallantly they fought they concluded that American soldiers had not only caught but possessed the spirit of the Crusaders. With them it was ever onward and no retreat.

I have just returned from the Walter Reed Hospital, where one of these brave lads submitted to a fifth major operation, due to a piece of bursting shell entering his left lung during this battle. His comrades tell me that he refused to be borne off of the field, and when told at the hospital that he could not resume the fight he wept because he could no longer continue with his comrades in this great fight for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, he is not the only one at Walter Reed possessing this spirit; there are hundreds of others, maimed for life, happy in the thought that they had a part in this great world struggle, even though their bodies are physically disfigured for life.

I am sorry to say that there are those with us to-day who have not caught this spirit of sacrifice; but their one and only thought was how much they could get out of this war for themselves. And when the draft act was passed they were busy getting soft places for their sons within the draft age, and I am sorry that in the selection of hundreds of thousands of officers they, too, were commissioned and became nothing more nor less than rubber stamps for these profiteers.

Business had to be mobilized in order to support these lads, and thousands of business men, laborers, too old to shoulder the gun, were willing to make every sacrifice in order that we might win; and these men have contributed just as much toward the success of our cause as the boys on the field of battle, but these spirits possessed by the soldier, business man, and laborer demand now that the light of publicity be thrown on every man, woman, and child who had a part in the prosecution of the war, so that the profiteer and vampire may be known by their cowardly slinking way, and withdrawal from this light because of a sense of guilt; and, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, let us help in throwing on this light in order to point out their illegal acts, so that full justice might be administered.

During the prosecution of this war I received numerous complaints, and I have contented myself by calling them to the attention of the President, officers of the War Department, and the Department of Justice, because I believed that the enemy should not know that we had these with us who would steal from the Government while others were giving their lives to maintain the same. But now that the war is over I think it high time that a searching inquiry should be made with a view of prosecuting everyone who may be found guilty of profiteering or of presenting a false and fraudulent claim to the Government. I know that there are those who believe that an inquiry will not result in any good, because of our experiences during the Civil and Spanish-American Wars, and they point with justification to the fruitless inquiry of the Beef Trust scandal, when 21 years ago they had thousands of pounds of embalmed beef on hand which they could not sell to the public, but found ready market after the declaration of war with Spain. But, Mr. Speaker, are we not suffering to this day because those in authority at that time failed to do their duty? I well remember when the first cans of beef came to Chickamauga Park, some of the cans were bulged out, and when opened the meat had a green, slimy appearance, and for some reason our pet dogs in camp and the razor-back hogs of Georgia refused to touch it when thrown to them for food; yet the officers passed it for food to the soldiers, and for want of anything better they ate it after being cooked. And what was the result? Two-thirds of the soldiers became sick. I have seen hundreds of soldiers drop during a drill or parade, as though they were hit by a bullet. I ask again, can a Government long live when it permits acts of this sort to go unpunished? Mr. Speaker, I may not know the signs of the times, but I doubt if another beef scandal can be put over on the American public.

I know there are some who want to make politics out of this. In my resolution of inquiry, which was referred to the Rules Committee May 20, I asked for a nonpartisan committee, but I understand that the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and others on the majority side ask for a committee of 15, with only a third of them Democrats.

The President and Secretary Baker did not ask a soldier or business man offering his services for his politics. It so happened in my State that a large majority of the judge advocates and other officers selected were Republicans. I do not know what has been the practice in other States, but I have come to the conclusion that Secretary Baker in his attempt to avoid the politics of the Civil and Spanish-American Wars was leaning backward. However, it seems that there were those under his authority who did not share his views when it came to the selection of these officers. I was informed by Gen. Crowder that when it came to the selection of judge advocates from Ohio that the matter was left exclusively with Secretary Baker, and yet I found upon inquiry from the Secretary of War that he did not know a single judge advocate selected from Ohio. But somehow from the hundreds of able lawyers in Ohio it so happened that only three were of the Democratic faith, and a majority came from Cincinnati, because the examining committee thought Cincinnati was the largest city in Ohio, and every good lawyer must come from the larger cities.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am not asking for a nonpartisan committee because of a desire that Democrats should be protected. Far from it. I believe that a man who defrauded a Government during the war is a traitor and should be dealt with accordingly; and I do hope that when you come to a traitor who professes to be a Democrat that no blank cartridge be used.

But I am asking for a nonpartisan committee, because these men who profiteered during the war possess neither politics nor religion. They assume their cloak only to appear in respectable company. I am not saying that my good friend, the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, does not intend to go to the bottom in this investigation, but he will probably find that he may be embarrassed, because some of these have powerful friends among those who organized not only the Senate but the House as well. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, when this country entered into the Great War people generally believed that in the high civilization of the twentieth century war was impossible. We were entirely unprepared. We were told to be neutral. There were some men here and there over the country, red-blooded men, who urged preparation. But we were told at that time that they were "nervous and hysterical," and that there was no danger of war. The people did not recognize the fact that a ravening tiger was loose in the world. They did not recognize at that time that it was the duty of humanity and of this great Republic to go in and destroy that tiger.

And so the dictates of humanity forced us into this war. We were unprepared. Our regular officers had had no experience—not one of them—in the handling and equipping and supplying of great masses of men. They knew nothing about gas and grenades and trench warfare. They had not small arms munitions, artillery, airplanes, motor trucks, food, clothing, or even an army, and it was a stupendous task, and, of course, mistakes were made. Of course, in the hurry and confusion cost was not considered, and of course there was great extravagance. But to the everlasting credit of the American people all loyal men of all parties joined hands in common front against the common foe [applause], and for the first time in the history of the country the minority party supported the majority administration in time of war.

Now, I believe, with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], that this investigation should go on, not so much to determine who has been making mistakes or even to expose grafters and profiteers, desirable as that may be, but for the purpose of informing Congress how it may put an end to the enormous outlays and the expenses that are still going on without diminution six months after the war is over. The people are entitled to know what the facts are, but I also believe that investigation will show that the men who were at the head of the war operations were honestly doing the best they knew how. Honest mistakes that have been made we can overlook. Honest extravagance we can forget. The point of this investigation should be to inform this Congress as to the measures to be taken to cut off unnnecessary expense and to better equip Congress to handle the far more important matters that are pressing for solution. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from North Carolina use some of his time?

Mr. POU. How many more speeches, I would like to ask, will there be on that side?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Probably two; and then I shall reserve a little time in which to move the previous question.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] says the country demands this investigation. I do not know whether there is much demand for it in the country or not, but I know that the Democratic administration welcomes it. The Democratic membership of this House will vote for it. I shall vote for it, because it provides for a better committee, with broader powers than any existing committee, for the purpose of investigating the expenditures in the War Department and the general conduct of the war.

I should have preferred, Mr. Speaker, to see a joint committee of the Senate and House appointed. Such a committee, I believe, would have attracted the attention of the country and held it, whereas a committee here, making an investigation, and a committee over there on the other side of the Capitol making an investigation, will not do that. It would have been less expensive for the Government and less trouble to the officials of the War Department to appear before one committee than before two committees. It would have resulted in a more thorough investigation. I should have preferred such a committee on the conduct of the war and the expenditures for the war, such a committee as we had after the war between the States. But as we are not in control of things and can not dictate what kind of a committee we shall have we will support the committee provided for in this resolution. I for one believe I speak the unanimous voice of the Democratic side when I say we shall vote for this as the very best proposition to make this investigation that the Republicans will present to

the House. We hope to improve it by amendment, but we are so willing for this investigation that we will vote for it whether it is amended or not.

The Democrats of the House and the Democrats of the country are proud of the splendid record which the able and efficient Secretary of War has made, and proud of his honest and splendid management of the multiplied duties of his great office. [Applause.]

We are proud of the glorious record made by American armies across the water [applause], and we want to see every man who has failed in his duty to his country in this great hour, who has taken advantage of the exigencies of war and the hurried manner in which great things had to be done, to improperly enrich himself, whether he be a Democrat or a Republican, exposed and brought to justice. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, it would have been better if there had been a larger representation given to the Democrats upon the proposed committee. I think the suggestion of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU], that the Democrats have six and the Republicans nine, is certainly fair and certainly reasonable. I can see no answer to his position. I see no reason why there should be more than three subcommittees of this proposed committee. Two of those subcommittees could have two of the subjects of investigation assigned to each of them. This would meet the argument for five subcommittees. If that were done there could be three committees of five members each, three Democrats and two Republicans——

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. You are wrong again. [Laughter.]

Mr. FLOOD. I mean three Republicans and two Democrats. I wish it were the other way. [Laughter.] Three Republicans and two Democrats. Such a division would appeal more to the sense of justice and right of the country than a division of two to one, as we are to have it in the proposed committee. It would be nearer nonpartisan and would appeal more strongly to the sense of justice and right of the Members of this House. But whether this committee be partisan or nonpartisan, I want to see it created. I want to see a thorough investigation made. I want to see a speedy investigation made, and I know that the War Department and the Democratic administration and the Democratic membership of this House and the Democratic Party in the country have nothing to fear from this investigation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this being admittedly a nonpartisan investigation, I have been highly edified in listening to the absolutely "nonpartisan" speeches that have been made upon that side of the House. I can not avoid the conclusion, however, that beneath the braggadocio of some of these gentleman there lurks a little timidity about what may happen as a result of this investigation. While undoubtedly there has been a great waste of public money, for which the people of this country will have to pay, I sincerely trust it will not develop that any money has beeen misused for the benefit of any person or corporation. That is one of the things we are going to try to find out.

In my district there has been a Government activity—if that is the word to use. There was activity there for four or five months, during which some six or seven million dollars was spent in the erection of an alleged nitrate plant. One of the most beautiful spots in my county is now a devastated ruin and all work has been finally abandoned, but before it is finally paid for it will have cost the American people something over $12,000,000. I heard many rumors—not very pretty ones—I do not vouch for them—connected with the construction of this plant, rumors in the first place as to the qualifications necessary in order to obtain employment. I shall not elaborate upon these. But I heard of one instance, pretty well vouched for, of a man who obtained employment there as a carpenter, a man who had been well satisfied with wages amounting to in the neighborhood of $15 a week, who, through some influence or other, obtained employment there at a salary of $75 a week. He discovered that his job apparently consisted of every now and then approaching a wall and hammering in a nail which another gentleman kindly held for that purpose. He was conscientious enough to have some doubt whether the wages he was being paid, considering the amount of work he did, were not a trifle excessive, and he was somewhat concerned to observe after a few days that another gentleman was almost continuously in attendance upon him. When he walked up to hammer in a nail this other gentleman would observe him apparently with intense interest. When he sat upon a bench to rest and to ruminate, possibly upon the noble deeds of our great Secretary of War, he observed that this man was watching him intently. Finally he became disturbed and he accosted the man and said, "Sir, what does this mean? Are you shadowing me? Are you a detective?" The man replied, "No, sir; I am your helper." [Laughter.] Those are some of the things that we propose to investigate under this resolution.

Let us join together, Republicans and Democrats, in this House to see to it that the American people are fully advised as to where these vast expenditures have gone. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, how much time is there remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] has 10 minutes and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] has 12 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman from North Carolina use some time?

Mr. POU. There will be only one more speech on this side.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, very early in the history of our Government the House provided for certain committees whose duty it was to examine into the expenditures of Government departments. Those committees have not always functioned as they should. I believe it to be the duty of those committees to hold sessions in every Congress and to examine into the expenditures and all of the expenditures of the departments. They have not always done so; but in almost every session of Congress, and invariably so at the close of periods of great expenditures, these committees have made examinations, and special committees have been appointed for that purpose.

In ordinary times the War Department spends about $125,000,000 to $130,000,000 a year. Since the war began it has expended $16,000,000,000. One division of the War Department has expended more than $4,000,000,000. Manifestly these enormous expenditures should be audited and examined and inquired into. I assume they would be, without regard to whether Republicans or Democrats controlled the House. I believe we are proposing nothing more than the gentlemen on the other side would have proposed if they had had control of the House. I feel confident that the gentlemen on the other side expect, and are perfectly honest in their statement that they desire to have these investigations made, though I am frank to say that I never before heard a man express so much regret with regard to something that he wanted to have done as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL], who just spoke, expressed. While he was exceedingly anxious, so he said, to have these investigations made, he spoke with great regret with regard to them.

Mr. Speaker, the important work of this Congress will be constructive; but, as we proceed first with our program of appropriations and then with our program of constructive legislation, it becomes our duty—the American people expect it of us—to have a fair and thorough investigation, and we expect a fair investigation, of the activities and expenditures of the departments of the Government.

Something has been said about the representation on this committee, and gentlemen have insisted that the minority should have a larger representation than is suggested. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], I think, explained that matter fully and clearly. The minority could not be given a larger representation than is proposed on this committee if it is to be divided into subcommittees, as it seems necessary that it should be, without increasing the committee to a size that would call from other active work a larger number, both of the minority and the majority, than can be well spared. All of the legislative committees of the House will be very busy, and the active, forceful men on both sides will be needed in that work in as large number as are available, and it would not be wise, either from the standpoint of the majority or the minority, to have these investigating committees too large in number. In view of the situation, I think the arrangement made is eminently fair and just, and I want to say for the majority that we are taking up these investigations not in any spirit of endeavor to make political capital, whatever gentlemen may say, but because it is our duty to do so. It would be their duty if they were in control of the House to make such an audit and examination as would inform the American people of the manner and character of the very great expenditures during the period of the war.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I have noticed that since the beginning of this session of the Congress several of the older Members of the House have taken occasion to address themselves particularly to the new Members of the body. For just a moment I venture to do that thing.

You gentlemen who come here as new Members have heard for a good many years of the gag rule and the steam roller. Now, I want to say to you that in just a few moments you are

going to see these modern instrumentalities of politics in very full and active operation.

The issue will be put to the test here when the gentleman from Kansas moves the previous question. If the previous question be carried, then all possibility of amending this resolution will fail. If it be not carried, then the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] will have the opportunity of offering the amendment which he has had read for the information of the House, and that is to provide that the minority representation on the committee shall be not less than six in number.

Of course, the resolution which is before you does not change the majority and minority representation; that is left to the honored Speaker of this House. But I assume that the Speaker of this House will carry out the plan that was officially announced to the Committee on Rules to be "the plan" and name 10 majority members and 5 minority members. Against that injustice I protest.

A friend of mine on that side, and I am very fond of him, spoke to me a few moments ago of the similarity of debate in this Congress and eight years ago, when the Democrats first came into power. On this question of investigations I agreed with him as to some of the debate, but let me point out this difference in the investigations which the Democrats ordered and the investigation which the Republicans now propose to order.

The steel investigating committee consisted of nine members—five majority and four minority. The sugar investigating committee consisted of nine members—five majority and four minority. The so-called Mulhall investigating committee consisted of seven members—four of the majority and three of the minority. The Pujo investigation was conducted by one of the standing committees of the House, the Committee on Banking and Currency. My friend from North Carolina said that in the history of the Government there had been no investigating committee in which there were 2 to 1. My friend is mistaken. I venture to call your attention to a committee, and I hesitate somewhat to do it, because when brought to recollection I fear it will be pregnant with sad memories to those on the Republican side. In the last Republican Congress you created what was commonly known as the Ballinger-Pinchot investigating committee. It was a joint committee, as this committee ought to be, of the House and the Senate, and you had eight of the majority party and four of the minority. That is the only precedent you have. You remember what happened to you after the Ballinger-Pinchot investigation. Gentlemen, why not play the game fair? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The membership of this House, the relative proportion of party representation, entitles the minority under all the rules of the game to the representation suggested by the amendment that will be proposed, if opportunity be given, by the gentleman from North Carolina. We gave it to you while we were in power. Aye, more. Why not at least begin this matter with some semblance of fairness?

Of course, we do not oppose the investigation. It is to be an investigation of what in many respects is the most glorious chapter in the history of this United States. The job was done with thoroughness and completeness. We do not object, and we welcome the opportunity to show the efficiency with which those charged with the responsibility dealt in this great crisis of the world. But I do insist, Mr. Speaker, that in common decency, measured by all the decent precedents of the past; in common fairness, measured by the standard which we ourselves have set, we are entitled to this proportionate representation upon this very important committee. I appeal to the sense of fairness of this House to vote down the previous question and give us an opportunity to have a vote on the amendment that will then be offered by the gentleman from North Carolina. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, before taking any more time, I want to call attention of the gentleman from North Carolina to some rather formal amendments to the resolution that I shall ask unanimous consent to make.

Mr. POU. I have no objection if they are the corrections the gentleman showed me.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Line 6, page 2, I ask unanimous consent that the word "further" be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to strike out, on page 2, line 6, the word "further."

Mr. IGOE. Reserving the right to object, why not vote down the previous question and then we can take up this amendment and others at the same time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is another matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I ask unanimous consent that in line 10, page 2, the word "further" be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. On page 2, line 12, I ask unanimous consent that the word "select" be added after the word "said."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. In line 14, page 2, I ask unanimous consent that the word "further" be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion on this resolution. Gentlemen on the Democratic side say they court the investigation that it proposes—in fact, they are anxious for such an investigation—but the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] is not satisfied with the way the committee is made up. He has called the attention of the House to the fact that in other investigations authorized by the House the political proportions of the committees differed from the proportions proposed here. He cited, I think, four precedents—the steel investigation, the sugar investigations, and the so-called Money Trust or Pujo investigation. I call the gentleman's attention and the attention of the House to the fact that each of these investigations was to inquire into industrial and financial institutions of the country rather than a political [laughter on the Democratic side] or governmental activity.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Ah, the gentleman has let the cat out of the bag.

Mr. LONGWORTH. May I suggest to the gentleman from Kansas that the gentleman is perfectly right when he speaks of a political or governmental activity—they are synonymous under this administration.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Have been. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] Oh, gentlemen seem pleased. In all probability the investigation will disclose that there has been a mingling of political and governmental activities. I have not the slightest doubt of that. The other precedent referred to by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] called for an investigation of a governmental activity, but the membership of that committee was composed exactly as it is proposed to compose this committee, in the same proportion of the majority and the minority members.

Mr. GARRETT. Does the gentleman refer to the Pujo committee?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No; the Ballinger committee. However, it was a committee to investigate a governmental activity, and that is what this committee is. There is nothing unfair about these proportions.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. That was a Republican committee, and that is what this committee is to be.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes; that is true. I congratulate the Republican side of the House and the country upon the fact that the Republicans have an opportunity to make a delayed investigation of the activities of the War Department. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The Democratic majority that went out in the last Congress had many opportunities to inquire into the activities of the War Department. Many failures have been called to the attention of the country that did not seem to get a response from the committees of this House, and the matters were not investigated.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kansas yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. For a question.

Mr. PELL. In what way does the proportion of this proposed victory investigating committee compare with the proportions of the committee which investigated the Spanish War?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am really not able to answer the gentleman. I think, however, that that was a joint committee, although I am not sure. Mr. Speaker, this resolution calls for an investigation that is so collosal in its nature that there will have to be at least five subcommittees. The sensible thing to do will be to have two Republicans and one Democrat upon each one of these subcommittees, rather than to have two Republicans and one Democrat on a portion of the subcommit-

tees, and three Republicans and two Democrats on other subcommittees.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, before that is done, I would like to ask if the gentleman objects to a vote upon my proposed amendment?

Mr CAMPBELL of Kansas. I do. I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. POU. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 197, nays 154, answered "present" 2, not voting 76, as follows:

YEAS—197.

Ackerman	Fairfield	Luce	Rowe
Anderson	Fess	Lufkin	Sanders, Ind.
Andrews, Md.	Focht	Luhring	Sanders, N. Y.
Andrews, Nebr.	Fordney	McArthur	Sanford
Bacharach	Foster	McCulloch	Scott
Baer	Frear	McKenzie	Sells
Barbour	French	McKinley	Shreve
Begg	Fuller, Ill.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sinclair
Benham	Garland	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sinnott
Bland, Ind.	Glynn	MacCrate	Slemp
Boies	Good	MacGregor	Smith, Idaho
Bowers	Goodall	Madden	Smith, Mich.
Britten	Goodykoontz	Magee	Snell
Brooks, Ill.	Gould	Mapes	Snyder
Brooks, Pa.	Graham, Ill.	Mason	Stephens, Ohio
Browne	Green, Iowa	Merritt	Stiness
Browning	Greene, Mass.	Michener	Strong, Kans.
Burdick	Greene, Vt.	Miller	Strong, Pa.
Burroughs	Griest	Monahan, Wis.	Summers, Wash.
Butler	Hadley	Mondell	Sweet
Campbell, Kans.	Hamilton	Moore, Ohio	Taylor, Tenn.
Cannon	Hardy, Colo.	Moore, Pa.	Timberlake
Chindblom	Haskell	Moores, Ind.	Tincher
Christopherson	Haugen	Morgan	Tinkham
Classon	Hawley	Mott	Towner
Cole	Hays	Murphy	Treadway
Cooper	Hernandez	Nelson, Wis.	Vaile
Copley	Hersey	Newton, Minn.	Vare
Costello	Hickey	Newton, Mo.	Vestal
Crago	Hoch	Nichols, Mich.	Voigt
Cramton	Houghton	Nolan	Volstead
Crowther	Hulings	Ogden	Walsh
Currie, Mich.	Husted	Osborne	Walters
Curry, Calif.	Jefferis	Paige	Ward
Dallinger	Johnson, Wash.	Parker	Watson, Pa.
Darrow	Jones, Pa.	Platt	Webster
Davis, Minn.	Juul	Purnell	Wheeler
Denison	Kearns	Radcliffe	White, Kans.
Dickinson, Iowa	Kendall	Ramsey	White, Me.
Dowell	Kennedy, Iowa	Ramseyer	Williams
Dunbar	King	Randall, Wis.	Wilson, Ill.
Dunn	Kinkaid	Reavis	Winslow
Dyer	Knutson	Reber	Wood, Ind.
Echols	LaGuardia	Reed, N. Y.	Woodyard
Edmonds	Lampert	Reed, W. Va.	Yates
Elliott	Langley	Rhodes	Young, N. Dak.
Elston	Layton	Ricketts	Zihlman
Emerson	Lehlbach	Robsion, Ky.	
Esch	Little	Rogers	
Evans, Nebr.	Longworth	Rose	

NAYS—154.

Alexander	Dominick	Lee, Ga.	Rouse
Almon	Donovan	Lesher	Rubey
Ashbrook	Doremus	Lever	Rucker
Aswell	Drane	Linthicum	Sabath
Ayres	Dupré	Lonergan	Sanders, La.
Babka	Eagle	McAndrews	Sears
Bankhead	Evans, Mont.	McDuffie	Sims
Barkley	Fitzgerald	McGlennon	Sisson
Bee	Flood	McKiniry	Small
Bell	Gallagher	McLane	Smith, N. Y.
Black	Gallivan	Maher	Smithwick
Bland, Mo.	Gandy	Major	Steagall
Bland, Va.	Ganly	Mansfield	Stedman
Blanton	Gard	Martin	Steele
Booher	Garner	Mays	Stephens, Miss.
Box	Garrett	Mead	Taylor, Ark.
Brand	Goodwin, Ark.	Minahan, N. J.	Taylor, Colo.
Briggs	Hardy, Tex.	Moon	Thomas
Brinson	Harrison	Neely	Thompson, Okla.
Buchanan	Hayden	Nelson, Mo.	Tillman
Byrnes, S. C.	Heflin	Nichols, S. C.	Upshaw
Byrns, Tenn.	Hersman	O'Connell	Venable
Caldwell	Holland	Oldfield	Vinson
Campbell, Pa.	Huddleston	Oliver	Watkins
Candler	Hudspeth	Overstreet	Watson, Va.
Cantrill	Hull, Tenn.	Padgett	Weaver
Caraway	Igoe	Park	Webb
Carss	Jacoway	Parrish	Welling
Carter	Johnson, Ky.	Pell	Welty
Casey	Johnson, Miss.	Pou	Whaley
Clark, Mo.	Johnston, N. Y.	Quin	Wilson, La.
Cleary	Jones, Tex.	Ragsdale	Wilson, Pa.
Coady	Kincheloe	Rainey, H. T.	Wingo
Collier	Kitchin	Rainey, J. W.	Wise
Connally	Kleczka	Raker	Woods, Va.
Crisp	Lanham	Randall, Calif.	Wright
Cullen	Lankford	Rayburn	Young, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Lazaro	Riordan	
Dickinson, Mo.	Lea, Calif.	Romjue	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Blackmon	Dewalt

NOT VOTING—76.

Anthony	Fuller, Mass.	Kennedy, R. I.	Porter
Benson	Godwin, N. C.	Kettner	Riddick
Brumbaugh	Goldfogle	Kiess	Robinson, N. C.
Burke	Graham, Pa.	Kraus	Rodenberg
Carew	Griffin	Kreider	Rowan
Clark, Fla.	Hamill	Larsen	Saunders, Va.
Dale	Hastings	McClintic	Schall
Davey	Hicks	McFadden	Scully
Dempsey	Hill	McKeown	Sherwood
Dent	Howard	McPherson	Siegel
Dooling	Hull, Iowa	Mann	Smith, Ill.
Doughton	Humphreys	Montague	Steenerson
Eagan	Hutchinson	Mooney	Stevenson
Ellsworth	Ireland	Moore, Va.	Sullivan
Evans, Nev.	James	Morin	Sumners, Tex.
Ferris	Johnson, S. Dak.	Mudd	Temple
Fields	Kahn	Olney	Thompson, Ohio
Fisher	Kelley, Mich.	Peters	Tilson
Freeman	Kelly, Pa.	Phelan	Wason

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. BENSON.

Mr. BURKE with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. FREEMAN with Mr. DAVEY.

Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts with Mr. EVANS of Nevada.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. DENT.

Mr. HICKS with Mr. KETTNER.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. KRAUS with Mr. MOORE of Virginia.

Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. OLNEY.

Mr. WASON with Mr. STEVENSON.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no," but I have a general pair with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MCFADDEN, who would have voted "yes." I desire to change my vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. DEWALT was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 341, nays 0, answered "present" 1, not voting 87, as follows:

YEAS—341.

Ackerman	Classon	Ganly	Langley
Alexander	Cleary	Gard	Lanham
Almon	Coady	Garland	Lankford
Anderson	Cole	Garner	Layton
Andrews, Md.	Collier	Garrett	Lazaro
Andrews, Nebr.	Connally	Glynn	Lea, Calif.
Ashbrook	Cooper	Godwin, N. C.	Lee, Ga.
Aswell	Copley	Good	Lesher
Ayres	Costello	Goodall	Lever
Babka	Crago	Goodykoontz	Linthicum
Bacharach	Cramton	Graham, Ill.	Little
Baer	Crisp	Greene, Mass.	Lonergan
Bankhead	Cullen	Greene, Vt.	Longworth
Barbour	Currie, Mich.	Griest	Luce
Barkley	Curry, Calif.	Hadley	Lufkin
Bee	Dale	Hamilton	Luhring
Begg	Dallinger	Hardy, Colo.	McAndrews
Bell	Darrow	Hardy, Tex.	McArthur
Benham	Davis, Minn.	Haskell	McCulloch
Benson	Davis, Tenn.	Hawley	McDuffie
Black	Denison	Hayden	McGlennon
Bland, Ind.	Dewalt	Hays	McKiniry
Bland, Mo.	Dickinson, Mo.	Heflin	McLane
Bland, Va.	Dickinson, Iowa	Hernandez	McLaughlin, Mich.
Blanton	Dominick	Hersey	McLaughlin, Nebr.
Boies	Donovan	Hersman	MacCrate
Booher	Doremus	Hickey	MacGregor
Bowers	Dowell	Hoch	Madden
Box	Drane	Holland	Magee
Brand	Dunbar	Houghton	Maher
Briggs	Dunn	Huddleston	Major
Brinson	Dupré	Hudspeth	Mansfield
Brooks, Ill.	Dyer	Hulings	Mapes
Brooks, Pa.	Eagle	Hull, Tenn.	Martin
Browne	Echols	Igoe	Mason
Browning	Edmonds	Jacoway	Mays
Buchanan	Elliott	Jefferis	Mead
Burdick	Elston	Johnson, Ky.	Merritt
Burroughs	Emerson	Johnson, Miss.	Michener
Butler	Esch	Johnson, Wash.	Minahan, N. J.
Byrnes, S. C.	Evans, Mont.	Johnston, N. Y.	Mondell
Byrns, Tenn.	Evans, Nebr.	Jones, Pa.	Moon
Caldwell	Fairfield	Jones, Tex.	Moore, Ohio
Campbell, Kans.	Fess	Juul	Moore, Pa.
Campbell, Pa.	Fitzgerald	Kearns	Moores, Ind.
Candler	Flood	Kendall	Morgan
Cannon	Focht	Kennedy, Iowa	Mott
Cantrill	Fordney	Kincheloe	Murphy
Caraway	Foster	King	Neely
Carss	Frear	Kinkaid	Nelson, Mo.
Carter	French	Kitchin	Nelson, Wis.
Casey	Fuller, Ill.	Kleczka	Newton, Minn.
Chindblom	Gallagher	Knutson	Newton, Mo.
Christopherson	Gallivan	LaGuardia	Nicholls, S. C.
Clark, Mo.	Gandy	Lampert	Nichols, Mich.

Nolan	Rhodes	Snell	Ward
O'Connell	Ricketts	Snyder	Wason
Ogden	Riddick	Steagall	Watkins
Oldfield	Riordan	Stedman	Watson, Pa.
Oliver	Robsion, Ky.	Steele	Watson, Va.
Olney	Rodenberg	Stephens, Ohio	Weaver
Osborne	Rogers	Stiness	Webb
Overstreet	Romjue	Strong, Kans.	Webster
Padgett	Rose	Strong, Pa.	Welling
Paige	Rouse	Summers, Wash.	Welty
Park	Rowe	Sweet	Whaley
Parker	Rubey	Taylor, Ark.	Wheeler
Parrish	Rucker	Taylor, Colo.	White, Kans.
Platt	Sabath	Taylor, Tenn.	White, Me.
Pou	Sanders, Ind.	Thomas	Williams
Purnell	Sanders, La.	Thompson, Okla.	Wilson, Ill.
Quin	Sanders, N. Y.	Tillman	Wilson, La.
Radcliffe	Scott	Timberlake	Wilson, Pa.
Ragsdale	Sears	Tincher	Wingo
Rainey, H. T.	Sells	Tinkham	Winslow
Rainey, J. W.	Shreve	Towner	Wise
Raker	Sims	Treadway	Wood, Ind.
Ramsey	Sinclair	Upshaw	Woodyard
Ramseyer	Sinnott	Vaile	Wright
Randall, Calif.	Sisson	Vare	Yates
Randall, Wis.	Slemp	Venable	Young, N. Dak.
Rayburn	Small	Vestal	Young, Tex.
Reavis	Smith, Idaho	Vinson	Zihlman
Reber	Smith, Mich.	Voigt	
Reed, N. Y.	Smith, N. Y.	Volstead	
Reed, W. Va.	Smithwick	Walsh	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Blackmon

NOT VOTING—87.

Anthony	Gould	Kettner	Phelan
Britten	Graham, Pa.	Kiess	Porter
Brumbaugh	Green, Iowa	Kraus	Robinson, N. C.
Burke	Griffin	Kreider	Rowan
Carew	Hamill	Larsen	Sanford
Clark, Fla.	Harrison	Lehlbach	Saunders, Va.
Crowther	Hastings	McClintic	Schall
Davey	Haugen	McFadden	Scully
Dempsey	Hicks	McKenzie	Sherwood
Dent	Hill	McKeown	Siegel
Dooling	Howard	McKinley	Smith, Ill.
Doughton	Hull, Iowa	McPherson	Steenerson
Eagan	Humphreys	Mann	Stephens, Miss.
Ellsworth	Husted	Miller	Stevenson
Evans, Nev.	Hutchinson	Monahan, Wis.	Sullivan
Ferris	Ireland	Montague	Sumners, Tex.
Fields	James	Mooney	Temple
Fisher	Johnson, S. Dak.	Moore, Va.	Thompson, Ohio
Freeman	Kahn	Morin	Tilson
Fuller, Mass.	Kelley, Mich.	Mudd	Walters
Goldfogle	Kelly, Pa.	Pell	Woods, Va.
Goodwin, Ark.	Kennedy, R. I.	Peters	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. FISHER.

Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. DAVEY.

Mr. LEHLBACH with Mr. MCCLINTIC.

Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. PELL.

Mr. WALTERS with Mr. WOODS of Virginia.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to vote "yea."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called?

Mr. MILLER. I was present.

The SPEAKER. That is not sufficient.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

DISTRICT APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4226), being the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 4226, the District appropriation bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. And pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] if we can not agree upon time for general debate?

Mr. BUCHANAN. What suggestion has the gentleman to make? How much time will your side require?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. So far as I am concerned, I do not care to use more than 30 minutes. I would suggest that we limit the debate to 40 minutes on a side, unless the gentleman has a lot of requests for time.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Let us say 45 minutes on a side, with this understanding, that if no contest is made upon the half-and-half plan it will be limited to 45 minutes on a side, but if there is a contest I think we can agree to time on that subject alone.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Make it 40 minutes on a side, and I will agree to the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. BUCHANAN. All right. Let it go.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. And the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] to control half the time and I the other half.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the debate be limited to 80 minutes, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Texas. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, is it proposed at the conclusion of that time to begin the reading of the bill to-day?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is my desire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4226, the District appropriation bill, with Mr. TOWNER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill may be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, in response to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], concerning the present status of the Federal road act, I desire to submit a communication from the department, which gives the information, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH].

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, while the subject is still fresh in our minds, I desire to advert to the resolution just passed by the House, and particularly to the speech made by my distinguished friend from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. Gentlemen will recall that that side of the House voted unanimously against ordering the previous question, on the ground that they had not received fair treatment in that they were allowed only 5 out of 15 members on this committee; in other words, they contend that with committees, particularly investigating committees, the proportion for the majority should be less than 2 to 1.

Since listening, profoundly moved as I was, by the affecting character of that speech, I have procured a copy of the Congressional Directory of the Sixty-third Congress, that being the first time that the Democratic Party had had for many years an opportunity to impress their policies upon the country and who were then in complete control of this House. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] said that there was no precedent in the history of this House for giving the minority on any committee which had investigating powers as low as one out of two. I will proceed to read certain committee lists to test his statement.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And he was addressing himself particularly to the new Members.

Mr. LONGWORTH. He was appearing in the character of a good old uncle.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman evidently has my statement confused with the statement made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, no. The gentleman from Tennessee made this positive statement. He said: "Treat us at least fairly; let there be some semblance of decency; give us more than one out of every two, because there is no precedent in history for less."

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman will allow me, I will read the list of one of these committees.

I read at random from one of the various investigating committees as formed by the Sixty-third Congress, when the Democratic side was in power:

The Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department: James M. Graham, of Illinois; Oscar Callaway, of Texas; Joseph A. Goulden, of New York; Dudley M. Hughes, of Georgia; Tom Stout, of Montana.

Count them; five Democrats. I now read the names of the other members:

Frank W. Mondell, of Wyoming; Charles H. Burke, of South Dakota.

Count them, my friends; two Republicans. In other words, when the Democratic Party had assumed control of the affairs of this House, instead of giving the Republicans a better deal than we are giving the Democrats now, they gave us only two out of seven. The proportion was two and one-half to one, instead of two to one.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will in a moment. Let me read another:

The Committee on Expenditures in the War Department—

That is the kind of committee we have just formed—a Committee on Expenditures in the War Department. I read:

John A. M. Adair, of Indiana; Hannibal L. Godwin, of North Carolina; John J. Eagan, of New Jersey; Peter J. Dooling, of New York; Frank L. Dershem, of Pennsylvania.

Five. On the Republican side of the committee:

Ernest W. Roberts, of Massachusetts.

One. They were kind enough to give us one out of six on that committee. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Now, gentlemen, I am not going to debate the question whether it would have been better or not to have given the minority a larger proportion, though it seems to me very patent that in a committee of 15, where there are to be five separate subcommittees, it is the only proportion which would be fair to both sides of the House. But the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] says that we have been unfair; that we have been indecent. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman from Minnesota give me two minutes more?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I yield the gentleman two minutes more. That is all I can give.

Mr. LONGWORTH. He accuses us of indecency in this matter. I am sure my friend from Tennessee did not have in mind, when he made that attack on this side of the House, the treatment that we received—without complaint, I assume, because I did not happen to be a Member of that Congress myself—without complaint, the proportion of only one out of two and one-half. As a matter of fact, if we had followed the precedent set by the party that is now in the minority, which was then in a majority for the first time in many years, the proportion of this committee would have been as 11 to 4.

In other words, gentlemen, we have not only treated you fairly, but we have treated you much more fairly than you treated us. My friend from Tennessee may shed tears, if he likes, in addressing this House, but I beg of him not to shed "crocodile tears." [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] for 40 minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, it came as a very great surprise to me that any gentleman on that side should care to reopen an issue which has just been so shamefully settled. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In the remarks which I made, referring to investigating committees, I referred to special investigating committees. I did not refer to the standing committees of the House. We have made no complaint as to the assignments given us upon the standing committees of the House. Those were accepted without protest. I think myself that the arrangement was as fair as it could have been made. What I complained of was the assignment upon this special committee. The able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], however, has seen fit to call attention to the five-and-two proposition in the Sixty-third Congress. In that Congress the Democratic Party had a majority of about 143. In this Congress the Republicans have a majority of about 41. And yet we gave you upon the standing Committee on Expenditures at that time the same proportion, notwithstanding our majority of 143, that you have given us at this time with your majority of only 41. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. In just a moment I will try to. Now, in view of the fact that this matter has been reopened, and as I see the honored Speaker of the House leaving the Chamber, I desire to make an appeal to him. I stated in the course of my remarks that I supposed the Speaker would carry out the plans that had been formulated by his party's steering committee, but upon reflection I think I was mistaken and that I did the Speaker a grave injustice in that respect. Notwithstanding this resolution which has been forced upon the Speaker of this House, notwithstanding the program which has been laid down by the steering committee of the majority side, that there shall be 10 to 5, I yet have—and that is my only remaining hope—an abiding faith that the Speaker of this House will, fair as he is, disregard the recommendation of his party's steering committee and do us the decent justice that ought to be done when it comes to appointing this committee. [Applause on the Democratic side.] With that expression, Mr. Chairman, of the confidence I have in the fairness and the justice of the Speaker of this House, who now remains our only hope for justice, the episode, so far as I am concerned, is closed. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee yields back the remainder of his time, two minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 33 minutes left.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I wish the Chair would call my attention to the fact when I have spoken 20 minutes, if I succeed in speaking that long.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will try to do so.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I feel as though an armistice relative to the recent heated discussion at least has been signed; not that the war is over, but that an armistice has been signed.

Now, I want to call attention to something that you are all interested in, because you represent all parts of this country. The bill that I am going to present to you pertains particularly to the Capital of the Nation—your Capital—and if you discover any politics in it, any partisanship on the part of any member of the committee presenting it—and I am a part of that—I wish you would point it out. We have endeavored here to proceed in an economical way, not because of past extravagance, but because we want to do justice to the people of this District, the city of Washington, and the people of the United States. I want to make an illustration, a comparison. Your subcommittee is composed of five members.

Having been connected with municipalities before I came to Congress, I can not help thinking that your subcommittee really are aldermen of the city of Washington. Now, if this were Cleveland, Detroit, Minneapolis, St. Louis, or some other city of that size, perhaps your five aldermen here could get along pretty well, provided we had six months or a year's time in which to investigate all these matters; but we have not that time, and this is not Cleveland, Cincinnati, Detroit, or any other city of similar size. This is Washington, the Capital of the Nation. And I want to tell you the more you study it the more you will be surprised to find the complexity of the conditions which confront your little board of aldermen.

In the ordinary city the taxgatherer collects the money, the board of aldermen distribute it, and it is all audited by one office. Not so in Washington. I am not condemning the system, I am merely stating to you a fact. I will give you a few illustrations to show you the complexity and the trouble that your subcommittee have to contend with. Appropriations for the District of Columbia are carried in the District bill proper, which I now present to you. Large sums are carried in the sundry civil bill. Large sums are carried in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill, and the deficiency bills always carry appropriations for the District of Columbia. The funds for park maintenance are carried in the sundry civil bill and are expended by the Chief of Engineers of the Army. That is only one instance. To keep track of all these different things, first, where do we get the money for a particular purpose; next, how is it disposed of and under whose guidance—these are some of the complications.

The funds for the water department are carried in the District bill, but are expended partly by the District Commissioners and partly by the Chief of Engineers of the Army. Those things all have to be watched, audited, and looked after, and your little board of aldermen of five men have got to straighten out all those things and explain to 435 Members why it is so, and all about it.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not want to bother the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I shall not consider it any bother. I shall be glad to answer any question, if I can.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill if all the park police force under the direction of the Army are not paid out of the Army appropriation bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. No; they are not. We pay a part of them and the Federal Government pays another part.

Mr. MADDEN. I did not think we paid any part.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I am informed by the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations that we do.

Mr. SISSON. If the gentleman will yield——

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SISSON. At the beginning of the war the police force was very greatly reduced, and a certain number of men were detailed from the Army on police duty, and they were paid out of the police fund. Of course, this committee had nothing to do with that, because they were regularly appointed as policemen for the District of Columbia. They were detailed as policemen, and they were in their uniforms. How many there were I do not know.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I think that is correct. I will just give you briefly a few other illustrations. Mind you, I am not criticizing this thing. I am simply showing the obstacles and confusion that your committee have to contend with, both in the appropriations and the settlement.

The Zoological Park, with an annual appropriation of $115,000, is under the Smithsonian Institution. There is a small appropriation for the burial of indigent soldiers, which is under the War Department.

The public buildings and grounds, care and maintenance of parks, and so forth, are under the War Department. Rock Creek Park and Potomac Parkway are under a commission. The Aqueduct Bridge is under the War Department. Columbia Hospital is under a board of trustees. The salaries and expenses of the office of public buildings and grounds are under the War Department. The $240 bonus to employees is carried in the District bill, but we did not inaugurate it. The refunding of taxes, an indefinite sum, is in the District bill.

I simply cite these things to you to show you that this is different from any other city in the country, and that in order to comprehend it fully much time should be consumed in investigating it.

Now, as to the present bill. The last appropriation bill, for 1919, including deficiencies, amounted to $15,451,318.66. The bill under consideration carries $14,782,981. The bill which failed of passage carried $14,093,701. You must bear in mind that we spent a good deal of time here in the last session in the consideration of a District of Columbia appropriation bill, which passed the House but failed to become a law, owing to the fact that the Sixty-fifth Congress expired on the 4th of March. That bill carried $689,280 less than the present bill. In this bill we have not come up to the estimates of the commissioners, and we have not come up to the estimates of the War Department. We have not given them all that they asked for, but we have done pretty well, I think. We have given them within about $800,000 of what they requested.

Gentlemen, owing to the failure of the passage of the last bill I really think the District of Columbia suffered more inconvenience, considering the amount involved, than almost any other branch of our Government. The bill failed of passage, and it left things in a very disordered state in the District of Columbia. So, in order to expedite the passage of this bill, your committee virtually took the old bill, which failed of passage the last time, and called it the foundation of this bill. It is true we raised some salaries. We raised the salaries of teachers. We put on some new employment; but the bill passed the scrutiny of this House, and it carried $14,782,981. Now, we have taken that as the foundation, so to speak, or the nucleus, of the present bill, and we have added a little over $600,000 to it. We were then in war. At least, hostilities had only been partially suspended. We felt a little cramped for funds. We did not go on with many improvements. In other words, I choose to style the old bill which failed of passage simply a maintenance bill. Consider that remark, gentlemen. In other words, instead of being a bill to add new improvements or to go ahead with new and needed construction, it was simply to maintain the things that we had.

Therefore, I call the old bill which failed of passage the maintenance bill. We have taken that bill and added $600,000 or $800,000 to it in the matter of new construction that the District of Columbia very much needs.

Take the item of streets, which I think is the largest. The old bill carried no appropriation whatever, not a single dollar, for the improvement or opening of new streets in the entire District of Columbia. We simply tried to maintain those we already had as best we could, and provided for no new construction whatever. The present bill, owing to a change in conditions, for new work on streets has added to it $282,300. We have added a partial and moderate amount to what the District Commissioners have asked for in the estimate. I am frank to say that in the last old bill while the commissioners made an estimate of improvements desired, still they said that "we think it would not be advisable to go into new projects if you will properly maintain the old ones." So we did so, but now we have added a reasonable and moderate sum of $282,300 for the advancement of new work on about 20 different highways in the District of Columbia.

We have also put into the bill what is called a consolidation of the improvement of new streets. Heretofore in District improvements in the old city of Washington the appropriations have been made in a lump sum, and by reference simply to certain streets on the back of the estimates. While the improvement of suburban roads have been made by appropriations carried in detail on the face of each bill, in this bill the committee recommends carrying one item for street improvement, and it will have the effect of presenting to Congress on the face of the appropriation bill every street that is to be paved or repaved during the ensuing year. So that the entire Congress can pick up the bill and pick out streets we are going to improve and the amount we are going to pay therefor in each case. Whether that is an improvement it is for the Congress to determine. I think it is.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. Does this committee give any serious attention to the matter of street cleaning and the removal of garbage?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will come to that in a few minutes. I will say that we do, and for street cleaning we appropriate a large sum of money in this bill.

Mr. MADDEN. I was going to call the gentleman's attention, and through him the committee's attention, to the fact that it frequently happens that those charged with the responsibility of removing the garbage pay no attention to it, and that the property owners are required to go without having the garbage removed, and are subjected to the stench that ensues from a failure to carry it away. It happen, in many instances, that the men who are employed to take the garbage away refuse to do it unless somebody pays them extra for doing it. It seems to me that there ought to be some method devised by which regularity of action would follow the appropriation in the matter of removal of garbage, and that the people who pay the taxes would not be imposed upon by the contractor or employees and be required to pay additional money for the work that ought to be done and paid for out of the appropriation.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We have had a little difficulty on the garbage question. The contractors were not able to comply with the contract. We have taken over the garbage plant at Cherry Hill, bought it, and paid $85,000 for it, improved it to the amount of $35,000, and we are virtually running our own garbage proposition. We have been obliged to do so, but I think we are doing it cheaper than we did under the old system.

Mr. MADDEN. That is supposed to be a garbage-reduction plant. Of course, the garbage must be gotten to the plant before it can be reduced. The thing I am complaining of is that the garbage is not moved from the premises, and that the people have to pay these men for doing the work that Congress appropriates the money to pay for.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I hope that the gentleman is not censuring the Commissioners of the District.

Mr. MADDEN. No; I am calling attention of the committee to the matter so that the committee may make inquiry into it and remedy it.

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. I will state to my friend that some time back there was a good deal of complaint about the garbage. That came to our attention and we called the attention of the District Commissioners to it, and they stated that they had had a great deal of complaint. Legislation went into the bill year before last and the money was appropriated, and we find that there has been very much less complaint since. The difficulty has been to get labor to do this work. I do not think the gentleman will find that the complaints will continue now that we are getting labor enough.

Mr. MADDEN. If I may be permitted to say, my next complaint is that after having called up those who are supposed to be in supreme authority at the District Building you get a man on the telephone who states that you want to communicate with some one else, and tries to switch you off onto somebody else. You can not find the somebody else, and finally, when you have tried five or six, they switch you back to the first man and he tells you that he has not the time to talk to you about it. It seems to me that there is something radically wrong at headquarters where they do the executive work. It makes no difference how many men you employ to do a thing if the man at the head pays no attention to complaints and fails to see that you get it done.

Mr. SISSON. How recent has this complaint been?

Mr. MADDEN. Every day.

Mr. SISSON. I am inclined to believe the gentleman has just been troubled a little and it worries him to the extent that he makes it every day.

Mr. MADDEN. It does not worry me at all. I was simply telling the facts as I found them. Of course, I believe that if we call the matter to the attention of this committee, they will be able to call it to the attention of the people who were complained about.

Mr. SISSON. I was just thinking perhaps the gentleman had heard some of the old complaints that came to us in large numbers some time ago. We have not heard complaints lately.

Mr. MADDEN. I am only complaining about things that I know myself.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I think I can settle this difficulty. You have a subcommittee now, a little board of aldermen, that is going to investigate the garbage question thoroughly, and I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] will be satisfied with the next bill that is reported and with all that comes in between that time and now, because we are going to watch that.

I am going to make my remarks a little shorter than I intended. Let us take the question of repairs on streets. As I say, this is a constructive bill. Under the previous bill repairs on streets contained an item for only $375,000. The commissioners, however, this time recommend $675,000. We went as far as we thought we could under all the conditions, and we have allowed them $500,000 for repairs to streets, because I believe the streets of Washington ought to be kept in good repair.

Sewers—there is but one item, and it is new—$40,000. There has been a great deal of talk about what is called the upper Potomac interceptor. It is a proposition that will cost about $40,000. When that is completed the function of that interceptor will be to collect the Georgetown sewage, now discharged into the Potomac River, and carry it into the regular sewerage system of the city. Hence there will be no further complaint about the water in the Potomac being impure and unhealthy. That little $40,000 item, I think, is going to be pretty well expended.

In the last bill we could not give a single dollar—we did not feel as though we could—with which to build any permanent school buildings. We therefore gave you 60 little portable schools, emergency propositions; but we determined then that when the war was over and peace was declared we would attempt to rebuild or add some permanent additions to our school buildings, so we have taken up four school buildings that we think are most essential at this time. There is the Petworth School, where the limit of cost is $130,000. There has already been appropriated on that school $87,000, and we have added in this bill $20,000 additional. Unless that is done, virtually we will have to stop doing things at the Petworth School.

At the Burrville School the limit of cost is $60,000. Forty thousand dollars has already been appropriated, and they must have $10,000 more right now in order to continue the building at all.

At the Monroe School the limit of cost is $130,000. Ninety thousand dollars has been appropriated, and we give them $20,000 more. Perhaps we were a little bit niggardly——

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the committee know anything about what percentage of children of school age are required to attend school only for half a day?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I could not tell the gentleman. We did not have any hearings on that.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, it seems that we are not giving the District school facilities enough, and that instead of giving the amount required for the completion of the schools, to a partial amount of the limit of cost, you ought to allow the full cost and have the schools completed.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We have given exactly what the commissioners said they wanted for those four school buildings.

Mr. MADDEN. Very well; then you ought to build some more schools.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We are going to. There are 16 or 17 in contemplation, but we can not build them just now, at least the commissioners do not think it advisable, and we have taken these four buildings at their own figures.

Mr. MADDEN. There is money in the Treasury to the amount of $5,000,000. Why not take that and build some school buildings and give the children a chance to go to school?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I am afraid that the gentleman is now talking about the financial system of the District.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. Can the gentleman tell us how much has been appropriated to build different schools with a limit of cost so low that it is impossible under present conditions to complete them?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I think there are 16 or 17.

Mr. MAPES. Does not the gentleman think that the committee in making these appropriations originally and fixing the limit of cost below what is advisable under present conditions either was in error or else the committee now ought to increase the limit of cost so that the buildings can be constructed?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. They ought to and they will, but when the limit of cost was fixed material was not as high as it is now.

Mr. MAPES. But if the buildings were needed at that time, they are much more needed now, with the greatly increased population in the District, and ought not the committee to change the limit of cost so that they can construct these buildings?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We have 80 portable school buildings to take care of that situation.

Mr. MAPES. But they are not used. Answering the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], I can say that in some of the schools, to my personal knowledge, all of the pupils up to and including the fourth grade are prevented from going to school more than one-half day because of the lack of school facilities.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman realize that under the provisions of this bill the men who take up the ashes and the garbage and the trash of the District draw a great deal more money than do the several hundred school-teachers who are teaching the school children of this District?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I realize that to a certain extent, but I realize some of the men who have been taking up ashes have lost about $60,000 this year.

Mr. BLANTON. I am talking about the laborers who actually take them up, who are receiving more money than good school-teachers who are teaching the children in this District.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I agree with the gentleman in this, and I am glad to say we raised the school-teachers——

Mr. BLANTON. I want to raise them as high as I can.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The blue sky is a little too much for me. I want to raise the school-teachers, and we have raised them a little bit in here, and if the gentleman does not make the point of order it will go through.

Mr. BLANTON. It is so little.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Well, I do not know. The poorest paid school-teacher under this bill, if it becomes a law, will be $1,040 per school year.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will.

Mr. PLATT. Has it not been the settled policy of the Washington schools for quite a number of years not to require the little children of the first and second grades to go to school more than half a day? I know it was five or six years ago, and I think it is good policy.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I can not tell; we have had no hearings upon that at all. I think the old bill and this bill together contain between 40 and 50 new employments, and we have raised the salary of a few people in the old and new bill, but very little in this particular bill. I speak of the old bill as the one that my colleague [Mr. SISSON] and myself worked to get through the House last year, but which failed in the Senate. Now, we come to the question of salaries that my friend speaks of. This bill contains the following: Four hundred and ninety-eight school-teachers in class 4. The basic salary, according to this bill, is $850 each, which added to the $240 bonus makes $1,090. Five hundred and forty-three in class 3. The basic salary under this bill is $800. Add the $240 to that and you have $1,040. Three hundred and sixty-four in class 2. The

basic salary under this bill is $800, nothing below that, all $800, and adding the $240 to it makes $1,040. Ninety in class 1. Eight hundred dollars basic salary; in other words, this bill raises the small-grade teachers—1,495 of them—that is, the kindergarten and low grades, those who were a few years ago getting $540. If this bill passes, the lowest one will get $1,040. In other words, we add $78,750 to the salaries of these low-grade teachers.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will allow me, of course it does not add this $240.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is true, but they get the $240 bonus.

Mr. MADDEN. To the low-grade teachers. The act gives the $240 bonus to everybody in Government service receiving less than a certain salary.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I understand that very well. I am simply saying, in reference to the low-grade teachers not being paid very much, what they actually got out of the Treasury, and $1,040 is the lowest.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman know every clerk almost who has entered the Government service during the recent war has entered on a salary of at least $1,000 plus this bonus?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I know that very well, indeed, and the matter has been discussed and considered, and I will tell the gentleman this: They say—and it is not my argument—that they work six days in the week, and the little school-teacher, they say, works only five days——

Mr. BLANTON. Works seven.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. They say that; I do not say that.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield for an interruption?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes, sir.

Mr. FESS. I would like to know what is to become of the schools if we can not find a reconciliation between the salaries of men and women who do not need to prepare to do the work and get higher salaries than the teachers who spend much time to prepare after this expenditure?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will tell the gentleman what I think will be the result: Many, many, many of them will retire from teaching and go off to do other work.

Mr. FESS. What will become of the schools? [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Does not the gentleman know, without asking me—he is one of the best educators in the country—does not the gentleman know what the result will be?

Mr. FESS. I will say to my friend I feel——

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I agree before the gentleman answers.

Mr. FESS. I feel sure the gentleman is struck with the proposition I have in mind, and I ask this question seriously: With the scale of prices now ranging, what is to become of the class of men or women who want to go into school work and must spend a lot of time to get ready when other people who do not need to spend any time to get ready for the work get much higher rates than they do?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Of course, that is true, especially this new class of clerks that come under the war-work system. The teacher is partly cared for under the longevity system. Under the longevity system the school-teacher's salary keeps increasing every year, and therefore it is an inducement to hold him or her to the job. It is a good deal like the young man graduating from Annapolis. Every year he gets a fogy increase of salary, and by the time he is about 62 years old he is retired at $4,000 or $5,000 a year for the remainder of his life. The longevity system has a tendency to induce the teachers to remain. The prospect which longevity pay holds out to them in my humble belief will keep many, many of them on the job.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will yield.

Mr. MAPES. Under this longevity system what is the minimum the primary teacher will receive?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. For the primary teacher it is about $1,040, with the bonus.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Minnesota desires additional time——

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I would like to have three or four minutes.

Mr. SISSON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given five minutes additional, with five minutes additional on this side. I want to say this in justice——

Mr. WALSH. You can not do that in committee after the time has been agreed upon.

Mr. SISSON. That is true, but if nobody raises objection right now we can.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. If my friend from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] will give me, say, about two minutes, that will be all I want.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield two minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Ordinarily, my friends, I am against riders on appropriation bills; in fact, almost universally against them. Now, there are one or two little riders on this bill. We have in here a provision that the Commissioners of the District when they purchase automobiles or office furniture and supplies shall be authorized to purchase them from the general supply committee of the Army, and so forth. You have heard of that. In all the other branches of the Government there is a law which authorizes that to be done. The District of Columbia is the exception. Now, that is new legislation. Any man here can make a point of order on it. But we trust that you will not leave the District of Columbia out in the cold and simply say, technically speaking, that a point of order lies and that you will knock it out. We have added this in order to make it absolutely safe:

Provided, That this section shall not be construed to amend, alter, or repeal the Executive order of December 3, 1918, concerning the transfer of office material, supplies, and equipment in the District of Columbia falling into disuse because of the cessation of war activities.

In other words, we do not want to conflict with the Executive order of the administration in passing this legislation. We thought we would like to be very safe on the proposition. I do not believe any man here, when there are some automobiles and desks to be supplied, would object to them buying them from that supply bureau when they can buy them cheaper there than at any other place. But it is new legislation. If you want to knock it out on a point of order, all right.

And there are one or two other pieces of legislation like that. Now, the committee is in a hurry, because the officials of the District of Columbia, the departments here, need to have this bill passed.

And there is a great big question called the "half and half." I am not going to discuss it at this time. A portion of the House think one way and many others disagree with them. If anybody is going to raise that question now and spend half a day or a day on it, you are at liberty to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the joint resolution of the following title:

H. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women.

DISTRICT APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON].

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to go into the details of this bill, but in explanation of the money appropriated in the bill which failed, for street improvement, it is fair to state that we did reappropriate all the money which had been carried in the previous bill, not a dollar of which had been expended in new streets, not because, in many instances, the new streets and the new pavements were not needed but because by order of the War Material Board of the Army the District of Columbia, like all other cities situated like the District of Columbia is situated, was not permitted to get any material of any kind, and, in addition to that, they were not permitted to get labor. So while the money was available for that use the District Commissioners could not use it. The war conditions at that time were such that when this bill was made up the subcommittee agreed unanimously with the commissioners in their recommendations simply to reappropriate all the money that had heretofore been appropriated for those purposes, and that was done.

Now, they have either used, or have contracted to be used, practically all of the reappropriated money; that is to say, the current law carries the money, and they are authorized to spend and contract up to the 1st day of July. That has been done.

Now, your committee gave to the District Commissioners some $350,000 for new work, which means that within 12 months there will be infinitely more money expended on the streets and more streets improved within the same length of time than in any other period in the history of the District of Columbia, so far as my knowledge goes. But that was due to the fact that in

these days now, the closing days of this year, they are letting the contracts for the streets under the current law. So, as a matter of fact, while on its face the bill does not carry quite as much for streets annually as is usually carried, it is carrying at least 33⅓ per cent more for streets actually in one year than has ever been carried heretofore.

I want to say also just a word about the school-teachers' salaries. The current law for the first time increased the base pay of school-teachers. The lowest-paid school-teacher was $500. That is what is known as the longevity law, and before any Member of Congress will be able to understand anything about the longevity law he will have to go back to the act which was passed many years ago to ascertain just exactly its provisions and as to the classification of teachers. Last year we raised the base pay of teachers from $500, which was the lowest, to $750. We eliminated the three lower grades and put all four grades on the $750 basis. Now, this does not mean that $750 is the salary of the school-teachers, because every year that they teach a certain sum is added to that amount. But, gentlemen of the committee, under the current law the lowest pay that a teacher gets on entering any department of the school work is $870. That, plus the $120 now carried and the $120 bonus, makes $240, and the lowest-paid teacher will now enter school at this next session getting $1,140 on entrance.

Mr. SHREVE. Will the gentleman yield just at that point?

Mr. SISSON. I will yield only for a question, as I have but 10 minutes.

Mr. SHREVE. What is the pay of the teachers of the high schools?

Mr. SISSON. The salaries of the teachers of the high schools are also graded, and they also have longevity.

Mr. SHREVE. What amount will they draw this year?

Mr. SISSON. Class 6–B, I think, is that of the high-school teachers. They get $2,020, and then the extra $120 bonus, which makes $2,140.

Mr. SHREVE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SISSON. Now, I had heard so much complaint about the salaries of the school-teachers in the District of Columbia that I wrote to the schools of all of the cities of over 100,000 inhabitants in the United States, and I got from them reports as to the salaries which they paid, and with the longevity pay carried under the longevity law, together with the $250 raise which we gave last year, plus the $240 bonus this year, the base pay of the teachers of the District of Columbia is higher than that of nearly all of the cities of the United States, and there is only one city which for several years has paid as much, and that is the city of Boston. The city of Philadelphia last year, beginning this session, raised their base pay to about the Boston standard.

Now, those are the cities whose salaries are comparable with those of the District of Columbia. Therefore I am not willing that the statement shall go unchallenged here that the school-teachers of the District of Columbia have not been treated fairly by your present subcommittee, because if you will compare the salaries paid the District of Columbia teachers with those paid in the cities where the inhabitants themselves voluntarily vote the tax, you will find that the District of Columbia is in advance of nearly all the cities, and, with the exception of the city of Boston and the city of Philadelphia, is slightly above those of Cleveland and Detroit, which also pay good salaries.

Now, your subcommittee did not feel warranted in increasing the salaries, because a teacher goes in in many cities with what they call a probation period. Here they go on at $1,040; the next year they get $1,090, and so on for 10 years, gradually increasing each year that they remain in the service, and then when they go from the lower grades to the higher class—we call them "grades"—they do not lose that longevity, but the longevity which they have earned is added to the base pay of the next higher grade which they enter. It is, therefore, a most difficult problem for your subcommittee to tell how much money is needed to take care of what is called longevity pay. The school authorities and the Board of Education make the best estimates they can. But if a school-teacher dies or leaves the service and a new teacher comes in, that makes the longevity pay a little bit less than it would be otherwise, because the first school-teachers do not get longevity pay. It amounts, in round numbers, to something like $575,000, so that you can take a $500,000 fund and divide it up among the school-teachers in accordance with their longevity. Therefore this complaint on the part of the school-teachers in regard to being underpaid heretofore may be a just one; but if it is a just one, it is a criticism of the entire school system of America and is not local here in Washington, because we are along with Boston and Philadelphia, and in Philadelphia they did not pay the increased rate until last year, when they had a reorganization and a reclassification.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. VARE. Is it not a fact that a beginner at $1,040 in the District of Columbia receives a salary larger than any beginner elsewhere?

Mr. SISSON. That is true. Counting the bonus of $240 this year, they get even a higher salary than in Boston or Philadelphia. But I am speaking of what was carried in the current law by the committee. We put it right up to the top notch. For that reason I felt that school-teachers' salaries were reasonable, and I shall not raise any complaint. But I do not believe that the raise which the subcommittee and the full committee put into this bill, as compared with the current law, was justified as compared with other similar salaries paid elsewhere throughout the United States.

Now, I want to say one word with reference to school buildings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SISSON. I wanted just two minutes to explain the school-building items, but I can do that under the five-minute rule.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to my colleague from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I ask leave to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have impatiently waited up to this time, after nearly 30 hours have elapsed, for some older and abler Member of this House to properly denounce one of the most atrocious and dastardly crimes that has ever been attempted in this Republic. I have waited for weeks, hoping that some older Member of this Congress would take the floor and properly denounce the dastardly attack that several weeks ago was made upon that former little giant of this House, our lamented Hon. John L. Burnett, of Alabama, who probably would be among us now, giving us his good advice and counsel, had it not been for the probable shock caused by the deadly, dastardly, cowardly anarchist bomb that was sent into his household at the time so many others were sent through the United States mail from one side of the United States to the other.

Time and again on the floor of this House recently I have warned this Congress of the fact that there were harbored under this Government, by groups of men in organizations, these vicious anarchistic tendencies. I noticed in the papers a denial immediately on behalf of the organizations to which I referred, denying that they had any connection with deadly bombs placed on the front doorstep of a Cabinet officer of the United States in the dead hour of night. Would you expect a murderer to admit his crime?

I realize, when I call attention to the fact that these organizations harbor such things, there are thousands of good men, loyal and patriotic citizens of this country—even Members of Congress, loyal and big men they are—who are members of organized labor unions of this land, and who do not approve of such actions. But I have warned this Congress heretofore that, no matter how many good men there are in unions, the fact remains to-day that it is in the unions of this country, it is among organized labor in this country, that anarchists find harbor and succor and protection.

I call attention to the warning I gave this Congress May 23, 1919, published in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, wherein I recited the partial war record of labor unions, and facts clearly demonstrating that they were dominated by the radical and vicious element, and wherein I challenged Mr. Samuel Gompers and the American Federation of Labor to disprove any of such statements, to wit:

"Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, when my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] stated that thousands of our soldiers have been held idle in the camps of this country solely because officers afraid of losing their jobs refused to discharge many worthy cases I agreed with him as far as he went, but suggested another reason why they have been held, to wit, that in Texas and elsewhere Mr. Samuel Gompers, the president and master of the American Federation of Labor, stated that he and organized labor would never stand for war-time wage schedules

to be reduced one cent, and that Mr. Gompers's opposition to speedy demobilization had greatly influenced the holding of the boys in the camps of this country.

"In the closing hours of the Sixty-fifth Congress I called attention to the fact that our labor unions had permitted Socialism and Bolshevism to dominate and use them as cat's paws, and, regardless of how much and often he preached to the contrary, Mr. Gompers allowed such domination to prevail, and has not purged such organizations of such viciousness. I further called attention to the fact of organized labor's partial war record, and stated that the time had come when Congress must decide whether this Government is to be run in the interests equally of the 110,000,000 people of this Republic or whether it is to be selfishly run by Mr. Gompers in the class interest of the 3,000,000 members of labor unions.

"In a speech in Texas I repeated such statements, following which, in a published interview, Mr. Gompers, without a single denial, stated: 'That I confessed an utter incapacity of understanding the plainest proposition of right, justice, freedom, and democracy.'

"Comparing Mr. Gompers's democracy with my own, he represents only 3,000,000 people, whose union slogan is 'For ourselves only,' while I have deeply at heart the welfare and interests equally not only of Mr. Gompers's men but also of the other 107,000,000 people of the United States of America.

"The Dallas Central Labor Council, the crafts at Cleburne, Tex., and others have tried to excuse this war record by partial denials, and by calling attention to the fact that some members of unions loyally served in France, and wanting to know where I was, and then asserting that I was busy attending banquets and theater parties.

"Union members who during the war profited by raids on the Public Treasury can not hide now behind the patriotism of member-soldiers or excuse themselves by beclouding the record. The issue is too vital. The record must be kept straight.

"I represent no interests other than the welfare of my constituents generally, and have never received one penny contribution, campaign or otherwise, from any source. I have many unions in my district, in the cities of Abilene, Baird, Sweetwater, Ballinger, Coleman, Cisco, Ranger, Eastland, Strawn, Mineral Wells, Comanche, Brownwood Lampasas, Llano, San Saba, Brady, and other places. Nevertheless I have lately paid out of my own pocket nearly a thousand dollars for printing, addressing, and mailing to them these criticisms.

"Raised on a farm, having delivered groceries in the back door of practically every home in Austin, and by keeping books at night earning every dollar expended for five years' training at my State university, I could not be unfriendly to laborers. I heartily favor lawful unions. I heartily favor the labor principles in the peace treaty, namely: 'Labor is no commodity; association for lawful purposes; adequate wage; 8-hour day and 48-hour week; 1 rest day; abolition of child labor; equal pay for men and women doing work of equal value; equitable economic treatment; and female inspectors.' No fair-minded person would demand less or would demand more.

"Any system is vicious that destroys individual competitive efficiency and incites lazy, inefficient, indifferent service upheld by force. Every doctor, lawyer, preacher, teacher, farmer, Congressman, officer, banker, merchant, and unorganized laborer succeeds only when in honest competition he renders the most efficient service of greatest value to the public. To hold their positions and advance their incomes members of unions have ceased to rely upon individual skill and efficient service, but now collectively depend almost entirely upon Mr. Gompers, force, and anarchy. If unions will abolish strikes, picketing, boycotts, force, disregard of law, and anarchy, I will be their strongest friend, but without such reform I am against them forever and eternally. Now, to correct the record. Unions may boast they have done this or that for the war, but I challenge Mr. Gompers to disprove any of the following well-known facts:

"The Railroad Administration certifies that the raises demanded by the four great brotherhoods and granted to the railroad employees by Director McAdoo approximated $754,811,000; that the additional raises later demanded of and granted by Director Hines approximated $67,500,000, aggregating $822,311,000 raises in salaries (during war) to 400,000 employees (far from trenches); that in 1917 passenger conductors received $135 to $165 per month, plus overtime, but with the raises they now receive an average of $180 per month plus time and a half for all time they put in over eight hours a day and are granted one day off each week.

"Duties of a passenger conductor are not very laborious, unpleasant, or hazardous. Did not the Government require more sacrifice of the soldier to fight on foreign soil, sometimes 24 hours per day in cootie-infested trenches, knee deep in mud, for $33 per month and keep, than it required of the passenger conductor to continue working 8 hours per day 6 days a week during the war for $135 to $165, plus overtime, per month? We can not forget the brotherhoods' threat to tie up every railroad in the United States while in a death struggle we were rescuing the world. No highwayman ever drew a deadlier weapon or made a deadlier threat. No wonder after throwing up his hands and delivering over the $754,811,000 the honest statesman McAdoo resigned. We can not forget the later threat or revolution. No wonder Director Hines handed over the additional $67,500,000. But, alas, this $822,311,000 is paid by the unorganized bleeding public. Has our service improved over 1917? The service is good, bad, or indifferent, just as the employees will it. Employees make the service. Unions furnish the employees. If the service is good, credit unions; if bad, hold unions responsible.

"The department certifies that the raises granted to telegraph employees aggregate $3,300,867. Telephone raises are now being determined, yet in Indiana union strikers attempted to chase poor helpless work girls off the roofs of buildings. And telegraphers are now threatening a nation-wide strike.

"While every raise granted to postal employees was justly merited, still could not the demand have waited for peace? Upon criticism being made that it takes an extra day or two longer than necessary for New York mail to reach Washington, Mr. Gompers condemned the whole Postal Service. Who performs the Postal Service? From the time such letters are posted until they are delivered they are handled by members of unions. They are collected, stamped, distributed, bagged, transported, handled, and delivered by unions. If the service is good, the unions deserve the credit. If the service is bad, the unions should be held responsible for it.

"During the war unions have forced wage schedules to a maximum of $1.25 per hour plus time and a half for over eight hours—more than the governor of Texas receives, more than circuit judges in Texas receive. Unions accomplished this by striking 6,000 times during the war, each averaging 18 days. The armistice was signed November 11. This is May. Yet several hundred thousand soldiers have been held idle in camps without excuse. Why? Simply because Mr. Gompers threatened in Texas and elsewhere he would not permit any reduction in war-time wage schedules. With Mr. Gompers against speedy demobilization, it is easy to understand why thousands of our soldiers have been held absolutely idle in the camps of this country. He said that he and unions would not stand for any reduction. Speedy demobilization would tend to reduce. Therefore there could be no speedy demobilization without disaster to the Republic, if Mr. Gompers's threat meant anything. Yet one county in my district, Runnels, with many of its boys yet in camps, is begging for 1,000 laborers to harvest the wheat. I introduced on the day this Congress met a bill to promptly discharge from the service upon application every man physically fit whose purpose when enlisting was to serve only for the duration of the war. I hope that it will be promptly passed.

"Exclusive of all postal and railroad employees elsewhere provided for, unions demanded a blanket bonus of $120 for each of the 240,000 Government clerks. Congress obeyed and granted the $120 bonus, but required such clerks to work eight instead of only seven hours per day. Mr. Gompers said it was 'damnable,' although the eight-hour day was still a plank in the union platform. He demanded its veto. Unions published threats to march on the Capitol and to cripple the Government by walking out. President Wilson sized up the situation and realized that the peril menaced the whole world, hence vetoed the eight hours. These 240,000 clerks, many occupying positions vacated by soldiers and many industrially exempt, took their $120 bonus and continued to work only seven hours. Without such bonus these clerks drew salaries up to $2,500 per year, paid twice a month. Were unions satisfied? They later demanded a blanket $240 bonus for the next year. Congress promptly granted it, giving to each of these 240,000 clerks a $240 bonus, and they still work seven hours. Many receive large salaries from private concerns for work after 5 p. m. They enjoy all the pleasures of Washington, work in comfortable buildings, with ice water and electric fans, are allowed 30 days' vacation on full pay, 30 days additional on doctor's certificate with full pay, all 52 Sundays, all legal holidays, half Saturdays in summer, and all special occasions; some drive their own automobiles, wear the finest tailored clothes, and own their own homes. And they are now arranging to demand a still larger bonus when Congress meets.

"Yet on April 25, 1919, when Maj. Gerow requested some of the clerks in the Zone Finance Division of the War Department to work a little overtime in order to more promptly mail out the

little $60 bonus checks granted to soldiers, some of these clerks struck against their Government and walked out and ceased to function when their Government most needed their services.

"Last July Gen. Crowder said it would be unnecessary to draft boys, as he was going to make every man either work or fight. Mr. Gompers defied him, threatening that if the 'work-or-fight' order was applied to them, unions would not stand it. Gen. Crowder then requested and Congress drafted 670,000 18-year-old boys, costing millions in educational expenses alone.

"The Bolshevik Lenin threatens death to captive Americans unless we release Mooney. Unions threaten disastrous strikes if we do not comply.

"With other death threats, Lenin from Russia demands Debs's release. Our unions threaten ruinous strikes unless we comply.

"Forty-five States have ratified national prohibition. It is a part of the fundamental law of the land; yet our unions threaten a nation-wide strike against our Constitution. A majority of union members are nonusers, yet unions threaten 'no liquor no work.' Chicago's 175 unions demand that Congress repeal prohibition.

"And to avert direful calamity during his enforced absence in Europe, the President has been influenced to ask that of Congress which Congress will never do—repeal any portion of the prohibition laws, which are the result of 40 years' tireless effort.

"The Washington school board lately suspended a teacher for teaching Bolshevism in the public schools. Unions are now demanding her reinstatement. The penalty was light, for the board merely suspended such teacher for a week only. If she was teaching Bolshevism to the children of this Nation's Capital, instead of being suspended she should have been discharged.

"Since March 11, 1919, unions have paid a horde of barkers $25 per week to picket the Raleigh Hotel, and they stand at each entrance to this hotel and defiantly insult every man, woman, and child who enters by telling them that they are 'not decent' as they are patronizing a 'scab' hotel.

"[News item, Evening Star, Washington, D. C., Apr. 10, 1919.]

"PICKET IS FINED $25 ON WOMAN'S CHARGE—MRS. ROUSE RESENTED REMARKS AS SHE WAS LEAVING HOTEL RALEIGH.

"Hugh R. Truelove, a newcomer to Washington, making his home at 920 E Street and employed, he says, by the striking waiters as one of the pickets of that organization fighting the Hotel Raleigh, arrested April 7 and charged with making indecent and threatening remarks to patrons of the hotel, was tried and convicted in the District of Columbia branch of the police court to-day and sentenced by Judge John P. McMahon to pay a fine of $25.

"The complainant in the case was Mrs. Ethel Rouse, a member of the College Woman's Community at Lutherville, Md., who testified that she, in company with her husband and two girls associated with her in the community work, went to the Hotel Raleigh for lunch, and when leaving the hotel Truelove insulted her and her party by remarking, 'Decent people no longer patronize the Hotel Raleigh. If you were decent you would not patronize the hotel.'

"Truelove in his defense said that he was employed by the striking waiters at $25 a week to stand at the main entrance of the hotel and make certain stereotyped remarks to all patrons of the hotel entering or leaving the building, among those set remarks being the one he was charged with applying to Mrs. Rouse and her friends.

"I am informed that these striking waiters, besides their wages paid and wholesome food furnished them by the hotel, received tips from patrons as high as $6 to $8 per day, and that some of them would hardly notice you if you offered them a tip of less than 50 cents. The following is one of the 16 demands made of the hotel by the union:

"Steady and extra waiters shall have at each meal the choice of at least one roast, one entree, with an additional fish entree on fast days, also soup, potatoes, one vegetable, coffee, tea, or milk, bread and butter, and one dessert. A wholesome breakfast shall also be served. No one kind of roast or entree may be served more than once in any four consecutive days.

"Every good woman who enters this hotel is subjected to insult by having forced in her hand a vicious cartoon card and told she is entering a scab hotel. Unions here have lately so picketed 23 merchants in Washington. Why? Because Americans in the Capital of the American Republic refused to bow to unreasonable autocratic union demands.

"The American Federation of Labor has publicly threatened to put out of Congress every Member who has dared to disobey Mr. Gompers. Because duty impelled, I have taken my life, political and otherwise, in my hands by warning my people of existing facts; the Carmen's District Council of Kansas City notified me April 26 that it was urging the brotherhood for the State of Texas to replace me with a friend to unions.

"From the four corners of the United States I have filled my wastebasket with anonymous threats apprising me of the innumerable kinds of deaths that will befall me and my family if I ever again open my mouth against unions. One from Altoona, Pa., advised me that the brotherhood would never let me escape, as I had been marked for special suffering. Another from Altoona, in the name of the 10,000 members of the railroad brotherhood there, calls me 'a dirty, low-lived, copperheaded, Confederate dog surviving 61–65.' Another from Altoona assures me that next year unions will pick a soldier in my district to use in ridding Congress of me. The Fort Worth Record belittles me with irony and ridicule. In defense of unions the Comanche Enterprise threatens me with political destruction and questions my prohibition record, notwithstanding during 20 years I have made several hundred prohibition speeches, have helped to dry numerous Texas counties, and of the Texas delegation in the Sixty-fifth Congress I was the only Congressman who spoke for national prohibition, and numerous prohibition bills were introduced by me.

"I have before me a printed application for membership in the International Typographical Union from an unorganized town. It requires the obligation to be sworn to by the applicant before an officer qualified to administer oaths. I copy from said obligation the following:

"That my fidelity to the union and my duty to the members thereof shall in no sense be interfered with by any allegiance that I may now or hereafter owe to any other organization, social, political, or religious, secret or otherwise.

"Thus union is placed before God and country.

"Lately in New York Dr. Scott Nearing publicly urged a bloody revolution against the United States; 3,000 members of various unions, of the most radical type it is true, applauded.

"In the Pythian Temple here in Washington on May-day eve, under the auspices of the Fur Workers Union et al., and with Government officers present, bloody revolution against the United States Government was publicly preached and applauded, the red flag anthem was sung, and the following was embraced in resolutions adopted:

"Labor now knows its strength. Labor now makes demands. And these demands are heard; they must be heard, for labor, in its might, has learned to achieve for labor, and labor's word is fast becoming law.

"And concerning this meeting on May-day eve the Washington Star said:

"The spirit of anarchy, nihilism, Bolshevism, sabotage, and defiance of vested power and authority in Government dominated the assembly.

"I realize that many, many honest, upright, loyal, patriotic, deserving citizens in unions do not approve. Yet the vicious element controls unions. Socialism and Bolshevism are making catspaws of unions. The revolutionists of Seattle were members of unions. I. W. W.'s are unbridled unionists, even if they are disowned by Mr. Gompers. Several hundred thousand union men are foreigners and can not speak English. Yet, when that little, fearless giant, Congressman Burnett, proposed a proper immigration measure to keep anarchists in Europe and Asia he was sent a deadly bomb through the United States mails.

"Does the public longer wonder why we Congressmen hesitate to disobey Mr. Gompers? Has the public ever received a death bomb specially prepared and sent to kill a family? Verily, the tail is wagging the dog. Verily, Mr. Gompers has us all buffaloed. Three million union men organized have under duress and are slave driving the other 107,000,000 unorganized peoples of the United States.

"Newspapers are hog tied. Not a merchant, banker, lawyer, doctor, preacher, or legislator can open his mouth without an attempt to ruin him. What is the remedy? There is only one. The other 107,000,000 people must organize to properly control unions.

"The Dallas Council properly asks where I was during the crisis, but unjustly accuses me of being inattentive to duty and 'gloriously entertained with banquets and theater parties.' Since war began I have devoted to the cause every moment of my time, every dollar of my salary above a meager living, and every dollar I possessed. I have even sacrificed my home. Since the adjournment of Congress, working both a day shift and a night shift, I have put in from 12 to 16 hours per day trying to alleviate the sufferings of the people of my country. Yet, when compared with the sacrifice made by our brave soldiers both in France and in the camps of this country, I have done nothing."

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I refuse to yield, Mr. Chairman. I have only 25 minutes in which to discuss a big subject.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman refuses to yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Right now I do. If I had more time I would gladly yield to the distinguished and able gentleman from Ohio.

Neither Mr. Gompers nor the American Federation of Labor, nor anyone for them, has denied or disapproved any of my assertions.

Has anyone denied that when Dr. Scott Nearing preached revolution against the Government of the United States there were 3,000 members of unions applauding him? When he preached revolution against our Government he was applauded by 3,000 men, every one of whom was a member of some union. Has anyone denied that Lenin, from Russia, the admitted

Bolshevik leader of anarchy, sent a notice to this Government that if the United States does not release Debs he will shoot captive Americans, and that we find unions of the United States saying, "Comply with Lenin's request or we will call a strike that will shatter the United States from San Francisco to Florida"? Has anyone denied that Lenin, from Russia, sent us a notice, "Unless you release Mooney," the convicted bomb thrower of San Francisco, who murderously caused a score of innocent people to lose their lives, "we will shoot captive Americans that we hold at this time," and that we find some of the unions of this country saying, "Comply with Lenin's request or we will turn this Government upside down with a nation-wide strike"? Has anyone denied that here in the Nation's Capital, here in Washington on May-day eve, a meeting was held in the Pythian Temple, if you please, under the auspices of the Fur Workers' Union and others, in the presence of secret-service men of this Government, dominated by a bunch of anarchists, nearly every one of whom were members of unions, and that they sang the red-flag anthem, and they preached bloody revolution openly against this Government and against the flag? And we men in Congress have never opened our mouths about it. Why? Echo answers, "Why?"

On the front page of the Washington Post yesterday morning, on the front page of the Washington Times that came to us at noon yesterday, and on the front page of the Washington Star that came to us yesterday was a story telling us that a deadly bomb at the dark hour of midnight had been placed upon the front doorstep of your Attorney General. Those papers carried at the same time and on the same front page the intelligence that on that very night there had met in Washington representatives from all the unions in this city, many of them Government employees, who were addressed by the wife of this convicted bomb thrower of California. Not a man in this Congress opened his mouth. Why, may I ask? Have you been getting the same anonymous letters that I have been getting? The following appeared in the Washington Post:

GREAT "WET" PROTEST—CENTRAL LABOR UNION TO MASS 50,000 AT CAPITOL JUNE 14.

Plans for a monster demonstration by organized labor of Washington in front of the Capitol on Flag Day to protest against "war-time" prohibition and legislation preventing the manufacture of 2¾ per cent beer are nearing completion, it was announced at the meeting last night of the Central Labor Union at Musicians' Hall, 1006 E Street NW. Pledges to participate in the mass protest have been received by the central body from every labor union in the District. Some organizations have adopted resolutions imposing fines upon members who fail to take part.

MRS. MOONEY SPEAKS.

Mrs. Rena Mooney, who is touring the country and speaking before all central labor bodies in behalf of her husband, Thomas Mooney, and others convicted in connection with the bomb-plot explosion during the preparedness parade in San Francisco in 1916, addressed the meeting.

The following is the item appearing in the Washington Times:

LABOR TO HOLD WET RALLY HERE JUNE 14.

Organized labor will stage a monster demonstration against prohibition and legislation affecting the manufacture of 2¾ per cent beer in front of the Capitol on Flag Day—June 14. Plans toward this end were furthered last night at a meeting of the Central Labor Union in Musicians' Hall, 1006 E Street NW. Mrs. Rena Mooney, wife of Thomas Mooney, who was convicted of bomb throwing in the San Francisco preparedness parade in 1916, addressed the meeting.

Pledges to participate in the demonstration are being received by the central body from every labor union of the District. Some local labor organizations will impose fines on members who fail to take part, it was announced.

The following is the item appearing in the Washington Star:

LABOR TO HOLD WET RALLY HERE JUNE 14.

Organized labor will stage a monster demonstration against prohibition and legislation affecting the manufacture of 2¾ per cent beer in front of the Capitol on Flag Day—June 14. Plans toward this end were furthered last night at a meeting of the Central Labor Union in Musicians' Hall, 1006 E Street NW. Mrs. Rena Mooney, wife of Thomas Mooney, who was convicted of bomb throwing in the San Francisco preparedness parade in 1916, addressed the meeting.

Pledges to participate in the demonstration are being received by the central body from every labor union of the District. Some local labor organizations will impose fines on members who fail to take part, it was announced.

Hence it can not be denied that on the very night a murderous assassin wrecked many buildings in Washington by exploding a deadly bomb at the residence of the Attorney General of the United States the labor unions of Washington, embracing employees of the United States Government, entertained Mrs. Mooney, the wife of a convicted bomb thrower now serving his just sentence. What was her mission? For what purpose was she granted an audience? Is it not well known that she is now appealing to unions to go behind the law, behind the judgments of courts, behind the mandates of society and force the release of her felon husband? Yet some Government employees give a ready ear. While our newspapers announce to us that our Government is turning heaven and earth upside down to hunt out and arrest these late murderous conspirators against Government, such newspapers in the same issue advise us that the federated unions of Washington, embracing Government employees, have entertained the wife of a convicted bomb thrower, who by such audience and hearing is at least influenced to believe that such unions will help her to evade the law and free the murderer. Why the necessity of going to the trouble and expense of ferreting out the crime and arresting and convicting such criminals if unions are to undo justice and help criminals to escape?

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I will not yield now.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman says no Member of Congress opened his mouth. I am a new Member, but I should like to open my mouth to resent the statement of the gentleman that the men he names are all union men.

Mr. BLANTON. I hope when you open your mouth again you will tell these anarchists—I do not care whether they are labor unionists or not—that if they do not stop their practices we will hang them as high as Haman, and I hope you tell Mr. Gompers that if he does not purge his labor unions of anarchy and disregard of law that Congress, representing the people, will do it for him. They have been sending me anonymous letters from all over the United States, telling me that if I ever opened my mouth against the unions again what would happen to me and my family. Do you think they believe they can scare a man who comes from west Texas? [Laughter.] I have lived in west Texas too long to be scared by a murderous anarchist.

What did the Washington Star say about this Pythian Temple meeting in Washington which occurred on May-day eve? After they met, they passed the following resolution:

Labor now knows its strength. Labor now makes demands. And those demands are heard—they must be heard—for labor in its might has learned to achieve for labor, and labor's word is fast becoming law.

Concerning this meeting the Washington Star said:

The spirit of anarchy, nihilism, Bolshevism, sabotage, and defiance of vested law and authority in government dominated the whole assemblage.

Not a man in this Congress has raised his voice against it. Why? I will tell you. Mr. Gompers has got us all buffaloed. Why, when the Keating banquet was held here, shortly after the adjournment of Congress, there appeared in the Washington Star the next day the following threat to Congressmen from the American Federation of Labor, if you please, the following threat from its secretary, Mr. Morrison, who says that the American Federation of Labor is going to put out of Congress every man who refuses to obey the mandate of Samuel Gompers. Is that what has kept our tongues tied, or is it the threat of bombs like those that came into the home of our Hon. John L. Burnett, the little giant from Alabama?

I wish my friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] was here. I want him to go back to the good people of Fayette County, Franklin County, Lamar County, Marion County, Pickens County, Winston County, and Walker County, in his district, and apologize to his splendid constituency for jumping on me the other day because I attempted to tell the people the facts connected with organized labor. My good Alabama friend is too good a man and too able a Representative to indorse the evils I am condemning. Let me repeat again Secretary Morrison's threat, as it appeared in the Washington Star, to wit:

An active campaign is to be conducted by organized labor throughout the Nation to defeat Members of Congress who have shown themselves to be the foes of labor and who are responsible for the failure to deal with unemployment problems during the last session. Strong and determined efforts will be made to elect men carrying union cards or otherwise known to be friends of labor.

This was divulged last night by Frank Morrison, secretary of the American Federation of Labor, who was one of the principal speakers at the testimonial banquet given to Edward Keating, retiring Member of Congress from Colorado, by the joint conference retirement committee representing various organizations of Government employees.

In a highly spirited speech Secretary Morrison declared organized labor knows its friends and enemies, and that persistent warfare is to be waged against the latter. Already plans for a general campaign have been discussed by officers of the federation. He said that organizations want to see more trade-unionists in both branches of Congress. He severely scored those legislators who have failed to support legislation beneficial to the working classes of America.

Go down here to the Raleigh Hotel in Washington, take your wife into the main entrance of that hotel, and you will find down there right now paid barkers—paid $25 a week by unions here in Washington—to stand there at the main entrances and tell your wife, and every other good woman who enters there, that she is not decent, that she is going into a scab hotel, that she is not decent if she goes there. If one of them were to attempt to tell a man or woman in my district a thing of that kind, do you

know what would happen to him? Let me again call your attention to the report of such matter in our daily press, to wit:

[News item, Evening Star, Washington, D. C., Apr. 10, 1919.]

PICKET IS FINED $25 ON WOMAN'S CHARGE—MRS. ROUSE RESENTED REMARKS AS SHE WAS LEAVING HOTEL RALEIGH.

Hugh R. Truelove, a newcomer to Washington, making his home at 929 E Street, and employed, he says, by the striking waiters as one of the pickets of that organization fighting the Hotel Raleigh, arrested April 7 and charged with making indecent and threatening remarks to patrons of the hotel, was tried and convicted in the District of Columbia branch of the police court to-day and sentenced by Judge John P. McMahon to pay a fine of $25.

The complainant in the case was Mrs. Ethel Rouse, a member of the College Woman's Community at Lutherville, Md., who testified that she, in company with her husband and two girls associated with her in the community work, went to the Hotel Raleigh for lunch, and when leaving the hotel Truelove insulted her and her party by remarking, "Decent people no longer patronize the Hotel Raleigh. If you were decent you would not patronize the hotel."

Truelove, in his defense, said that he was employed by the striking waiters at $25 a week to stand at the main entrance of the hotel and make certain stereotyped remarks to all patrons of the hotel entering or leaving the building, among those set remarks being the one he was charged with applying to Mrs. Rouse and her friends.

And also let me again call your attention to the statement made by Manager Weston that besides the wages and good and wholesome food furnished these striking waiters they had been making in tips from six to eight dollars per day, and would hardly give you any service for a tip under 50 cents; and also that, among their many demands, they demanded the following:

Steady and extra waiters shall have at each meal the choice of at least one roast, one entrée, with an additional fish entrée on fast days; also soup, potatoes, one vegetable, coffee, tea, or milk, bread and butter, and one dessert. A wholesome breakfast shall also be served. No one kind of roast or entrée may be served more than once in any four consecutive days.

This is an everlasting disgrace to Washington, and to the United States, and to America, and to civilization, and you know it as well as I do. Why do not we Members of Congress wake up and stop it? The reason that it is permitted by the police of Washington is because you Republicans in power and we Democrats, who ought to be, do not take the proper action to put it out of business. Why, it would destroy the business enterprise of almost any person or aggregation of persons. I am glad that the Raleigh is so well established that they can not ruin it. They can not hurt the Raleigh. We fellows have been coming here to the Raleigh for 20 years before we came to Congress. They could not hurt it, but they can keep some of the Congressmen away from there. You remember before this Congress met the unions sent to every Member of Congress a letter saying, "Don't you go to the Raleigh Hotel." How many of you obeyed the mandate in that letter? Here is one who has not obeyed it. Here is one that can look them square in the eye and say, "When you tell me to do this or that, I will tell you to go to hell." I shall do my duty. That is the kind of a man I am. That is what my people sent me here to tell them.

Disregard of law? These paid barkers are paid to disregard the law. What regard for law have they when they tell a good woman she is not decent simply because she prefers to patronize the Raleigh Hotel? The unions have gotten beyond the control of Mr. Gompers and of the good men in unions, even if he and they would control them. The vicious are in the saddle.

Why, read the following notice in this afternoon's paper:

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND WETS TO BE IN PARADE HERE.

More than 100,000 men and women workers, representing all parts of the country, are to participate in the huge antiprohibition demonstration before Congress on Flag Day, June 14. Those in the parade will not be marching as individuals, according to the officials of the American Federation of Labor, who are completing plans for the demonstration, but will march as representatives of millions of workers all through the United States who are solidly opposed to the enforcement of the war-time prohibition bill in as far as it applies to light wines and beer.

Labor Congressmen will address the workers from the steps of the Capitol. The demonstration will be under the auspices of the Central Labor Union.

What is a labor Congressman? What do they mean by labor Congressmen? Why, we are all for labor and for lawful labor unions. Have we any Congressmen here who belong to unions? I say, no; there are no such men here. The membership of this body are honorable men, are for labor and lawful unions, but belong to no class or organization. Why should the good men who belong to the unions here in Washington, and who may favor prohibition and not want its repeal, be fined for not parading on the 14th against prohibition? The papers said yesterday that such members would be fined. On page 30 of the McClure Magazine for June Mr. Gompers says that—

To stop them, deliberately and by force, from the use of their beer and wine is as unjust as it would be for a crowd of vegetarians to get together and pass a law to stop you and me from eating meat.

That is an old academic question, thrashed out and decided to the contrary nearly 50 years ago. Yet, Mr. Gompers intimates that if we take away their beer and wine, laborers may turn into Bolshevists. I wish that my good friend from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW] would carefully digest the above, and then go back to Atlanta and explain why it is that he takes the floor in defense of unions when I point out the things they should purge their organizations of. Every State in the Union, except the three little ones, have ratified national prohibition. I told you the other day that I can not follow my beloved President when he asks me to repeal prohibition, as good a Democrat as I am. [Applause.]

Now, when the war was going on we found the railroad conductors on passenger trains, who did little work, and even had to have an auditor to go with them to take up the tickets. These conductors who were getting $135 to $165 a month plus time and a half for all time put in over eight hours and getting one day off each week, more than we paid the boys who were sent to the trenches of France, who stood fighting for 24 hours in trenches knee deep in the mud, cootie infested, fighting like the devil to save the country—we find 400,000 railroad men, organized like no organization was ever perfected before, coming to the Government in our hour of need and insisting that if we do not give them $754,000,000 right now in cash they are going to ruin us and going to tie up the railroads. They said: "We will tie up the railroads from Alaska to Florida."

Mr. McAdoo, statesman like he was, did like you and I would have done. When a highwayman pulls a pistol or a gun on you—we west Texas fellows do not usually let them get the drop on us—but if they do get the drop on us we throw up our hands. Mr. McAdoo did like you or I would have done and west Texas would do when the other fellow gets the drop on us, and said "take the money."

But he was honest, for when he turned the $754,000,000 over he resigned. Then they came to Mr. Hines, and they said: "If you do not give us $67,500,000 more, we will cause a revolution in this country." Mr. Hines did what we would have done. He handed over the money. That $822,000,000 came out of the pockets of the people of the United States. It came out of the pockets of the bleeding public of the United States. Talk about $10 shoes! Do you know why there are $10 shoes and $12 shoes? It is because these laborers, organized in these cities, are getting $1.25 an hour. The manufacturers of Hannan and Nettleton and Clapp and other shoes which you purchase for $12 or $15 do not make any more than they did 10 years ago when you bought those shoes for $5. It all goes into the pockets of organized labor. Maybe they deserve it.

The Rochester Herald of Thursday, April 10, 1919, published the startling notice that the local electrical union would thenceforth demand the following:

That its journeymen receive $9 per day of six hours; that its foremen of five or more men receive $10.50 per day of six hours; and that all time over that was to be paid for at the rate of $3 per hour; that on Saturday they would work only three hours, yet receive a full day's wages; that when they worked in rain or snow they would receive $18 per day for six hours.

The Washington Times yesterday said editorially that the time had come when laborers would work six hours for their employer, six hours for themselves, have eight hours for sleep and four for pleasure. Therein lies part of the vice. They clamor for shorter hours and higher wages only to do double employment and receive double salaries, just as is being done now by thousands of Government employees here in Washington who work seven hours for the Government and a great part of their time for private firms and corporations. If through strikes and force and disregard of law unions can force $9 a day for six hours, they can force $18 for three hours, and if railroad conductors on passenger trains can in war time force $180 per month plus time and a half for all time over eight hours and over six days a week they can force a salary of $500 for six hours with treble for overtime. The Board of Conciliation under such circumstances is a farce, and we ought to do away with it and save the thousands of dollars we spend on it each year.

Six thousand strikes in war time—a holdup of the people, and I say that the time has come for the tail to quit wagging the dog. It has been wagging the dog too long. Every extra dollar obtained by strikes has come out of the unorganized public. When you fellows wake up and find that the other 107,000,000 unorganized people of this Government have awakened to this situation, and they find that their money has been going to 3,000,000 organized men who have been slave driving them and this Government—when you find that out you are going to be just as afraid of the voice of the 107,000,000 people as we are now afraid of the voice of Morrison, when he tells us in the Washington papers that he is going to put us out of Congress if we do not obey. He will not beat me out of Congress, I

promise you that. I have labor unions all over my district, but they have confidence in me. The laboring people in my district know that I am a better friend to them now than these Congressmen who get up on the floor and preach unionism and say they believe in strikes and force, and when you say that it is a perversion of the oath you took under the Constitution of this Government. I am not afraid of them. They are not going to beat me out of my district. I beat three men the last time, one of them an ex-Member of Congress and two legislators, by 15,000 majority, and much of the majority was made up of laboring men, and I will do it again. But if I have to be beaten, if they put a bomb under me to-night, Mr. Chairman and colleagues, I am ready to face my Maker and say, "God, my witness, I have done my duty in warning my colleagues of this awful thing that is grappling at the throat of our Republic."

But what happened to the late lamented Mr. Borland, from Missouri, will not happen to me. This man made a good fight and deserved to win, and I believe that he would still be living if his heart had not been broken by the fight Mr. Gompers and organized labor made upon him. They claim his defeat and gloat over it. Here is the kind of literature they used in Colorado. Here is one of their circulars:

To organized labor and its friends:

Ben C. Hilliard, Democratic candidate for Congress, is a friend of organized labor. He has established the workday system in the Denver schools, and all mechanical work is being done by organized labor.

The President of the United States has proven himself a friend of organized labor. He deserves a Congressman who will stand with him for progressive legislation.

Hilliard's opponent is an officer with the State militia.

Let us, my dear colleagues, do full justice to the unions of our country, see that they receive every consideration to which they are entitled, put into execution every labor principle contained in the peace treaty, but at the same time wake up and tell unions and tell Mr. Gompers that they must purge themselves of lawlessness and anarchy, for this Government must be run in the interest and welfare of all the 110,000,000 people alike if we follow the mandates of the Father of our Country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia to the extent that they are sufficient therefor and the remainder out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, but the amount to be paid from the Treasury of the United States shall in no event be as much as one-half of said expenses, in full for the following expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, except amounts to pay the interest and sinking fund on the funded debt of said District, of which amounts one half is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, namely.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the paragraph. I do not care to discuss it at length, except to point out that it is clearly a change of the statute of June 11, 1878, which fixes the proportion that Congress shall appropriate as the amount that the Federal Government shall bear in the expenses of the District, found in volume 20 of the Statutes at Large, page 104.

Now, I make this point of order, being one of those who are in favor of abolishing the half-and-half system in the District of Columbia, but I do not think it should be done upon a general appropriation bill. I think it should be considered by the District Committee in regular course and that legislation should be brought into the House after hearings have been held, and I submit this is a change of organic law and is not in order upon a general appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota desire to be heard?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I do not know as a question of parliamentary law whether the gentleman is right or not, but I have been informed that this question has arisen several times and a point of order has been made upon which it has been universally decided, or at least two or three times, that it is not subject to the point of order under the Holman rule, and it has been so decided by two or three Speakers before. I may be wrong, but I think I am right, that the Holman rule protects it.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire whatever to take up the time of the committee in arguing the point of order if the Chairman does not care to hear from me. Of course, I take the position that the point of order is not well taken, that this amendment is clearly in order under the rules of the House. Mr. Chairman, as the Chair makes no intimation as to the views of the Chair I will briefly argue the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the statement of the gentleman will be of value, whether the Chair needs to be informed about the matter or not.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, it is undoubtedly true under the rules of the House that legislation is not in order upon an appropriation bill, with certain exceptions, one exception being under clause 2 of Rule XXI, which says that legislation is in order when it—

Shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salaries of the officers of the United States—

Of course, that is not applicable here—

by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States—

That is not applicable—

or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill: *Provided*, That it shall be in order further to amend such bill upon the report of the committee or any joint commission authorized by law or the House Members of any such commission having jurisdiction of the subject matter of such amendment, which amendment, being germane to the subject matter of the bill, shall retrench expenditures.

Under existing law, the act of June 11, 1878, half of the expenses of the District of Columbia is paid out of the Treasury. Now, the paragraph read, against which the point of order is made, is legislation, but what is the character of that legislation? It repeals the law saying half the expenses of the District government shall be paid out of the Treasury, and the paragraph goes further and it says that no amount paid out of the Treasury of the United States for the expenses of the District shall amount to as much as one-half of the expenses, which clearly, beyond cavil, reduces the amount appropriated out of the Treasury of the United States, and it fits like a glove the section of the rule providing that legislation is in order if it reduces the amount covered by the bill. I count myself happy, Mr. Chairman, however, to have precedents fortifying me in this position.

Way back in the Fifty-second Congress, when the Holman rule was adopted—and the language of the rule was, word for word, what it is now—the Speaker held that a motion to recommit, which is nothing but an amendment, reducing the proportion of the money to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States for the expenses of the District under one-half of the expenses was a retrenchment, that it reduced the amount covered in the bill, and that it came within the Holman rule, and, therefore, was in order. For the last three Congresses, I may state, this amendment has been before each one of those Congresses, and has always been held in order under the provision of the Holman rule, as it reduced expenditures. Every Chairman who has passed upon it has so held. I call the attention of the Chair to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 10, 1914, when an amendment exactly like this was offered, a point of order made against it, and the question was argued, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] in the chair held:

The Chair is of the opinion there is but one question in this, and that is the question of germaneness. The Chair will resolve that in favor of the amendment and hold that it is in order. The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Now, I can continue, Mr. Chairman, to go on and consume the time of the committee, but if I proceed I shall simply be talking in a circle, for I have already, I think, clearly shown to the Chair that the rules of the House provide that legislation is in order on an appropriation bill in certain cases, one case being when it is germane and it reduces the amount of money to come out of the Treasury of the United States. The object of the Holman rule is a wholesome, beneficial one to economize and save money, and it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, this is a splendid time to put into effect retrenchment.

The amendment in question retrenches. It legislates, the legislation being to reduce the amount of money coming out of the Treasury, and the amendment specifically says that in no case shall the amount of money appropriated out of the Treasury of the United States for the expenses of the District of Columbia equal one-half of the amount of the appropriation bill. If it can not equal one-half, it is undoubtedly a retrenchment, and, in my opinion, is clearly in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's statement, as the Chair understands it, is borne out clearly by a long line of rulings. The organic act of June 11, 1878, provides that, to the extent to which Congress shall approve of said estimates, Congress shall appropriate the amount of 50 per cent thereof and the remaining 50 per cent of such approved estimates shall be levied and assessed upon the taxable property and privileges in the said District other than the property of the United States and the District of Columbia.

The language of the bill provides—

That the following sums are appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia to the extent that they are sufficient therefor, and the remainder out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

It is, of course, clear that this is a change of existing or basic law. It would be within the rule which does not allow legislation upon appropriation bills if it were not within one of the exceptions of such rule. The exception of the rule, called to the attention of the Chair by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], is the exception that provides that if by the amendment offered or the change in the law the appropriations are reduced, the exception prevails and the rule to that extent is nullified.

In this case it is quite clear that if the language of the bill remains a reduction of expenditures from the Treasury of the United States must necessarily result. The very point has been decided in two recent cases exactly in point except the positions were reversed. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], I think, was in the chair when the bill as presented contained the provision exactly in accordance with the organic act:

That one-half of the following sums, respectively, be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury.

And in two successive years the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] held, after an elaborate argument in the first instance, that the language of an amendment offered as a substitute, almost, if not exactly, identical with the language which is now the first section of this bill, was in order as an amendment to the original law, because of the fact that it reduced expenditures.

So it seems to the Chair it is quite clear that it is the duty of the Chair to hold that the point of order against the first section on that account is not well taken, and the objections are overruled.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Executive office: Two commissioners, at $6,000 each; engineer commissioner, so much as may be necessary (to make salary $6,000); secretary, $2,700; 3 assistant secretaries to commissioners, at $1,600 each; clerks—1 $1,500, 3 at $1,400 each, 1 $1,200, 1 (who shall be a stenographer and typewriter) $1,200, 1 $840, 2 at $720 each; 2 messengers, at $600 each; stenographer and typewriter, $1,200.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. WALSH. I reserve a point of order on this paragraph, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois making the point of order desire to be heard?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a disposition to increase the salaries of some that are already fixed by statute, but there is no disposition to increase the salaries of the little fellows who receive $900, $1,000, or $1,100.

I request, Mr. Chairman, that this paragraph be passed at this time and be taken up for consideration after the bill has been read. And I will withdraw any action on this at the present moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the paragraph be passed temporarily. Is there objection?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I have no objection, Mr. Chairman, to taking it up later. The gentleman may change his mind and withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed, from time to time, to prescribe a schedule of fees to be paid for inspecting passenger elevators and for inspecting hotels, public halls, moving-picture shows, theaters, and other places of amusement which are required to have annual licenses, and for inspecting buildings which are required by law to have fire escapes; and they are further authorized and directed to impose fees for all inspections or service to be performed by any public officer or employee of the District of Columbia under any law or regulation now in force or hereafter enacted; said fees to cover the cost and expense of such inspections or service; and a schedule of such fees shall be printed and conspicuously displayed in the office of the said commissioners, and said fees shall be paid to the collector of taxes, District of Columbia, and deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of revenues of the District of Columbia and the United States in equal parts.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph. It is clearly new legislation and should properly come before the Committee on the District of Columbia, which has jurisdiction of legislation of this nature. And it seems to me it is pernicious legislation, in addition, to have the owners of the premises inspected pay for the inspection.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman make the point of order or reserve it?

Mr. MAPES. I intend to make it, but I will reserve it if the gentleman cares to have me do so.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I wish the gentleman would. I wish to say that this is the same provision carried in the bill we passed here last session and which failed to become a law.

Mr. SISSON. We are already operating under that law now, and this statute is carrying that out. I will state frankly that we have no possible objection to the gentleman's committee going into this whole matter and bringing in a proper law, but until that is done I think the very safety of the people to be benefited would demand that they have this inspection.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It was passed before in the other bill, and no objection was raised to it.

Mr. SISSON. And they have had this inspection.

Mr. MAPES. What does the gentleman mean by the statement that this is the law now?

Mr. SISSON. I say this is the law under which they are now operating—this statute here now.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. This is the law now.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will yield further, I want to inquire is it not a fact that this is what has been construed by the District authorities to be the law?

Mr. SISSON. I did not intend to go into that.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will pardon me, I will complete the statement. The authorities have construed the law as giving them the authority; but recently, through litigation, it has been developed that they have not the authority; and in order to continue the inspection in the same way and with the same charges as heretofore they have asked for this legislation.

Mr. SISSON. Yes. This has been the construction placed upon an old statute for quite a while. Now, if you do not do this, there will be practically no inspection in the District. There is no provision made to pay the inspectors out of these fees. I will say frankly to the gentleman that the Committee on Appropriations will be glad if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] will permit this item to remain in the bill until a statute can be put on the statute books, because then the committee will have an absolute guide as to what ought to be done in this case.

Mr. MAPES. If the gentleman will permit, this is clearly new legislation. It is not on the appropriation act passed last session. While I do not desire to go into the merits of the question now, it seems to me it is not desirable legislation, and it strikes me that the Committee on Appropriations should report an appropriation to pay these inspectors, rather than to have them paid by the men whose premises they inspect.

Mr. SISSON. I will say to the gentleman that in most of the cities they have a fee system for the inspection of elevators, where a certificate or license is issued. A regular license is posted up in every elevator. I do not know of any exception to that, although there may be exceptions. But in order to run an elevator in most of the cities a license is required, and that license states on its face the last inspection of the elevator, and a certain fee is paid for that license.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, in most of the States the fee charged is only a nominal fee and is not a fee intended to cover the cost of inspection.

Mr. SISSON. That is not the case here.

Mr. WALSH. It says, "Said fees shall pay the cost of inspection."

Mr. SISSON. It is conducted on the fee system. I have not the information here, but I understand a certain fee is charged for inspecting the buildings.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. Does the language in this paragraph in any way interfere with the authority of the commissioners to make the inspection of elevators, and so forth? Does it not simply authorize them to charge the owners of the premises for the inspection? In other words, if this language is stricken out, would it interfere in any way with the right of the commissioners to inspect the buildings and the elevators?

Mr. SISSON. The testimony of the commissioners is that this language is absolutely necessary now.

Mr. MAPES. Necessary for what?

Mr. SISSON. Necessary for the inspection of these buildings.

Mr. MAPES. The language does not so read.

Mr. SISSON. That is the construction they have placed upon it. They have had some little litigation in reference to the power of the District Commissioners to regulate the elevators under the present law—that is, the statute—and that lawsuit which

was in progress at that time was the occasion for the District Commissioners asking for this authority. The last committee unanimously gave it to them, and this committee simply reaffirmed the action of the committee before.

Now, I hope the gentleman will permit this provision to remain in the bill, and that his committee will take the matter up and prepare a well-considered plan for having the elevators in the hotels and public buildings inspected.

Mr. MAPES. I will say, Mr. Chairman, that the language of this provision seems to me clear that it can not in any way interfere with the actual inspection. This language simply authorizes the commissioners to provide a schedule of fees for the owners of the premises to pay for the inspection; and for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I think it is subject to a point of order, although it is very unfortunate. It is very important legislation and the inspection of buildings, which by law are required to have fire escapes, will not be carried on.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MAPES. It seems to me clear, Mr. Chairman, that there is nothing in this provision that justifies the remark of the chairman reporting the bill, that it in any way prohibits or restricts the commissioners in authorizing the inspection of buildings and elevators and fire escapes and what not. It is so apparent from the language of the provision that I do not want to let the remark of the gentleman from Minnesota go unanswered.

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. Suppose that this legislation goes out and the District Commissioners find themselves where they can not have these elevators inspected, and suppose an accident occurs in an elevator. Of course, I suppose the gentleman is willing to assume the burden of that responsibility, but I am frank to say that no member of the Committee on Appropriations was willing to assume that burden, especially when the gentlemen charged with enforcing this law were so positive that they needed this additional fund. The fees have already been fixed. This does not change any fees nor the amount of money that is paid for any inspection, but there has been no authority heretofore to require that an elevator which on inspection is found to be in bad shape shall be condemned. They insist very strenuously that they need this power. If the gentleman is willing to assume the responsibility, I will say frankly that the Committee on Appropriations have absolutely no pride in the matter.

Mr. MAPES. I dislike to take the rôle of calling the attention of the members of the Appropriations Committee to the testimony of the commissioners on this subject, but I think if they will read the testimony of the commissioners they will see that their recollection of the testimony is very much distorted. The commissioners themselves testified that this has nothing to do with their right to make the inspection but with the right to make the charge.

Mr. SISSON. But they must have the inspection fee for the purpose of getting the men to make the inspection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Public Utilities Commission: For salaries (including inspector of gas and meters, $2,000; assistant inspectors of gas and meters—1 $1,200, 2 at $900 each; messenger, $600); in all, $33,000: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding $4,000 per annum.

Mr. MAPES. I move to strike out the last word. I should like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], who has charge of the bill, who the persons are who are employed by the Public Utilities Commission in addition to the people mentioned in this paragraph.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That proviso was a safeguard put on there which is carried in the current law, so that they shall not, under any emergency that might arise, employ anybody at a greater rate of compensation than $4,000. They seemed to have pretty complete blanket authority under the utilities proposition, and that was put on there for the reason I have stated. It is carried in the permanent law.

Mr. MAPES. This appropriates specifically only $4,000; but there is a lump-sum appropriation of $33,000.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will read the gentleman the schedule of salaries: Executive secretary, $4,000; accountant, $3,000; assistant accountant, $2,000; traffic engineer, $3,600; inspector, $1,600; another inspector, $1,600; another at $1,400; another at $1,200; inspector of gas and meters, $2,000; assistant inspector of gas and meters, $1,200; another at $900; inspector of electric meters, $1,600; chief clerk, $1,800; clerk and stenographer, $1,400; another clerk and stenographer, $1,200; another at $1,200; another at $1,000; messenger, $720; another messenger at $600, making $32,920. That is the salary list. Now, there has been no increase in it or anything of that kind.

Mr. MAPES. Why does the Committee on Appropriations in this case change its settled policy of a great many years against appropriating lump sums and in favor of making specific appropriations?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We have not done so in this case.

Mr. MAPES. Why have you changed from the specific appropriation to the lump sum?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We have not changed. It has always been a lump sum, and I have simply given the gentleman the details that make up that lump sum.

Mr. MAPES. Why in this particular item does the Committee on Appropriations report it in a lump sum instead of specifically, as it does in other cases?

Mr. SISSON. Under the specific law authorizing these commissioners to make the valuation in the District of Columbia they carry a lump sum, and have no pay roll and no salary, because they did not know at what salary they could get the men.

Mr. MAPES. Is not this true, that under this appropriation, instead of dividing the $28,000 among these different employees, as the gentleman from Minnesota has read, the commissioners could divide it into seven equal parts and pay each man $4,000?

Mr. SISSON. I suppose they could have done that.

Mr. MAPES. My question is, why the Appropriation Committee recommended in this instance against the long-settled policy of lump-sum appropriations?

Mr. SISSON. I have always been opposed to lump sums. But at this particular time we could not have made up a pay roll, nor could the District commissioners have made it up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I think I have the information which my colleague is seeking. I think the motive which actuated the committee was this: We could have put into the bill the salary roll which has just been read by the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. DAVIS. To have done so would have tended to make such a roll permanent or a statutory roll, and we feared that it never would be reduced, and so it was felt by the subcommittee that there would be a better chance of hereafter cutting down appropriations for the utility commission if we appropriated a lump sum.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. In 1918 the appropriation was $34,000, but they only spent $28,785.07. When you put them on a statutory roll you never knew a salary reduced.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee or the gentleman from Michigan under what authority of law are these employees and officers paid, the list of which the chairman of the subcommittee has read.

Mr. CRAMTON. That list was paid under the authority of the appropriatiton bill of the current year, but if the bill is passed as reported I suppose that list in so far as it may be necessary for the work of the commission will be continued.

Mr. WALSH. I direct the attention of the gentleman from Michigan to the fact that it is paid under the current law or under the item carried in this bill. There is no authority for spending any of this money for salary to other people, because the amount of salary is limited to $2,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; I think the gentleman is in error.

Mr. WALSH. They may have paid it under the next paragraph.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will call the gentleman's attention to the value of small punctuation marks sometimes. He will notice the parentheses surrounding this language:

(including inspector of gas and meters, $2,000; assistant inspectors of gas and meters—1 $1,200, 2 at $900 each; messenger, $600).

The important language is "for salaries * * *; in all, $33,000." That whole $33,000 may be used for salaries and the gentleman overlooks the parentheses.

Mr. WALSH. I did not overlook the parentheses, but my question is, What authority of law is there for paying anybody $1,200, $1,600, or $900, and various other positions that have been paid for?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I think you will find it under the act of March 4, 1913, creating the public-utilities commission. Paragraph 95 reads as follows:

The commission shall have the power in each and every instance to employ and prescribe the duties of such officers, clerks, stenographers, typewriters, inspectors, experts, and employees as it may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, and to fix and pay their compensation within the appropriations provided by Congress.

Mr. WALSH. And that is the authority for the list that the gentleman has just read?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes; but they did not want to put them on the statutory roll. The work of the utilities commission has greatly decreased.

Mr. WALSH. I should think so, when we consider the state of the public utilities.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The expenses are greatly decreasing, and if you put these on the statutory roll you never knew a salary on the statutory roll reduced.

The Clerk read as follows:

For incidental and all other general necessary expenses authorized by law, including the employment of expert services where necessary, $20,000.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Can the gentleman inform the committee what this $20,000 is to be expended for? I notice that the language here includes the employment of expert services, which I suppose was provided for by the lump-sum appropriation of $33,000 in the preceding paragraph.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. No; that is extra. I read the gentleman the law under which they were authorized to employ expert services. They had a man named Beeler here, and some others, when we were all jammed up in consequence of war work, when the cars were stopped, and everything of that kind. They employed this man Beeler and paid him quite a salary to put in these skip-stops and the platforms and things of that kind. The cost of that is included in this $20,000. There has to be considerable more of that kind of work done before we have satisfactory services on the part of the street cars. This is not the $33,000 salary item at all.

Mr. MAPES. To bear out what the gentleman said, that the expenses were being reduced, I notice this appropriation is for $20,000, and last year the appropriation for the same item was $25,000.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. I would like to ask the gentleman how much of the $25,000 was paid to the expert, Mr. Beeler?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I notice here the expenses: Services of John A. Beeler, 71 days, at $110 a day, $7,810; services of assistant, $7,261, without giving the number of days.

Mr. MAPES. The assistant was paid more than the principal?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes; he apparently worked longer. Traveling expenses, John A. Beeler, $150.68; traveling expenses, assistant, $81.10; total expenses, aside from expert's fees, $231.78. Total, $15,302.78.

Mr. MAPES. Was that all of the $25,000 that was expended?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is all that was expended for this particular expert.

Mr. MAPES. Who is this Mr. Beeler?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. He is supposed to be the greatest expert in the United States on matters of this kind. They paid him a pretty good salary, something I rather objected to at the time, but they said they could not get Mr. Beeler—and they had to have him, they thought—for less than $110 a day.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Minnesota yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. MAPES. I yield the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota for five minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. Is this the expert who is responsible for eliminating the six tickets for a quarter system of fares and imposing the 2-cent extra charge for transfers, along with increasing in number of flat-wheeled cars upon which we are obliged to ride, and disrupting things generally?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I have no official information along that line, except that I have conversed with some members of the Utilities Commission, without naming them; but Mr. Beeler had nothing to do with this at all. The Utilities Commission proper fixed the 2-cent transfer charge.

Mr. WALSH. And this $110-per-day expert advice that he has been giving——

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It was not on the transfers at all.

Mr. WALSH. It was not upon the fare or the equipment of the cars?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. No.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the language beginning on line 10, page 9, and including all the language in line 12, on the same page, including the figures $20,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 10, strike out all of lines 10, 11, and 12, including the figures $20,000.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I am anxious to have information about this item, but it seems to me that the carrying of this tremendous lump-sum item in this appropriation bill is simply an invitation to do again what was apparently done in the employment of some experts at what would seem to be highly exorbitant fees and perquisites in connection with the duty which must repose in the Public Utilities Commission. I think that I am not overstating the case when I state that the public utilities of Washington, the Capital City of the Nation, particularly in regard to its street car services, are entirely inadequate, and the word "inadequate" is a most mild expression. Not alone during the time of confusion incident to the coming of many people into Washington, but to-day the street car service in Washington is a crying shame. The people who are dependent upon it, and there are thousands of them dependent upon it, are compelled to resort to the shifting system of reporting at different times and all sorts of staggered hours, all sorts of subterfuges made to meet the existing contingencies, and the sum result of what has been done in regard to the street car service in the city of Washington has been the charge of 2 cents for a transfer, which the Capital Traction Co. said it did not want and did not need, and the Washington Electric Railway have said is not sufficient to tide it over its financial difficulties. Now, I but speak of this because when we consider all that has been done we have this lump sum of $20,000 here open as an invitation to these men who compose the Public Utilities Commission, these men who are intrusted and who have the authority, an unquestioned authority, to provide good public utilities for the people of Washington in transportation, in gas, electric light, and in telephones——

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman know who make up the Public Utilities Commission?

Mr. GARD. Why, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia make up that commission.

Mr. WALSH. Do they appoint themselves the Public Utilities Commission?

Mr. GARD. Oh, no; they are by operation of law. By operation of law the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are the Public Utilities Commission, and it would seem to me that these excellent gentlemen, two of them residents of the District of Columbia and one a delegate from the Engineer Corps, by themselves and their present assistants are in all respects competent to do that which the law imposes on them to do, and that is to oversee the public utilities, the different public utilities in the District of Columbia, and I repeat, not alone to the residents here but to the visitor at the National Capital. The public utilities of the city of Washington, in telephone and transportation especially, are a crying shame, and I think instead of having a lump-sum item of $20,000 here carried to attract some alleged expert who receives out of $20,000 about $15,000 in his per diem charges and in his expenses and everything of that kind, that what we need is a more rigid adherence to that which the law imposes upon the Public Utilities Commission, their counsel, their inspectors, and all who get the greater part of this $33,000 charge, to see that for all the people of the United States here in the Capital City are maintained as they should be maintained the public utilities, and I would be pleased to hear from members of the committee regarding the continuation of this item of $20,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I will state that the hearings and the statement of the commissioners as to what became of the $20,000 in the last item are as follows: Stenographic services and notes, $2,000; car tickets, $25; books, periodicals, and so forth, $150; stationery and office supplies, $875; blank books, printing, and so forth, $1,400; postage, $100; traveling expenses, $250. Then comes expert services, which I do not think will be necessary next time, $15,000; making a total of $20,000. Now, that is what the $20,000 item was composed of last year and the estimate for the next year the same thing. Now, if this is stricken out the utilities commission will have nothing to work upon at all. This really is contingent expenses. Now, that is the way it was put to your subcommittee.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, with the word of the chairman of the committee, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment proposed so as to strike out the figures "$20,000" and insert "$10,000," because it would seem to me that would cover all the emergency which seems to face the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modified amendment offered by Mr. GARD: Page 9, line 12, strike out the figures "$20,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$10,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have my colleague read a little from the hearings along this particular line, which will take two or three minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, if I may be recognized, I wish to say I do not care to delay the committee, but the motion pending is, in effect, a motion to end the work of the Public Utilities Commission, and whether we favor or disapprove some of the results of their work, we all agree that the subject matter, pertaining, as it does, to our public utilities, is one of the utmost importance to the people of this city. I am sure that if the street railroads, for instance, of Washington were now under public ownership and rendered service only one-half as poor as we have had here the last year it would be hailed everywhere as a proof of the failure of municipal ownership. Now, I am sure the gentleman does not want to end the work of the only public agency that there is at present struggling with these problems. But that is what his amendment would result in.

Now, in the hearings one of the commissioners, Mr. Gardiner, expressed his views as to the need of this money for experts, which is what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] especially objects to. He points out that the Public Utilities Commission is of the same membership as the District commission, and therefore these men on the Public Utilities Commission have all the other multitudinous duties of District Commissioners to attend to, and hence they must either entirely neglect their work as commissioners, which is very important, or they must to a large degree delegate the work of investigation under the Public Utilities Commission. Mr. Gardiner, one of the commissioners, said:

As public utility commissioners we should ride on those street cars every day; we should drive along the tracks and ride on the street cars; and we should take up the complaints of the people and look into them and find out the conditions. That is what a public utility commission should do, but we can not do it. As you know very well, we are kept right in that building all the time. That is my own opinion about this thing. * * * The Public Utilities Commission should be a separate body, who should devote all their attention to their work. Then it would not need the services of all of these experts.

But this Congress has created a commission composed of these commissioners, and unless this bill is to blindly legislate out of existence the only body now charged with that work we must continue a decent appropriation that will enable them to do their work. And while I agree with the motives that I am sure inspire the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD], I am sure it would be extremely shortsighted for this House, without investigation and simply on the impulse of the moment, to hamstring the work of this utilities commission.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Certainly.

Mr. MAPES. Can the gentleman tell us whether the Public Utilities Commission has investigated anything in connection with the street car service here except the question of the fares and putting into effect the skip stops?

Mr. CRAMTON. The Public Utilities Commission has up the matter of gas rates, the electric rates, the whole electric situation, the valuation of these utilities, and, as one of these matters, this matter of street car service, and that includes both the matter of fares and of service, the furnishing of more cars, the routing of cars, the issuance of transfers, providing skip stops, and other propositions of that kind.

Mr. MAPES. What has it done to improve the service and prevent the tie-ups and the delays in the traffic?

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, I hope my colleague will understand that I am not one of the experts that is provided for in this appropriation and I am not prepared to answer all of those questions in detail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio rise?

Mr. GARD. I rise to be heard on the modified amendment. I have not been heard on that. However, I will be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON].

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the utilities commission has not acted as promptly as I would like in regard to the valuation of all the public utilities in the District of Columbia, but they have had some litigation. They have been assisted in the making of these valuations, but every point has been contested by some of the companies. Some of the companies have agreed to the valuation, and the commission has made a valuation on the majority of the utilities.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Is it not a fact—not only a fact now, but contemplated in the future—that there is going to be more litigation in regard to this matter, and that out of this fund they would have to pay some of the expenses?

Mr. SISSON. I was about to say that they are getting down to the point where they expect to make some orders to carry into effect all of the reforms that they hope to be able to bring about in the District of Columbia.

This legislation, you will all recall, was made necessary by virtue of a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, which decided that before you could make a rate as to railways the burden of proof was on the Government to be able to show that the rates were not confiscatory. I have never agreed to the soundness of that decision, but still that is the position in which we find ourselves. That made it necessary not only throughout the States, that valuation of railroads on the part of the Federal Government should be made, but also within the District of Columbia. Congress was about to pass an act granting universal transfers, and another bill was introduced consolidating the street railway companies. Col. Harding was then on the District commission, and Col. Harding and the attorneys came before your subcommittee some years ago and stated that in the event that legislation should be enacted it would simply put the District into litigation, and they requested that nothing of that sort should be done until this physical valuation should be made. Now, we have all agreed that the public utilities in the District of Columbia are not what they ought to be, but your committee did not feel that it would be proper for it to deprive the commission of the money which it requested and which it might need in the event it had quite a good deal of litigation in reference to any other order which it might enter. So we left this sum at $20,000 not to enable them to bring about the very reforms that my friend from Ohio desires to be made but——

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Also our committee feels that if there is a change in the legislation as to the kind of commission we should have, the committee headed by my colleague from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] should wrestle with that problem.

Mr. SISSON. Yes; and his committee framed the legislation by which we are operating.

Mr. MAPES. I am glad that there is one piece of legislation that the Committee on Appropriations is willing that the regular Committee on the District of Columbia should handle.

Mr. SISSON. We will turn it all over to you.

Mr. MAPES. I rose to ask the gentleman a question about a subject to which he referred when he spoke about legislation being proposed some time ago looking toward the consolidation of the different companies. I saw a notice in one of the newspapers a few days ago to the effect that a public utilities company had defaulted on the interest on its bonds, and the newspaper article went on to say that a company was organized some time ago for the purpose of bringing about a merger of the two companies. I would like to ask the gentleman if the Public Utilities Commission is doing any work to bring about the consolidation of the two companies here?

Mr. SISSON. Some time ago I went into the matter with a great deal of earnestness, but whether that earnestness was accompanied by much ability I do not know; but I have been a very strong advocate of a universal transfer. I also felt that if we did not have universal transfers we ought to have a consolidation of the companies. You would thereby be relieved of managerial and overhead charges, it seems to me, which would tend to bring the business into a position where the overhead charges would be brought down to about half what they are now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SISSON. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISSON. Now, if I could have my way about it, I would like to eliminate the two companies and have but one company.

Mr. MAPES. It is universally conceded that two street car companies in one city are a nuisance.

Mr. SISSON. That is absolutely true.

Mr. MAPES. I wanted to direct the gentleman's attention to this question: Is there not some way in which the Public Utilities Commission can spend this money in the employment of expert services to force a consolidation of the two companies?

Mr. SISSON. My understanding is that before you could make a consolidation, even by act of Congress, it would be necessary that the body making the order of consolidation should not only have the authority to make the order, but also under that decision of the Supreme Court in making the consolidation it would be necessary to have a physical valuation of the property, so that the accounts might be properly adjusted. Of course, they could make a consolidation, but they would have to agree upon the respective values of the properties. But when you are compelling them to do it you ought to have the facts whereby you and the court could sustain the order.

Mr. MAPES. As a matter of practical procedure, is there no way that we can compel a consolidation of the companies here, except by taking them over by the Government?

Mr. SISSON. I do not know about that. I think Congress would have the power to pass an act requiring them to consolidate, but the Utilities Commission or some other commission would have to make the valuation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] desire time?

Mr. GARD. Yes; I desire to be heard in favor of the amendment offered by me.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment can be modified by unanimous consent, reducing the amount from $20,000 to $10,000.

Mr. GARD. I want to be heard on that. I was heard on the proposition to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to inquire how long the chairman in charge of the bill desires to keep the committee in session?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We would like to proceed for an hour longer, but probably we shall not be able to proceed more than half an hour.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I say I would like to proceed for an hour, but I know we can not, and hence I was going to suggest that the committee rise at 6 o'clock.

Mr. BLANTON. If the chairman of the committee intends to move to rise at 6 o'clock, I will withdraw the point.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes; at 6 o'clock I will move that the committee rise.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, if there was any sort of procedure by which the public utilities of Washington could be benefited and the benefit accrue to the people who live here and who come here, I should be in favor of any sort of an appropriation, even in excess of this lump-sum appropriation of $20,000.

The test of public utilities, which are created and have their existence only for the benefit of the public, is in the good they bring to the public, and it is not a proper carrying out of an authorized service when the extent of benefit of any public utilities commission consists in giving increased rates to telephone companies, gas companies, electric-light companies, and street railway companies, and no benefit is afforded to the people who are compelled to use these commodities. I would not for a moment think of handicapping the Public Utilities Commission of Washington, but here we have three commissioners, we have a number of officers whom the chairman says it is the plan not to carry on the permanent roll, because they hope every year that there will not be any necessity for their continuance. Therefore they carry only little inconsequential items amounting to about $3,800, whereas the bulk of the appropriation, the $28,000, is spent upon assistants, upon counsel for the public utilities commission, upon engineers, upon inspectors, upon men who do the work. The only thing that remains therefore for this $20,000 which they said a moment ago they thought there was no use for—the chairman of this commitee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Davis], has figured out that practically all the expense of last year was the expense of the expert, which will not be needed this year. But in order that full scope might be given to whatever necessities could arise, in order to give full scope to the payment of all necessary expenses, it was my thought to decrease this apparently unnecessary provision of $20,000 at least to $10,000.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. GARD. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Does the gentleman want this commission to stop work?

Mr. GARD. I want them to go to work.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Can they go to work unless they have the money?

Mr. GARD. They certainly can go to work. They have $33,000 in a previous item.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman's argument is certainly in favor of these utility companies themselves, because they want the commission to stop work, and not to spend any money, and not to do anything.

Mr. GARD. They have their own salaries and this $33,000 with which to carry on their work, and unless the gentleman can tell me something immediately in prospect for which this $20,000 can be properly expended, then I must insist upon my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. GARD) there were—ayes 6, noes 10.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. On this question the ayes are 6, the noes are 10, and the amendment is rejected.

Mr. BLANTON. I made the point of no quorum before the Chair made that announcement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Will not the gentleman withdraw that point?

Mr. BLANTON. I would rather have a larger vote here than the few Republicans who sit over there and the few Democrats who sit here. I think there are about 14 Republicans on the other side.

Mr. GARD. There are hardly 20 people in the Hall, and I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I thought we could proceed rapidly with the appropriation bill, but it does not appear possible to do so, and I will move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the District of Columbia appropriation bill, H. R. 4226, had come to no resolution thereon.

JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILL PRESENTED TO THE WHITE HOUSE FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the White House for the approval of the President of the United States the following joint resolution and bill:

H. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the city of Dawson, Ga., tents and cots for use of Confederate veterans in their State convention, June 17 and 18, 1919.

H. R. 1200. Making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. KREIDER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Thursday, June 5, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 4746) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Oxford, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4747) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Greene, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4748) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Richfield Springs, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4749) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Cooperstown, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4750) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Sidney, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4751) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Walton, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4752) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Delhi, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4753) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Deposit, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4754) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Union, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4755) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Endicott, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4756) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Johnson City, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4757) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Oneonta, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4758) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Norwich, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4759) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Binghamton, N. Y., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 4760) to increase the efficiency of the Medical Department of the United States Navy and to improve the status and efficiency of the Hospital Corps of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 4761) to abolish the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency and the office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and authorizing the Federal Reserve Board to perform the duties thereof; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 4762) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Brooklyn, N. Y., four German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 4763) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Washingtonville, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4764) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the counties of Guernsey, Morgan, Monroe, Muskingum, Noble, and Washington, State of Ohio, 20 German cannons or fieldpieces each, with carriage, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 4765) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Newfield, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAJOR: A bill (H. R. 4766) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to certain cities in Missouri one German cannon or fieldpiece, with equipment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. VOIGT: A bill (H. R. 4767) to repeal section 19 of the trading-with-the-enemy act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 4768) for the relief of certain employees of the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 4769) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver a condemned cannon to the village of Heuvelton, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 4770) to amend the war-risk insurance act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 4771) authorizing the establishment of a poultry experimental farm near Glendale, Ariz.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 4772) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Hamburg, N. Y., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OGDEN: A bill (H. R. 4773) providing for wage increases in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 4774) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and cannon balls, to the twin cities of Danville and Buckeye City, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 4775) authorizing the Commissioner of Navigation to register as a vessel of the United States the foreign-built vessel called the *J. A. Bisso;* to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McGLENNON: A bill (H. R. 4776) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Bayonne, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 4777) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4778) to provide for a site and erect a public building thereon at Clinton, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4779) to provide for a site and erect a public building thereon at Lenoir City, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4780) to provide a site and erect a public building thereon at Oneida, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4781) to provide a site and erect a public building thereon at Lafollette, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4782) to provide a site and erect a public building thereon at Jefferson City, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4783) to provide a site and erect a public building thereon at Rockwood, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BRAND: A bill (H. R. 4784) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Carnesville, Ga. ,one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4785) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hartwell, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4786) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Watkinsville, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4787) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Monroe, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4788) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Covington, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4789) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Madison, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4790) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Greensboro, Ga., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4791) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Washington, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4792) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lexington, Ga., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4793) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Elberton, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4794) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Danielsville, Ga., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 4795) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hopkinsville, Ky., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4796) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Calhoun, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4797) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hawesville, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4798) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Madisonville, Ky., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4799) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Morganfield, Ky., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 4800) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of East Aurora, N. Y., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4801) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Springville, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 4802) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the village of Winsted, in the town of Winchester, in the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4803) to provide for the purchase of an additional site and the erection of an addition to the present post office thereon at Waterbury, in the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROSE: A bill (H. R. 4804) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Williamsburg, Blair County, Pa., one German cannon, fieldpiece, or other war trophies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4805) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Albany, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4806) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Corbin, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4807) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Pineville, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4808) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Somerset, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4809) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Harlan, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4810) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Benham, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4811) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of London, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4812) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Lynch, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4813) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Burkesville, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4814) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Manchester, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4815) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Hyden, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4816) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Burnside, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4817) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Monticello, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4818) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to Whitley City, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4819) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Mount Vernon, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4820) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Middlesboro, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4821) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Tompkinsville, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4822) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Livingston, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4823) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Williamsburg, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4824) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Barbourville, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 4825) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Grayville, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4826) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Eldorado, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4827) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of West Salem, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4828) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cypress, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 4829) to relieve Congress from the adjudication of private claims against the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 4830) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Department of Labor" by providing for a bureau of the unemployed; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 4831) to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provisions for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4832) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish a 4-inch fieldpiece, captured by the Three hundred and fifteenth Infantry on November 11, 1918, in action against Cote de Morimont, north of Verdun, to the city of Philadelphia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 4833) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Moore, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4834) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Purcell, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4835) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lexington, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4836) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sulphur, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4837) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hickory, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4838) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Dougherty, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4839) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Paoli, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4840) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Washington, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4841) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Elmore City, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4842) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Maysville, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4843) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lindsay, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4844) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Stratford, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4845) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wynnewood, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4846) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Pauls Valley, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4847) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Rosedale, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4848) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Byars, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4849) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Harrah, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4850) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Guthrie, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4851) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wayne, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4852) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Blanchard, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4853) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Norman, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4854) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Noble, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4855) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Britton, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4856) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Luther, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4857) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Arcadia, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4858) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Edmond, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4859) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Oklahoma City, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4860) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Crescent, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4861) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Marshall, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4862) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Mulhall, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4863) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Coyle, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4864) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Stillwater, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4865) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Perkins, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4866) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Yale, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4867) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cushing, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4868) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Davis, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 4869) to amend section 4516 of the Revised Statutes of the United States and section 2 of an act entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States, to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto, and to promote safety at sea," approved March 4, 1915; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4870) to provide revenue for the Government and to safeguard, by a license control of imports of potassium salts and by imposing an import duty thereon, the interests of domestic potash producers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 4871) to prohibit the transportation of illegally caught lobsters, also the importation, bringing into, or landing in the United States of any lobsters less than a certain size taken or obtained outside of territorial limits of the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 4872) to repeal the law known as the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4873) for the erection of a public building in the city of Stillwater, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4874) for the erection of a public building in the city of Yale, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4875) for the erection of a public building in the city of Cushing, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4876) for the erection of a public building in the city of Edmond, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4877) for the erection of a public building in the city of Norman, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4878) for the erection of a public building in the city of Purcell, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4879) for the erection of a public building in the city of Davis, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4880) for the erection of a public building in the city of Sulphur, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4881) for the erection of a public building in the city of Wynnewood, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4882) for the erection of a public building in the city of Pauls Valley, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4883) for the erection of a public building in the town of Lindsay, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4884) for the erection of a public building in the town of Stratford, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HERSMAN: A bill (H. R. 4885) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building and site at San Luis Obispo, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GOULD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 98) creating a commission to devise a policy of cooperation between the employing and the working element of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial from the Legislature of Michigan, favoring the payment to each discharged soldier, sailor, and marine of a bonus in addition to his regular pay and allowance; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of Michigan, relative to freight rates on materials for public works; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of Michigan, favoring an appropriation by Congress to secure the early eradication of the European corn borer in the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of Michigan, favoring the enactment of laws preventing the return to the United States of

any German or Austrian who has been engaged in opposition to the United States and its Allies, and that all alien enemies interned in this country be deported and forever debarred from returning; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial from the Michigan Legislature, favoring the enlarged canalization of the St. Lawrence River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Memorial from the Ohio Legislature, requesting all trophies of the late war captured by Ohio troops be collected and sent to Ohio as perpetual memorials; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FESS: Memorial from the Ohio Legislature, requesting the Secretary of War to make provision that all trophies of war captured by Ohio troops be collected and sent to Ohio, to be kept as perpetual memorials; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 4886) to correct the military record of Edwin Collar; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4887) to correct the military record of Harrison R. Crecelius; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4888) to correct the military record of Anderson Creason; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4889) to correct the military record of John B. Hutchings; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4890) to correct the military record of Benjamin Munkers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4891) to correct the military record of William Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4892) for the relief of William M. Gritten; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4893) for the relief of George W. Drake; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4894) for the relief of Robert Griffin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4895) for the relief of Jessie Lee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4896) for the relief of James B. Norman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4897) for the relief of Christopher L. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4898) for the relief of Vincent Rust; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4899) for the relief of James F. Alexander; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 4900) granting an increase of pension to Arthur C. Gregg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 4901) granting an increase of pension to Clarence L. Wimer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 4902) granting a pension to George W. Earhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4903) granting a pension to Harvey Shimer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4904) granting a pension to Jacob Gish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4905) granting a pension to Howard H. Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4906) granting an increase of pension to Mark Hebblethwaite; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 4907) for the relief of certain pay officers of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4908) for the relief of Julio Carrazco, a citizen of Mexico; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EMERSON. A bill (H. R. 4909) granting an increase of pension to Seth N. Byers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4910) granting an increase of pension to Oscar P. Quiggle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4911) granting a pension to Mathew N. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4912) granting a pension to Emma A. Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4913) granting a pension to Mrs. Edward McLaughlin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 4914) granting a pension to Mrs. Nannie A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4915) granting an increase of pension to John A. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4916) granting an increase of pension to John S. Lozier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4917) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Cribbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4918) granting an increase of pension to John W. Paulus; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4919) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Margaret Pressler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4920) granting an increase of pension to Peter V. Gruesbeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4921) granting an increase of pension to Charles Culbertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4922) to correct the military record of James Hennessy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4923) to correct the military record of Andrew K. Hite; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4924) to correct the military record of Barnebal Schwartz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4925) to correct the military record of the late Warren W. Wilkinson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HASKELL: A bill (H. R. 4926) granting a pension to Jacob Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 4927) for the relief of Nancy A. Parson, C. M. Parson, D. F. Staggs, Ollie Staggs, Rosa Staggs, Lena Birchfield, Alice Birchfield, Bertie Gwin, Greely Gilbert, Linville Gilbert, and Nelson Gilbert; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4928) to reimburse T. Caffey, postmaster at Leeds, Ala., for money and stamps stolen from said post office at Leeds, Ala., and repaid by him to the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4929) granting a pension to James E. Norman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4930) granting an increase of pension to Newton Sigsby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4931) granting an increase of pension to John Coss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 4932) granting an increase of pension to Charles Will; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 4933) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hartman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 4934) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Loomis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 4935) granting a pension to Peter L. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4936) granting a pension to Henry A. Meal; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4937) granting an increase of pension to James Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 4938) granting a pension to Ella V. Altmeyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4939) granting a pension to Sarah M. J. Bertrand; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4940) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Robertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4941) granting an increase of pension to Stewart Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4942) granting an increase of pension to James A. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4943) granting an increase of pension to William Tomlinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4944) granting an increase of pension to William H. Snowden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4945) granting an increase of pension to William H. S. Sipolt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4946) granting an increase of pension to Enos Snodgrass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4947) granting an increase of pension to Perry Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4948) granting an increase of pension to William Goodman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4949) granting an increase of pension to Victor Fousse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4950) granting an increase of pension to Nathan C. Dobbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4951) granting an increase of pension to James B. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4952) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Conner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4953) granting an increase of pension to Frederick M. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4954) granting an increase of pension to Ezekiel H. Ballah; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 4955) for the relief of Walter Parks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 4956) providing for the purchase of certain inventions, designs, and methods of aircraft, aircraft parts, and aviation technique of Edwin Fairfax Naulty and Leslie Fairfax Naulty, of New York; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 4957) granting a pension to Eliza Hess Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4958) granting an increase of pension to Jesse B. Connelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4959) granting an increase of pension to James K. Meacham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANFORD: A bill (H. R. 4960) granting a pension to Louis N. Hickey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 4961) granting an increase of pension to Simon P. Kieffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4962) granting an increase of pension to Georgeanna C. Pierson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4963) granting an increase of pension to John L. Clifton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4964) for the relief of Jacob W. Moyer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4965) granting a pension to Robert Goodman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4966) granting a pension to Bridget Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4967) granting an increase of pension to John L. Dick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4968) granting a pension to Malissa Sands; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4969) granting a pension to Mary Ann Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 4970) for the relief of Harriet Fisher; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 97) to pay to Silas McElroy, of Cleveland, Ohio, the sum of $10,000 for injuries received while in the service of the Government; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the Christian Street Methodist Episcopal Church, David Lord, pastor, urging amendment to the National Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of S. D. P. F., No. 14, relating to Jugo-Slav affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Jefferson Lodge, No. 9, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, protesting against affairs existing in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolutions of Licking Lodge, No. 80, of Newark, Ohio, of the International Association of Machinists, favoring the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Licking Lodge, No. 80, International Association of Machinists, opposing continuance of daylight-saving act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BABKA: Petition of members employed in first and second class post offices of the United States and its island possessions, relating to increase of salary; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BEGG: Petition of Civil War veterans over 72 years of age who are members of the Ohio Soldiers and Sailors' Home, Erie County, Ohio, asking that they be given $50 per month instead of $40; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Sill Post, No. 57, Department of Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic, of North Baltimore, Ohio, to provide for the burial of the Civil War veterans and their wives; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of Methodist Episcopal Church congregation of Auburn, Salem County, N. J., protesting against repeal of war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition protesting against repeal of war-prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARSS: Petition of Lodge No. 21, Z. S. Z., relating to Jugo-Slav affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of J. R. Z. No. 3, relating to Jugo-Slav affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLE: Petition of Ministerial Association of Bucyrus, Ohio, to grant to all American Indians full rights of American citizenship; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COPLEY: Petition of the Zriuski, Frankapen, No. 18, C. of L. of Illinois, urging justice to the Jugo-Slav; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DARROW: Petition of P. H. Molter and seven other residents of Philadelphia, Pa., opposing repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Idle Hour Tennis Club, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of citizens of Sparta, Monroe County, Wis., opposing the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of sundry farmers, voters, and taxpayers of Baraboo, Wis., asking for repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of La Crosse, Wis., protesting against luxury-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of St. John the Baptist, K. S. K. J., organization of Wenona, Ill., on the Jugo-Slav-Italian matter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Utica, Ill., protesting against any modification of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Rockford (Ill.) Gas Co., opposing repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Rykert & Andrews, of Sycamore, Ill., for repeal of luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of McAdams & Sons, of Ottawa, Ill., for repeal of tax on automobiles and other industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Automobile Dealers' Association, favoring H. R. 2857, to regulate the interstate use of automobiles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL: Resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Broome County, N. Y., favoring the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of residents of Cherry Valley, N. Y., and vicinity, asking the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Otego Valley Grange No. 1427, urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculure.

Also, memorial of Binghamton Grange, 1072, of Binghamton, N. Y., favoring the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of residents of Walton, N. Y., for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of residents of Oneonta, N. Y., and vicinity, for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of residents of Vestal, N. Y., and vicinity, urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of residents of Binghamton, N. Y., and of Smyrna, N. Y., asking for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Tiger Post, No. 23, American Legion, against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Lithuanian residents of Binghamton, N. Y., for the protection of Lithuania by the United States of America from foreign aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorials of Benjamin T. Ash and other jewelers of Binghamton, N. Y., and vicinity; of Hills, McLean & Haskins, of Binghamton, N. Y.; and of J. Gordon Black, of Richfield Springs, N. Y., favoring the repeal of the so-called luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the New York Sales Co., Universal Motor Co., Larrabee-Deyo Motor Truck Co., of Binghamton, N. Y.; also of Clark A. Sandford and Earl E. Jenkins, of Margaretville, N. Y.; also of R. W. Hume, of Oneonta, N. Y., opposing manufacturers' sale tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of residents of Richfield Springs, N. Y., and vicinity, asking the repeal of section 904 of the revenue law of 1918 and other sales taxes in title 9; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian Churches of Deposit, N. Y.; also Methodist Episcopal Church of Cooperstown, N. Y.; also Sunday school of High Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Binghamton, N. Y., urging the rejection of the President's recommendation that light wines and beer be removed from the operation of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOCH: Petition of 396 voters, members of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, Emporia, Kans., protesting against the proposed repeal of any part of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Overbrook, Kans., protesting against the proposed repeal of portions of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Petition of Mrs. Mattie Hopper and others, of Briggsville, Ark., protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition on beer and light wines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of McKessan & Robbins, the Hastings Pavement Co., the R. R. Appleton Co., all of New York City, in the State of New York, favoring daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Oil Seeds Co., of New York City, opposing appropriation for continuance of Department of Labor Employment Service; to the Commitee on Labor.

Also, petition of Samuel Meckler, of Brooklyn, N. Y., condemning the atrocities against the Jews in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of G. Levor & Co. (Inc.) and 300 employees, of Greater New York and New York State, urging against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KENDALL: Petition of sundry Jugo-Slavic organizations of Adah, Ralphton, Gray's Landing, Fayette City, Orient, Boswell, Republic, and Edenborn, in the Twenty-third congressional district, State of Pennsylvania, against a subjugation of any part of their mother country to Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Star Junction, Pa., against the repeal of war-time prohibition as it relates to wines and beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution passed by Local Union No. 3163, United Mine Workers of America, Macdonaldton, Pa., favoring operation and supervision of mines by the United States Government; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, resolution passed by Local Union No. 3078, United Mine Workers of America, Meyersdale, Pa., favoring United States Government control of mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, resolution passed by Local Union No. 3168, United Mine Workers of America, Berlin, Pa., favoring United States Government control of mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petition of York Run Grange, No. 1699, Patrons of Husbandry, Smithfield, Pa., for repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution adopted by the Central Presbyterian Church, of South Brownsville, Pa., favoring a dry Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution adopted by the Sabbath-school convention held in the First Methodist Episcopal Church, of Perryopolis, Pa., favoring a dry Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petitions of Leo E. Adler, I. Shnoper, and Mrs. I. Shnoper, all of Providence, R. I., urging passage of resolution condemning atrocities committed against the Jews in Poland and other Slavic countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of E. B. Hale, Catherine A. Ross, Annie McManus, Mary Quinn, Emma W. Littlefield, K. H. Clark, Cora B. Hoard, Henry R. Davis, Mary E. Davis, Amey L. Willson, J. J. McGrath, Mary T. Walsh, Martha S. L. Potter, J. Howard Covell, Katharine H. Austin, Mary Mackie, and E. Carol Hodge, all of Providence, R. I., and A. Shuman & Co., of Boston, Mass., protesting against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution adopted at mass meeting of 10,000 citizens at Providence, R. I., protesting against the Jewish massacres in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Pawtucket (R. I.) Chamber of Commerce, protesting against proposed repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Resolutions of the Plantsville (Conn.) Baptist Church, for prohibition between demobilization and January 16, 1920; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of many residents of Onondaga Valley, Onondaga County, N. Y., protesting against the repeal of the war emergency prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of Walbridge & Co., of Buffalo, N. Y., urging repeal of 10 per cent tax on sporting goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Dr. William M. Mehl, of Buffalo, N. Y., urging repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Brost Bros., of Depew; E. B. Olmsted (Inc.) and Klepser Bros., of Buffalo; and Buffalo Automobile Dealers' Association, all of New York State, asking removal of tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Industrial Traffic Club, of Buffalo, N. Y., opposing rider in railroad appropriation bill which would strip Interstate Commerce Commission of power from long-and-short-haul clause act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of members of Retail Merchants' Association, P. M. Smith and 29 employees, J. A. Watcham, George S. Staniland, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. and 45 employees, all of Buffalo, N. Y., against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURPHY: Petition requesting the Secretary of War to remove to the State of Ohio all trophies captured by the Ohio troops during the war with Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Petitions from citizens of Shell Lake and of Grantsburg, Wis., protesting against the President's recommendation that Congress lift the ban on wine and beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of executive committee of Workers' Defense Union, of New York City, relative to the labor problems; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Richey, Browne & Donald (Inc.), of New York, against proposed continuance of the Department of Labor Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Shaw-Walker Co. and 500 employees, the Allen-Nugent Co., Carter, Macy & Co. (Inc.), the Metal & Thermit Corporation, and McKessan & Robbins, all of New York City and State of New York, favoring daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PAIGE: Petition of Division 12, Ancient Order of Hibernians, against the Smith bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Boston Chamber of Commerce; Cambridge Board of Trade; Andrew J. Peters, mayor of Boston; Jordan Marsh & Co.; Sylpho Nathol Co.; Boston Insurance Co.; A. Lincoln Filem and others, including 350 retail merchants, all in Massachusetts, against repeal of the daylight-saving bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Retail Trade Board, Chamber of Commerce, Boston Mass., representing 350 leading Boston stores, urging repeal of luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Associated Industries of Massachusetts, D. M. Dillon, Steam Boiler Works, and the Atlantic Works, protesting against appropriation for the continuance of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Central Labor Union, of Gardner, Mass., protesting against war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Rev. J. A. Day, of Charlton; Methodist Episcopal Churches of Spencer and Leominster; and E. A. Bedurtha and 95 others, of Leominster, all in the State of Massachusetts, against amendment to the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 400 wounded patients, against curtailing appropriation to maintain General Hospital No. 10, at Brookline, Mass.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RAKER: Petitions of Mrs. R. G. Green, of the People's Church, of Westwood, Calif., and L. B. Hinman, pastor Methodist Episcopal Church, of Auburn, Calif., urging the enforcement of the present war-time prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of San Francisco Labor Council, urging early enactment of legislation now pending which provides homes for returned soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, letter by John Kelly, keeper, Coast Guard Station No. 320, Point Reyes, Calif., and associates, urging the adoption of proposed legislation amalgamating the Coast Guard Seryice with the Navy Department; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, urging the repeal of the war-time prohibition measure as it affects manufacture of beer and light wines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICKETTS: Petition of members of South Harvey Methodist Episcopal Church and Sabbath School against repeal of the war prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of Fred A. Peeper, of Covington, Ky., protesting against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of sundry citizens of New York City, protesting against the tax on sodas and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chevrolet Tarrytown Leahy, urging repeal of tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Metal & Thermit Corporation, New York, opposing the continuance of the Department of Labor Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of MacArthur Bros. Co.; McKesson & Robbins; the international committee of the Young Men's Christian Association; and Emma J. Carr, principal Lockwood Academy, all of New York, favoring daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHALL: Petition of Jacob Roth and others, to introduce a bill to save Jews in Poland and eastern countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of C. E. Pendell and others, to repeal daylight saving; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SEARS: Petition of New England Association and citizens of St. Cloud, Fla., asking that national soldiers' home be located at St. Cloud, Fla.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition by citizens of the seventeenth congressional district of Illinois, in behalf of the rights of the Jugo-Slavs under the peace treaty with Austria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, protest against modification of war-time prohibition act from citizens of the seventeenth congressional district of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEELE: Protest of the Easton Board of Trade and individual residents of Easton, Bethlehem, and Northampton County, all in the State of Pennsylvania, against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Croatian Gymnastic Society, of South Bethlehem, with reference to disposition of provinces under consideration by the peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STINESS: Resolution of mass meeting of 10,000 citizens of Providence, R. I., protesting against the Jewish massacres in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: Petition of D. B. MaGee, pastor University Church, of Salina, Kans., protesting against repeal of the prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of George F. Walston, against repeal of the prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of members and friends of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hotchkiss, Colo., protesting against amendment of prohibition law pertaining to beer and light wines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of members and friends of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Hotchkiss, Colo., against repeal of the war-time prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTERS: Petition of St. Joseph's Sodality, of Johnstown, Pa., against the Smith educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Ladies Sodality of the Church of the Immaculate Conception, B. V. M., of Johnstown, Pa., against the Smith educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of St. Columba's Sodality, of Johnstown, Pa., against the Smith educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of St. Patrick's Ladies' Sodality of Johnstown, Pa., against the Smith educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of St. John's Ladies' Sodality of Johnstown, Pa., against the Smith educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of American Car & Foundry Co. of Huntington, W. Va., favoring the present daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Huntington Lodge, No. 104, International Association of Machinists, of Huntington, W. Va., favoring the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *June 5, 1919.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we invoke Thy blessing upon our labor this new day. The words which are spoken here are far-reaching in their effect. The final conclusions of this high office have to do with the happiness and prosperity of millions of Thy people. Give us a just sense of our responsibility. Give us a blessed consciousness of the Divine Presence, that we may know that we are working together with God in the upbuilding of a fairer, higher, and sweeter civilization. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, June 3, 1919, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	Lodge	Sheppard
Ball	Hale	McCormick	Sherman
Borah	Harding	McCumber	Simmons
Brandegee	Harris	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Harrison	McLean	Smith, Md.
Capper	Henderson	McNary	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	Moses	Smoot
Cummins	Johnson, Calif.	Nelson	Spencer
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Sterling
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Newberry	Sutherland
Dillingham	Kellogg	Norris	Swanson
Edge	Kendrick	Nugent	Trammell
Elkins	Kenyon	Overman	Underwood
Fall	Keyes	Page	Wadsworth
Fernald	King	Penrose	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Kirby	Phelan	Warren
France	Knox	Phipps	Watson
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Pomerene	Williams
Gay	Lenroot	Ransdell	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

GILLESPIE PLANT EXPLOSION (S. DOC. NO. 30).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of $327.77 requir[illegible] by the War Department for payment of claims for personal injury or death sustained through the explosions and fires at the T. A. Gillespie Loading Co.'s plant in October, 1918, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

LONGEVITY PAY OF TEACHERS (S. DOC. NO. 29).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation in the sum of $73,000 required for longevity pay to school-teachers and allowances to principals, as provided for by law, for the fiscal year 1919, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

EMPLOYEES OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 28).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a recommendation of the Auditor for the Post Office Department for the reappropriation of the unexpended balances of the appropriations for compensation to employees of that office for the fiscal year 1919, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE. I present two telegrams in the nature of petitions from citizens of Holyoke, Mass., which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLYOKE, MASS., *June 2, 1919.*

Hon. H. LODGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Resolution adopted at mass meeting May 29, 1919, by citizens of Polish extraction in Easthampton:

"Whereas on the 22d day of May, 1919, there were held in nearly all cities of the United States meetings and demonstrations at which one portion of the population was being incited in a demagogic manner against the other; and

"Whereas at these meetings there was made an attempt at disgracing in the eyes of the American people the new Polish State now arising from bondage of over a century; and

"Whereas, due to an ingenious propoganda, the Senate of the United States, contrary to the tenets of the Monroe doctrine and to the prin-

ciple of the inviolability of the internal affairs of each and every country, interfered, without previously investigating the merits of the case, with the internal affairs of Poland, we therefore, American citizens of Polish descent, resolve as follows:

"First. To call upon the Secretary of State of the United States to curb forthwith said propaganda as carried on by the Jews, propaganda which is spreading unrest and racial hatred.

"Second. To impress upon the American press the necessity for a proper caution in connection with spreading news concerning Poland as supplied by the Jews, in order to avoid the jeopardizing of the good name of the American journalism, which good name might suffer a blot as soon as authentic information in re alleged massacres of the Jews in Poland would be on hand.

"Third. We call upon the Jewish population in America to be diligently cautious of the motives prompting the slandering of the Polish nation and behold the pernicious results of the anti-Polish propaganda, which can not but bring harm to the Jews in Poland, and which would solely benefit the Germans.

"We furthermore resolve to forward copies of these unanimously adopted resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, and to the Speakers of both Houses of the United States Congress."

C. LEWANDOWSKY, *Chairman.*

—

HOLYOKE, MASS., *May 31, 1919.*

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The following resolutions were adopted at a mass meeting of American citizens of Polish extraction, May 30, at Kosciusko Hall, Holyoke, Mass.:

"Whereas almost on the very day when, at the peace conference in Paris, there were going on negotiations concerning the eastern frontiers of Poland, malicious intrigue attempted to disgrace Poland in the eyes of the world at large and of America in particular, by denouncing Poland as a country of pogroms and of anarchy was started; and

"Whereas for the purpose of achieving the aforesaid end Jewish propagandists did not hesitate to provoke racial hatred in America at a time when each and every loyal citizen of this country should be duty bound to preserve harmony among American citizens of whatever creed or race; and

"Whereas these very propagandists attempt to drag the United States Government and Congress into their shady political game by insinuating interference with the international affairs of Poland, an undertaking which might establish for Europe a precedent for a similar meddling with the internal affairs of the United States: We, therefore, American citizens of Polish descent, protesting solemnly against the unparalleled carelessness of disgracing the good name and the honor of the Polish nation without previously investigating the merits of the matter, without securing information from official Polish sources, do herewith

"*Resolve*, To call upon the United States Government to curb the investigating of one portion of the American Nation against the other in time to prevent the harm from passing beyond repair.

"To urge upon our fellow citizens to be more impartial, equitable, and just in giving credence to rumors concerning Poland; rumors emanating invariably from the same source and invariably benefitting solely the Germans.

"To call upon the American press, urging the latter to familiarize itself with matters Polish through the medium of trustworthy correspondents who have no racial interest in slandering Poland.

"Furthermore, we resolve to forward copies of this resolution, which was carried unanimously, to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Speakers of both Houses of Congress, and to the Associated Press."

KOSCIUSKO CLUB.

Mr. McCUMBER presented a memorial of the Congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Mott, N. Dak., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Thompson, N. Dak., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KELLOGG presented petitions of sundry citizens of Minneapolis, St. Paul, Pleasant Grove, Rock Dell, Rochester, Salem, High Forest, Orion, Haverhill, Oronoco, Farmington, Viola, Eyota, Elmira, Cascade, Stewartville, Marion, Janesville, St. Clair, Smith Mills, Waldorf, Waseca, Eagle Lake, New Richland, Otisco, Matawan, Wells, Alma City, Pemberton, Morristown, Medford, Dover, Kalmar, and Waconia, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of St. Paul, Duluth, White Bear, Glenwood, Paynesville, Minneapolis, Fergus Falls, Rush City, Buffalo, and Hutchinson, all in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted at the twenty-fourth annual convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Washington, Washington, D. C., favoring the enactment of legislation to extend the franchise in the parishes and separate congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CAPPER presented memorials of the congregations of the First Baptist Church of Topeka, the Union Church of Castleton, the Presbyterian Church of Trousdale, the Methodist Episcopal Church of Tonganoxie, the First Methodist Church of Winfield, and the Methodist and Congregational Churches of Centralia; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Wellington, and of sundry citizens of Scott City, Colony, and Highland, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NEWBERRY presented memorials of the Chamber of Commerce of Kalamazoo, of sundry citizens of Holland, and of sundry rural letter carriers of the counties of Ottawa, Muskegon, Kent, and Newaygo, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented memorials of sundry citizens of Portland, Romeo, Big Rapids, Mount Clemens, Ionia, Lyons, Detroit, and Cadillac, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of Charles A. Learned Post, No. 1, United States World War Veterans, of Detroit, Mich., praying that conscientious objectors be prohibited from wearing the victory buttons, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of sundry citizens of Jackson, Mich., praying for the repeal of the so-called "luxury" tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of Local Branch, No. 2, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for a readjustment of salaries of postal clerks, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. SHERMAN. I send to the desk and ask to have read a telegram from Chicago, Ill., signed by certain injured private soldiers who have been discharged and are in hospitals at Chicago.

There being no objection, the telegram was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 3, 1919.*

Hon. L. Y. SHERMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

Army Hospital No. 32 ordered closed June 15. Patients transferred to Fort Sheridan. We in wheel chairs and on crutches protest leaving fireproof building and moved where our lives will be endangered in wooden buildings already condemned and publicly protested. We were willing to give our lives in France, but refuse to risk being burned alive here. Are helpless unless you interest Illinois Senators and Congressmen to keep us where we will be safe from death by fire and where we can have some comfort and recreation. Some of us are paralyzed. Many are unable to move without help. For God's sake come to our rescue.

Privates Walter F. Darmsfel, Edward Sauer, Ernest A. Cohn, George Prokosch, Harrison H. Webb, Johnston Rowlston, Joseph Krzywacki, M. B. Kipp, Gus Meyn, Charles H. Vanfleet, George F. Hadd, Maurice T. Blair, Frank C. Schultz, Charles Chandler, Harry Rackowcky, Irvine S. Tucker, Vito Adamo, Thomas H. Tiller, and 100 more of our pals if you want them.

Mr. SHERMAN presented petitions of sundry citizens of the counties of Hancock and McDonough, in the State of Illinois, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Monmouth, Little York, and Kirkwood, all in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HALE presented a memorial of the Aroostook and Penobscot Union Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Presque Isle, Me., remonstrating against the free entry of potatoes from all other countries, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Yarmouth, Me., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Mapleton, Me., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FERNALD presented the memorials of E. C. McLaughlin, E. B. Tetley, G. H. Gove, and sundry other citizens of Maine, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PHELAN presented a memorial of the California Cattlemen's Association, of San Francisco, Calif., remonstrating against Government ownership or operation of marketing facilities, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. KNOX presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Pennsylvania, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas in the proper economic development of the resources of the various States of the Union, it is essential that a connected system of main arteries of traffic between the States be evolved, which will assist in the marketing and distribution of their products and commodities; and

Whereas in order to develop such an interstate system the Federal Government should establish a national highway system and make the necessary appropriations to carry the same into effect; and

Whereas in the construction of a system of main arteries an opportunity will be offered to provide employment, during the period of adjustment of this Nation, for unemployed labor and the heroes returning from France: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the house concur*), That the members of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby petition the Congress of the United States to establish a national system of highways, and to cooperate with the States of the Union in carrying out plans for the development of such a system, together with the provisions of the present Federal aid act or any amendment or amendments thereto.

Resolved, That the present appropriation for Federal aid to the States be continued and increased, and the States urged to undertake comprehensive highway improvements to keep pace with the transportation needs of the Nation.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Commonwealth forward a copy of this resolution to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and that a copy thereof be sent to each Member of said bodies from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

W. P. GALLAGHER,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

The foregoing resolution was concurred in by the house of representatives May 6, 1919.

THOMAS H. GARVIN,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Harrisburg, May 17, 1919.

PENNSYLVANIA, *ss:*

I, Cyrus E. Woods, secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, having the custody of the great seal of Pennsylvania, do hereby certify that the foregoing and annexed is a full, true, and correct copy of concurrent resolution No. 14–B, passed by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, petitioning the Congress of the United States to establish a national system of highways, etc., as the same remains on file and appears of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State to be affixed, the day and year above written.

[SEAL.]

CYRUS E. WOODS,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. KNOX presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Unionville, Newmansville, Towanda, and Powell, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Meadville, Cochranton, Pen Argyl, Williamsport, Monessen, Wilkes-Barre, Hatboro, Lock Haven, Pittsburgh, Horsham, Houston, Shenandoah, West Chester, South Brownsville, Gowen City, and Ulysses, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Local Grange No. 1358, Patrons of Husbandry, of Pleasant Hill, Pa., and a petition of Local Grange No. 1686, Patrons of Husbandry, of Gratz, Pa., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Eureka, Mont., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SOLDIERS' VIEW OF ANARCHISTIC OUTRAGES.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of the Come Back of June 4, 1919. The Come Back is published by and for the patients and enlisted personnel of the Walter Reed Army General Hospital, with the authority of the Surgeon General of the Army. It has, under the title "More plain words," a rather brief statement in every way showing the spirit we would expect in the gallant boys of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. I ask that the Secretary may read the article headed "More plain words."

Mr. BRANDEGEE. What is the newspaper?

Mr. FLETCHER. The Come Back, published at the Walter Reed Hospital.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

MORE PLAIN WORDS.

Under the caption "Plain words," a circular, setting out the creed of the anarchist bomber, was found among the tattered clothes of the terrorist who was blown to pieces when he dynamited the home of A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General, late Monday night.

We take those "plain words" of social sedition, proclaiming "Down with the powers that be," to represent the tenets of all the band of "reds" who tried to murder several officials by setting infernal machines and wrecking the homes of their intended victims.

It is time for "plain words" when bombs are scattered and when "The Anarchist Fighters" put out literature announcing "It is war, class war, against the darkness of your laws and the institutions you call order."

Army men are used to plain words. Open speaking and to the point is right in our line. We are just back from a campaign where "Over we go!" meant worlds of trouble for the Prussian lads who had said that our "so-called order" of democracy was all bunk.

We left several of our best "buddies" on the torn fields of France because we think our "so-called order" is one of the finest institutions on earth.

We have come back home with a deeper pride in the freedom of our laws because we have seen strong men die for their perpetuation and because we have looked upon the wreckage of other "so-called orders."

We have come back home, some of us with empty sleeves and shattered nerves, to enjoy the peace of freedom, for which we have suffered through two red years. We are a peace-loving lot, but we instinctively reach for the musket when we hear slander of the good things for which that old flag stands.

If there must be a house cleaning at home we are the boys to do it. If the autocracy of terrorism prowls in the shadows we are the fellows who are ready to go scouting for the scowling face.

We don't propose to allow Columbia to become a "no clean man's land"; we've had enough of the "so-called order" of might in Flanders.

Mystic promises of terror don't worry us. Prussian propaganda made black threats in more trying days; it bluffed lots of folks but not our outfit. We have seen the German menace smashed like an eggshell. We saw the infernal machines of the greatest war engine in history broken to atoms and the boasted Head Hussars hurled from their holds of hate.

We know how to subdue spies and snipers and submarines. We can squelch the sneaking terrorists.

We don't want any misunderstanding. Our order of democracy and justice is here to stay. The officers we placed at the head of our Government are going to stick on the job. "Old Glory" is going to float over a land of folks who do not hide bombs under front porches.

That is all of our plain words. In the drive on the terrorists you can count on those of us in the uniform of the United States for the front-line positions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 122) authorizing a commission to acquire and maintain a cemetery in France in the name of the United States for the reception and interment of the bodies of American officers and men who lost their lives in connection with the European war, and to appropriate $500,000 therefor, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 7) thereon.

Mr. JONES of Washington, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 1274) making it unnecessary to secure permits from the United States Shipping Board for the construction of ships in American shipyards for foreign account, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 8) thereon.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 643) to provide for the equitable distribution of captured war devices and trophies to the States and Territories of the United States and to the District of Columbia, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 9) thereon.

RATIFICATION OF TREATIES (S. DOC. NO. 26).

Mr. MOSES, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 67), and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the manuscript submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] on June 2, 1919, entitled "Ratification of treaties—method and procedure in foreign countries and proceedings in the Senate in the case of rejected treaties," be printed as a Senate document.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 27).

Mr. MOSES, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 68), and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

Resolved, That the articles submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK] on June 2, 1919, entitled "The league of nations," be printed as a Senate document.

REPRESENTATIVES OF IRELAND AT PARIS.

Mr. BORAH. I report from the Committee on Foreign Relations in an amended form Senate resolution 48 submitted by me, and I submit a report (No. 6) thereon. As it has been changed so that it would be difficult for the Secretary to read, I will read it.

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States earnestly requests the American peace commission at Versailles to endeavor to secure for Edward De Valera, Arthur Griffiths, and Count George Noble Plunkett a hearing before said peace conference in order that they may present the cause of Ireland.

I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho whether he thinks it will require any length of time for consideration?

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator mean of the peace conference?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; whether it will require any considerable length of time of the Senate? I have a resolution

coming over from yesterday, and I do not want it to be crowded out.

Mr. BORAH. I do not think it will take any considerable length of time. I do not know of any debate to be had upon it. I do not intend to discuss it at length myself, unless debate is started by some other Senator.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Otherwise, I should like to have the resolution go over until to-morrow.

Mr. BORAH. I do not think it will take any length of time to consider the resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I dislike very much to object to the immediate consideration of this resolution, but I consider it ill-advised, and really none of our business. I shall object to the immediate consideration of the resolution. I shall, however, satisfy myself when it comes up in the regular way with merely voting against it and shall not take up the time of the Senate to discuss it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution goes to the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 1377) for the relief of Amherst W. Barber; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

A bill (S. 1378) to authorize the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey to construct a bridge across the navigable waters of Newark Bay, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 1379) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Marengo, Ind., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1380) granting a pension to Mary E. Hagedorn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 1381) granting pensions to certain soldiers and widows of deceased soldiers of the Utah Territorial Militia who served in the Indian wars in Utah Territory, and to amend the act approved March 4, 1917, entitled "An act to pension the survivors of certain Indian wars from January 1, 1859, to January, 1891, inclusive, and for other purposes"; and

A bill (S. 1382) granting an increase of pension to Melvin G. Harmer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

A bill (S. 1383) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended June 18, 1910; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 1384) for the relief of George W. Samson (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLOGG:

A bill (S. 1385) to donate war trophies to the city of St. Paul, in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FERNALD:

A bill (S. 1386) granting a pension to Sarah J. Strout (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1387) granting a pension to Walter White (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KNOX:

A bill (S. 1388) to correct the military record of John L. O'Mara and grant him an honorable discharge; and

A bill (S. 1389) for the relief of Jacob Swartz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 1390) authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to deliver to each of the several county seats in the State of Utah captured German cannon, cannon balls or shell, and gun carriages, condemned United States cannon, cannon balls, and shells, or gun carriages; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 1391) to add certain lands to the Sequoia National Park, Calif., and to change the name of said park to Roosevelt National Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1392) for the relief of Capt. S. M. Neisser, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1393) granting a pension to James W. Wilson;

A bill (S. 1394) granting an increase of pension to Henry Dority (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1395) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Gunther (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DIAL:

A bill (S. 1396) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Newberry, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1397) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Orangeburg, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1398) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Pickens, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1399) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Spartanburg, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1400) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of St. Matthews, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1401) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sumter, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1402) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Saluda, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1403) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of St. George, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1404) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of York, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1405) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Walhalla, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1406) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Darlington, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1407) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of McCormick, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1408) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Moncks Corner, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1409) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ridgeland, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1410) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of York, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1411) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Walterboro, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1412) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Winnsboro, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1413) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Union, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1414) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Florence, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1415) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Georgetown, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1416) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Dillon, S. C., one captured German cannon.

A bill (S. 1417) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Gaffney, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1418) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Greenville, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1419) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Greenwood, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1420) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hampton, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1421) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Edgefield, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1422) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Kingstree, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1423) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Laurens, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1424) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lexington, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1425) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lancaster, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1426) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Manning, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1427) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Marion, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1428) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Anderson, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1429) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Allendale, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1430) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bamberg, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1431) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Barnwell, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1432) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Beaufort, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1433) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bennettsville, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1434) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bishopville, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1435) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Abbeville, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1436) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Camden, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1437) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Charleston, S. C., on captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1438) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chester, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1439) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chesterfield, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1440) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Columbia, S. C., one captured German cannon; and

A bill (S. 1441) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Conway, S. C., one captured German cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLOGG:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 46) extending until July 1, 1920, the effective date of section 10 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 47) authorizing and directing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of marriage and divorce; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. HARRISON:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 48) proposing an amendment to Article V of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUXILIARY ENGINEER CORPS.

Mr. RANSDELL. By request I introduce a bill to create an auxiliary engineer corps in the United States Army for duty on works of public improvement, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 1376) to create an auxiliary engineer corps in the United States Army for duty on works of public improvement was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. RANSDELL. To accompany the proposed bill is a brief statement explaining its purposes, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

Brief to accompany the proposed bill for an auxiliary engineer corps, under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

The purpose of this bill, briefly stated, is:

1. To provide an organization auxiliary to the Army Engineer Corps and subject to the orders of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in the discharge of his duties and needed for the efficient and economical performance of the Government work under his charge.

2. To provide an efficient working organization, complete from top to bottom, with a military status based solely upon the merit system and with provisions for continuity of service and moderate pay, but with sufficient inducement offered men to enter and remain in the organization as a chosen profession and life work, in which the lowest-paid employee may have a chance to make something out of himself if he is made of the right stuff. As the honor men of the West Point Military Academy furnish the personnel of the Army Engineer Corps, so shall our colleges and schools throughout the United States furnish their honor men for the proposed personnel of the auxiliary engineer corps through the civil service. The functions of this organization are clearly set forth in the bill.

3. To provide a complete business and engineering organization for all its departments in the field and office of highly trained and experienced men as a national after-the-war necessity to meet existing conditions that will put the United States on a par with England, which has its Corps of Royal Engineers, and with France, which has its Corps de Pont et Chaussee, that construct and take care of the public works, transportation, and highway facilities in those two countries.

4. To meet existing unusual conditions which defy and hinder economical progress, that can not be met except by the legislation proposed in this bill, to lift the Engineer Service at large out of the present ever-shifting conditions, and to give permanency and stability to the service. Men enter the service and use the training they receive to obtain better positions and better pay outside the Engineer Service. There are no means available and no inducements to offer any man to remain in the service. Conditions in this respect are growing worse. Experienced men who have been in the service for many years quit to better their conditions financially, and in many instances they more than double their pay by leaving the service. The loss of every trained and experienced man is a dead loss to the service as well as a financial loss to the Government, and what is worse, it reduces efficiency, hampers and cripples progress, and at times brings work to a standstill. On the other hand, the men quitting the service have nothing to lose but everything to gain financially. The proposed bill remedies all these defects. There is a remedy provided nearly in every section, that is called for by present conditions.

5. The proposed legislation will stabilize wages on public works and will have the same influence on the Nation's industries. It will eliminate strikes. No one has ever heard or known of a strike within a military organization. The thing is impossible, unthinkable. The principles laid down in this bill when put to practice will provide the United States a well-organized and highly intelligent and scientific dependable working force, instead of the present force of individuals without esprit de corps, everyone for himself.

6. The three-year training period provided before a man can get into the permanent organization will call for those sound qualifications upon which the proposed organization will be built.

7. The Engineer Service at large now contains the men qualified and ready to be mobilized into the permanent organization, also some men who are in the three-year training period.

8. The war has revolutionized many ideas and given man's judgment a new setting. The legislation proposed by this bill is an evolution which is called for by conditions due to the war and for which there can be found no remedy except by an act of Congress. There is no other way to get out of the deep rut. All effort and progress now are like climbing up hill on roller skates; anyone who has ever tried the latter performance will understand the meaning.

9. It is not a change of engineers which the country called for, but a permanent organization with a military status, to consist of the experienced men trained in the Engineer Service, men with the special qualifications needed in the performance of our Nation's waterway work and with provision for filling its depleted ranks and under the orders and direction of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, so as to relieve the War Department of all duties not strictly military.

10. The proposed legislation is not a salary grasp; ability, length of service, and present pay establish the grade of the personnel in the auxiliary engineer corps, as shall be determined by the efficiency board provided in the bill.

11. The business men of this country will support this measure.

EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANT CLERK.

Mr. KNOX submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 70), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk at the rate of $1,800 per annum, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL PAGES.

Mr. HARDING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 69), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to employ five additional pages for the Senate Chamber, at $3 per day each, for a period lasting until the end of the present session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, to be paid from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate.

CALENDAR MONDAY.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that hereafter I shall insist upon the observance of the rule relating to Calendar Monday. This means that after the conclusion of routine morning business no Senator may speak or introduce any business not on the calendar so long as there is objection. I do this in order that the calendar may be considered during the morning hour on Mondays until 2 o'clock, as is contemplated by the rule. I give this notice now in order that Senators may understand that there will be nothing personal in any objection that I may make.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 3157. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

TREATY OF PEACE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was informed privately by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] that he wanted to call up his resolution.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I supposed that the resolution came up as a matter of right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The ruling of the Chair has been for four years that such resolutions do not come up unless they are called up.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to have the resolution laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska.

The Secretary proceeded to read the resolution.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry, and, if I may do so, I should like to make a preliminary statement before I submit the question. The Indian appropriation bill is on the calendar. I am very anxious to get it up this morning. I do not think it will take very long to dispose of it. It is important that this legislation should get through at the earliest date possible, and I want to ask if debate is in order on the pending resolution during the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is, after the routine morning business has been completed. It has been the invariable ruling that resolutions coming over were debatable.

Mr. CURTIS. Under Rule VIII it is provided that—

All motions made before 2 o'clock to proceed to the consideration of any matter shall be determined without debate.

Of course, the question is whether this resolution comes up as a matter of fact without motion. If it comes up as a matter of course it is subject to debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is quite clear about this matter. It was the custom of Presiding Officers prior to the induction into office of the present occupant of the chair to for-

mally lay before the Senate all resolutions coming over from a preceding day, but the present occupant of the chair has made the ruling, and the Senate has acquiesced in it, that he would not lay such resolutions before the Senate, but that the Senators who had submitted them should have the right to call them up before the close of morning business.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I shall not take up any more time, but I trust that the Senator from Nebraska will get through as soon as he can, because I should like to get up the Indian appropriation bill at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, of course I have no desire unduly to detain the Senate on this matter, and I have already assured the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] that I should not do so. I realize the great desirability of bringing before the Senate the appropriation bill to which the Senator from Kansas refers, but I have suggested to him that it would be a very easy matter under the circumstances for him to secure from the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] permission temporarily to lay aside the unfinished business, as we have done in many other cases, and then to put through the appropriation bill which he desires passed.

Mr. President, I ask first that the Secretary read the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 64), as follows:

Whereas the Senator from Idaho, Mr. BORAH, has stated in the Senate that certain interests in the city of New York have secured copies of the peace treaty with Germany while the American people have been unable to secure one; and

Whereas the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. LODGE, has stated in the Senate that he knows of four such copies of said treaty of peace with Germany now in New York and that the only place where it is not allowed to come is the United States Senate; and

Whereas the Senator from Idaho, Mr. BORAH, has stated that the interests now having possession of said copies of said treaty are peculiarly interested in the treaty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be, and it hereby is, authorized and directed to investigate the matter with a view to ascertaining the facts, and particularly to ascertain and report to the Senate the name of the persons, corporations, or interests which have secured copies of said treaty and from whom they were secured and by what methods, and also to ascertain and report to the Senate in what manner and to what extent said interests are "particularly" interested in said treaty. For these purposes the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and it is, authorized to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with the same, the expenses thereof, including the cost of travel, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I assume that there will not be any very substantial objection to the adoption of this resolution. I realize that, as a proper formality, it must first be sent to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and I shall later on ask that that action be taken; but it seems to me a matter of the most tremendous urgency that an investigation should be had of the charge made upon the responsibility of two Senators upon the floor of the Senate that copies of the peace treaty with Germany have fallen into the hands of New York interests while being withheld from the Senate of the United States.

The demand for an investigation should have been made by the Senators who lugged into the Senate this very serious charge. They do not appear to have appreciated either the gravity of their own statements, or the embarrassing position in which they place themselves by not demanding an investigation. They declare, in effect, that the President of the United States withholds copies of this treaty from the Senate, and they insinuate very broadly that he permits copies to go to business concerns in New York City. These concerns, they say, have particular interest in the treaty, of which they have secured advance copies.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, I am ready to take all the blame that can be placed upon me by the Senator, but I wish he would not say "they." I said nothing whatever about financial interests.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I shall quote what the Senator said——

Mr. LODGE. I wish the Senator would.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And I assume when the Senator from Massachusetts, leading the main body of the Senators on the other side of the Chamber, and the Senator from Idaho, leading the other faction of his party, concur on the same day in making these charges and insinuations against a coordinate branch of the Government, that they are in accord, and that what one of them says is indorsed by the other. These New York concerns——

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Idaho has no objection to that statement, but he thinks that it may be a little harsh upon the Senator from Massachusetts. The Senator from Massachusetts did not say anything about "special interests" at all, nor "particular interests," nor anything of that sort. I was sorry he did not; but he did not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, it is possible that the Senator from Massachusetts is in a slightly different attitude from the Senator from Idaho. They concurred, however, in their attack. Apparently these special New York interests having an interest in the treaty did not permit the Senator from Idaho to examine it while in their possession, whereas the Senator from Massachusetts appears to have been particularly favored. These New York concerns, they say, have particular interest in the terms of the treaty. This involves an attack upon the President of the United States of the most scandalous character.

It appears to be a new chapter in the attack on the treaty itself, a new chapter in which both of the Senators concur. It is done for the purpose of attacking the treaty. It conveys to the public mind the idea that there is a secret combination between the commission headed by the President in Paris and the business interests in New York, by which the latter are to be given advance information withheld from the Senate—a monstrous charge. Men who make such a charge owe it to the public to demand an investigation, and they would have demanded an investigation if they had been making a charge in the public interest and not merely for the purpose of injuring the great treaty and postponing the establishment of peace.

I was not in Washington on the day these senatorial statements and insinuations were made; but I searched the papers in vain to find a report of any demand by either of the Senators that the scandalous situation they pictured be investigated. Indeed, the Senator from Idaho went so far as to say upon the floor of the Senate that he did not want an investigation.

Personally I have no knowledge of this matter; I have never seen the treaty, nor asked to see it. I do not know the New York interests that have copies. If any New York interests have copies, they evidently have closer communication with the enemies of the treaty than with the friends of the treaty. I want to know how those New York interests got those copies, if they have them; the country wants to know; the Senate must find out. It is not sufficient to leave the matter to the confidential knowledge of the Senators who are fighting this treaty. We are all entitled to know what New York interests are using copies of this treaty in their business, not simply those Senators taken into the confidence of the aforesaid New York interests.

Mr. President, I shall not, unless it becomes necessary, take the time to quote into the RECORD all of the statements made by the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Idaho on June 3, but I notice one statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts in which he says that he held in his hand yesterday a copy of the treaty and that it was offered to him to bring here. He says that it was not given to him, but that it still exists in New York.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Does he say why he would not accept it?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think he does.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. What was the reason? I should like to have that go in the RECORD also; also the page from which the Senator is reading.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am reading from page 558; and as the Senator is so curious, I will read that paragraph.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I should like to hear it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK (reading)—

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I will now take occasion to say what I was going to say out of order when the request for unanimous consent was before us. Now, I will say in order upon the woman-suffrage joint resolution that the treaty is in New York. I had a copy of it in my hand yesterday, and I heard of several others. I was offered a copy to bring on here and show to my colleagues. I said that no copy could come into my hands without being made public.

It evidently did come into his hands without being made public; and, if we are to believe the reports, it rested in his hands for an hour and a half.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. He meant that he would not accept it and bring it down here unless he made it public.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not know any great moral advantage of such a treaty coming into the hands of the Senator from Massachusetts and being withheld from the hands of his associates. I can see no great moral boast in that. If he held the treaty in his hands, he held stolen goods—goods probably secured by bribery; goods which the President of the United States and other international representatives in Paris had

promised should not be made public, for public reasons, and in order that the negotiation of the treaty might not be interfered with—

Therefore, it was not given to me, but it is there in New York. I heard of four copies in existence in New York.

The Senator is very well advised, evidently, of these nefarious interests concerning which the Senator from Idaho has made some rather strong insinuations—

How many more there may be in the country I do not know; but, as far as I can make out, the only place where it is not allowed to come is the Senate of the United States.

That is a pretty strong statement for a Senator of the United States to make—that the President is withholding copies of the treaty from the Senate and permitting it to go everywhere else, and into the hands of concerns that have special interests in the treaty. How a Senator could have believed such a thing, and not have demanded an investigation, I do not understand.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will.

Mr. FALL. What information has the Senator that the President is withholding the treaty from the Senate?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. My information is of various characters; and it is a matter of world-wide notoriety that the representatives of the nations which made this treaty agreed, for the public interest and in the interest of an early peace, to withhold the publication of the copies until a result had been secured with Germany, just as has always been the case in the negotiation of treaties.

Mr. FALL. That is my understanding of the general situation—that is, that there should be no publicity given to the treaty—but I have not any information leading me to believe that the President has refused to give it to the Senate, because a treaty is given to the Senate in confidence, and publicity is not given to it except by the consent of the President or the Senate. We on this side, I am sure, have no information that the President would decline to give the Senate the treaty, but we have proof that the Senator from Nebraska is leading the opposition to an inquiry for the treaty. That is all we know about it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is going far afield from the issue which is now before the Senate.

Mr. FALL. I will come to that issue before we get through with it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. When we come to debate the question of whether the Senate of the United States should break into presidential negotiations, and demand the tentative copy of a treaty before it has been signed by the enemy, the Senator is going into a field in which he will find no precedent whatever for the Senate making any such meddlesome demand.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And, if the Senator will pardon me, he is going into a field where George Washington denied that the Senate had the right to enter.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Absolutely.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to correct that statement a moment, the message of George Washington was to the House of Representatives; and he distinctly said that he had already furnished to the Senate of the United States all the information, including every particle of the evidence, every letter, and all communications.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is right about that. It does happen that the House did ask for the information.

Mr. FALL. Exactly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the President denied the right of the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. FALL. Oh, no. He denied it to the House, because of the publicity, and stated that he had already transmitted to the Senate of the United States all the information.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I desire to add, however, that he did not transmit it, or transmit anything, until after the treaty was completed and signed.

Mr. FALL. That is a question as between the Senator from Montana and historical records with reference to the matter and President Washington's own note to the House, to which reference has just been made.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, there is later authority on this question than George Washington.

Mr. BORAH. I was going to say, why do you quote George Washington? You have repudiated all his doctrines.

Mr. SWANSON. We have the illustrious Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] as a later authority on this question. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to read, for the edification of the Senator from New Mexico, what the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee said on this question. He is a very fine authority on the prerogatives of the Senate and the prerogatives of the President.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I shall be very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. FALL. The Senator from Virginia always edifies the Senator from New Mexico. I shall be glad to have him pursue his ordinary course.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator from Massachusetts is the latest authority we have, in 1906.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, that was during the administration of a Republican President, was it not?

Mr. SWANSON. I was about to suggest that. I want to show what the Senator's views were when a Republican President was engaged in negotiations and a demand was made by some Democrats for certain information. I should like to put in a later authority on that point. This was the Algeciras conference, and Senator Bacon was trying to get some information with reference to it.

Mr. BORAH. May I make a suggestion? That has been read some twenty-five or thirty times. May I suggest that we have a special print of it, so that we will have ready access to it?

Mr. SWANSON. I shall be very glad to have printed the portion of it that I shall read:

He is entitled under the Constitution to come here and join with us in the consideration of treaties or other executive business. As a matter of fact, that was never done but by Washington, and it has been abandoned ever since, although the right remains recognized by our rule to-day. Yet I think we should be disposed to resent it if a request of that sort was made to us by the President of the United States.

* * * * * * *

Mr. President, I repeat we are justly jealous of our own prerogatives and our own rights, but we can not maintain them or insist upon them unless we are equally observant of the prerogatives and the rights of the other departments of the Government. It is a mere invasion of the powers and rights of the President if we are to plunge in at a stage of the negotiation where we have no business whatever and demand from him the instructions which he has given to his properly appointed representatives. When the treaty made by those representatives comes before us, then is the time, and not before, in which we can properly ask for information in regard to all which led up to it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator to ask a question?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. What is the date of that?

Mr. SWANSON. January 24, 1906, when there was a Republican President.

Mr. NORRIS. That was before the promulgation of the doctrine of "open covenants of peace, openly arrived at." It does not apply now.

Mr. SWANSON. That does not change the constitutional right.

Let me give another suggestion to the Senator from Massachusetts, which, I think, has not been put. As was suggested to me by a distinguished Senator the other day, it would be just as right and just as just if the President were to send word to us that, if not incompatible with the public interest, he would be obliged if we would send him our secret Journal.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. In conclusion, Mr. President, I have very little to say. The Senator from Massachusetts has gone on record in the declaration that this treaty is under the control of the President of the United States; that the United States has no representatives in Paris besides the President. He has made the statement, almost flat-footed, that those representatives, under the control of the President of the United States, have given out copies of this treaty. He states that there are at least four, and I think he really said five, copies extant in New York at the present time. The Senator from Idaho indorses what he says, and declares that those treaties are in the hands of interests which are using them for private purposes, because they are interested in the terms of the treaty.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, the Senator from Idaho asserted the right to print it in the RECORD, while the Senator from Massachusetts would not even bring it to the Senate at all. That is where they differ.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Now, I say the time has come for an investigation. I want to know what interests the Senator from Massachusetts has been talking to. I want to know what interests there are which are denounced by the Senator from Idaho as having special interests in the terms of this treaty. I want to know how those interests got possession of copies of this treaty, and hold them in New York at the present time, and confidentially discuss them with Senators of the United States. I think the people of the United States have a right to know, and therefore I ask that this resolution be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Nebraska would not talk in such a violent way. He frightens me, he frightens the Senate, when he gets so violent.

Let me say to my friend from Virginia——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I hope the Senator will not construe as violence what is simply a robust voice gathered upon the plains of the West.

Mr. LODGE. I do not know where it was gathered.

I want to say to the Senator from Virginia that that paragraph from my speech, which has been read here repeatedly—I think the Senator from Idaho understated it when he said it had been read twenty-five times—is just as correct and true today as it was then, absolutely. We can not compel the President to send anything here, and what I spoke about was asking for instructions, his instructions to his representatives. We are not asking for instructions. We are asking for a public document, and he can refuse it if he sees fit.

Now, Mr. President, let me come to the question of the investigation, which I shall be delighted to have ordered. I went to the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate this morning and said that I hoped he would get through this morning this resolution getting authority from the Committee to Audit and Control. To my surprise I found that the Senator from Nebraska, who is in such a state of hurry and haste, had had it put over, so that I could not get it before the Senate this morning. If I had had my way we would have passed it and begun the investigation at once. I shall be delighted to have it come to my committee, which is also the committee of the Senator from Idaho, and we will investigate each other with great pleasure.

The Senator finds fault that we did not carry on an investigation in New York. I am not aware that we have any authority to carry on investigations.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Oh, Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. Let me finish. I did not interrupt the Senator.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But the Senator is misrepresenting my statement and my position, and I am sure he does not desire to do that. What I criticized the Senator for was not demanding an investigation in the Senate, as I have now demanded it.

Mr. LODGE. I noted down that the Senator said, "should have investigated."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; the Senator is enitrely mistaken. I have it here in writing.

Mr. LODGE. At all events, I saw no reason why we should undertake an investigation in New York.

Now, let me state all that the committee can possibly find out from me. I will state it now. It will save time.

I was shown a copy of the treaty with Germany by a friend of mine who is connected with no interest, but is entirely a private citizen. How it came into his hands I did not inquire. He is a man of the utmost uprightness of character. If I were at liberty to mention his name, which I am not, the whole country would know that there never was a more outrageous suggestion than to suppose that anything could have come into his hands by corruption. It came to him, I have not any question, in a perfectly legitimate way; I have no knowledge how.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. Day before yesterday the Senator spoke of four copies of the existence of which he had knowledge.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me to tell my poor little story in my own way, I will come to that.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I stand rebuked by the unconscious arrogance of conscious power and will take my seat.

Mr. LODGE. There is no arrogance to it; but the Senator is trying to tell it, and no doubt can tell it much better than I. I wanted to go on and tell it in my own way, and then he can tell it in his way afterwards.

Mr. THOMAS. I merely asked a question, Mr. President, and I am sorry that I interrupted the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. I am coming to it if the Senator will permit me. I think I have at least the right to tell it in my own way. I had the floor.

I was going on to say that that copy I had an opportunity to examine, at least one article of it. The text of the treaty covers 208 folio pages. The whole treaty, French and English text both, covers 415 pages. The English text covers 208 small folio pages, as I recall. The only part that I acquired any sort of familiarity with was an article at the end, which seemed to be a sort of addendum to the body of the treaty with Germany, because it had nothing to do with the peace with Germany, but which established, at great length—I think it is as long as the league of nations article; that is a mere guess, but I should think so—a great and permanent organization for the internationalization of labor, a very interesting article. I was afterwards told by another gentleman, wholly unconnected with any great business or financial interests in any way, that he also had a copy, which he would allow me to take and examine at length; and I told him I preferred not to take any copy to bring here, because any copy that was put into my hands I should feel it my duty to make public. It was this gentleman who said to me that he knew of four copies in New York. That is merely hearsay. I know personally of only two.

I saw nobody representing a financial interest. I did not go within 2 or 3 miles of Wall Street. Therefore I can not bear testimony as to the possession of copies of the treaty by financial interests. But it was stated by the State Department when they were explaining what I had said and what I had seen, although the State Department was not with me when I saw it. They said that they thought I must have seen parts of the treaty which were in the hands of financial interests in New York. I suggest, when you begin to investigate, you investigate your own department at the start. They said that publicly. It was published in the newspapers.

Nobody has denied the presence of those copies here or in New York. Of course, there is a copy here in the State Department, and I have no doubt that Senators more favored than I have seen it. Those copies are here. How they came I do not pretend to say. They must have come from Paris. They must have been given out by somebody who had control of them. I do not pretend to say who did it. I only know they are here in this country and, on the authority of the State Department, that they are in the hands of some of the financial interests. That is not my statement.

Now, Mr. President, that is all I could suggest to any committee.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator state who in the State Department made that statement and to whom it was made?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Frank Polk made it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. To whom?

Mr. LODGE. He made it to the press, and it was printed in the press that evening.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is willing sometimes to take the press statements, but I notice on other occasions he discredits them.

Mr. LODGE. I am not fond of speaking of private conversation, but I know personally that the statement was given. That is all I can give in the way of testimony. That is all I shall give. It would be on my part a gross breach of faith to state the names of the two gentlemen, who are friends of mine, who told me they had copies. That I shall decline, of course, to give; but anything beyond that question which the Senator from Nebraska thinks he will find serviceable I shall be only too happy to give, and I will call before the committee everyone he can suggest.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Including the peace commission?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; including the peace commission, if I can reach them. I shall be very glad to find out the whole of it. That is the whole story, as far as I know it.

Mr. FALL. If the Senator from Massachusetts will allow me a moment——

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. FALL. Does not the Senator think it would be a good idea to call before the Senate Committee the Senator from Nebraska himself, who a few days since in the Senate stated definitely of his own knowledge certain things with reference to this treaty, knowledge which none in this body has except as communicated by him. I refer to his statement with reference to the resolution of the Senator from California, made on the 23d of May and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. For instance, he said that he can state definitely that no publication of this treaty had been made in any country whatsoever, and yet the public press notifies us of the fact that it has been made and is on sale in a book of 415 pages to-day, in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, or in any neutral countries of the Continent as well as in Germany. He has made the statement, as I understand him, that he knew the President of the United States wanted the treaty made public. He said:

> I do not know that I am going too far, but I feel justified in saying that the President of the United States would have no objection, so far as the United States and the people of the United States are concerned, to the full publication of this document, but it can not be published in the United States without getting back to other countries.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> As I say, I hesitate to go too far in stating things that I believe I know; but I do know that it would be a cause of infinite embarrassment, particularly in France, to make public at this time the present terms of the demands being made on Germany.

I suggest in the investigation the chairman should investigate as to the source of knowledge of the one member of this committee who apparently has some confidential knowledge which the other Members of the Senate have not.

Mr. LODGE. Of course the Senator from Nebraska is a leading and most distinguished member of the Foreign Relations Committee. He is right there, and he can investigate himself while he is investigating us. That is all very easily done.

Mr. President, the whole thing is very simple. There is no question about the fact that copies of the treaty with Germany are in this country. That is admitted by the State Department, and I can bear witness to having seen one. There is no question whatever that they are on sale in neutral countries, as the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] has just said.

Now, I can see no good reason why we should not have from the State Department the official copy of the text of a treaty which the rest of the world has no difficulty in procuring. But if the President thinks there is any reason why we should not have it, why does he not tell us so, and the whole demand would cease at once? Yet we know nothing but this hearsay, what the newspapers say, and what the Senator from Nebraska thinks the President thinks. One word would stop it.

Mr. FALL and Mr. HITCHCOCK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Will the Senator from Massachusetts yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FALL. I presume the Senator would not consider the sending of the treaty to the Senate as imparting instructions to us to publish it, or as necessarily followed by a publication of the treaty.

Mr. LODGE. Not in the least. All treaties are marked confidential, and they are published only when we take off the injunction of secrecy.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a moment ago I said that George Washington had denied the right which is sought here. The Senator from New Mexico very properly said that matter happened to come before George Washington in the shape of a resolution from the House of Representatives. I then stated that he was perfectly correct about the source, but that the language which Gen. Washington used was equally applicable to either branch of the National Legislature. I shall quote that language now.

Mr. President, I am reading from one of the ablest recent presentations of the constitutional power of the United States as related to world affairs and treaty rights. It comes from the pen of the former Senator from Utah, Mr. Sutherland, one of the three greatest lawyers who have been in this body since I have been here—one of the best international lawyers. I can not find the original, but I am quoting it as quoted by him in this book.

Mr. FALL. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. FALL. Does ex-Senator Sutherland attempt to set out the entire letter of Washington or only a part of it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. He sets out so much of it as applies to the particular question that you and I are now discussing.

Mr. FALL. But he does not set out that portion of it which the Senator admitted was contained in the letter, to the effect that he had already communicated to the Senate all these documents.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; but not on the demand to the Senate nor by its right. The language that Gen. Washington used is this:

> The nature of foreign negotiations requires caution, and their success must often depend on secrecy; and even when brought to a conclusion a full disclosure of all the measures, demands, or eventual concessions which may have been proposed or contemplated would be extremely impolitic; for this might have a pernicious influence on future negotiations or produce immediate inconveniences, perhaps danger and mischief, in relation to other powers—

That is, foreign powers—

> The necessity of such caution and secrecy was one cogent reason for vesting the power of making treaties in the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, the principle upon which that body was formed confining it to a small number of members.

Then he goes on to deny the special right of the House of Representatives to make a demand of that sort.

Now, then, I want to quote a little from ex-Senator Sutherland in connection with this point. Then I shall quote a little from, perhaps, the ablest diplomatist and international lawyer that the other side has furnished to the country since the Civil War, with two exceptions—Senator Spooner, of Wisconsin. From ex-Senator Sutherland I now quote. He tells how in the convention forming the Constitution the framers had a great deal of dispute as to with whom should be left the treaty-making power, some of them wanting to imitate the example of Great Britain and leave it exclusively with the Executive, others wanting to go to the opposite extreme and leave it to the House of Representatives. Then ex-Senator Sutherland says:

> In the end the plan which was finally adopted commended itself to the good sense of the convention as insuring preliminary secrecy and expedition whenever necessary, without losing the benefit of the thorough consideration and popular approval which would result from the independent action of the Senate, in which every State would have an equal vote and an equal opportunity of being heard. Negotiation with foreign Governments is a matter of such delicacy that it can be carried on far better by a single person, like the President, than by a large number of officials, like the Senate, while the combined judgment of the larger number, including both President and Senate, respecting the value and wisdom of the result of the negotiation will generally prove a safer reliance.
>
> The unwisdom of premature and sometimes of ultimate public disclosure of treaty or other negotiations with foreign Governments is so clear that the refusal of President Washington to accede to a request from the House of Representatives to lay before that body the instructions, correspondence, and documents relating to the negotiation of the Jay treaty was approved by the House itself, and has ever since been recognized as establishing a wise precedent for subsequent guidance.

Now, Mr. President, our forefathers happened to be in that particular generation very remarkable men in their knowledge of what had been taking place upon the earth in connection with the formation of governments and the carrying of them on. They finally decided that so far as the *negotiation* of a treaty was concerned it should be left with the Executive, untrammeled, unworried, unbothered by anybody, and that so far as the making of a treaty was concerned, after the result of the negotiation was made known, that it should be the deliberate action of this body, representing in equal numbers the separate States of the Union, this Government being combined of these United States.

One of the three or four ablest men who have appeared upon the other side of the Chamber since the Civil War was former Senator Spooner, of the State of Wisconsin. Senator Spooner said, on page 1418 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 23, 1906:

> I believe that it is not a proper course to be pursued by the Senate in respect to our foreign relations, save in extraordinary circumstances, if at all.

That was in connection with a resolution that had been introduced by the late Senator from Georgia, Mr. Bacon, then upon the Foreign Relations Committee, wanting to know the status of the negotiation which the then President of the United States was carrying on.

The Senate—

Says Senator Spooner—

> has nothing whatever to do with the *negotiation* of treaties or the conduct of our foreign intercourse and relations save the exercise of the one constitutional function of advice and consent, which the Constitution requires as a precedent condition to the *making* of a treaty.

Not the negotiation of it.

> Except as to the participation in the treaty-making power, the Senate, under the Constitution, has obviously neither responsibilities nor power.

Mr. President, this comes with a good deal of weight when you consider the man who uttered it. He was by long odds the ablest man in connection with our foreign affairs I have known in this Chamber, except, perhaps, two others.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will continue reading, if the Senator will pardon me, until I finish this part from Mr. Spooner.

Mr. FALL. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS (reading)—

> From the foundation of the Government it has been conceded in practice and in theory that the Constitution vests the power of *negotiation* and the various phases—and they are multifarious—of the *conduct* of our foreign relations exclusively in the President. And, Mr. President, he does not exercise that constitutional power, nor can he be made to do it, under the tutelage or guardianship of the Senate or of the House or of the Senate and House combined.

Mr. President, from the beginning of this discussion down to now there has been a plain, palpable, and obvious effort and desire, or something that looked like it, to nag and worry and bedevil the President of the United States, not with regard to the *making* of a treaty but with regard to its *negotiation*, and every possible step has been taken to create in foreign countries the impression that his own people are not behind him. Instead of leaving him to his constitutional function, and then considering what he has done after he has done it and brought it here, you have been constantly suggesting and nagging and worrying and bedeviling, and you are up to it now.

Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts talks as if the treaty had been completed. The treaty not only has not been completed but we are in negotiation with Germany right now about its modification in certain respects, and it was a very wise thing upon the part of the President not to send a part of the

treaty here, or the treaty in process of negotiation, instead of waiting until after it was finally negotiated. The treaty has not been negotiated yet. The other side to the treaty—Germany, Austria, Turkey—has not yet signed it. The other side to the treaty has requested modifications, and the latest news shows that, as far as the financial part of the treaty is concerned, there are going to be modifications. And yet you want your own Executive, charged by the Constitution with the exclusive right—not under your tutelage at all—of negotiating treaties, to send to you parts of the negotiations in process of construction. From day to day, I suppose, he ought to have sent you just what they had done the day before, according to these gentlemen, and then correct the day after to-morrow what they had undone the day before.

As to this particular matter of copies of the treaty being in New York, I will undertake to wager a doughnut or two that when we come to find out who has these treaties, who has these copies of the treaty, we will find that they are Republicans, and that the man who first brought back a copy, or several copies, of the treaty is a Republican, and a high financial magnate in the Republican Party.

Mr. BORAH. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Just one moment. Now, then, as to how the copies could have gotten here, I can imagine only one honest way in which they could have come. The German commissioners violated faith, published the treaty, and sent it not only over Germany but over neutral countries. They afterwards apologized for it, and said that the publication had taken place at Berlin contrary to their will and without their consent. It is possible that one of these copies in French and in German and in English, which I am informed are on the streets in Holland, in Denmark, and in some other parts of the world, have been gotten hold of honestly; but the insinuation, if such an insinuation is intended—and I hope it is not—that the President gave it to some interests somewhere, while declining to give it to the Senate of the United States, or that somebody in the President's confidence, by the President's consent, did it, is a thing which I repel, and I do not believe is true.

Now I will yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I will not interrupt the Senator now, but I shall try to get the floor later.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well.

Now, Mr. President, there are those who think that this Government has been awkwardly constructed—the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is not one of them, I am glad to say—and that our forefathers blundered in many respects. Some people think that we ought not to have had a Government limited by the will of the people as expressed in the Constitution at all, but that it ought to have been left, as the British Parliament is left, to do whatever we thought was well and right. There are others who think that all of the lines of demarcation between the powers of the respective parts of the Federal Government in the Constitution are "more honored in the breach than the observance."

I believe that the Constitutional Convention did one of the wisest things it ever did when it put the treaty-making power just exactly as it did—in its first stage of *negotiation*, for the purpose of secrecy and surety and for keeping the confidence amongst nations and amongst States, exclusively in the hands of the President of the United States, for, as George Washington says here:

> The nature of foreign negotiations requires caution, and their success must often depend on secrecy; and even when brought to a conclusion a full disclosure of all the measures * * * proposed or contemplated would be extremely impolitic.

As Senator Spooner says in what I read you a moment ago, the very purpose and object of giving the President exclusive negotiatory power, as contradistinguished from the treaty-making power, was that the whole treaty power might work effectively. You can not carry the negotiations of a treaty to the newsboys on the street and have their votes as to what you are going to do next.

The President of the United States had a right to do what he has done; he was wise in doing it; and the proceedings in this body demonstrate his wisdom, for in so far as we have interfered we have interfered only to mar and not to mend.

Then when it came to the making of a treaty the framers of the Constitution were also wise there. They said that while we will entrust negotiations exclusively to the Executive, we will not trust the final result to him; he must take into his confidence then the ambassadors from the States who represent these United States in this Union and who are assembled in the Senate of the United States. So they made him do that.

Then, thinking further that the other House—the direct representatives of the people—were not consulted, they said, "We will make it safe by requiring two-thirds of the Senators present to vote affirmatively in favor of a ratification before a treaty shall be valid and binding. We feel assured that two-thirds of the Senators will never do anything in connection with our foreign affairs that a majority of the House of Representatives would not be in accord with."

Mr. President, if this copy or these copies of the treaty have not come by getting hold of the German copies, and if they have come to any special interests—and it will be discovered later on that the head of the interests is a Republican—then they must have been gotten out in some wrongful way; and if so, that is not a thing to be proud of.

So far as I am concerned, it seems to me, now that the Germans have published the treaty, it does not make much difference whether it is published everywhere else or by us or not; but the President has made an agreement with these other peoples that the treaty was not to be published until it was completely negotiated and until Germany had signed it. And, by the way, that is only courtesy and comity to Germany, enemy as she is. She did not live up to it; she violated the trust reposed in her. A part of the consideration that led men to come to that conclusion of temporary secrecy was that we ought to wait until the other side to the treaty has agreed to it before we send it to our own people—until Germany, Austria, Turkey, and Bulgaria have signed up.

The treaty can not be sent to the Senate until the negotiations are completed, and the negotiations can not be completed until Germany and the others have signed. It begins to look as though Germany is not going to sign, and that we shall have to go to Berlin. When we go to Berlin we shall have a different treaty. If we are forced to go to Berlin we are not going to be satisfied with the present treaty. There will then be other exactions. There will have to be additions to it.

Now, how are Senators helping the United States in Europe in these negotiations? Is what you are saying here in the shape of carping and criticism helping your representatives there? Are you gaining for them the greater confidence of neutrals and enemies and friends by what you are doing and saying here? If you are destroying that confidence, are you doing it deliberately and for a set purpose, or are you doing it accidentally and just out of pure foolishness? Which is it?

I think, Mr. President, that I have demonstrated the fact that the language of George Washington would apply to the Senate as well as to the other House, although the language which I have quoted was used in reply to a House resolution.

I wish merely to state this before I conclude: It has been universally admitted that the President's power of negotiation is so exclusive that he may make a treaty, have it signed, and then pocket it, as Thomas Jefferson did in the case of a treaty with Great Britain; or the President may send the treaty to the Senate, the Senate may amend it, and then he may pocket it at the White House, as Taft did in reference to the British arbitration treaty, because he declined to pursue the negotiation any further, and the Senate had no right to negotiate and no method of doing it, because that was the President's exclusive power and his exclusive right. As Taft said, you remember, "I merely put that treaty on the shelf, waiting for the people to elect a new Senate"; and he added, in his very felicitous and facetious way—he was the best loser, by the way, that America has ever had—"but the people instead of changing the Senate changed me," and the treaty is still on the shelf at the White House. He did, however, what he had a right to do and what everybody knew he had a right to do, as did Washington and Jefferson and Madison in the cases with which Senators are, or ought to be, acquainted.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, the Senator, of course, pursues one of the methods of argument by reading a portion of a document proving his point and declining or failing to read the other portion. In Senator Sutherland's work he was commenting upon a certain condition which might exist and giving his views with reference to the publicity of pending treaty negotiations or the publicity of certain documents after a treaty had been concluded. For the purposes of his argument no more than for the purposes of the Senator's argument was it necessary for him to disclose the entire facts of the case. It would not have been, however, at all disastrous, in so far as the argument was concerned which Senator Sutherland was making, to have disclosed the entire George Washington letter, but it would have been disastrous to the Senator if he was attempting to make any argument to disclose the entire Washington letter.

The House of Representatives called upon Washington by joint resolution for certain letters from and to foreigners during the negotiations in connection with a treaty. The treaty had been communicated to the Senate of the United States prior to that time, and the treaty was ratified by the Senate, I

may say. The House of Representatives for the purpose of openly discussing not the treaty itself, because the seal of secrecy had at that time been removed from the treaty, but for the purpose of discussing the actions of certain negotiators and certain private information upon which the negotiators acted, requested this information from the President. The present occupant of the chair [Mr. POMERENE in the chair] will of course recall at that time that all sessions of the Senate of the United States were secret; there were no open debates in the Senate. In the House of Representatives the debates were open. President Washington replied, making the argument exactly as it has been read by the Senator against publicity of the negotiations or of private documents in public debate in the House of Representatives, but stated to the House of Representatives that he had sent every one of the papers requested by them, together with all of the other papers in the case, to the constitutional body entitled to their possession, the Senate of the United States. That statement is made in the same Washington letter.

I asked to interrupt the Senator for a moment while he was reading Senator Spooner's remarks, to request that he read Senator Bacon's remarks at that time. Senator Bacon was a very eminent and very prominent Senator, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of this body for many years, and died as the chairman of that committee. It was his resolution to which Senator Spooner was objecting.

There are some Senators in this body, Mr. President, who are sticklers for precedent and who do not agree with the President of the United States, or at least with the declarations of the President of the United States, with reference to open diplomacy and "open covenants openly arrived at." I am sorry to say that there are many Senators upon my side of the Chamber who insist that all treaties should be discussed behind closed doors, with the audience excluded from the galleries. I am not one of those Senators. I think, sir, as the President said—and I shall not undertake to quote his words—when he addressed this body and the other body with reference to the Brest-Litovsk treaty which had just been made, a new era had come, and he congratulated Lenin and Trotski and the Bolsheviki that they insisted upon conducting the negotiations at Brest-Litovsk openly and publishing the treaty broadcast.

While the President of the United States should be pretty fair authority, and despite the fact that once before his sentiments upon this particular subject at issue have been read into the RECORD, yet in view of the fact that fifteen or twenty times the sentiments of Senator Spooner or the words of Senator Spooner and the words of Senator LODGE and others have been read into the RECORD, I shall presume upon the time of the Senate to call attention again, specifically, to the President's ideas entertained prior to this time, at least, and even later, when he addressed the Congress of the United States upon the German Bolsheviki treaty. Referring to the President, he says:

> But there is another course which the President may follow, and which one or two Presidents of unusual political sagacity have followed, with the satisfactory results that were to have been expected. He may himself be less stiff and offish, may himself act in the true spirit of the Constitution, and establish intimate relations of confidence with the Senate on his own initiative, not carrying his plans to completion, and then laying them in final form before the Senate, to be accepted or rejected, but keeping himself in confidential communication with the leaders of the Senate while his plans are in course, when their advice will be of service to him and his information of the greatest service to them, in order that there may be veritable counsel and a real accommodation of views, instead of a final challenge and contest. The policy which has made rivals of the President and Senate has shown itself in the President as often as in the Senate, and if the Constitution did intend that the Senate should in such matters be an executive council it is not only the privilege of the President to treat it as such, it is also his best policy and his plain duty. (Woodrow Wilson's Constitutional Government in the United States, ch. 5 (1917).)

Mr. President, I have maintained since my entrance into public life that secret diplomacy was the greatest evil which our democracy was compelled to confront, that there lay more injury and more evil to the body politic, to the people, to our Government itself, and to the perpetuity of our American institutions in secret diplomacy than in all other weaknesses contained in our form of government or written in our Constitution combined. If precedent as established is followed in the treatment of this matter now at issue—and precedent, of course, will be insisted upon even by those who under different conditions or at different times have urged an opposite point of view—as it is now being insisted upon, the great people of the United States will know nothing about this treaty until it is published, if it is ratified. They know nothing about it now, and it appears that they are practically the only people in the world who are in ignorance of it. They are not to be informed of it, and, finally, under the forms of precedent, it will be communicated secretly by the President of the United States when he brings it back with him to this Chamber, which will, upon motion of some Senator or Senators, proceed to close its doors and consider this treaty changing the form of the Government of the United States, in secrecy from the people whose Government it is.

Senators insist upon precedent in this matter. Why, Mr. President, a portion of the treaty, a tentative draft of the treaty, was brought back by the President of the United States, and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House were called into consultation by him. He presented it to them; they discussed the matter there. What was the purpose? Why should he have presented a portion of the treaty to them, and why should his associates here, or his counsellors in the Senate, insist that he does not want the other portion of the treaty presented, confidentially at least, to us?

They may be right. The Senator from Nebraska is always assuming knowledge which he does not impart to us. He has intimate sources of knowledge, doubtless. He may be justified in saying that the President of the United States does not want the true text of this treaty to come before the Senate, and be considered by it, either publicly or privately. However, Mr. President, in view of the many declarations of the President of the United States upon this subject, unless I have a definite assurance that the President has so stated—not intimated to some Senator, in whose word, of course, I will have confidence—I must say that I doubt the objection of the President of the United States to a consideration of the treaty as so far agreed upon.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FALL. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator conceive conditions to exist in Europe that might call for withholding the publication of the treaty from the public until after it had been submitted to the German representatives and they had full opportunity to discuss it and present it to their Government, and perhaps their Government had opportunity to take advices from various parts of the—Empire, I was about to say? I will withdraw the word "Empire" and say "the Republic of Germany."

Mr. FALL. I can conceive of such conditions, but only upon the assumption that the people of France do not want this treaty, and therefore that the negotiators are afraid to give publicity to it, or that the people of England do not want the treaty, and therefore that their negotiators decline to give it to them.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think that the delegates from Germany themselves would request that the treaty be withheld from the public until they had an opportunity to examine it and to communicate its contents to their Government?

Mr. FALL. Oh, the Senator may be correct. Germany may have made such a request. Of that I have no knowledge. I do not know whether she has or not. Has the Senator seen any suggestion that Germany has requested that it be kept private?

Mr. KING. I have seen some intimation in some of the press to the effect that the German delegates asked that knowledge of the terms of the treaty be withheld from the public.

Mr. FALL. Well, I have not. There were no German delegates until the treaty was prepared and presented to them.

Mr. KING. I understand; but I mean after it was presented to them. Does not the Senator think also that a treaty of this character, where it was only tentative—that is to say, it had not been agreed upon by the other side, and they had not presented any definitive terms—should be withheld from the public until the other side had an opportunity to examine its contents and to make their suggestions, if they had any to make, of changes or modifications which they regarded as essential to secure their rights and perhaps to secure the support of their Government?

Mr. FALL. The course which the Senator has suggested is, of course, one which has been almost universally followed in the past history of the world; but it has been said that it was so followed because it was in the power of those who were in absolute control of the countries of the world to make treaties of peace or treaties of commerce or treaties of alliance, offensive or defensive, without the knowledge of their constituents or of their subjects, and that it was not the business of the subjects. It was under conditions of that kind that this precedent was established. The President of the United States himself has called attention to it much more eloquently than I can. We had all hoped that those conditions had been so changed that the negotiations for this peace might be open.

Now, as to our own attitude and as to what I think, replying further to the Senator, allow me to say this:

Great Britain and France and Italy and the other Allies had been at war with the German Empire for several years before the United States entered the war. These nations, including Russia, had a treaty—a hard and fast treaty—nego-

tiated between the representatives of those countries, and under their constitutions binding upon the countries themselves, not submitted to their people in any way whatsoever. They had entered into a treaty by which it was agreed that Russia would not make peace with Germany or with the Central Powers without the consent of Italy, France, and Great Britain; that Great Britain would not make peace with Germany or the Central Powers without the consent of France, Italy, and Russia, and each of the other nations was bound by that treaty.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me——

Mr. FALL. Let me conclude my sentence. Each of the other nations was bound by that treaty. We knew that treaty to exist when we entered the war. The Congress of the United States declared that the acts of the German Empire constituted war, and that we declared the state of war thus thrust upon us to exist. We did not declare war against Germany, as the Senator recalls, directly. We made that declaration, knowing that the Allies had this agreement between themselves, that they would meet in common at the peace table, and that neither would sign any agreement of any kind or character with any or all of the Central Powers without the consent of the others, or unless the others also signed it.

Now, that far I am correct. If the Senator wishes to ask me a question, I will yield at this point.

Mr. KING. I was not quite sure whether I apprehended the meaning of the Senator; and I wanted to ask him whether he felt that it was an act for which the Allies should be criticized, when they were in a war for their very existence, that they entered into treaties, offensive and defensive, and those treaties stipulated that neither should make a treaty of peace with the enemy without the consent of all?

Mr. FALL. Oh, no; oh, no. I have not the remotest idea of criticizing the Allies. Anything is justifiable under the plea of self-defense, as the Senator knows well as a lawyer. This was a perfectly justifiable act, of course, and I am not attempting to criticize it at all; but I am stating the historical and record facts, that the United States did not enter into any such alliance with those States. It could not have done so, except by negotiations carried on through the President, presented to and ratified by this body. Therefore, I can say that this Government had no understanding of any kind or character with reference to the signing of peace treaties with the other Allies. Is not that statement correct, as the Senator understands?

Mr. KING. As I understand the statement, I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. FALL. Very well.

Mr. KING. But it does not seem to me that the mere fact that there was a treaty, to which the Senator has referred, between the Allies before we entered into the war changes the proposition as to the propriety, if those making the treaty thought that such was the proper course to pursue, of withholding knowledge of the treaty from the public until certain conditions had been complied with, or until the treaty had been submitted to the enemy and they were perfectly willing that it should be disclosed to the public.

Mr. FALL. The Senator has asked me a question as to my judgment about these matters, and I will proceed to give it. I am trying to give it logically, and I will reach the point he is speaking of right now. I have it in mind.

Mr. President, remember that we were not a party to any treaty as to how the terms of peace should be arrived at. Remember that the President of the United States had solemnly said to the Congress of the United States and to the people of the United States that with the causes of this war we were not concerned; we had nothing to do with it. Remember that only recently the Vice President, the presiding officer of this body, has publicly stated that he was ashamed to acknowledge—I am not attempting to quote his words, but I think this is what he said, in effect—that for years he had believed that we had nothing to do with or nothing in common with those who were fighting this war, that our interests were not as theirs, and that he had changed his opinion. The President of the United States notified the people of the United States that with the causes of this war—whether they might be ethnological, whether they might be geographical, whether this war might have been brought about because there were certain numbers of alien people within the boundaries of a certain geographical division, irrespective of the cause of the war itself—this country was not concerned. Many of us disagreed with him at that time. I am frank to say that I am one who disagreed; but he held that opinion.

Therefore, when this country entered the war, in every communication to foreign Governments and to our own people on the subject, the President of the United States treated the Allies not as allies of this country, but, to use his own expression, as those countries with which we were associated in fighting the war; and I defy any Senator to read every remark made by the President upon this subject and to point out to me where he has not, with all his magnificent ability in handling language, declined to commit himself to the fact that we were allies of Great Britain, France, Russia, Italy, or of the other combatant countries. Not only do I defy you to show where he has ever intimated that we were allies, but, with his usual insight and discernment in the use of words, he has used a word which would convey to any mind the distinction which he has clearly in mind and which, up to the time when he went to Europe, he undoubtedly insisted that the people of the United States should bear in mind.

Now, sir, what were the causes of the war, as he set them forth in his message to the Congress of the United States? I am not going to undertake to quote them. Senators remember why we went to war with Germany—why the President of the United States stated that we were justifiable in declaring a state of war to exist, which he did ask us to declare to exist. Not one word with reference to the thousand and one matters which he is now considering through the assistance of the geographical and ethnological experts, who have overrun the streets of Paris; not one word of any invitation or desire upon his part that we should divide the roundheads from the longheads in Europe and set aside to each of them, or to the Czechs or to the Teutons, a certain geographical division. I say that the President of the United States might well have followed the example of other Presidents before he proceeded to Europe. He might well have taken counsel with himself; he might well have acquired the frame of mind which he was undoubtedly in when he wrote those words which I have read into the RECORD. If he had any idea of entering into such negotiations as he is now embarked upon he might well have taken counsel with himself and followed the example of other illustrious Presidents and consulted the Senate of the United States before he proceeded to bind himself hard and fast to Great Britain, to France, to Italy, and to the other allied countries of whom we are only associates.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FALL. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator mean to suggest in the statement he has just made that the President of the United States or that the Government, in dealing with the Central Powers after their defeat, should have conducted negotiations separate and apart from the governments with which our Government was associated during the war?

Mr. FALL. I mean just exactly that. I mean, sir, that the United States of America was entitled to deal, through its President as negotiator, with the German Empire, Austria, and their allies, and that upon making their peace we should have declared it, brought our soldiers home, and they should be here now, in my judgment, and restored the conditions prior to the war, or agreed upon new conditions upon which our people might do business with the German people.

Mr. KING. Then, as I understand——

Mr. FALL. Pardon me; I am going to answer the Senator. That is my judgment and it is my judgment of what should be done to-day. Then, as we were associated with these other people, and as the people of the United States of America are a peaceful people; as the people of America, while a great warlike people, are not a military people; as the people of the United States of America want peace forever, and will never change the condition of peace of their own free will, then the President of the United States, and I think justifiably, should have said, and I think his hands would have been upheld had he said: "We will now sit here; if you desire, we will counsel with you when you undertake to arrange the much more complex conditions existing between you and the German Empire. We have been your associates in this fight. We have fought to prevent future wars. We have fought for the United States of America, and its fight. Now, we are perfectly willing to be enrolled among those who will use every effort consistent with national sovereignty and integrity and American patriotism to assist you in preserving peace, not only for the next 10 years or the next 40 years, but for the next 100 years, or for unknown or untold centuries. We will sit here, if you so desire. We have settled our personal matters, those of particular interest to the people of the United States. We are back on a peace basis, except that this treaty has not yet been ratified. Pending its ratification, pending its consideration, pending my return to the United States carrying it with me as a completed document, I will sit here and counsel with you, with this statement—that if you can arrive at a treaty between yourselves any portion of which tending toward keeping the peace of the world in the future I can support, I will underwrite that treaty for you or that portion of that treaty."

You have been asking what I thought should have been the process of the negotiations, what I thought should have been the conduct of the President of the United States, with due deference to the great position which he holds, I say that these are my sentiments, and what I should have done.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think that if the President of the United States were merely an advisor, a sort of an amicus curiæ, as I understand the position of the Senator, in the negotiations, then after the treaty of peace had been made between the allied Governments and the Central Powers, if this Government had underwritten it he would have subjected himself to a storm of criticism——

Mr. FALL. Oh, Mr. President——

Mr. KING. Let me complete the question.

Mr. FALL. But the Senator assumes to put me in a position which I do not occupy.

Mr. KING. As I understood the Senator, and I am, of course, placing the interpretation upon the Senator's remarks that seemed to me to be obvious. Assuming that my interpretation is correct, does not the Senator think that would have been an entangling alliance against which he and other Senators are now inveighing?

Mr. FALL. What are you in now?

Mr. KING. I will wait until the treaty is signed, and then I shall be very happy to tell the Senator.

Mr. FALL. You saw a tentative draft of the proposed league of nations. What does the Senator call that? I did not propose the league of nations. I stated distinctly, and I reiterate it now for the benefit of the Senator, that looking on during the negotiations for peace, if I, in my judgment, believed that those negotiations had resulted in such a state of affairs that under the terms of the treaty peace could be kept, that it would conduce to peace, in so far as the terms relating to peace or conducing to peace hereafter were concerned, I would have ratified it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MYERS in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate resolution No. 12.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I had not intended to enter upon this line of discussion. It was brought out, as the Senators know is so often the case, by first one suggestion and then another. I shall consider, with the permission of the Senate, at some early date in the future some portions of this treaty and state some of my particular objections to it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN obtained the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will permit me, everyone seems to be in favor of the resolution submitted by my colleague. Can we not have unanimous consent to refer it to the committee? Then if Senators want to do so they can continue to debate it.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask to which resolution the Senator refers?

Mr. NORRIS. The resolution of the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK].

Mr. THOMAS. The resolution of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is now the unfinished business before the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand, but it will take only a moment to get unanimous consent that this resolution of investigation be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Nebraska for that purpose?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am perfectly willing to do so if it is understood that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is interested in this resolution.

Mr. NORRIS. He is not opposed to it; he is in favor of it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I thought he might want to discuss it.

Mr. NORRIS. He can discuss it at any time.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not know whether he will want to discuss it when it is away from the Senate or not. I think I shall object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made and the resolution goes to the calendar.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I may be wrong about the position of the Senator from Idaho, but I know he was waiting here and expected to discuss the matter.

Mr. NORRIS. He can discuss it when it comes back from the committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand that, but he may want to discuss it now in view of the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. Let it lie on the table until the Senator from Idaho returns to the Chamber.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. May I suggest to the Senator from Washington that the discussion for the last hour has been on the resolution which the Presiding Officer has just laid before the Senate anyway? The Senator from Idaho will have ample opportunity in which to present his views and to answer the senior Senator from Nebraska, so I trust the Senator will make no objection to the request for unanimous consent to refer the resolution to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It may only delay the reference of it until the Senator from Idaho comes into the Chamber. Then, if he does not want to discuss it at that time, it can go to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. NORRIS. My request was that the resolution introduced for the investigation by my colleague be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, where it has to go under the rule before we can pass it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that objection was made.

Mr. NORRIS. I so understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution then goes to the calendar.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to me for a moment?

Mr. KENYON. I was just going to ask a question with the permission of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. I would like to ask the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], whose resolution is now before the Senate and the unfinished business, when he expects to get a vote on it? There are some very important bills on the calendar, which we would like to have brought up, and this stands in the way of any other business.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I hesitate to state when I expect to get a vote on it, but I will answer the Senator from Iowa by saying that I am going to endeavor to get a vote upon it and shall continue in that endeavor every time the matter is laid before the Senate until a vote is obtained. I trust it may be within the next hour or so. If not, I hope within the next day or so, and if not then, within the next week or so, but at any rate I am going to continue it as the unfinished business until it comes to an issue and we learn exactly what our rights are or whether we have any rights at all.

Mr. KENYON. Then I hope the Senator will not lay the resolution aside for anything that may come along, but let us get rid of it and go on with some other business that does not require so much time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I quite agree with the Senator, and I shall not consent to lay it aside again.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution we were discussing before 2 o'clock be laid on the table without prejudice.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is satisfactory to me, unless we can have it referred.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] thinks the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] may want to speak upon it, and he does not wish to have it referred until the Senator from Idaho says whether he wants to speak upon it or not. This will not delay it long. Unanimous consent can be asked later in the day that it be referred to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah asks that the resolution lie on the table, going over without objection. Is there objection?

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to ask the Senator from California if he will not consent to temporarily lay aside the unfinished business, so that I may call up the Indian appropriation bill? It is very important that that bill should be acted on speedily. I thought the order had been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to know first if there is any objection to the request of the Senator from Utah. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. By unanimous consent, that will be the order.

Mr. CURTIS. I now renew my request of the Senator from California. It is important that the Indian appropriation bill shall be passed before July 1. In some of the departments they are already issuing furloughs to clerks because they have not money to pay them for this month. That being true, I would like to get the Indian appropriation bill through this afternoon. I do not think it will take over an hour or an hour and a half. If it should take a longer time, then I would very gladly consent to laying it aside.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I regret exceedingly that I can not comply with the request of the Senator from Kansas. I would be delighted to do so, but so much time has been occupied with what seemed to me a simple proposition that I want to bring it to a conclusion at the earliest possible moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. CURTIS. I give notice that I am going to stay here and do my best toward calling up the Indian appropriation bill. To-morrow morning, if it is not called up to-day, I shall call it up at the conclusion of the morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business, Senate resolution No. 12, is before the Senate and the pending question is the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations, on which the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. BORAH subsequently said: I understand that during my absence from the Chamber the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] went over upon the supposition that I might desire to debate it and therefore it was not permitted to be referred. I wish to say that if the Senator from Nebraska will ask unanimous consent, which will not interfere with the pending order, that it go to the committee, whatever I have to say upon it I can say while it is in the committee just as well as while it is here. If the Senator will ask permission that it be considered now, I will not object.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution introduced by me last night be now referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution is referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I want to say a few words briefly in support of the resolution offered by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. I do not propose to make any extended remarks. I think this issue has been clearly debated by the Senate, probably at too great length, and I noticed this morning that the discussion of the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] drifted into the question as to why the Senate was not furnished with a copy of the treaty. Some few days ago I introduced a similar resolution, requesting the Committee on Foreign Relations to transmit to the Senate an official copy of the treaty of peace. I care nothing for the form the resolution is to take. The Senate should be furnished with a copy of the treaty of peace immediately.

From my State and from every section of the country there is a demand for an authentic copy of this very important document, insistent inquiry as to why it is withheld and suggestion that continued refusal to make public the treaty necessarily implies that no reliance can be placed on the summary. Demand for publicity is made by lawyers, bankers, professional and educational men, and also by importers and manufacturers who are anxious to shape their commercial policy according to the lines of the treaty. To many of these men the summary has become an object of suspicion, and to some of actual distrust.

We have never had a war similar to this, and there was never so much interest in any public question. Anxiously the people awaited information of the treaty, and all that they received was a publication in the newspapers of what purported to be a summary. One naturally would expect a summary to be followed by the publication of that which was summarized. A sufficient time has elapsed for the receipt of the treaty. In fact, I am informed it is in the hands of the State Department. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], in his recent speech, if I understood him correctly, gave as the reason why the treaty is withheld that negotiations are still in progress, and then he volunteered the information that some changes have been made in it, information based apparently not on any word of the President or of the Department of State but derived solely from the press. If treaties can be made only with the advice and consent of the Senate, is it not strange that the Senate must look to the press for information? If our sole source of information is the press, can anyone maintain that the treaty is being made with our advice? Perhaps there are some among us who will maintain that the treaty is being made in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution. To me, a layman, it seems that the treaty is being made in open defiance of all precedents. How can anyone say that the treaty is being made with the advice of the Senate when the Senate knows nothing of the negotiations except what it gleans from the press? Can it be that he who is negotiating that treaty believes that he needs no advice and spurns the provision of the Constitution which requires that treaties must be made with the advice of the Senate? An alleged detailed summary has been published broadcast throughout the country. If it is a summary, if it is honest, if it was given forth in good faith, why is the whole document, now that it is in possession of the State Department, withheld from publication?

I should like to ask the former chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who has acted as the spokesman of the administration, this question: What is the real reason the official draft of the treaty is not forthcoming? Is there any reason why it should be withheld? And this question also: Has the former chairman been afforded an opportunity of seeing and reading the copy said to be in the State Department?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I have stated to-day that I have neither seen nor asked to see a copy of the treaty. I am confident that it would be a breach of the proprieties for me to ask the Executive or any branch of the executive department of the Government to look at a copy of a treaty that is not yet negotiated, a copy of a treaty that will not be fit to come to the Senate until it has been negotiated in accordance with the universal custom of the Government since it was established. There is not an instance the Senator can point to in the last 100 years in which the Senate has asked the Executive to send to it a copy of a treaty under negotiation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the Senator for his frank statement. He has quoted a precedent, but I will quote later in my speech the reasons why the precedent should be at this time disregarded by the President, because he himself has made a change by his messages to Congress in the very precedent and policy heretofore established.

If there is any real reason why it should be withheld, why does not the President make a plain statement to Congress and show why secret covenants secretly arrived at are indispensable. It is stated that the treaty contains a provision that when three signatories are obtained from the allied powers, the treaty becomes effective. Does this mean that if Italy, France, and England signed, they may resume commercial relations with Germany immediately, and thereby secure an advantage over the United States, unless this Senate will take the treaty on faith, and, without even reading it, consent to it? If any attention is to be paid to our commercial interests, is it not right and proper that a copy of the treaty be furnished to this Senate, so that its study may be at once commenced?

It may be that, owing to the difficulty with Italy, it was necessary to frame the treaty in this way, but, as I understand it at the present time, Italy is in agreement, and the danger that lurks in this provision may fall on the United States.

I can not understand why, if the German delegates are to be entrusted with this treaty, the United States Senate can not be trusted with it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The German delegates are no more entrusted with this treaty than the representatives of the United States are entrusted with it. The German delegates are not the treaty-ratifying body. They bear the same relation to Germany that the President of the United States and his associates on the American commission bear to our country. They are to negotiate the treaty. After they have negotiated it, after they have signed it, it will then be submitted to the ratifying body in Germany. The Senator realizes that this treaty has not been laid before the British Parliament; he realizes that it has not been laid before the Chamber of Deputies; it has not been laid before the Italian Parliament for ratification or for reading, even. It has not been laid before any ratifying body. It is exclusively and properly in the hands of those who are engaged in negotiating it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The Senator probably well knows there is no parliamentary body except this one that has the ratifying power. I do not know the source of his information, and I venture to say that a copy of this treaty, or a correct summary of it, has been perused and scanned by the members of the parliamentary bodies of Europe.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from New Jersey is mistaken in saying that the Senate of the United States is the only body which will pass in ratification upon this treaty. It is the custom with treaties of this sort to submit them for ratification to the responsible Governments of the country. It is true there have been treaties negotiated in the past of a minor character that were not submitted to Parliament, but this treaty undoubtedly will be submitted to the House of Commons for approval.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I see nothing in the argument of the Senator from Nebraska which will convince me that the treaty should be withheld from the Senate and the people of the United States. Those of us who are to bear the responsibility to vote upon it are anxious to study it

in connection with the proposed covenant for a league of nations, and we should not be denied that right. Neither should the President longer withhold information from the American people, in view of the promise he has made to them.

It was stated here the other day that it was contrary to precedent to send to this body a treaty of peace, inasmuch as it is left to the President to negotiate the treaty, and that, therefore, it would not officially come before this body until he had presented it. The President, however, is acting as a peace delegate in this connection rather than as President. What has been the situation? In every war that we have ever had—and there never was one like this—the President has been in Washington directing the peace commissioners and conferring with the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. He remained at the White House, ready to give to the treaty his impartial opinion and, when necessary, instructing the peace commissioners and directing changes if in his judgment the draft is not in the interests of the United States. Finally he sends it to the Senate with his recommendations. The President in this connection is acting as a peace delegate, and when he returns to the United States he returns with the treaty. He comes as a peace delegate, it is true, but really as a partisan committed to the terms of peace, and the American people are denied his impartial judgment and opinion as their President.

The only coordinate branch of government which can give the American people an impartial consideration of this treaty, inasmuch as they have been deprived of the impartial judgment of the President, is the Senate. It is therefore desirable that the President should immediately release the text of the treaty of peace in order that we may have sufficient time to consider the terms and give to the peace delegation at Versailles, as representatives of the people of this country, our suggestions.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should like to know the attitude of the Senator from New Jersey. Assuming that the President either wisely or unwisely has agreed with the other delegates to the peace conference not to give it out, what would the Senator say to that?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I will come to that later, because I will state to the Senator from Montana that it is in open defiance of the President's promise to the American people that he would have no secret covenant secretly arrived at.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Would the Senator have him break his promise to the other representatives?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would have him revise it and say the time has come when the American people should have the information, as I promised them on January 8, 1918, they would have.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Permit me to remind the Senator the resolution is not to ask the President to revise his promise, but to break his promise, assuming that it has been given.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator, in connection with the question asked by the Senator from Montana, if the President has promised the other Governments that he will not give publicity to the treaty, then has he not already violated that agreement in giving a summary, assuming the summary to be correct?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. Is not that just as bad, if that is a correct summary, as to give us the treaty itself?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am very glad the Senator has asked that question. I think everyone naturally assumes, and it is a very reasonable assumption in view of everything we know and have heard about this matter, that the representatives at the peace conference agreed among themselves not to give out the full text of the treaty, but to give out only a summary thereof, and that summary has been given out in strict accordance with the agreement, presumably.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator assume that the summary is correct and that it is a summary of the entire treaty?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator from Montana assumes that the summary was given out by and under the direction of the delegates at the peace conference.

Mr. NORRIS. But the Senator has not answered my question.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I assume that it is a reasonably accurate summary.

Mr. NORRIS. Assume that it is not only reasonably accurate, but that it is accurate. It seems to me we ought to have no assumption if that summary has come from the President.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. How can I assume it?

Mr. NORRIS. Then what is the difference between giving that summary publicity and making the whole treaty public and letting everyone draw his own conclusion as to what it is?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is another question altogether. That is a question that should be addressed to the wisdom of the conference at Paris. They agreed among themselves, I assume, not to give out the full treaty, but to give out a summary which, I assume, they approved.

Mr. NORRIS. Again, the Senator has not answered the question. What is the difference between the two, as far as publicity is concerned, if this summary is correct? What more harm could come from giving out all the treaty and letting everybody draw his own conclusion as to what it might mean than giving out somebody's conclusion as to what the treaty means?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I do not know that there is the slightest difference, but I am directing my mind to what they did over there. They reached the conclusion that it would be prudent and wise to give out a summary and that it would be imprudent and unwise to give out the full treaty. They may have erred, they may have reached a very senseless conclusion, but I want the Senator to assume that the President of the United States, either upon his own motion or being constrained to that course by the views of the others, agreed that the whole treaty should not be given out.

Mr. NORRIS. Assuming that to be true, we have not any official knowledge of it. The reply to this resolution, if those are the facts, would give an official statement in substance the same as the Senator from Montana has given, and that would be an answer; that is, I take it——

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But it would be quite appropriate.

Mr. NORRIS. While it would convince me that it was a very unwise thing to do, as the Senator said, he might conclude it was a foolish thing to do, it would at least be a proper answer to the resolution, and, I presume, would end the controversy.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But would it not be equally appropriate for the Senate to find out what the facts are before it demands the production of the treaty?

Mr. NORRIS. That is the way to find out. I do not believe there would be any difference in passing a resolution that would ask the President whether he has made this kind of an agreement. Would it not be just the same thing, in effect, as to pass this resolution and ask him to send the treaty to us?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am very glad, indeed, the Senator from Nebraska takes the view that if the President did enter into such an agreement, either willingly or being constrained to do so by reason of the views of the other delegates there, we ought not to ask him to break his agreement.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I would not, and if the President makes that answer, no matter how great a mistake I might think he had made, if he says officially that those are the facts, then it is finished; I will have to abide by it, and I would abide by it. It seems to me this resolution is the way to reach it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have no quarrel with the Senator from Nebraska, only I think the right way is to ascertain the facts beforehand.

Mr. NORRIS. How can that be done?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The State Department will tell you. The Committee on Foreign Relations is to ascertain what the fact is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] has the floor, and he will proceed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] that I would far rather have the President keep his promises to the American people and revise his promise to the peace delegates than to break his promise to the American people.

Mr. WALSH of Montana and Mr. McCORMICK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the Senator from Montana, in view of the fact I made the statement just now.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I quite agree with the Senator. I am wholly in accord with his desire that if the President made such a promise I should like to ask him to revise it; but I have not the slightest doubt that before he made it he had in mind his promise to the American people. I have no doubt in the world if he could have his own way this treaty would be placed in the form in which it is now, even if it is incomplete, before the American people. We all understand that at the outset he was desirous of giving to this proceeding a greater degree of publicity than was given to it, but he was overruled by representatives of France, Italy, and Japan, if we can rely upon——

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Where does the Senator——

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Wait a minute. I am coming to this point. I apprehend very likely that if the President was asked to revise his promise he would say he had reflected upon the matter with the other gentlemen associated with him. If that were true, what would the Senator from New Jersey do? Would he still demand the treaty?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I most certainly should demand that the President keep his pledge made to the American people January 8, 1918. I yield now to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, I venture to suggest to the Senator from Montana that, if this entirely respectful resolution were passed, it would fortify the President in suggesting to his colleagues that the American people still cherish some faint faith in the pledge that we would have "open covenants openly arrived at," and would help him to persuade his colleagues that he ought to abide by his pledge therein implied.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. May I ask a question, with the indulgence of the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I desire to say that I do not agree with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] that this is an entirely respectful resolution. Attention has already been called in the Senate to the fact that it is not in the form of the respectful resolutions which have usually been addressed to the President with reference to such matters.

In that connection, reference was made this morning to a late discussion on this general subject by Senator Sutherland, formerly a Member of this body, who states in the very same connection that the only appropriate way to draft a resolution in relation to matters of this character is to ask the President respectfully, if the matter is not inconsistent with public policy, to transmit the documents that are requested.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I care nothing for the verbiage of this resolution. I hope it is in plain terms calling for a copy of this treaty. I think the time has come to speak plainly, and I will not——

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. No; I will not yield until I finish, and then I shall be very glad to answer any question. I am going to conclude what I have to say in a few moments. I have been interrupted so often that I have spoken longer than I intended.

The only coordinate branch of government which can give the American people an impartial consideration of this treaty, inasmuch as they have been deprived of the impartial judgment of the President, he being committed at the peace table, is the Senate of the United States. It is therefore desirable that the President should immediately release the text of the treaty of peace in order that we may have sufficient time to consider the terms and give to the peace delegation at Versailles, as representatives of the people of this country, our suggestions on these great questions.

On January 8, 1918, the President of the United States came before Congress and delivered this message:

> It will be our wish and purpose that the processes of peace, when they are begun, shall be absolutely open and that they shall involve and permit henceforth no secret understandings of any kind. The day of conquest and aggrandizement is gone by; so is also the day of secret covenants entered into in the interest of particular governments and likely at some unlooked-for moment to upset the peace of the world. It is this happy fact, now clear to the view of every public man whose thoughts do not still linger in an age that is dead and gone, which makes it possible for every nation whose purposes are consistent with justice and the peace of the world to avow now or at any other time the objects it has in view.

Then followed the famous 14 points, the first one of which is:

> I. Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

When the President of the United States appeared before Congress on December 2, 1918, he stated his intention of departing immediately for Europe. He gave his reasons and made this pledge to the American people and to this body:

> I shall be in close touch with you and with affairs on this side of the water and you will know all that I do. At my request the French and English Governments have absolutely removed the censorship of cable news, which until within a fortnight they had maintained, and there is now no censorship whatever exercised at this end, except upon attempted trade communications with enemy countries. * * * I did so at the advice of the most experienced cable officials, and I hope that the results will justify my hopes that the news of the next few months may pass with utmost freedom and with the least possible delay from each side of the ocean to the other.

I trusted the President of the United States, as did the American people. The American people are patient, they are long-suffering, but the time will come when they will resent vigorously the secrecy of these negotiations. No sufficient reason has been given why the doctrine of open covenants openly arrived at, so frequently proclaimed as an essential, has not been practiced. "You can fool some of the people all of the time, you can fool all of the people some of the time, but you can not fool all of the people all of the time." The President of the United States is responsible to the people of this country, and it is his duty to keep the pledge he has made. It is plainly his duty to tell what he is doing, and as he appears unwilling to do so it is our duty to remind him of his promise, and that is the purpose of this resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, at the outset I wish to express my regret to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that I interrupted him this morning at a time when my interruption seemed to be an annoyance.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I trust the Senator will allow me to say that his interruptions are never to me an annoyance, and I hope I am incapable of being in any way rude to him. I did not intend to be. All I meant to say was, and I think what I did say was, that I was coming to that point in my own poor way if he would give me time. I certainly did not intend to be otherwise than courteous to the Senator from Colorado. I always welcome interruptions from him.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the fact that the Senator from Massachusetts is always courteous, not only to myself but to all of his associates, is what prompted me at this time to express regret that I had asked a question at a time when possibly I might have interfered with his general curfent of thought.

I did not intend further to delay the progress of this resolution to a final vote until the little colloquy of day before yesterday projected a new feature into the controversy and which formed, and very properly formed, the basis of the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. I am glad, Mr. President, that the Senator from Nebraska prepared and introduced his resolution so promptly, and I know that it would have been even more promptly introduced had he been here at the time the colloquy took place.

Mr. President, the situation, so far as I am able to comprehend it, may be thus summarized: Early in May the peace congress at Paris concluded tentatively its labors. Immediately thereafter, for reasons doubtless of a convincing character to them, the members of that congress agreed inter se to postpone the publication of the treaty, but gave to the world a synopsis of the treaty which purported, at least, to convey an intelligent idea of its contents. At the same time a complete copy of the proposed agreement was forwarded to the office of the Secretary of State at Washington, and it has been there ever since.

Copies of this treaty were, as a matter of course and of necessity, furnished to the representatives of the German Government or of the German people, who doubtless received them subject to the same injunction, but, characteristically, the treaty was published in Germany without regard to the condition.

About this time the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] prepared and introduced his resolution instructing the Secretary of State to transmit to this body a complete copy of the proposed treaty. Pending that resolution, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] was shown by a friend of his in the city of New York what purported to be a complete copy of the treaty, accompanied by the information that at least four such copies were in the hands of private parties in that city.

At the same time the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] made this announcement on day before yesterday on this floor, which is found on page 558 of the RECORD:

> That the treaty is now in the possession of certain interests in New York City. While the Senate of the United States is asking for a treaty with which it will ultimately have to deal, and while the American people are asking for a treaty by which they will ultimately, in all probability, be bound, and are unable to secure it, certain interests in the city of New York are in the possession of this treaty and are discussing it.

It was after and doubtless because of that statement that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] gave to the Senate the information which he had upon the subject. In a colloquy which immediately followed between the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts the following statements were made:

> Mr. LODGE. * * * The copies of the treaty were given out that I have referred to, and they found that many of them were going to America, and an order was issued from our headquarters in Paris that no more were to be permitted.
>
> Mr. SWANSON. By whom were they given out?
>
> Mr. LODGE. Given out by the authorities.
>
> Mr. SWANSON. What authorities?
>
> Mr. LODGE. The representatives of the United States.
>
> Mr. SWANSON. What representatives?
>
> Mr. LODGE. I suppose some of the President's followers. I do not suppose he gave them out himself.

Mr. SWANSON. What followers? They are not representatives. I have understood they do not represent the United States.

Mr. LODGE. There are no representatives over there except the President's personal agents.

Mr. SWANSON. There is nobody authorized to give out foreign affairs under the Constitution except the President of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. Very well, then, they were given out by his order.

Mr. SWANSON. Does the Senator make that statement on his own responsibility?

Mr. LODGE. No; I do not know whether he ordered it or not.

Mr. SWANSON. Does the Senator know where they came from?

Mr. LODGE. They came from Paris. They were given out by our representatives there.

Mr. President, I think it is a necessary conclusion from this discussion that the Senator from Massachusetts not only saw one of these copies but received information at the same time justifying his statement that they were given out by representatives of the United States in Paris. I was astounded at that declaration, and felt that it should be considered at some time in the future, in view of the serious nature of the assertion, because if it be true that by an agreement between the Nations, including our own, none of these copies was to be made public; and if it be also true that pending this agreement, and while it was in full force, some representative or representatives of the Government did transmit these copies to New York, those representatives should be identified and disciplined in the absence of some cogent explanation justifying their extraordinary action. I think, therefore, that this resolution is not only desirable, but absolutely necessary, for if, in addition to what I have said, it be also true—and I have no doubt that the Senator from Idaho believed it to be true when he made the statement—that certain interests in New York, deeply concerned in the terms and in the ratification or rejection of the treaty, had been favored with these copies in advance of information given to the American people, then there has not only been a breach of the agreement but a betrayal, in so far as information of the contents of the treaty may be concerned, of the interests and possibly of the well-being of the United States.

We know that there are great interests in this country centering in the city of New York, with which presumably up to this time the Senator from Idaho is not on familiar terms, but to which he further made reference in a subsequent part of the discussion by the statement:

> I want the President to know that those people in New York who have these copies are using it in a semipublic way, to wit, in a way which will inform all those who are interested with them as to its contents, and I shall not assume until the facts have shown the contrary that when that fact is brought to the attention of the President he will withhold from the people that which those who are particularly interested in the treaty have in their possession.

This conclusion, Mr. President, is a correct one, for, if it be true that certain specific parties of powerful industrial, economic, and commercial standing in the United States have, in spite of this agreement, been able to forearm themselves with copies of the treaty, then it is equally true that they have some sinister, or at least some private, purpose in view as contradistinguished from the public interest; and it is not only the right but the duty under those circumstances of the President of the United States at once to take the public into his confidence and see to it that the full text of the treaty is immediately published. I do not pretend to know anything about the matter beyond the statements which were made by the two distinguished Senators who made the statements to which I have called attention.

I have refrained, Mr. President, from discussing the treaty for a number of reasons which seemed to me, at least, to be controlling. In the first place, I do not know what the treaty is, and can not know until the Executive sees fit in some manner to inform the Senate of its contents. I do not believe that we can safely discuss it in advance of full knowledge of its terms, and I am not at all convinced that its discussion in this body in advance of its transmission will be helpful to the treaty-making powers across the sea.

Moreover, Mr. President, I entertain, and have always entertained, the conviction that we have no jurisdiction over this treaty, and can have no jurisdiction over it until the Executive sees fit in the usual course to submit it to our consideration. I have heretofore discussed my understanding of that provision of the treaty-making power which clothes the Senate with an authority which must be jointly exercised with that of the Executive. I shall not attempt at this time to review what I have said on that subject, but I do not think that I overstate the proposition when I say that, with two or three exceptions, among whom Mr. Madison and the late Senator Bacon may, perhaps, be considered the most conspicuous, the overwhelming judgment and opinion of the great lawyers and statesmen of the past and of the present has been that the President may consult the Senate or decline to consult the Senate in advance of the signing of a treaty and its transmission to this body by the Executive; that in almost all instances he has deemed it expedient to submit the treaty to us after it has been completed by negotiation, and it is only when he takes the initiative, either prior to the negotiation of the treaty or afterwards, that our part of the treaty-making power comes into play. While we may be concerned, and deeply concerned, regarding the covenants of any proposed treaty subject to negotiation; while we have a right, of course, following the dictates of our individual consciences, to discuss it in advance of its reception, I think the proposition I have stated is unchallengeable.

The Senator from Massachusetts, who complained this morning that he had been so frequently quoted, always took that ground prior to the inauguration of the present President of the United States, and, if I remember correctly, he always advocated cloture prior to that time, but has been one of the champions in opposition to the proposition since. The Senator is a man of great versatility; but if it be true that consistency is the vice of little minds, it is equally true that the Senator is entirely free from that vice; and if I were uncharitably disposed I might emphasize the fact that upon the great question of the league of nations the Senator has been equally emphatic in his advocacy of and his dissent from the virtue or the expediency of that great proposition.

Now, Mr. President, a word or two with regard to the pending resolution and I will yield the floor. I may do the Senator from Massachusetts a grave injustice—and if so, I am very sorry—but I can not relieve my mind from the suspicion that on any other occasion than this he would use his great knowledge and his great powers of argument in vindication of the right and jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations to take charge of and investigate the matter before the final investigation by the Senate. It is true that many resolutions comparatively unimportant have by unanimous consent been immediately considered which, if referred, would have gone to that committee, but this is not an unimportant resolution. I am sure that the author of it, at least, does not so regard it, notwithstanding the fact that it is couched in terms entirely at variance with all of the precedents of the past.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. Does the Senator know of any instance in which there has been material difference of opinion amongst Senators as to any statement of fact involved in a resolution when that resolution has not been referred to a committee for inquiry and report?

Mr. THOMAS. No, Mr. President; I do not. I think I so stated when I had the floor upon another occasion in the discussion of this particular subject.

Mr. President, I wish I could dismiss from my mind the impression that this resolution is more of a political resolution than anything else; that it is one of the various movements, now so common and with which we shall become more familiar as time shall pass, leading up to the great presidential campaign of 1920 and designed as material for that campaign. Of that I am not complaining; human nature is human nature, whether we find it on the other side or on this side of the Chamber, and the play of politics, to use a common expression, is one which has its experts on this side as well as upon the other side of the Chamber. I have come to this conclusion by listening to and reading the discussions upon the other side of the Chamber of this particular resolution. It seems to me that they are composed, generally speaking, of 99 per cent of politics and reflections upon the President of the United States and 1 per cent of genuine argument.

Mr. President, it may be that the result of a policy like this will be beneficial to those who are responsible for it. As to that, however, I am also somewhat doubtful. We all know that since the death of Mr. Roosevelt—whose demise has been publicly mourned and privately rejoiced over—many candidates for the Presidency of the United States have blossomed, and will continue to blossom, on the other side of this Chamber; and each, of course, is plowing his own furrow with his own heifer, in the hope that his plowshare will turn up the particular presidential grub. I hate to say anything that will put a damper upon the aspirations of my brethren upon the other side, for all of whom I entertain the highest personal opinion; yet I must remind them that never in the history of the United States has a Senator been nominated and elected to the Presidency; and from some of the performances that I have seen in this body since I have been here, on both sides, I have long ago ceased to wonder at what once addressed itself to my mind as a most remarkable phenomenon. So, while we may sow, there is every probability that those on the outside will reap, if there should be a harvest at all.

I have always regretted the intrusion of the personal factor into the consideration of any international question, unless, indeed, circumstances exist of the most irrefragible character reflecting upon the motives or the intentions of those conducting the negotiations. Some one has said that vituperation is not argument, but a mere form of self-indulgence; and I have never known a man to enter into it very largely who did not both weaken the force of his argument and justify suspicion of his sincerity. Now, it is very difficult for many people—good people, too; well-meaning people and sincere people—to discuss the league of nations, which is the most prominent feature of the proposed treaty, either as advocates for or opponents of that measure, without impugning the motives, ridiculing the arguments, or aspersing the mental integrity of their opponents; and that, Mr. President, if it is continued in, is just as sure as anything can be to drive the consideration of this great treaty into the arena of party politics, and thereby either largely imperil its success or contribute to its defeat.

I say this, Mr. President, not as an advocate of the treaty, because I do not know whether I shall vote for it or not, and I do not propose to commit myself until I have thoroughly familiarized myself, or become as familiar as I can, with all of its various specifications and covenants. I am not an enthusiast over a league of nations. I certainly have not been well disposed toward some of the articles of the original draft. I am not entirely sure that the amendments which have been offered are sufficiently comprehensive to remove my objections. But, Mr. President, I have no more doubt of the earnestness and the patriotism and the sincerity of those who believe in this league of nations, as it is drawn or otherwise, I have no more doubt that they are inspired by the highest motives of patriotism and sense of duty than I have that I try to be guided by the same lofty principles and sentiments in my consideration of it.

The President of the United States has for a long time borne the greatest burden ever placed by fate and the circumstances of the times upon the shoulders of a human being. He has carried the weight of the world upon himself and has been compelled to act not only as the advocate but as the arbiter of the mightiest problems that ever confronted a peace congress or any other congregation of men since civilization began. That he has made mistakes goes without saying; that he may have made blunders is equally probable; but that he has been actuated by a high sense of duty, a love of country, and with a full realization of his great responsibilities and their consequences I make no more doubt than I would presume to express the same doubt with regard to the responsibilities and performances of the martyred President. Whether or not I agree with the President finally in the vote which my duties require me to cast in this body, I here and now pay tribute to his intelligence, to his wisdom, to his patriotism, and to his statesmanship.

I sometimes think, Mr. President, that men can not forgive Mr. Wilson for the part he has been compelled to play, and has played so well, in the greatest crisis that has ever confronted the world of mankind, and that his fault in their eyes is that fate so arranged the destinies of America as to have laid its heavy hand upon the Republic during his administration; and I am reminded by the history of my country that every Executive compelled to meet, because confronted with, extraordinary conditions and responsibilities had to undergo the same ordeal and walk through the same valley of misunderstanding and vituperation, only to receive, when too late for him to appreciate it, the grateful plaudits of an admiring posterity.

Mr. President, a friend of mine a day or two ago handed me this clipping, which I will read. It is entitled "A Voice From the Past"; and then follows this quotation:

> The President succeeded on this occasion because he acted without sense and without constraint in a panorama that was gotten up more for the benefit of his party than for the glory of the Nation and the honor of the dead. * * * We pass over the silly remarks of the President; for the credit of the Nation we are willing that the veil of oblivion shall be dropped over them and that they shall no more be repeated or thought of.

Then follows the comment:

> This is not an extract from an editorial in the New York Sun or the New York Tribune. Nor were the sentiments quoted above taken from any of the public utterances of Senator POINDEXTER or Senator SHERMAN or Senator MCCORMICK. They are from an editorial that was printed in the Harrisburg Patriot and Union on November 24, 1863, and have no reference to Woodrow Wilson.
>
> The President in question was Abraham Lincoln. The "silly remarks" were the Gettysburg speech.

So, Mr. President, in time to come, some may be remembered, if remembered at all, only because of their abuse and misunderstanding, their vituperation and derogation, of the President of the United States. I do not wish to be understood in what I have just said as in the slightest degree reflecting upon the purpose or the sincerity of the author of this resolution; but I do say that when a resolution like this comes—which should be addressed to the President, instead of which it is addressed to the Secretary of State, which should be conditioned upon compatibility with the public interest, and that condition is absent, and which is sought to be forced through this body without reference to the appropriate channels—it justifies a criticism of the course pursued.

I do not myself see the present importance of the motion, if it be true that publicity has already been given to this treaty, and in any event I am willing to agree with my associates upon a time to vote upon it. I have no desire to take up the time of the Senate or of the country, to postpone or delay the consideration of important appropriation bills by an interminable discussion of a resolution that ought to come to a vote.

I hope, therefore, that before long the Senator will suggest the possibility of a unanimous-consent agreement under which we can dispose of the question one way or the other, get it behind us, as we have finally gotten the suffrage amendment behind us, and take up these more important, practical, and immediate measures.

Mr. BORAH obtained the floor.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator from North Dakota wish to discuss the pending resolution?

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to say just a word on this resolution.

Mr. BORAH. The one we are now considering?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. Very well; I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, in this great world crisis, when the greatest burdens that were ever imposed upon public men are now being carried on the shoulders of delegates assembled in Paris, I feel that I should be worse than wasting my time if I spent a single moment in attempting to put the President in a hole by holding up his declarations for "open covenants openly arrived at" on the one hand and his acts of secret covenants secretly arrived at on the other hand.

I do not agree with his declaration at all in international relations. There never has been a time in the history of the United States when every international question was not considered by the Senate behind closed doors; and even at our legislative sessions we have often, when we considered that we were trenching upon ground which might create international ill feeling, immediately voted to close the doors and to consider the matter in secret.

As between two families in which there is a proposal for marital relations, each family may consider from its own standpoint the advisability of the proposed union. Now, if it were possible that each must publish what was said in the family circle concerning the family of the other, there would be eternal enmity between those two families. So in the family of nations, in order that we may secure a fair and just consideration of every matter without at the same time affecting the other country in a way that would make that country our enemy for all time, we have found it necessary—and every other nation in the world has followed the same course—to consider those delicate international questions behind closed doors.

Mr. President, the President of the United States, in his declarations that appeal possibly to the ear but do not appeal to the judgment in the practical affairs of life, has seen fit to use the phrase that is so often quoted before the Senate of the United States. Not agreeing with him upon that, I think he has found that it is not applicable in considering the thousands of complex and delicate questions that are arising in that distracted country to-day, and among people upon whose lips is still the froth of battle and in whose hearts is still the hate of conflict; that it is not wise that all that is said and done should be openly said and done before the entire world. So, if he entered into an agreement with the other nations of the world, or if he opposed it, and the other great nations—our Allies—forced the matter to be considered behind closed doors, I think that they used the better judgment; and I would not for a moment infringe upon their right to first bring before us a completed treaty, signed and negotiated, before we had anything to do with it.

But, Mr. President, a little different situation is presented to-day. A portion of this treaty has already been published. It is asserted, and asserted in such a way that I can not doubt its authenticity, that complete copies of the treaty have fallen into the hands of certain Americans and American interests, and possibly into the public forums of some of the other countries of the world. That presents a little different aspect of the case. Now, I am not in favor of voting for this resolution exactly in the form that it is. I believe that it should have

been addressed to the President of the United States and not to the Secretary of State. But that is merely a matter of form, because the Secretary of State will act only upon the advice and with the consent of the President of the United States. I do think, however, that we ought to follow one precedent that has been a precedent from the very beginning of the intercourse between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government, and that is, in asking for any matter in which the executive department has in the first instance the entire and complete jurisdiction, it is but proper that we ask that department to give us the facts "if not incompatible with public interest."

Now, what objection can there be to that? I will ask the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] if he would have any objection to so amending his resolution that there shall be added after the word "requested," on line 2, the words "if not incompatible with public interest"?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, in response to the Senator's query, I will say that I have no objection to the addition of such a matter, and I will explain, if desired, the reasons why the resolution is addressed to the Secretary of State.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator is entitled to explain, and I yield for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The Senator has well remarked that the particular proposition that is presented here is a vastly different proposition from that presented by the ordinary diplomatic procedure, or that which comes to us during the ordinary proceedings when treaties are considered. As he says, there has been given to the people a synopsis of the treaty. That synopsis has been printed by the official authority of the Secretary of State. In the possession of the Secretary of State is the completed document, as we understand, and therefore, a document having been given out by the Secretary of State that presumably gave a synopsis of the particular treaty, to the entire information the Congress and the people are entitled. I shall be very glad, if the Senator deems it essential, to amend the resolution in the respect that he suggests by adding "if not incompatible with the public welfare."

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I can see no impropriety in the world in asking the President of the United States or the Secretary of State to give us this information, if not incompatible with public interest; and I can see no impropriety or inconsistency, if the facts justify it, in the President's saying that it has been agreed between the nations of the world that entire publicity shall not be given until the instrument has been completed. That would be a sufficient answer to the American people, in my opinion, and would be a full justification, for certainly if there has been an agreement that all of the facts which are being considered shall not be given publicity until they arrive at an arrangement, then the President can well say, "It is against the public interest for me to break the word of the representatives of the United States that this shall be our course of conduct."

So, Mr. President, I can see no reason on earth why we can not properly ask the President for this information through the Secretary of State, coupling with it the courteous phrase which we have always used, "if not incompatible with public interest." Then if the President thinks the facts warrant the statement, notwithstanding the fact that some portions have been made public in the shape of a synopsis and that some portions have surreptitiously escaped from the control of the delegation, he will fairly and honestly say to the American people that he does not think it compatible with public interest—and he might say, with national honor—to disclose to the public at present all of the terms of the proposed treaty.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I agree with very much that the Senator has said about the delicacy of international treaties, where each nation wants to secure the fullest possible advantages for its own country without giving the negotiations to the world; but there is one suggestion I should like to make to the Senator that has been troubling me somewhat.

This is a confessedly unfinished treaty, subject this minute to amendment of any item in it by the commissioners having it now under charge. What advantage can it be to the Senate to have it at present? What use have you or I or any other Senator for an unfinished, still amendable, and still being amended treaty; and what is our purpose in wanting it, if we are in fact earnestly engaged in an effort to carry the treaty to a final vote in the Senate? I can not see the purpose in wanting it.

Mr. McCUMBER. There can not be so very much more in these supposed treaties that are in the hands of certain financial or other interests in New York than that which is contained in the synopsis; and I am rather inclined to think that at least under all the conditions the American people have a right to know whether or not there is anything so diametrically opposed to what has been given out in the synopsis as to justify any such apprehensions as have been created by the mere verbal statements and hints.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. But the knowledge of the fact to which the Senator refers came out subsequently to the introduction of this resolution. I am only wondering why we want an unfinished treaty that the President does not himself willingly give out?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not know, Mr. President. I want the President to express an opinion whether or not he wishes willingly to give it out. I do not want the President to be charged with attempting to hold this matter in secret of his own accord when, as a matter of fact, he would like to give it out. I would be perfectly willing to present the matter to him and ask him to give us the facts if not incompatible with the public interest, and his judgment will determine whether or not it would be so incompatible.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. There is great force in what the Senator says, and it is appealing. The thing itself has justified at this time this particular course. If this had gone to the committee, it seems to me, the very argument the Senator makes here might have led us long ago to pass this resolution, and I think we could have done it. I think the Senator's appeal is one that would strike a reasonable man; and if there is any necessity for this action at all, which I still can not see, it strikes me how easily the course would have been, as applied to the Hitchcock resolution, to have it go to the committee for its consideration and report to the Senate in the usual way. Suspicion attaches to it, perhaps, that it is desired to avoid the committee's investigation.

Mr. McCUMBER. As I said before, if I thought this was being done in any way to gain some kind of a partisan or political advantage, I would never vote for it, because I think that in this particular season in the world's history we ought to lay aside our partisanship. I must assume that it is in the best of faith that we may secure for the benefit of the American people all that has been given to the world and nothing more, and if the President feels, as I have an opinion that he will feel undoubtedly, that he can not with justice to us or his colleagues give out this information, all he has to do is to say so.

Mr. President, I move to amend the resolution by inserting——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is not in order at this time. There is a motion before the Senate, and the amendment is not in order, unless the original mover of the resolution accepts it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I accept the amendment, which I understand it is to add "if not incompatible with public interest."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed modification will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "requested," in line 2, insert "if not incompatible with the public interest."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This modification of the original resolution will be made.

Mr. KELLOGG obtained the floor.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. KELLOGG. If it is only for a question.

Mr. EDGE. I wish to ask a question of the Senator who offered the amendment. I have no particular objection to the amendment, but I did not have the opportunity of hearing his entire argument, having been called from the Chamber. On what particular line of reasoning does he assume it is necessary to insert the words "if not incompatible with the public interest" when it has been so clearly established by the various arguments during the last three weeks that the public already has to a great extent the entire document? The Senator from California feels that there is no objection to including it, but if the public already has it, and it has been clearly established that they have, I can not conceive why it could possibly be incompatible with the public interest.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not know that the public has a true, authenticated copy of the treaty or that any portion of the public has a true copy of the final agreement or so far as it has progressed to-day. I explained in my argument, and I would not wish to repeat it at this time, that certainly this is the usual courteous way of addressing the President upon diplomatic questions which he has under consideration. It is his right, of course, no matter whether we use the term or not to state to us that it is not compatible with the public in-

terest for him to do so at this time, but the old custom of intercourse between the legislative and executive branches upon matters that are peculiarly within the jurisdiction of the legislative branch has been to make the request in this courteous language.

Mr. EDGE. If I may have just a moment more, with permission of the Senator from Minnesota——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield to the Senator if he will be very brief. I was going to make a few remarks on this matter myself.

Mr. EDGE. Very well, I will postpone my statement for the moment.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, ordinarily I would not take the time of the Senate to discuss this resolution, as I know there is important business pending, but it is a matter of principle, I think of great consequence to the people of this country, and I wish very briefly to state the reasons which impel me to vote for it.

I do not agree with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] with regard to consideration of treaties in secret session. I supported and voted for a rule to change the rules of the Senate so that treaties should be considered in open session. I did not mean by that that all treaties and all discussions were to be considered in open session. I meant to make that the rule, subject to exception whenever the Senate should so vote, because whenever there arises a situation where the relations of foreign countries are so delicate that the subject to be discusssd may affect our interests, the doors should be closed.

I realize that it is the prerogative of the Senate and to the interest of the public that it should be done under such circumstances. But I do believe that the day of secret treaties and the day of the consideration of treaties of such vast importance in the world as this are past and that they should be considered in the open. I shall not base what I have to say upon any narrow construction of the declarations of the President in the past nor upon his declarations at all, except I would remind the Senate that they were not simply remarks made in passing during some public speech under the enthusiasm of the occasion. The principles laid down by the President as to open covenants were deliberate statements delivered in a message of the greatest importance, in which he outlined the 14 points which in his mind should form the foundation of the world peace to terminate the war, and in the list it was made the corner stone of this peace that diplomacy should be in the open, "Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed frankly and in the public view."

Not alone that, but the President has stated this time and again as the principle in which he believed. I do not say that all the conversation across the table at Versailles in the peace conference should be made public or that the meetings should be open to the entire public. I believe, however, that the great fundamental principles which the allied Governments are laying down in this treaty should be given to the world and should from time to time be made known to the people of the United States as well as to the people of other countries. They have a right to consider them. That self-determination which seems to be the corner stone of the President's theory of peace should impel him and should impel everyone in good faith to see that the people are informed as to the real terms of this treaty.

Mr. President, do we realize the tremendous importance to the world of this peace treaty? As the war involved more nations, more peoples, greater destruction and devastation, greater change in governments and overthrow of nations than has occurred in the same time since recorded history, so this peace treaty involves issues of greater moment to the people of the world than any and all the other treaties, I might say, that have ever come into existence and have gone on the tides of time.

The treaty proposes to determine the destiny of many nations and many peoples with aspirations of self-government, to divide territories, to impose punishment an dthe burdens of the war, and to evolve from this world chaos a peace that will be more satisfactory to the world than any prior peace, a peace that will be permanent. If it is to be a lasting peace, if it is not to be simply the cause of future wars, it must to a certain degree satisfy the aspirations of all the struggling nations of the world. Our country entered the war to protect our rights, our people, and our institutions, and to aid in developing such a peace, and we should from time to time be informed of the facts as to the activities of the peace commissioners in France.

Does the Senate remember the tremendous arraignment in the English journals of the secrecy that was observed in Paris and the injury it did in England and the other countries of Europe? Perhaps it was necessary. I am not disposed to criticize what has been done in that regard, but the situation is different now. I might lay aside entirely the declarations of the President, and I do not discuss them with any partisan view; I might disregard all his statements and all consideration of the consequences to the people of this country and the people of the world in connection with an understanding of the terms of the treaty which are about to be imposed upon them; but there are other reasons why the Senate will not at this time encroach upon the prerogative of the President by asking for the official text of this treaty. I realize fully that the negotiation of the terms of the treaty is peculiarly the prerogative of the President. I realize that he might consult the Senate, and concerning a treaty of such great importance to his country I think it would be wise; but he must decide that.

The peace pact has been drafted after months of careful consideration by the principal statesmen of Europe, including our own commissioners. It has been delivered to the representatives of the German Government. It would seem inevitable that upon such delivery it would be made public. But beyond that let us look at it reasonably.

A synopsis of this treaty was published, and presumably it was intended that the summary should embrace an accurate description of the terms of the treaty, so that we might be informed as to the character of the treaty our commissioners were negotiating. If the synopsis was accurate the publication of the treaty can do no harm. If it is not accurate, without impugning the motive of anyone, there is every reason why we should have the treaty at the earliest possible moment. The American people have a right to express their opinion upon the settlement of these great issues.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

Mr. KELLOGG. I do not mean by that that we should always have our ear to the ground to catch every sound of public approval or disapproval, but I remember the statement William H. Vanderbilt once made, that everybody knows more than anybody; and the Senate of the United States can learn something from the people of this country. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. The Senator, as I understand his very clear exposition of this question, concedes that the jurisdiction of the Senate as a part of the treaty-making power does not attach until after the treaty is made. Am I right in assuming that?

Mr. KELLOGG. I concede that the Executive has the right to negotiate the terms of a treaty, but, of course, it has no binding effect until it is ratified by the coordinate branch of the Government which is a part of the treaty-making power. I concede that the President need not consult the Senate before he has formulated the treaty, if that is his judgment, although I believe he should have done it, and that practice is justified by precedent.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit another inquiry?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator has just used the word "formulated." Does the Senator contend that the treaty is now formulated in the sense that jurisdiction of the Senate attaches and that it is the duty of the President to submit it to the Senate now?

Mr. KELLOGG. Not for ratification, of course. I concede this. For five months the statesmen of the allied countries have labored in Paris to formulate a treaty which it is stated was to be presented to Germany for Germany's signature, and, as Lloyd-George said, it must be signed either in Paris or Berlin. That treaty was given to the German representatives. It has been published in Germany. Beyond that, it has been given secretly to citizens in our own country. I wish to ask the Senator if there is any citizen in this country more entitled to know its terms than a Senator of the United States, who has upon him the great responsibility of considering its terms or making suggestions as to its revision?

Mr. KING. If the Senator propounds that question for the purpose of avoiding—and I do not use that word harshly—the question which I propounded to him, and he has not answered my question, I will say very frankly I think the Senate is as much entitled to it, and more so, than any citizen of the United States, the Senate being a part of the treaty-making power. If the Senator will permit me ,the point I am making is this: Does the Senator concede that the treaty is so formulated now that we are entitled, as a matter of right under the Constitution, to have it submitted to us for consideration?

Mr. KELLOGG. If the Senator's question is whether the treaty is at present completed sufficiently that the Senate may consider it for ratification, I should say no; but the Senate is entitled to know at this time the contents of that document, and there can be no harm, but the greatest good, accomplished by giving it to the Senate. A respectful request to the Secretary of

State to produce a copy of the treaty is without objection and should be made.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me——

Mr. KELLOGG. If the Secretary of State knows of any reason why it should not be produced, if it is not compatible with the public interest, he can so state, and then the Senate can consider whether his statement justifies the Senate in further insistence. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. The question which I propounded did not call for an answer as to the question of the expediency or policy, but the question of right, predicated upon the Constitution, and I ask the question again, with the permission of my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, because he has not answered it. Does the Senator say that the Senate, as a matter of right under the Constitution, is entitled now to have the treaty submitted to it by the President of the United States?

Mr. KELLOGG. I do.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator is wrong.

Mr. KELLOGG. Not as a completed treaty for the purpose of ratification, but for the information of the Senate. As I said before, it is unbelievable that this treaty should be given out to private citizens without giving it to the Senate, and it should be resented by the Senate, and it should be resented by the people of this country who are entitled to know its contents.

In further answer to the Senator from Utah, ordinarily when commissioners or the President negotiate a treaty its terms are not given to the public either by synopsis or by publication of the entire text to a part of the world, but it is given to the Senate in confidence, and the Senate usually refers it to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The President or the high commissioners have not followed this ordinary custom of negotiating a treaty and first submitting it to the Senate, but they are negotiating a treaty and first submitting it to Germany and then to private citizens of this country, and third, at a time when it suits the convenience of the commissioners or the President, to the Senate of the United States. When the President or the commissioners, whoever is responsible, makes the treaty public by giving it out, either by a synopsis or a full text to the people of Germany or to the people of this country, or any of them, the Senate is entitled to the same rights that others enjoy, and indeed has a greater right. It should be given to the Senate first, and I can not see any way that it will embarrass or prejudice the negotiations at Paris or the President if this document is given to the Senate.

I know nothing of the pledges the President may have made. I have no desire that he should break his word to the statesmen of the allied nations. We do not know that he has given any pledge. We have read in the Associated Press—and that is the only information we have—that he has pledged himself, but the President has not so informed us nor has the Secretary of State nor any of the commissioners that they have given pledges that this treaty should not be published. We have read the synopsis in the public press. We are told that the treaty is in the hands of Germany and in the hands of private citizens in this country, and no one denies it. Under those circumstances we have the right to insist that it should have been given to us first.

Mr. PHELAN. If the Senator will yield to me I should like to ask him a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. PHELAN. It seems that some one has given out a copy of an inchoate treaty. The Senator does not pretend to say that it is the final treaty, but it is subject to possible objections by the German Government and to correction.

As I understand the Constitution and the law, and I am sure the Senator will agree with me, the Senate has no jurisdiction over the making of a treaty until it is submitted to the Senate by the President of the United States, and therefore it is not incumbent upon the President or anyone representing him either by courtesy or by legal requirement to submit a treaty which has not been finally negotiated between the high contracting parties. In fact, it would be in the nature of an affront to send to the Senate something that was not complete, and the Senate would have no jurisdiction of it until the President had complied with his constitutional duty to negotiate the treaty.

The Senate, therefore, in worrying over the absence of this pretended draft of a treaty is doing an idle thing, and I ask the Senator is it not the law that the President must first negotiate the treaty and then submit it to the Senate, and the Senate has no voice in the determination of the terms of that treaty until the President has made his final report to the Senate submitting to the Senate the treaty?

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I think I am fully aware of the constitutional power of the Senate. The Senate has no constitutional power to ratify a treaty until it has been made. I quite agree that the Senate has the right and power to give its advice in any phase of any negotiation, and it has been frequently asked, and it may offer that advice without a request, because the question whether a treaty shall finally be made is decided by the Senate of the United States. Where a treaty has progressed so far that it has been formulated by the allied and associated governments and presented practically as an ultimatum to Germany, and has been published in Germany and in this country, as well as delivered to private citizens, the Senate has a constitutional right to it and may advise the President of its opinion as to any of the terms of the treaty. I think some of the advice the President has received from publicists and statesmen of the United States has been of some benefit to the American people.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit an inquiry there?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield.

Mr. KING. Is the right of the Senate any greater to tender the President advice than the right of the House of Representatives to tender him advice?

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes, sir; because treaties are made with the advice and consent of the Senate and not of the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate longer. What I have said is not uttered with a view to casting any obstacle in the way of the President. I agree, as I did during the entire course of the war, that the American people should be united, and that there should be no partisanship displayed in prosecuting the war or in adjusting foreign complications. I feel that this attitude should prevail now, that every Senator should act upon this great question according to his conscience and judgment, and that the American people have a right to express to their Senators their opinion by petition or otherwise. It is because I desire that the American people shall have accurate information and that Senators may have accurate information on which to found their opinions and advice that I am impelled to vote for the pending resolution.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I was so much impressed very shortly after I was sworn in as a Member of this deliberative body with the action on the part of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], when he held up to the view of the Senate a very large volume of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, purporting to be, as I recall it, the oral contributions of the last 10 days of the last session, that illustration being perhaps a forerunner of a little less deliberation and more action from the Sixty-sixth Congress, that I do not want to offend and take more than a moment of the time of the Senate to express a single thought in connection with this resolution.

While I am, may I say, still fresh from the country outside of the Senate Chamber, and perhaps have not yet absorbed the germ which seems in a way to develop long arguments, many of which, however, are very interesting and instructive, I believe that the passage of this resolution is important, particularly as a protest from the Senate of the United States to our representatives in Paris, not that the Secretary of State because of the passage of this resolution would probably send—for he probably would not—the peace treaty to this body, but rather that we shall send directly on the passage of the resolution to our representatives abroad this viewpoint—that we are not criticizing necessarily the action, which was undoubtedly deemed proper and necessary, agreeing with the representatives of other major nations originally, that the peace treaty should not be made public. That was perhaps in every way justified; I know nothing to the contrary; but conditions have certainly changed.

To-day it is a well-established fact that the peace treaty is in the hands of people in various sections of the world; and by the passage of this resolution we at least present the feeling of this body, representing the people of the country, that, if such an understanding was justified some weeks ago, to-day, at least, under existing circumstances, if it is necessary for us to officially pass a resolution to demonstrate it, the President of the United States should insist at another meeting with Clemenceau, Lloyd-George, and those with whom he has agreed, that the ban of secrecy under present conditions should be lifted, and that the Senate of the United States should be possessed of the document that is now apparently in the hands of the people of so many countries of the world.

For that reason I feel that the resolution is very important, so as to give that thought and that sentiment to the President, representing us, and we representing the people.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I had intended to say something on the resolution presented by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] this morning. The opportunity, however, did not present itself. I shall say something which may be relevant to that resolution, notwithstanding the fact that it has gone to the committee, and then submit a few observations with reference to the pending resolution.

I should have been satisfied to have left the treaty to be published at the pleasure of the President if the action of the peace conference had been confined to the question of making a treaty; but when the peace conference assumed the responsibility of not only formulating a treaty with the enemy, but of incorporating in that treaty what the President in France a few days ago stated in unmistakable terms to be a supergovernment for the world, then this whole matter became something more than a treaty.

It became a matter of grave concern not only to the treaty-making power, technically speaking, but a matter of the utmost concern to the American people to know just what kind of a supergovernment we were to have and how it is incorporated in the treaty, and why, as Mr. Taft repeats night after night, it is indispensable to the performance and execution of the treaty. In other words, we are facing a situation such as has never before confronted us, such as the men who framed the Constitution and provided for the treaty-making power never contemplated, to wit, a situation in which we are not only making a treaty, properly speaking, but under the guise of making a treaty are indeed changing the entire structure of our Government.

So I say—and I suspect that is the attitude of mind of the able Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]—that had these two matters been entirely divorced and the treaty with Germany had remained, as these things were contemplated by those who provided for the treaty-making power, distinctly and separately a treaty, there would have been very little discussion as to its publicity until such time as the President saw fit to make it public. But the league of nations incorporated in the treaty is being discussed from one end of the land to the other, and it is being constantly stated to the American people that the two are inseparably connected, and that the treaty with Germany can not be made effective without the league of nations. While that debate is going on by some one who assumes to know what the terms of the treaty are, those who are opposed to the league of nations are placed at the disadvantage of debating something as to which the retort is made to us, "You do not know anything about it." There is scarcely a night passes but Mr. Taft alights from his special car and tells the American people what the contents of this treaty are, while the American people know nothing about it through those upon whom is devolved the responsibility of knowing under the Constitution. Should not both sides and all parties and the people generally have equal opportunity to know the contents and terms of the treaty?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator from Idaho assure the Senate that he knows personally that Mr. Taft makes statements of that character concerning this treaty?

Mr. BORAH. I have read it over and over again until it has become perfectly familiar—as I have no doubt the Senator has heard over and over again, as I understand he has been out with Mr. Taft—I have read over and over again that Mr. Taft says the treaty with Germany can not be made effective and can not be carried out and executed without the league of nations being incorporated in and made a part of it. If that is true, it presupposes that Mr. Taft is familiar with all the details of the treaty, which he says can not be executed without the league of nations.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, I can say to the Senator that, from the several times that I have heard Mr. Taft speak, practically his whole discussion is upon the league of nations, of which we have official copies here published by the Senate, word for word, and concerning which there is no need to make any other inquiry as to its contents; that aside from that the only statement Mr. Taft makes is that it will be necessary to create some international machinery—he does not say what—to carry into effect a treaty against Germany and to compel her to observe that treaty after it is signed. That is the extent, the beginning and the end, of what Mr. Taft says.

Mr. BORAH. I thank the Senator for his contribution. It sustains precisely what I have said, to wit, that Mr. Taft reiterates that the peace treaty must be carried out through and by means of machinery provided by the league of nations. Now, how does Mr. Taft know that the details of the treaty can not be executed other than by the machinery of the league of nations unless he knows something about the treaty?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator from Idaho tell us what compulsion there is going to be to require Germany to observe the terms of the treaty if the various nations make the treaty and go home and leave nothing to require and to compel Germany to carry out its terms?

Mr. BORAH. That is what I say.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is all that Mr. Taft says.

Mr. BORAH. Well, that is precisely what I say. Mr. Taft says that this treaty can not be executed unless the league of nations is created and the machinery of the league is put into operation. There have been a vast number of treaties in the last 150 years made and executed without the league of nations, and it is not entirely clear to an obtuse mind, like some of us are supposed unfortunately to possess, why that could not be true again, unless there are some peculiar terms and conditions written into the German treaty of which we have no knowledge and of which Mr. Taft has sufficient knowledge. One reason why we want the treaty is because we believe it can be shown that the league is not necessary to the treaty.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to put some questions to the Senator from Idaho, if he will permit. Will the Senator from Idaho tell the public how it is going to be possible to insure the existence of Poland, which is necessarily set up under the terms of this treaty, and must be set up, no matter what they are; what means are to be adopted to secure the independence of Czechoslovakia, which we all have agreed must be a new nation, created under the terms of this treaty? Can the Senator answer those two questions? Is the United States going to guarantee the existence of those countries? Is Great Britain going to guarantee the existence of those countries? Can Germany be depended upon to permit the existence of those countries?

The Senator from Idaho can very well see that there is no possibility in carrying out the very purpose of this war, unless some machinery is set up of an international character to carry out the will of the countries that are imposing this peace upon Germany.

Mr. BORAH. I suppose the Senator would also include Shantung along with Poland?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, I will be satisfied if the Senator from Idaho will merely answer the questions I have asked.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I will answer.

I do not know how you are going to carry out the plans which have been formulated at Versailles without knowing the terms of the treaty, and I do not know how you are going to do it with a league of nations such as you have formed. The league of nations which you have formed is as powerless and ineffective to do what the Senator in his fancy contemplates that he and Mr. Taft are going to do as anything of which I can conceive. It has absolutely no power to do anything, except superinduce and bring on war, and it is utterly without power to prevent war or carry on war when it comes. It is almost perfect to bring on war. In fact, with such things in it as Shantung it practically guarantees war. But it is wholly inefficient to prevent war.

I was going to say, Mr. President, when interrupted by the Senator from Nebraska, that we would have been content to have left the treaty where it now is in the hands of the Executive and with certain Governments of Europe and certain people in New York had the matter been divorced from the league. But when they became intertwined and interlaced, the ex-President constantly insisting to the American people that a great danger arises out of the breakdown of that treaty with Germany without the league attached to it, it becomes necessary for those who are concerned in it to know its details.

Again, Mr. President, when the President of the United States took his second departure for our foreign capital he advised the people of the United States that when the treaty with Germany came back here the league of nations would be so interwoven with it, its conditions and its terms, that those who were opposed to the league of nations would find it exceedingly difficult to disentangle and disengage the two instruments, and, therefore, if we did not propose to delay peace we would be compelled to accept the league of nations, whether we desired it or not. I think that is a fair statement of what the President said; it is certainly a fair statement of what the President intended.

Now, what is the situation? We have the league of nations in its present form. We have no knowledge whatever of the manner in which it is intertwined or interwoven with the treaty itself, and yet we are advised by no less an authority than the negotiator of the treaty that it was the desire and purpose of

those with whom he was associated so to intertwine it with the treaty that we would have to accept the league or else postpone the treaty of peace. Are we not entitled, therefore, in view of the task which is imposed upon us and the difficult undertaking which has been put up behind closed doors in Paris for us to deal with, to have both instruments and to know precisely how we are to meet the situation?

I want you to reflect for a moment upon the situation which confronts the Senate of the United States. A conclave of ambassadors, sitting behind closed doors at Versailles, have deliberately sat down to the task of imposing upon the American people, whether they want it or not, a league of nations by so linking that league up with the treaty of peace, which, in some form we do want, that we have to take the former in order to get the latter. They have had weeks and months to frame up their scheme so as to make it impossible for the American people to have a deliberate choice as to the two propositions. Perhaps never in the history of the world was it ever before deliberately determined to deprive a free people of a choice or of the right of selecting between two propositions—whether they would take one and leave the other or whether they would surrender their judgment upon one rather than refuse the other. But this is the situation which confronts us, and the instrument by which this is accomplished is now in possession of all the world, practically, except the people of the United States.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] said this morning, and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] reiterated it, that there is a disposition upon this side of the Chamber to assail the President personally. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] thought the mere statement that the treaty of peace was at large in this country was a criticism of the President. Let me say now, once for all in this debate, because I presume it will continue for some time, that, so far as the President is concerned as President or in his individual capacity, separated and divorced from this scheme of a league of nations, I have no personal feeling which I propose or wish to gratify here or elsewhere; but, in so far as he is attempting what, in my judgment, is a betrayal of the independence and sovereignty of this Republic into the hands of foreign powers, there is no energy that I possess and no intellectual power which is mine that I will not exert here and elsewhere to frustrate his designs. I do not challenge other men's motives; I am not discussing the league of nations from the viewpoint of other men, and therefore I do not assail individuals; but, as I view it from my standpoint, from the vision which I get into the future, if I should do less than all that is within my power to frustrate that design, I would feel that I had written myself down beside the betrayers of the American people. The Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Nebraska, much as I admire them personally and little as I desire to quarrel with them, will make no progress with the Senator from Idaho by charging personal assailment of the President. I intend at no time, unless driven to it, to engage in such tactics. But I do propose to speak freely and sincerely of this scheme as I see it, and that is a surrender of the dearest rights of a free people to the domination and control of foreign powers. This is not merely the negotiation and completion and ratification of a treaty. Those of us who view it as we do—and the Senator from Nebraska no doubt thinks it is our misfortune—look at it in an entirely different light, and no individual can stand between me and anything that I can do to defeat what I consider a treacherous scheme to forfeit those rights and privileges, without which we would be without power to choose our own policies or determine our own future.

Furthermore, the President said in his Decoration Day address a few days ago that those who were opposing this scheme were placing themselves in the same position and in the same attitude as the men who opposed the formation of the American Union, and that we would be just as ashamed in time to come as those who had attempted to thwart the efforts of the patriots who finally consummated the organization of our free institutions and set in operation the Constitution of the United States. I can not conceive of a more vicious attack upon the loyalty and patriotism of Senators or citizens than that attack and all which it implies. Does anyone suppose, now that the enemy are conquered, the war is over, and, thank God, free speech has been restored in the American Republic, that all the attacks in this fight are going to be on one side? If the supporters of the league prefer that style of debate, there will be blows to give as well as blows to take.

Neither the times from which the President chooses his figure nor the facts connected which his figure recalls are entirely happy. We might well retort that those who are now trying to place the people of the United States in a league which will be controlled or dominated by European powers and under the European system are the legitimate descendants of the Tories who insisted that the patriots of 1776 were making a great mistake in trying to establish and maintain here upon the Western Continent a free, independent, self-governing people, that which we who oppose the league are now contending for.

The time is here, the hour has struck, when men must speak boldly and without hesitation, and leave time to judge who are disloyal to American institutions.

When Mr. Taft opened his campaign in Portland, Oreg., after the first draft of the league, he declared that certain Senators, mentioning their names, were not to be trusted overnight, unfit, in other words, either in morals or patriotism, to be heard or heeded. Let those who are on the inside, who are in possession of all the documents, like the President and apparently the ex-President, make public those documents and give all parties the information to which they are entitled and then let them proceed to the debate upon a high plane and the discussion of the subject upon its merits and we will be glad to conform to their method of debate. But if they prefer the other style of warfare it may be that necessity will require us to conform to that also.

Mr. President, I stated on the floor of the Senate the other day that it was understood there were copies of this treaty in New York in the hands of business interests. I have no doubt about that at all. I did not say anything in my statement which indicated that the President had delivered those copies to those interests. On the other hand, I stated specifically that I assumed when the President ascertained that these interests had gotten hold of them he would feel that he was relieved from the arrangement he had made with the associated Governments and would publish the treaty to the American people. I have no right to assume, and I have not assumed, that the President would deliver these copies to these persons in New York, and it is not necessary for the Senator from Nebraska to go so far as to draw that inference from anything I said. If he is anxious to turn the matter into a reflection it must be either by reason of his misguided zeal or because he is unconsciously betraying knowledge personal to himself.

Mr. President, there are a great many people in Paris, and some of them are as thoroughly intertwined with the business interests of New York as the league of nations will be intertwined with the German treaty when we get it back here. I have in my own mind very little doubt as to how those copies of the treaty got to New York. We have had investigations heretofore which showed how quick some men who had been trusted transmitted information to Wall Street, and millions have been made by them, as they have confessed themselves, by inside information which they had. I do not attack or assail the President. I simply say that it is my belief the copies are there; they can be had; and it is immaterial to me whence they came. I believe those who are greatly concerned undoubtedly in all of the terms of the treaty, and especially interested in some provisions of it, have the document before them. I do not say I know it. I have not seen the documents, and yet I feel I know it; I am just as well satisfied that they are there, and have been for the last 10 days, as I can be of anything which I have not seen with my own eyes.

I did not make the statement, Mr. President, for any other purpose than to help get the treaty published. That is the only thing in which I am interested, and I feel that the Senator from Nebraska would concede that if copies of the treaty are at large, and have been put into hands which are semipublic, certainly nothing can be lost by their being sent here.

Again, Mr. President, we know that the treaty has been published in Germany for the last several days, according to the Associated Press, the only source of information in these days of "open covenants openly arrived at." We know that it has been published in Berlin, and that copies are in Switzerland, in Denmark, in Holland, in Norway, and in Sweden, and are circulating throughout the world. I take it, therefore, that no possible advantage can be derived by the Germans by reason of the fact that we should be given the information. Nothing can be conveyed from here to Germany that Germany has not had for weeks, and if any disturbance should arise by reason of the publication of the treaty it will not be a disturbance in Germany, but it will be a disturbance among the many millions of American people who still love and are deeply concerned over things which relate to the life and honor of this old Republic. The disturbance will be among those who believe that the treaty, with the league intertwined and the obligations which it imposes upon us, will be such that, if accepted, would be detrimental to our interests and at war with our future happiness and tranquillity.

Suppose it should appear in this treaty, as has been stated to the public, that it ratifies the outrage upon China by the Ger-

mans in 1905; suppose it should appear unmistakably that in 1905 the German Government went into China and took possession of Shantung or certain interests therein by force and held them in the same way until after the breaking out of this war, when Japan, another military power, took possession of those interests under a solemn pledge to return them to the Chinese people at the end of the war; suppose it should appear that this outrage has been perpetuated and underwritten and guaranteed—by whom? By the man power, the sons and brothers and fathers, of the United States.

When that comes to be well understood by the American people the disturbance over the treaty will be under the American flag and not in Germany. It would seem to be the judgment of the American people that is feared.

These are the things, Mr. President, which have been foreshadowed, and which, by reason of the obligations which we are assuming under the league, are of transcendent moment, not to the Senate alone but to all the people of the United States; and therefore we are asking for the text of the treaty in order that we may not only have it ourselves but that those whom we represent may have it.

Why are Mr. Taft and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and this combination of able gentlemen presenting this matter to the American people? Mr. Taft has advised us why. He proposes to make public opinion so strong, so irresistible, according to his statement, that the American Senate can be and will be whipped into submission. Are we not entitled to have public opinion informed on both sides of the question? Are they so afraid of the justice and wisdom of the cause as to feel under the necessity of withhholding from us the facts that both sides may be presented?

A great New York paper, perhaps one of the great newspapers in the world, the other day said in its editorial columns that the Senate of the United States must ratify the treaty for the same reason that the Germans must sign it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. That newspaper said the Senate of the United States must ratify the treaty for the same reason that the Germans must sign it. That is the point at which we have arrived in this discussion. A dictatorial power, speaking as if by authority within a short distance of where these treaties have been circulating for the last 10 days, notifies the American Senate that it must act as the Germans act, under force and duress!

I say to this newspaper we will not consider it and pass upon it whipped, coerced, and forced like a conquered people. This paper and all kindred spirits, so anxious to hasten their country into this compromising alliance with foreign powers, will learn that the Senate will deal with this question as becomes American Senators. We will debate and we will have the facts upon which to debate, and some, at least, will disregard threatened coercion. Those who are urging this surrender of American rights will have to meet their antagonists in the open field of fair and free discussion, and deal with the question upon its merits.

I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. The Senator has spoken of Mr. Taft endeavoring to create this sentiment. I want to call his attention and the attention of the Senate to the fact that the chairman of the Democratic national committee, accompanied by the Secretary to the President, is now touring the country under the somewhat—well, let me not characterize it—under the claim of calling together the State committees for the purpose of consulting with reference to the party welfare, but that in each instance the business transacted is the discussion of the league of nations; and the effort is made, and I think generally successfully, to have an official ratification by the Democratic State committees of the league of nations, thus seeking to commit the Democratic Party to this league, and to do that at a time when the terms of the league itself are not yet submitted to the American people; and this distinguished chairman has gone further, and in substance has asserted that he is the representative of the President in this business.

So that if the country is to be committed, or if the Democratic Party is to be committed, to a league of nations which is intertwined with the treaty so that they are inseparable, and if the treaty of peace also contains clauses which have not yet been made public, which are in fact agreements with reference to the future government of the world, it seems to me that before public opinion is formed and forced in this way at least the public might have the evidence in the case laid before it.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield for just a moment in connection with the remarks just made by the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The Senator has criticized quite severely some people who are trying to create sentiment in favor of this league. If his criticism is justified, I should like to ask him whether his criticism would not apply with equal force to those who have been making speeches over the country against the league of nations?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I shall answer that with very great pleasure, with the consent of the Senator whose time I am taking.

There was submitted to the Senate, or rather there has been submitted to the country—yes, submitted to the Senate—a document said to constitute the agreement of the league of nations. It was sent here, it was said, for discussion. We proceeded to discuss it, and the country proceeded to discuss it. Subsequently it was amended. In that amended form the country proceeded to discuss it. The point I am making is that it is now said that there are in the treaty of peace certain provisions and conditions which modify and which affect the league of nations, so called, in the most radical way; and, without that being submitted to the country, without that being submitted to the Senate, and in advance of it, the Secretary to the President—who, of course, goes out as his spokesman, and who has professed to speak for him—and the chairman of the Democratic National Committee have been trying to commit the Democratic organization to this document, when the complete document is not before us.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, not only have we, as I say, the ex-President and the able, faithful chairman of the Democratic National Committee presenting arguments to the country why this treaty and league should be accepted, but all kinds of arguments are being presented to us from our considerate friends abroad. We are not quite free to settle this matter among ourselves, but day by day and week after week there appear in some of the leading papers of the country, if not all of them, an argument presented by our friends across the sea telling the American people how if they falter they will disappoint the world and chaos will come if they do not accept a league of nations to guarantee the integrity of the British Empire.

I read what appeared yesterday. This is from Lord Robert Cecil. The deep-seated and profound solicitude of this family for the welfare of this country is hereditary. It was his famous father who in the midst of our Civil War and when free institutions needed friends declared, "The people of the South are the natural allies of England; the North, on the other hand, keeps an opposition shop." A high standard, but not an unfamiliar one. Could he have had his way our Union would have been torn in twain and the cause of free institutions put back a thousand years. Knowing, therefore, something of the standards and ideals of this family in dealing with the cause of this country, let us appreciate Lord Cecil's anxiety for our morals and his conception of our obligations.

I read:

> I see it suggested in some places that the United States should not accept membership in the league of nations because it might involve some sacrifice of national sovereignty. It would be foolish to deny that if nations are to make any organizations for peace each of them must be content to modify in some degree, however slight, its liberty of action. That is the inevitable result of cooperation, and I do not wish to underrate the sacrifice involved; but, after all, nothing is worth doing in this world that can be done without a sacrifice, and if any real change in the present international status is to take place it can only be because the nations of the world are so convinced of the evils of war that they are ready to risk something to prevent its occurrence in the future.

Yes, Mr. President; involving some sacrifice, some surrender of sovereignty! May I ask what sacrifice the country of which this gentleman is so prominent a citizen will make when it enters this league of nations? What possible sacrifice has the British Government made by reason of its joining the league?

We heard a great deal in this country before we went over to Versailles about the freedom of the seas. You have not heard anything about it since. Great Britain notified the courteous gentlemen from the other countries that the question of the freedom of the seas was not a matter which came within the jurisdiction of the Versailles conference. Why? That left to Great Britain her dominancy of the sea, which, with her additional power secured by reason of this war, enables her to dominate the world inside the league or outside the league. Her supreme navy and her dominancy of the sea is her foreign policy, and to it all other nations must bow. That which was essential to her independence and her sovereignty and her power was excluded from the consideration of the Versailles conference at the first sitting.

England, when this treaty is signed, will control one-fourth of the inhabited globe and dominate one-third of its entire population. Her guns are trained across every strategic path

of the sea. She has her forts and her fortified harbors and her coaling stations and her islands in every part of the inhabitable globe. With her supreme navy and the seas within her control, she is in complete domination of the league of nations from the very first hour that it is organized.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. Just a minute and I will yield to the Senator.

Now, I ask, what has England sacrificed? By virtue of this war she will acquire territory directly or indirectly almost as large as the United States. She has acquired people over whom she will exercise control to the number of about 33,000,000. She has not surrendered one iota of her sovereignty or her power as an independent nation, as I shall show in a few minutes, by virtue of her voting power in the league. On the other hand, Mr. President, the moment we enter this league we change our entire policy of a century and a half. That which has been regarded as our safety and our security, which has enabled us to strengthen and to grow through this century and a half, the policy of Washington, is surrendered. The minute we enter the league we not only surrender the policy of Washington, but we surrender the policy established by Monroe. Those policies which have distinguished us through all these years and enabled us to acquire the commanding position which we now hold among the nations of the world, which enabled us to enter this war in the full panoply of power, and practically to determine the cause of civilization, are to be surrendered. I ask any candid man what does England surrender in compensation for this? What great national policy does she forego? What tradition does she reject? What right, privilege, or prestige does she sacrifice?

"Ah," Lord Robert Cecil says, "some sacrifice has to be made."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. Not only has England retained her policy but she has acquired an additional advantage. Under and inside of this league of nations, covered by it, is the same old balance of power—a combination or an alliance of Great Britain and France and the United States, so that Great Britain not only has her old balance of power with the United States to take the place of Russia, but she has, in addition to that, the league of nations, which she absolutely controls by her votes, to guarantee the territorial integrity of one-fourth of the inhabitable globe, and to hold in constant subjection one-third of the inhabitants of the earth. If the league works, very well, she controls it; if the league breaks down, very well, she has her balance of power with America as her ally.

I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I was present in the Senate here on the 26th of May, when the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] made a very ferocious attack upon the league of nations, and I think the Senator from Idaho listened to him. The burden of that attack was that this league of nations was to be dominated by some 17 small nations of color; and I did not hear the Senator from Idaho dissent from that claim at that time. I should like the Senator from Idaho now to state whether he agrees with the Senator from Missouri, his colleague in these attacks, that this league is to be dominated by these 17 small nations of color, or is it to be dominated by Great Britain?

Mr. BORAH. It will be dominated by Great Britain when Great Britain is interested, for Great Britain dominates the 17 small nations.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Oh, that is the idea? I am glad to have some reconciliation effected, because I was distressed over the thought that this league of nations would otherwise have two masters.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I have observed the distress of the Senator for several days; it seems verging on despair.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. At an earlier date we were told that it was to be dominated by the kings and potentates of Europe and Asia, and then it got to be Great Britain, and finally it got to be these petty nations that the Senator from Missouri classified. Now I understand that the Senator from Idaho goes back to the old claim that it is to be dominated by the British Empire.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. REED. Nobody is so dense as a man who purposely closes his ears and shuts up his mind. What I said was perfectly plain, and has been once explained to the Senator from Nebraska, and explained in language so simple that I am sure he understood it; but, so that it may appear in the RECORD again at this time, I will restate it, with the courtesy of the Senator.

We heard for months a great deal about a league of nations. We read through the press excerpts of what it was claimed was to go into this league. In the month of November or December—I have forgotten which—I made a speech in opposition to this league of nations in progress of formation, and I started with the assumption that such a league, if it had force, would necessarily embrace the principal nations of Europe, and I said that if it did embrace the principal nations of Europe there would be a certain number of kingdoms represented and there would be certain Asiatic powers. I assumed then that this league would be what the President had said it must be, a league embracing the principal nations of the world; and I showed that if it did embrace the principal nations of the world there would be only two or three republics and a large number of kingdoms, with the exception of the governments that were in process of formation, the character of which we could not yet tell.

That was my speech, that the Senator has referred to, in which I said that kings would dominate. They would have dominated in that kind of a league. They would have dominated if the league had been formed as the President said he was going to form one, embracing all the principal nations of the world.

Later we obtained a copy of the league of nations, which gave us the information that there were five nations—France, Japan, Italy, Great Britain, and the United States—which were to constitute the members, and certain other nations named in a secret protocol, the names of the nations being kept from us.

I discussed that question, and I assumed at that time that the backward nations, the half-civilized nations, would not come into the league, and I discussed the question from that standpoint. Finally we were given the list of these nations, and to my astonishment, and I think to the astonishment of every man, we found Liberia, and Haiti and Hedjaz, and Honduras, and Nicaragua, and Siam, and India, and other half-civilized or retrograde nations placed in the league with the power each to cast a vote in the league the equal of the vote of the United States or the equal of the vote of any other nation. I discussed that, and called attention to the fact that the nations of dark skin were in the majority, and that on any race question they would be very likely to vote together and vote for the dark-skinned proposition. I also called attention to the fact that what had been previously denied—denied by my friend and denied by others—that Great Britain would have five votes in the league had been disclosed now was six votes, and that Great Britain had a preponderating influence in the league because of those six votes.

The Senator can call those contradictory statements if he wants to, but they are absolutely consistent. The only change is that we have been more and more finding out the iniquities of this monstrous document.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I want to make this observation: The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] has detailed to us the difficulty he had in arriving at a basis for his discussion of the league of nations. It just occurred to me that it might have been advisable for him to wait until he got the league of nations before he began the discussion; and I should like to suggest, with reference to the treaty of peace, that it might be a good thing for Senators to withhold their discussion until they know what it is.

Mr. REED. Exactly.

Mr. BORAH. Let me answer that by saying this: It would have been better for the Senator from Missouri to have joined the League to Enforce Peace, and then one of the contributors to that league, who seems to be in possession of the document at this time, could have informed him of what the contents were. There seems to be a conduit between the League to Enforce Peace and those who possess the information with reference to the contents of this treaty, and I hope that when the Senator begins his investigation he will call first some of the most prominent members of the League to Enforce Peace.

Now, I want to call attention to how another sacrifice has been made by Great Britain.

We first have the council, composed of five great powers, all of whom, except the United States, are interlinked with secret treaties—secret treaties which Mr. Balfour has been candid enough to say would not be abrogated, notwithstanding the league of nations—secret treaties between Japan and Great Britain, and Italy and Great Britain, and we are to have one between France and Great Britain, so we are advised. But, Mr. President, we go from the council to the assembly, and we

see something perfectly fascinating in its audacity. It really is a stroke of genius, such as no other nation, in my judgment, ever had the genius to suggest, and no other nation except the United States has had the inverted genius to accept.

The members of this league are, first, the United States of America; second, Great Britain. That ought to have ended the proposition. The United States has one vote, Great Britain one vote.

Now, tell me, Senators, who still have some regard for this country and who do not regret that your ancestors came here, upon what possible theory would you proceed further in foreign affairs in reference to foreign nations than to give Great Britain and the United States the same number of votes? But, they say, naming the British Empire—which includes Canada—then Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, India. Is there any possible reason why India or New Zealand should have a vote in that assembly and not the State of Minnesota? Are not New Zealand and India just as completely controlled in foreign affairs by the foreign office of Great Britain as Minnesota is in our foreign affairs by the United States? Is there any difference between giving India, New Zealand, and Australia a vote and giving it to New Mexico or Ohio or even the new State of Idaho? Upon what possible theory? It arises out of the supreme desire of the English nation to show that it is sacrificing something in this grand scheme of cooperation. Six votes to our one in the assembly, and that assembly, do not forget, is a matter of tremendous moment under this new covenant.

Both in the council and in the assembly, wherever a majority vote is sufficient, Europe and Asia will completely dominate every situation. The whole thing will be completely in their hands. We will be under the voting power of foreigners. In all cases where unanimous vote is required the situation, in many respects, will be worse. While it is true that in some instances we could check affirmative action, so could any nation of Europe check affirmative action on our part. If we as a nation or people should feel under the necessity of urging affirmative action as essential to peace or to our own protection, one nation could veto anything we might desire to do. If we wanted to move, for instance, to enforce the Monroe doctrine, one nation, Japan or New Zealand, could veto our action. If we desired to prevent colonization of the Japanese immigration upon the Western Continent, one nation could veto that right. In other words, this great Republic must bow in shameless subserviency to foreign powers and depend for all time in the future as to its policies upon what foreign nations will deem wise and proper.

So, Mr. President, I challenge any man upon this floor or, if my weak voice can be heard in the House of Parliament, I ask any Englishman to state where sacrifice has been made upon the part of the British Government in entering into this league of nations. It is in a position to dominate and control and direct its policies just the same as it to-day directs and controls the policies of the British Empire; and never for a single moment did it lose sight of that proposition, from the first step in the writing of the league until it was completed.

Just a word, Mr. President, with reference to another matter, and I will conclude. A good deal has been said in the last 10 days with reference to this being a party question. Unfortunately, I presume, I hold a little different opinion about this than most of my colleagues on this side of the Chamber. Therefore I do not assume to speak for anyone but myself.

The able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] said the other day in his address that he regretted very much a tendency upon this side of the Chamber to make this a partisan question, and that, while they were desirous of holding it out of party politics upon that side, there was a disposition here to force it into party politics. My friend from Arkansas had not lately visited the Isle of Patmos. He should have sought a later revelation.

Why, at the very time he was speaking here upon the floor of the Senate the chairman of the Democratic committee in Chicago was making it a party issue and was so declaring to the entire country, if the Associated Press dispatch be a correct statement of what he said and was so declaring. He declred he welcomed it as a party issue, and then proceeded to put the party brand upon it.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. In just a moment. If you will read the Associated Press dispatch from Chicago in the Washington Post of May 29, you will see I am correct. I have not seen it denied. In other words, he pointed to many achievements of the Democratic Party, and, of course, pointed to the record of Mr. Wilson, which was proper, and then pointed to the league of nations as the greatest issue of the party and the greatest achievement of all time. A party issue! The second night before the President left for Europe he called his party organization in conference. Mr. Cummings hastened from the White House to the first public rostrum, and in a public speech announced that the Democratic Party was supporting the league and that those who were opposed to it were opposing it for party reasons. By this declaration by the chairman of the party made a few hours after consultation with the President, this league was made a party question, so far as the Democratic Party is concerned.

During the recess of Congress I had the pleasure of visiting some 11 States of the Union in the discussion of this matter. I crossed the path of the able chairman several times. There was no place where he visited and no council which he called in which it was not left unmistakably within the knowledge of the public that the Democratic Party as a party is behind the league of nations. It was everywhere understood that support of the league is a test of party loyalty. There is not an informed man in Washington who does not know that to be true.

It has been a party issue, Mr. President, ever since the President of the United States called his conference, and Mr. Cummings now is traveling over the country organizing in every part of the country, and one of the principal arguments in favor of the Democratic Party, as he puts it, is the covenant of the league of nations.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I do not know that my recollection of the press reports of the Chicago meeting is any better than that of the Senator from Idaho, but if my recollection is correct, the chairman of the Democratic committee took the position that the league of nations should be ratified—that it should not be made a party issue.

Mr. BORAH. No, Mr. President——

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. But that if any other party wanted to force it as a party issue, he was ready to take up the fight. I would like to concur in that suggestion. If there is any party that wants to make it a party issue, the Democrats of this country, in my judgment, will welcome the issue.

Mr. BORAH. There is no use for the Senator from New Mexico to occupy my time with that proposition. The Senator from New Mexico knows infinitely better than the Senator from Idaho that it is a party issue in the Democratic Party now and has been ever since the covenant was first announced. There is not a Democrat in the country who does not know that his party as a party is supporting it.

I noticed the other day there was a nonpartisan dinner in New York in favor of the league of nations. The gentleman who presided at that dinner was a distinguished Democratic judge, and the main speaker was the nonpartisan chairman of the Democratic Party, Mr. Cummings, and the other speaker was that gentleman whom we all know is nonpartisan in all his actions, Mr. McAdoo.

If you will read the report of his speech in the New York papers you will have no doubt about the fact that while Mr. McAdoo always desires to be nonpartisan, he is so obsessed with the idea of the league of nations and that it will be so helpful to the Democratic Party that he was forced to admit that it was the greatest achievement of the party of which he is a member.

Mr. President, there is only one objection which I make to that, and that is it takes so much credit from our friend Mr. Taft. I do not think it is fair to deprive that distinguished gentleman of his proportion of the glory. Is it true, Mr. President, that they pay a vast amount of deference to Mr. Taft? The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] went so far the other day as to say that since Mr. Taft began to advocate the league of nations he had redeemed himself before the American people. Mr. Taft will doubtless realize that he was once in a fallen state and that redemption came by his supporting a league of nations, which league of nations Mr. Cummings tells us is a Democratic achievement.

Mr. President, how could you prevent its becoming a party issue. Let us test the question first by mere party tactics or expediency and then let us test it by a higher standard. Let us suppose the league is defeated. It will necessarily be defeated by Republican votes. Will the Democratic Party then abandon the fight; will it not in 1920 then point to its defeat, denounce the Republican Party for defeating it, and then go to the country declaring that a great plan for world peace had been frustrated by the Republican Party? And will the Republican Party indorse the declaration of the Democrats and admit its mistake? If it does not, then will it not be an issue to fight out in the campaign? It is simply impossible to keep this out of the campaign in some way in 1920. It is not an ordinary treaty, interest in which will die out when ratified or defeated. It is a matter of tremendous political moment, one which has aroused the people deeply, and one upon which they will ultimately be heard.

Suppose, on the other hand, the league is ratified. The Democratic Party, as its distinguished chairman and Mr. McAdoo are already claiming, will point to it as the great achievement of the party. Even if we should support it as Republicans we will be given no credit. You will recall how faithfully we supported the war. But 10 days before the election the President made the war and all questions growing out of the war a party issue. He appealed directly to the people to elect a Democratic Congress. Whether we vote for or against the league the Democratic Party is already claiming it and will claim it is a party issue. I trust we are not without the wisdom which comes from experience after the last six years.

But, Mr. President, let us test this upon a higher plane. There is a deeper and profounder reason why it must be a party issue. It should not be made a party issue for mere party advantage. I agree to that. I agree, further, that no man should support or oppose it because his party tells him to do so, but this is a question upon which the American people are widely separated and irreconcilably divided. Those who are in favor of it will so express themselves and those who are opposed to it will express their opposition. How can they do so except through party action? Under our form of government the people can only speak effectively through political organizations called political parties. There are hundreds and thousands and millions of people in this country who will want to elect a President and a Congress in 1920 opposed to the policy of this country meddling in European affairs. If by our act here we commit this country to such a policy no power can prevent the issue being settled by a popular vote in 1920. You can not disfranchise a people by the political parties in power joining upon a certain issue. You can monopolize almost anything in this country. But you can not monopolize the right of the people to organize a political party. And the only possible way that the masses can effectuate their purposes is to act through political parties and organizations.

I have been in 11 States of the Union since Congress closed and I entertain no doubt at all that the great mass of the people are against any principle which will take their sons to Europe to do police service or to protect European boundaries. I have no doubt they are unalterably opposed to this thing of entering into the broils and turmoils of Europe. Do you suppose these people will consent to be deprived of their votes in this manner? If the Democratic Party indorses and the Republican Party indorses or remains silent, do you think they will yield up their loyalty to their country for loyalty to their party? If you do, you are doomed to disillusionment. I am making no threats; I am stating a fact. On this great question the people are ahead of their leaders. Their hearts are sounder and their minds clearer.

I expect to see the Republican Party true to its traditions, loyal to its teachings for half a century, loyal to the precepts which brought it into existence, declare in favor of remaining aloof from European alliances and in favor of Europe remaining out of American affairs. I expect to see it declare in favor of the untrammeled sovereignty and independence of this Republic. I expect to see it declare that no power except the power of this Government, through the processes of government, shall ever have the right to commit this country to war, either directly or indirectly. I expect to see it declare in favor of bringing the boys out of Europe and keeping them out of Europe unless our own Republic shall be threatened, and if it is threatened we will determine that and not some foreign council. But it is just as certain to my mind as anything in the future can be that if the two old parties should favor a contrary policy some other means will be found through and by means of which the people will express and effectuate their views.

Why, Senators, shall we say that the question of how much tariff shall be levied is a party issue but whether we shall entangle ourselves in European affairs is not a party issue? Shall we say that the question of who secured woman suffrage is a stupendous party issue but the question of whether or not we shall hold intact the Monroe doctrine is no concern of a party? Shall we say that the question of economy is a party issue but the question of whether our Government shall remain free and independent as it was organized is of no concern to our party? Reflect for a moment what a miserable coward you are making of the party of which you are members. Shall we say that the amount of taxes which you shall pay is a party issue but whether our sons shall accept a call of war in defense of foreign boundaries is not a party issue? I repeat, we can not play the game upon so low a plane.

It is true that this may lead to a realignment. That might be a blessing to our country. A false issue has too long divided the South and the North. Let the Mason and Dixon line disappear before the burning issues of the salvation of our common country. The North and South may have different views over domestic questions. But in loyalty to our institutions and devotion to our independence geography does not divide our people. Let us stop finessing. Let men line up. Let those who believe that the American people should continue independent and free to control their own affairs according to their own wisdom and judgment stand upon one side and those who believe that we should transfer some of our most vital powers to a supergovernment controlled by foreigners stand upon the other. Let those who continue to adhere to the policy of Washington and Jefferson and Jackson and Lincoln stand upon one side and those who would surrender our traditions, our teachings, and our policies to the interpretation, construction, and enforcement of European alliances stand upon the other. Yes, indeed, there will be party division.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, before the Senate adjourns I want to do justice to Mr. Polk, of the State Department, and I desire to do it in the presence of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. Earlier in the day the Senator from Massachusetts said:

> I only know they—
>
> Meaning copies of the treaty—
>
> are here in this country and, on the authority of the State Department, that they are in the hands of the financial interests. That is not my statement. Now, Mr. President, that is all I could suggest to any committee.
>
> Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator state who in the State Department made that statement, and to whom it was made?
>
> Mr. LODGE. Mr. Frank Polk made it.
>
> Mr. HITCHCOCK. To whom?
>
> Mr. LODGE. He made it to the press, and it was printed in the press that evening.

I have taken the trouble to ascertain where it was printed, and so far as I am able to ascertain there was no publication anywhere concerning a statement by Mr. Polk, except in the Washington Star. I will read that portion of it which seems to refer to this matter. The article was written by Mr. Oliver Owen Kuhn. It does not purport to give a quotation from Mr. Polk, but is an allegation by Mr. Kuhn. It states:

> It is admitted by the State Department that separate sections of the treaty, notably the financial and economic clauses, have fallen into hands of others than the department, but the department says it is not apprised of the reported fact that still other interests, notably the New York group of international financiers, have the document in full.
>
> Other than State Department copies of the document, the only complete text that has been received in Washington, so far as known by the department, is that received by the Japanese Embassy, which copy, the department has been assured, was forwarded on to Tokio.
>
> Investigation of just how the treaty fell into the hands of the New York financiers could be made, but the department here fails to indicate that it will take any steps in this direction. It is certain, however, that the treaty has not been transmitted to outside interests in America other than by mail or by person. Senator LODGE charges that the treaty came from attachés of the American commission to negotiate peace. The department in Washington declares that it is so far removed from the scene of negotiations that it can not affirm or deny.

Mr. President, that is rather a different statement from that which the Senator from Massachusetts averred. I took occasion immediately after his statement to call up Mr. Polk over the telephone, and he declared positively that he had not made the statement attributed to him by the Senator from Massachusetts, and that the only thing he had said was, referring to the statement of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] on the floor of the Senate, that it might be true, but he had no means of knowing whether it was true or not. I say this in justice to Mr. Polk.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the statement in the Star to which the Senator from Nebraska refers and of which he has read a portion says:

> This may be said to summarize the State Department's answer to the charges made by both Mr. LODGE, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and his party cohort, Mr. BORAH.

I do not exactly know what "a party cohort" is.

Mr. President, on the day on which the first discussion about the presence of the treaty in this country arose, after the adjournment, as I was going to my office, I was met by a reporter of the Associated Press, who stopped me and said, "the State Department says that what you saw were fragments or extracts of the treaty in the hands of some New York business firm." I asked, "What did I say in the Senate?" He replied, "that you had seen the whole treaty." I said, "I am not in the habit of deliberately lying in public or private; I did see the whole treaty." The inquiry from this reporter who had just come from the State Department annoyed me a good deal, and I called up Mr. Polk on the telephone then and there. He said the reporter had misunderstood him; that, of course, he had not intended to question any statement I had made; and that all he had said was that he thought what had been referred to might be portions of the treaty relating to financial matters which had fallen into the hands of New York bankers or business men, whoever they were. That was the statement on which I acted.

I certainly meant to do no injustice to Mr. Polk, of whom I have the highest opinion, but he told me himself that he had made the statement of the character to which I have referred to the reporter.

I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, June 6, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *June 5, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father in heaven, we come to Thee with all the accumulated faith of the past, assured by the faith resident in our souls, seeking wisdom, strength, and courage from the source of all that is reliable.

We only know a little. Thou art infinite. Inspire us to the right and hold our course onward and upward, that out of all the confused conditions which surround us in the physical, intellectual, moral, and spiritual life we may fulfill the highest and best conditions. Through Him who taught us by word and example how to live together in peace and harmony. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, the roll call in yesterday's RECORD shows that I was absent. I desire to say that I accompanied Gov. Robinson, of Oklahoma, his staff, and members of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress to New York for the purpose of welcoming home the Oklahoma soldiers of the Thirty-sixth Division. I also wish to say that if I had been present, I would have voted for the Agricultural bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's statement is out of order.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] asks leave of absence for three days on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

EMPLOYEES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and move to discharge the Committee on Expenditures in the Agricultural Department from further consideration of House resolution 66, and that it be called up for immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves that the Committee on Expenditures in the Agricultural Department be discharged from further consideration of resolution 66, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 66.

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts:

(1) The names of all Government employees in the various branches of the Department of Agriculture who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of service given to such employer, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such outside service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, sister or sisters, or brother or brothers are in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month, respectively, received by each and all of said relatives.

(3) The amount of annual income, if any, over and above the salary received by the Government employees in said department.

To direct the attention of said department more fully to the particular information requested, reference is made to the form of questionnaire in H. J. Res. 5.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I understand that such a motion is not debatable, and I therefore move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Debate is not in order on the motion to discharge the committee. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas to discharge the committee.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were 71 ayes and 5 noes.

So the motion to discharge the committee was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And that motion is debatable?

The SPEAKER. That question is debatable.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I presume the purpose of the gentleman is to ascertain whether there are employed in the Department of Agriculture persons who hold dual positions?

Mr. BLANTON. That is my purpose. I understand that there are, and in every other department of the Government, existing for years.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In the second paragraph the resolution provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit the names of all employees, and so forth, in the employ of the Government. How could the Secretary of Agriculture make a report as to all employees of the Government?

Mr. BLANTON. Any employees of the Government in his department.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I submit that there should be an amendment, because the Secretary of Agriculture would have no general jurisdiction such as is indicated here.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is mistaken about that. For instance, the question is as to the report of the names of all the employees in his department who have relatives in other departments of the Government. That is the purpose of section 2. It does not relate entirely to employees in the Agricultural Department.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am afraid the gentleman's resolution will defeat itself if it passes in this form. He should say "in the Department of Agriculture." If he would strike out "Government" and insert "Department of Agriculture," he would cover the situation. I question whether the resolution might not go so far as to relieve the Secretary of Agriculture from making any report at all.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on line 11, after the word "employees," there be inserted the words "in the Department of Agriculture."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves to amend by inserting after the word "employees," in line 11, the words "in the Department of Agriculture."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. Has the gentleman any idea as to what the expense of this will be?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; it will not put the Government to the expense of more than $150 for printing a certain questionnaire, which I will give to each one of these departments, and in fact have already sent them out to some of them; that is, if my questionnaire is used.

Mr. LITTLE. Will not some clerks have to be employed in the matter?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no. As far as that is concerned, I take it that most of these questionnaires will be delivered to the joint congressional commission which now has the matter under investigation. Anyway each department now has sufficient clerks to handle it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Since there will be no opportunity for amendment, I suggest these things to the gentleman: I think the word "promptly" is superfluous in line 2, because the resolution provides further on that the report shall be made at the earliest date possible. Then, I think the word "also" should be added at the end of line 6—

various branches of the Department of Agriculture who are also employed by any person, firm, or corporation.

Mr. BLANTON. I think the word "promptly" should remain there, because the earliest date practicable to some people means 6 months or 12 months or 18 months, and we ought to give the department to understand that we want these reports just as soon as they may be had.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I withdraw the suggestion as to that. It is a matter of tautology only. I think the word "also" should be inserted at the end of line 6—

the names of all Government employees in the various branches of the Department of Agriculture who are also employed—

And so forth.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend by inserting the word "also" after the word "are," at the end of line 6, page 1.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, at the end of the line insert the word "also."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under section 2 of this resolution the Secretary of Agriculture is required to report all those employees in his department who have any relatives employed in his or in other departments. The gentleman knows that there are no records in the Department of Agriculture showing that fact, and the only way that the Secretary of Agriculture can obtain that information is to call before him every employee of the department and ask that employee whether he or she has relatives in any other department of the Government.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no. If the gentleman will read section 3, or rather the end of the resolution, he will see that a proper method is pointed out, suggested to every one of the heads of these departments, whereby they may easily ascertain everything that we ask of them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is House joint resolution No. 5 the one introduced by the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. What information does that convey to the Department of Agriculture that would enable the head of that department to answer this question?

Mr. BLANTON. If they will submit that form of questionnaire proposed by me in House joint resolution No. 5, which can be done very easily, to each employee in the department, within 24 hours that department can have the answers to every question asked.

Mr. BARKLEY. Section 3 of the resolution provides that the Secretary of Agriculture must report not only these other things that have been mentioned, but he must carry on a census among the employees of the Department of Agriculture to find out how much income they have over and above their salaries in the department.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no. If he will submit my proposed questionnaire to them, which they can answer in 24 hours, he can have all of this information at his finger ends ready to give it to Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. What valuable purpose does the gentleman expect to serve in having Congress provided with the amount of income of each employee of the Department of Agriculture over and above his salary?

Mr. BLANTON. I am very glad the gentleman has asked me that, and I will explain it so that he can easily understand it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will ask the gentleman to make it very plain.

Mr. BLANTON. I stated on the floor of the House the other day that down in the Bureau of Mines, as chief chemist of that department, Mr. Charles L. Parsons was paid by the Government $4,800 a year, and in that same department Mr. Parsons, although an employee of the Government, although he was expected to give the seven hours a day, from 9 a. m. until 5 p. m., to this Government, although this Government was paying him for the brain that he is supposed to use for the Government in those seven hours of work a day, has had housed in that department as an officer of a private corporation the American Chemical Society, with its corps of clerks in there, and which had no connection with this Government—a corps of clerks and employees which are not connected with the Government in any way whatever, he receiving an extra salary of $3,500 from this corporation. And last year from 13,500 members of that private corporation he collected in a department of this Government $137,000, that went into the coffers of this institution; that this institution has been getting its rent free from the Government; that it has been getting its janitor service free; that it has been getting its ice water and electric lights and fans free; and that the only time Mr. Parsons has to give to the private corporation is the time that was supposed to have been given to this Government, from 9 a. m. until 5 p. m., because no employee of this private corporation could remain in that building after 5 o'clock p. m.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Not yet. I want to fully answer the gentleman, so that he will understand it. [Applause on Republican side.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I think I clearly understand as to that one man. The question I desire to ask is this: Admitting that the information with reference to this employee would be of value to the Congress, under the terms of the gentleman's resolution the Secretary of Agriculture is required to report whether any employee in his department has a house in Washington, we will say, or somewhere else, which rents for so much a month, and that that is a part of his income over and above his salary.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes it does.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman must let me answer him. A few weeks ago an employee of this Government, a Mr. Gallup, who had been in the employ of the Government for years as a clerk, died. I am reliably informed that his administrator reports that that clerk left an estate of about $187,000 of District securities, money loaned in this District on first-mortgage liens.

He further reported that this clerk in the department left $34,000 of securities in his hands, as good as Government bonds, that could be taken down here to a bank and cashed any day. When clerks are coming before this Congress like they will be doing in a few days, clamoring for an increase of bonus, when Congress has already increased their bonus first to $120, when Congress, on further demand and further insistence, has increased their bonus to $240, when we could not give our good soldiers who have come back from France and Flanders but a little $60 bonus; when, as I say, they will be coming in here in a few days asking us to give them more bonus, when, if this resolution is answered properly—and I pointed out the proper way for it to be answered—it will be shown to this Congress that some of these clerks at least have more money than almost any other financial institution in this District; that they have piled it up year after year. Some of them have money loaned to banks, I understand. They are going to come here and ask us to raise their bonus. Some of them may need a bonus, some of them may need an increase of salary, but why not give it to the ones needing it and not make it a blanket raise; do not make it a blanket raise to the inefficient as well as the efficient; do not give it to the particular clerks down here in the Finance Division of the War Department who, when they were asked to work two or three hours' extra time more speedily to mail out this $60 bonus to our deserving soldier boys, struck against the Government and walked out and said, "To hell with the soldiers' bonuses; we will not work over the time prescribed by Congress, seven hours."

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would like to state that the gentleman has not made it very plain why every employee of the United States should be put through a "third-degree" operation to find if they have some income above their salaries.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I have made it plain to every person in this House except my good friend from Kentucky. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman overestimates his clarity of statement.

Mr. GARRETT. I note the gentleman has three matters of inquiry. One of them refers to the question of their employment besides Government employment.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. I see no objection to that. The other is to get the names of relatives of those who are employed in other departments. I do not see any particular harm about that, but I want to ask the gentleman from Texas if he does not think he is going too far when he undertakes to ascertain and have reported to this House the income other than the income that is derived from their employment. The gentleman here would have reported the income derived from investments. In other words, he is delving into the private affairs of these people in a way that does not seem to me the Congress is justified in doing.

Mr. BLANTON. Just a moment.

Mr. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion?

Mr. BLANTON. Let me first answer the two gentlemen, the one from Kentucky and the one from Tennessee. I assumed that inquiry was a proper one by answering it. It is a proper one. What right have we to look into the private income of individuals employed by this Government? We have just this right: If they were demanding merely a salary, that would be all right, but it is not merely a salary they demand, but they come in here each term of Congress and each session of Congress and each piece of session and demand in addition to the salary an extra bonus paid to every one of them in a blanket raise.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. BLANTON. Just a moment. If these people are getting salaries that will not pay expenses, if these people are getting salaries that will not pay house rent and grocery bills and dry goods bills and telephone bills and all of the incidental expenses that come to a family and a household, then they have got the right to ask for a blanket bonus of $360, which they are going to do in a few days, but if there is a clerk like Mr. Gallup, who has got $187,000 loaned out in District securities, I would ask if you are not concerned in knowing that fact when you grant a man in that financial situation a $360 bonus when you sat here

and reduced the bonus to your soldier boys down to a little measly $60.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest this to the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman's third provision is:

The amount of annual income, if any, over and above the salary received by the Government employees in said department.

Probably we would have no right to pass that anyway. The policy of the Government in reference to the collection of taxes on incomes forbids anybody in the Internal Revenue Bureau or the Treasury Department from divulging the amount of the income of any person who has to make a return or information found on the return. It would be contravening both the policy and the statute of the Government to direct the Secretary of Agriculture or even the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to ascertain and make public such income by a simple House resolution. It would require a joint resolution of the two Houses to be signed by the President, which would be practically repealing that portion of the law.

I think the gentleman from Texas, in view of that, should be willing to strike out section 3. It serves no useful purpose which the gentleman has in mind.

I agree with the gentleman from Texas, and also as expressed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], that the first and second paragraphs or sections are all right, and that there is no objection to them, but if I were the gentleman I would strike out section 3.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, of course, knows more about the rules of the House and the law than I do. I certainly admit that, but I want to call the gentleman's attention to the rulings under Rule XXII, under which I have called up this resolution. He will find that back for 100 years this House has ruled that it has the right, through resolutions, to call on any department of Government at any time for any kind of information that exists in that department that will aid the membership of the House in passing upon questions which may come before it for consideration.

Mr. KITCHIN. But if there is a law against it——

Mr. BLANTON. If there is a law against it. But if it is a ruling——

Mr. KITCHIN. It is no ruling. It is the law. If the Secretary of Agriculture desired to find out what the exact return is in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, he could go there, but when the Secretary of Agriculture goes there to find out the commissioner would say, "You can not get that."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, the law referred to by the gentleman from North Carolina merely relates to the Internal Revenue Department giving out information to the public. It has nothing in the world to do with the question of the House of Representatives calling on the department of Government for information that exists in that department.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the better judgment of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] propounds a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARD. I want to know when is the proper time to offer an amendment to strike out.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas has the floor. That can be done when he yields the floor.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the better judgment of the older men in Congress on this question, and I move that section 3 be stricken from this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] moves that section 3 be stricken from the resolution.

Mr. GARD. A parliamentary inquiry. Does the gentleman move that or ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves it. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, under the same section of the rule I move that the committee be discharged from further consideration of House resolution No. 65.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves that the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor be discharged from further consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 65.

Resolved, That the Secretary of Labor be, and he is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts:

(1) The names of all Government employees in the various branches of the Labor Department who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of service given to such employer, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such outside service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, sister or sisters, or brother or brothers, are in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month respectively received by each and all of said relatives.

(3) The amount of annual income, if any, over and above their Government salary received by the Government employees in said department.

Attention is directed to the form of questionnaire in House joint resolution 5, as one calculated to elicit the information sought.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment. I move, Mr. Speaker, first, that the vote by which the former resolution was agreed to be reconsidered and that motion laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is too late. This motion is now pending. The question is on discharging the committee, as moved by the gentleman.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, now I move that the vote by which the former resolution was passed be reconsidered and that the motion be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman will wait until we dispose of this.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the same amendments which were made to the preceding resolution be considered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that section 3 of House resolution No. 65 be stricken out.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will modify his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the same amendment——

The SPEAKER. The Chair put the unanimous consent that the gentleman asks, that section 3 be stricken out.

Mr. BLANTON. There were some other amendments besides the one to section 3.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will submit the amendments and have them reported by the Clerk.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the following amendment, that——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. You do not require the amendment to section 1. That is all right in this instance.

Mr. BLANTON. I move that on line 10, after the word "employees," there be added "in the Department of Labor."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, namely, that section 3 be stricken out, with the understanding, however, that section 3 embraces only the three lines 1, 2, and 3.

Mr. GARRETT. That other ought to go out.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out lines 1, 2, and 3 on page 2.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend by striking out, in addition to that, lines 4, 5, and 6.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not yield the floor.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman loses the floor when he offers an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike it all out.

Mr. GARD. There is not any motion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLANTON moves to strike out all of section 3, from lines 1 to 6, on page 2, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. BLANTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

On motion of Mr. BLANTON, a motion to reconsider also the vote by which resolution No. 66 was agreed to was laid on the table.

EMPLOYEES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department be discharged from further consideration of House resolution No. 67.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves that the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department be discharged from the further consideration of House resolution No. 67, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 67.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts:

(1) The names of all Government employees in the various branches of the Interior Department who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of service given to such employer, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such outside service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, sister or sisters, or brother or brothers, are in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month respectively received by each and all of said relatives.

(3) The amount of annual income, if any, over and above their Government salary, received by the Government employees in said department.

Attention is directed to the form of questionnaire in H. J. Res. 5 as one calculated to elicit the information sought.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to discharge the committee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment. On line 11, after the word "employees," insert the words "in the Department of the Interior."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Amend, page 1, line 11, by inserting, after the word "employees," the words "in the Department of the Interior."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will yield in a moment. Now, Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment: To strike out all of section 3, lines 1 to 6, on page 2, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers a further amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Amend, page 2, by striking out all of lines 1 to 6, inclusive.

Mr. BLANTON. Now I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. BLACK. I want to know what useful purpose the gentleman expects to accomplish by requiring the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Agriculture to find out how many brothers a man may have in the service, or how many sisters he may have? In what way would that affect the compensation or the merits of it?

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I think I can answer the gentleman to his entire satisfaction.

Mr. BLACK. Or the substance of his employment.

Mr. BLANTON. Since I introduced a resolution here the other day to appoint an auditor to audit the accounts and expenditures in the United States Employment Service I understand that there has been dismissed from that service within the last few days quite a score of employees on big salaries, including the sister of the director of that department, who last July carried a book in her pocket which authorized her to go to any railroad station in the United States and sign up a slip and call for transportation. She used that book in New York on the 4th day of last July to get transportation and Pullman service for three different people from New York to Atlantic City, and on the 7th day of July transportation and Pullman service for herself from Atlantic City back to New York. That is a practice that I want to break up in this Government. [Applause on the Republican side.] And I want to say that in breaking it up I am just as loyal a Democrat as there is on the floor of this House. [Applause.]

I want to say further, Mr. Speaker, that this system at which I am aiming these resolutions right now is not a Democratic system. It is a vicious system, as I said the other day, which we Democrats inherited from our good brothers on the Republican side six years ago. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Has that answered the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BLACK. That is not to my mind a satisfactory answer, to require the heads of these departments to find out how many brothers and sisters and mothers and fathers an employee may have that are employed by the Government. It seems to me, if the gentleman wants to find out whether we have any useless employees in the Government service, he is not going about it in the right way. I do not think the second paragraph of your resolution will serve any useful purpose.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Densmore has the right to employ his sister. Other members or officials of that Labor Department have the right to employ their wives, if they can give just as good service as anybody else. But when they get to riding around over this country on Government transportation, if you please, from Washington to the California coast, and from New York to Atlantic City, and to the various other watering places of this country in the summer months, I want to know it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman answer this question?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. BLACK. Will the answers to these inquiries that you propose to propound disclose any information of that sort?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; they will.

Mr. BLACK. In what way?

Mr. BLANTON. Because I have had good auditors promise me that when these departments call upon them they are going to give the evidence, and they are not afraid to do it. [Applause on Republican side.]

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. BLANTON. Gladly.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman is doubtless aware of the fact that there was created in the last Congress, and appointed in part by the Speaker, a joint congressional committee for the investigation of the salaries in the District of Columbia?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I am aware of that. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARD. What purpose not embraced within the purview of the employment of such a committee as that is contained in the gentleman's request for information from these departments?

Mr. BLANTON. It is to bring out evidence that is covered by no part of the questionnaire prepared by this joint congressional committee. One member of that committee has made speech after speech in Washington, at banquets and meetings of the employees of this Government, saying, "Don't be afraid of us, boys; we are not going to hurt you, but we are going to help you." [Laughter on Republican side.] I have tried my best to get that joint congressional committee to prepare a questionnaire that will elicit the information that I want to know, as one new Member of Congress, when I pass upon the reclassification of salaries.

Mr. GARD. Would it not be better for the gentleman to save the condemnation until this joint legislative committee can make its report?

Mr. BLANTON. I am saving it. If you just knew all I have got in my pocket you would think I am saving it. [Laughter.] Does the gentleman want to ask me any further questions? [Laughter.]

Mr. GARD. It is not a matter of saving it. It is a matter of saving your condemnation until you see what this committee appointed for this purpose is going to do.

Mr. BLANTON. My good friend, who has occupied the bench, well knows that a judge upon the bench does not pass judgment until the culprit comes before him in the court, and then he passes his condemnation.

Mr. GARD. Whom does the gentleman call the culprit, the joint legislative committee or the clerk in the District of Columbia?

Mr. BLANTON. I say it with due deliberation that when this House appoints a joint congressional committee to bring us evidence that we are to use in passing upon the reclassification of salaries, when that joint congressional committee are spending thousands of dollars of the people's money in doing it, they ought to bring us information that is worth something.

Mr. GARD. Possibly they will. How does the gentleman know they are not going to do that?

Mr. BLANTON. They have not asked a question of a man or woman or child in this District that would elicit the information whether or not employees are working for private concerns

or private individuals or private corporations, and giving more of their time on the outside than they are giving to this Government.

Mr. GARD. That is a difference of opinion between those who compose this joint legislative committee and the gentleman; but in all good faith to this committee, which the gentleman voted for, the House members of which themselves distinguished former Members of this House, were appointed by the honored former Speaker of this House, ought we not in all fairness to wait in our condemnation at least until the evidence is before us and not go off upon any assumption or wild ideas that something is going to happen that may not happen at all? In other words, I want to voice my confidence in this joint congressional committee until I know they have abused that confidence. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the statement of the gentleman from Ohio is a fair and judicial one. All I am trying to do by these resolutions is to bring before this Congress evidence that will not be elicited by the questionnaires which have already been prepared by the joint congressional committee, and which have already been answered by every one of these employees of this Government, which evidence is now being compiled into a voluminous record that will probably cost thousands of dollars to print and put on our desks and into the pages of which many of us will never look——

Mr. GARD. I presume the gentleman from Texas will look into it.

Mr. BLANTON. I will look into it, I promise you, but I want to obtain the evidence that they fail to obtain. Their evidence is all in. So far as they are concerned, the case is closed, and I want to bring additional evidence here, because, fortunately, my good colleagues, you and I are the ones who are to pass upon their report and upon the reclassification of salaries. This joint congressional committee is merely a creature of this House. It is merely a servant of this House, to help gather information here for our guidance. If they do not prepare to bring all the evidence we want, we have the right to take steps to obtain the balance for ourselves. I do not know whether my good friend from Ohio [Mr. GARD] would be interested in this additional evidence or not, but I promise you I will be interested in it.

Mr. GARD. I shall be quite as much interested as the gentleman is.

Mr. BLANTON. If he inspects it with that clear, judicial mind of his, when he comes to make up his conclusions he will be glad that a new Member helped him to get this information.

Mr. GARD. The difference between the gentleman and myself is that I am not explosively premature. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Well, there is something in that. I might tell my good friend a joke on myself in that connection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMERSON. Tell the joke.

Mr. BLANTON. I was going down to one of the departments not long ago with Senator SHEPPARD, who, in my judgment, is one of the greatest men who legislate in this Capitol to-day.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Turn around, so we can hear you.

Mr. BLANTON. I am talking to my good Democratic friends now. There happened to be a tennis racket in the automobile, and I said to Senator SHEPPARD, "That is one of the greatest games that we have in this country to-day." He said, "Why?" I said, "It teaches you the three great essentials in life." He said, "What are they?" I said, "It teaches you, first, to see quickly and to see correctly, and then it teaches you, second, to think quickly and think correctly, and, thirdly, it teaches you to act quickly and act correctly." The Senator said, "Oh, golf has got it skinned a city block. Golf teaches you the great essential." I said, "What is that, Senator?" He said, "It teaches you how to act deliberately." And that is the joke on me in connection with the statement made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD]. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARD. I commend to the gentleman from Texas the teachings of that ancient and honorable Scotch game. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think the gentleman from Texas has permitted himself to be slightly misled probably by the statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] with reference to the "congressional committee." I know of no committee of that kind which performs the work that has been spoken of. The committee that corresponds the nearest to that is one which was indeed authorized by Congress, but one appointed by the President and not a joint congressional committee.

Mr. BLANTON. It is a joint congressional commission, and I want to say that the members of it are my friends, and I consider them so, and I would not say a word to even hurt the feelings of one of them. Two of them have been very kind to me. One of them came to my office and discussed the matter with me. One of them wrote me. The gentleman from Missouri came to my office and discussed it quite at length with me, but could not promise that he could do anything for me in getting my proposed questionnaire submitted. I want to say I have perfect confidence in the great Democratic leader on this side of the House, Mr. CHAMP CLARK. I consider him one of the great men of this country, and I am willing to follow him in his splendid leadership here. I am not casting any aspersions on his appointees, but he is human, the same as everybody else. If he was not human he would not be sitting in this bunch of fellows now. [Laughter and applause.] Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. BLANTON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

EMPLOYEES IN THE NAVY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to discharge the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department from further consideration of House resolution 68.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 68.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts:

(1) The names of all Government employees in the various branches of the Navy Department who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of service given to such employer, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such outside service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, sister or sisters, or brother or brothers, are in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month respectively received by each and all of said relatives.

(3) The amount of annual income, if any, over and above their Government salary, received by the Government employees in said department.

Attention is directed to the form of questionnaire in H. J. Res. 5 as one calculated to elicit the information sought.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to discharge the committee.

The motion to discharge the committee was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment:

On page 1, line 11, after the word "employees," insert the words "in the Navy Department."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 11, after the word "employees," insert the words "in the Navy Department."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, strike out all of section 3, including the lines 1 to 6.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out section 3 and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 3. That the Clerk of this House do report to the House what Members have their sons or their relatives as clerks, and the ages and accomplishments of said relatives."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am willing to accept that amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the amendment as amended by the substitute.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. BLANTON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

EMPLOYEES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice be discharged from further consideration of House resolution 69.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 69.

Resolved, That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts:

(1) The names of all Government employees in the various branches of the Department of Justice who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of service given to such employer, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such outside service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, sister or sisters, or brother or brothers, are in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month, respectively, received by each and all of said relatives.

(3) The amount of annual income, if any, over and above their Government salary, received by the Government employees in said department.

Attention is directed to the form of questionnaire in H. J. Res. 5 as one calculated to elicit the information sought.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas to discharge the committee.

The motion to discharge the committee was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina who offered a substitute amendment a few moments ago, I want to state to that good gentleman that I do not know who is his secretary.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, what is before the House.

The SPEAKER. The resolution to discharge the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice and adopt the resolution.

Mr. BLANTON. I move the previous question on the motion to discharge the committee.

The SPEAKER. That has been agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say to the gentleman from South Carolina that I do not know who occupies the position of his secretary, but I want him to know, and I want every other man in the House to know, that the man who sits in my office as my secretary and draws $2,000 from this Government came here from Texas in order to accept the position with me in Washington; that he gave up a position of general superintendent of one of the biggest firms in Galveston, Tex.—Clarke & Courts—known from one side of Texas to the other. He gave up a position that paid him $2,400. He had under him over 100 men that he supervised; and that is the kind of talent I am giving to the people of my district on a salary of $2,000 a year as one of the employees of my office.

Mr. STEVENSON. I introduced the resolution in order that all the righteousness might come out at one time. If that disturbs the gentleman from Texas, I regret it, but what I would like to know is how Thomas L. Blanton, jr., occupies the position on the clerks' roll as clerk to THOMAS L. BLANTON, of Texas, as he did last year, and also if he did not have a son on the roll as a page. The gentleman says he does not know who my secretary is, and he says that his secretary gave up a $2,400 position. I will say to the gentleman that my secretary is Eugene Hutchinson, of Rock Hill, S. C., a man 35 years old, whom I have paid $2,400 ever since he has been here. He is a good clerk, and the gentleman will not find in any investigation that I have been dividing the salary with him either.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I was sure of that when he offered the amendment.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I will not yield further now.

Mr. STEVENSON. I did not think so.

Mr. BLANTON. Because we have appropriation bills to consider. Oh, I yield, if the gentleman has anything that he wants to get rid of.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman stated that he was sure of that when I offered the amendment. I would like to know if the gentleman is merely playing with the House and asking questions by means of resolutions and also asking questions of Members merely for the purpose of hearing himself talk? I am becoming impressed that that is what he is doing. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, if I am playing with the House, I want the gentleman to know that the House is sitting here willing to be played with.

Mr. STEVENSON. The House is suffering a good deal.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman asked me why there appeared upon the roll the name of my son as my secretary. Evidently the gentleman has not been attending the sessions of this House. Evidently the gentleman does not read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because it was stated upon the floor of this House during the last Congress, when that question was raised by my economic friend from Indiana [Mr. WOOD], and it was put into the RECORD by affidavits, sworn to before a notary public, that the name of my son was placed on that roll in order to control the $2,000 salary, so that I could provide an efficient office force; that from time to time I had had as many as three and four different employees in my office; and I want to state for the benefit of my distinguished friend from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] that ever since this Congress adjourned, when lots of you good friends of mine were off on your vacations, deserved as they were, because we had been working very hard, I spent from 12 to 16 hours in my office almost every day and night since the adjournment of Congress. I have had a day shift and a night shift. [Applause.] And I have paid as high as $100 a month out of my pocket for clerk hire.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I decline to yield, because I want to get through here, so that we may go on with the appropriation bills.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BLANTON. I decline to yield. I move the previous question on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I will not.

Mr. STEVENSON. What is the name of the gentleman's secretary that he says he has now?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was passed and to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, have the amendments been incorporated in this resolution? If not, I would like to offer them myself.

The SPEAKER. They have not been.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, that has been overlooked. I ask unanimous consent to consider these amendments.

The SPEAKER. It is too late to offer amendments except by unanimous consent.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendment may be considered as a part of the resolution. On line 11, page 1, after the word "employees," add the words "in the Department of Justice."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that there may be incorporated the amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 11, after the word "employees," insert the words "in the Department of Justice."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that section 3 of the resolution be eliminated.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that section 3 of the resolution be eliminated. Is there objection?

There was no objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I now move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to and to lay that on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

EMPLOYEES IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department may be discharged from further consideration of House resolution 70.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves to discharge the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department from further consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 70.

Resolved, That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts:

(1) The names of all Government employees in the Post Office Department who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of service given to such employer, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such outside service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, sister or sisters, or brother or brothers, are in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month respectively received by each and all of said relatives.

(3) The amount of annual income, if any, over and above the salary received by the Government employees in said department.

To direct the attention of said department more fully to the particular information requested, reference is made to the form of questionnaire in H. J. Res. 5.

The SPEAKER. The question is on discharging the committee from further consideration of the resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend, on page 1, line 10, by inserting the words "in the Post Office Department" after the word "employees."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "employees," insert the words "in the Post Office Department."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend, on page 2, by striking out section 3.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, strike out all of lines 1 to 6, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, there was one question asked by my distinguished friend from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON], which inadvertently I did not answer. He is entitled to an answer. He asked me why it was that I had a son who was a page boy in the House of Representatives.

Mr. STEVENSON. Oh, no; I did not ask any such question.

Mr. BLANTON. What did the gentleman ask?

Mr. STEVENSON. I stated that the gentleman had a son who was a page in the House of Representatives last year. I did not ask any question. I also stated that he has a son whose name is now on the roll as his clerk. I did not ask the gentleman any question about it.

Mr. BLANTON. He has a right to have an answer to that inquiry. Under the old custom, the good old Republican custom, which has prevailed here in Washington back to a time when the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, the party in power has the distribution of certain patronage. When I reached here two years ago, a new man from west Texas, I was told that I had a position of page in the House of Representatives at my disposal.

I spoke to my people in my home town shortly afterwards, to a big audience of them, and I said: "People, I have at my disposal in Washington the position of page. It is considered by some men"—possibly by the gentleman from South Carolina—"as an insignificant position, but I consider it an honorable position. I would like for one of your west Texas boys to occupy it. You can not afford to send your boy up there; but if you can and want to do it, I will promise any man here if he will send his boy there I will appoint him page in the House of Representatives; but if you can not send your boy I will consider it an honor for my boy to sit in the House of Representatives at the knee of CHAMP CLARK, of Missouri."

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. And my people——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. In a minute I will yield. I will yield to my good friend——

Mr. BANKHEAD. It really would be in the nature of a parliamentary inquiry, but probably that would not be parliamentary. I make the point of order that the gentleman from Texas is not discussing the resolution.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of a semblance of order I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas has the floor.

Mr. BLANTON. I have the floor, and I am going to get through in just about a minute. I told my people——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a ruling.

The SPEAKER. The Chair really was not listening to the gentleman from Texas, he regrets to say. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Under those circumstances I will not insist on a ruling.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, although the distinguished Speaker was not listening to me, evidently I had the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama. [Laughter.] I told my people that if they did not want me to have my son as a page or their son as a page, there would be enough Republican boys here to act as page, but I preferred to give it to a Democratic boy from west Texas——

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I do.

Mr. CARTER. Did I understand the gentleman to say earlier in his remarks that he told his people that they could not afford to send their boys here to Washington to take the place?

Mr. BLANTON. I said they could not afford to do it. [Laughter.]

Mr. CARTER. That is what I wanted to get in the RECORD.

Mr. BLANTON. I told them——

Mr. CARTER. That is prior to the time you told them you were going to appoint your son. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. The remark of my distinguished friend from Oklahoma is very facetious. It remains the fact I had the express permission of my people, and I want to say now if any good Republican friend of mine will give me his page patronage I will put my little son back here, because I am willing for him to associate with this splendid body of men, even though he does have to look into the countenance of my good friend from Alabama occasionally. [Laughter.] I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw that and offer an amendment. In line 10—no; the amendments have been agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution as amended.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Has the amendment been offered in line 11?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk reports to the Chair that the amendments have been offered and agreed to. The question is on the resolution as amended.

The question was taken, and the resolution as amended was agreed to.

On a motion of Mr. BLANTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was passed was laid on the table.

EMPLOYEES IN THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of House resolution 71.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a statement?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield, because we are wasting time. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the gentleman ought to allow the House to have a statement from our committee about this.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not yield; debate is not in order.

Mr. BLANTON. I can not yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves to discharge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from further consideration of resolution 71, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 71.

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be, and it is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts:

(1) The names of all Government employees of said department who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of service given to such employer, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such outside service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, sister or sisters, or brother or brothers, are in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month, respectively, received by each and all of said relatives.

(3) The amount of annual income, if any, over and above the salary received by the Government employees in said department.

To direct the attention of said department more fully to the particular information requested, reference is made to the form of questionnaire in H. J. Res. 5.

The SPEAKER. The question is on discharging the committee.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, in justice to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I want to say that this committee reported to me this morning that they would like to take this matter up and consider it later on and be willing to give me a hearing on it, but in view of the fact that this resolution is so simple that it can be easily understood by anyone by reading it the first time I do not consider that a hearing is necessary on it, and I would consider it a waste of time to have a hearing on it; and in view of the fact we are passing upon similar resolutions at this time, I do not care to hold this resolution up, and, therefore, I offer the following amendment:

In line 11, page 1, after the word "employees," insert "in the Interstate Commerce Commission."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 11, after the word "employees," insert the words "in the Interstate Commerce Commission."

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire just five minutes to discuss this matter in connection with the lecture which I received a few minutes ago, and lest I might be considered as not speaking strictly to the motion, I will ask permission to proceed either in or out of order for five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. I will agree to the gentleman proceeding in order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] asks permission to speak for five minutes, not pertinent to the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak anyway in reference to the statement which the gentleman made, in which he misconstrued my position about there being relatives embraced in the employees. The gentleman is calling upon the departments here to require employees to state what relatives they have in any of the departments. Now, those employees are mere clerks, the subject of executive appointment and subject to removal. They are under the power of the heads of the departments and have no power to name a relative that goes into some other department, and, therefore, if there is any blame attached to their relatives being in other departments it can not be laid upon the innocent clerk who is in a department and has a relative somewhere else.

The gentleman says that I seem to be rather inclined to look upon the office of page as insignificant. Oh, no; I do not. I was told that I had one to my credit, but when I tried to get the place I found the son of Mr. BLANTON and the son of everybody else as pages. I had not any son, and I never got the appointment of any page. The point I make is, if it is wrong for a clerk in a department to have a brother or son or an uncle or an aunt in another department or in that particular department, where they are appointed by a responsible head, it is wrong for a man who is connected with the Government and has the power to appoint a subordinate to name his near relative to perform that work. [Applause.] Therefore I asked for this information, and if the gentleman does not like it I can not help it.

I will state also, Mr. Speaker, that at the last session, when my friend was after the clerks up yonder and talking about relatives, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] brought up the question, and he admitted that he had a 14-year-old boy on the roll as his clerk. And he has got him there to-day, and he admitted he got part of the pay.

Mr. BLANTON. I did not admit anything of the kind, and it is not so.

Mr. STEVENSON. The following is from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 14, 1918, page 3507:

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, in the two minutes allotted me I desire to call the attention of the House to the inconsistency of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], who is decrying the very small raise provided by this amendment to the employees of this Government. Mr. BLANTON is being fairly well paid for his services at $7,500 a year. In addition to that he is receiving, as I am informed, more than $700 mileage per session; also $2,000 a year for a son who is a clerk in his office. * * *

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman would not want to make a misstatement.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. What is your clerk's name?

Mr. BLANTON. My son is a clerk, but my son gets very little of that money. Mrs. R. L. Arceneaux is one of my clerks in my office, at $1,200 a year, and from time to time I have had various other employees.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Does not the gentleman think it comes in bad faith for a Member of Congress——

Mr. STEVENSON. I say that from a Member of Congress who by implication reflects on every employee of the Government who has a relative in any other department, it comes with bad grace to employ their own relatives to places subject to their appointment and designation where they may draw money from Uncle Sam.

Now, my friend said that he asked his people from west Texas if they wanted to send a page or if he should put in his own son. I say, whom did he ask? There are a great many people in that district, which is 600 miles long. Did he talk by newspaper advertisement? Did he address a letter to each constituent who has a son, or did he say to one or two if they would not send their sons he would put his son in?

Mr. CARTER. I just wanted to say that I understood the gentleman from Texas to state that he called all of the people in his district in mass meeting and submitted this momentous question to them, and they told him they would not send their boys, and he then asked to send his son.

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] comes here and by implication reflects upon the name of every clerk in the department, because, forsooth, they have a relative of some kind in some other department. I say, Mr. Speaker, it is unworthy of this Congress to make any such implication and then run away from the fact that some of their own clerks are their sons and especially while in the name of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is standing the name of Thomas L. Blanton, jr., on the record of the Clerk of the House down here as his clerk, and, unless I am mistaken, he is only 15 years old.

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to discuss the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. I understood that the Chair recognized me.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Gentlemen of the House, I sincerely hope that this resolution will not be adopted. On yesterday the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which this resolution was referred seven days ago, took official action to consider it and to invite Mr. BLANTON to come before it and testify with reference to it. Ever since this resolution was introduced and referred to our committee we have been holding hearings every day on the return of the telegraph and telephone wires of this country to their private owners. We have had no opportunity to consider this resolution, and at this particular time this resolution, above all those which have been brought in here, ought to be considered carefully.

Now, the Interstate Commerce Commission is not a political body. All their employees are under the civil service. They do not even control the appointment of their own clerks, except in making selections from the certified list furnished by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. That committee, by the action of the House just taken, has already been discharged, and the gentleman from Kentucky is, therefore, speaking out of order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am speaking now, Mr. Speaker, on the motion for the adoption of this resolution, and I submit that is not out of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not out of order.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is not a body in the United States that is now busier than the Interstate Commerce Commission, as everybody in this House knows, and if you pass this resolution it will require that commission to appoint additional clerks to investigate, not only the employees in Washington but every employee of the Interstate Commerce Commission everywhere else in the United States, to find out whether they have any relatives, not alone in the employ of the Interstate Commerce Commission, but also in every other branch of the United States Government; and of all resolutions that ought not to be adopted at this time without full consideration of a committee, this one is the most unnecessary and foolish, placing a burden on the Interstate Commerce Commission. Therefore I hope this resolution will not be adopted. [Applause and cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, fortunately there is in the little room yonder evidence of every employee of this House in writing. Whatever clerks I have are set down in writing in a printed book in that little room.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman is in order.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not going to take up the time of the House on trivial matters. But, Mr. Speaker, I do want to say this, in answer to the gentleman, that I have heard from the time I was a small boy that when you put a coal of fire upon a terrapin's back you are going to get some action. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I decline to yield.

Mr. STEVENSON. All right. I will answer the gentleman later.

Mr. BLANTON. And I expected, Mr. Speaker, when I brought these resolutions in here, in order to get evidence before this House, that personal attacks would be made upon me by Members, but more especially from the other side of the House than this side. [Laughter.]

Mr. KNUTSON. You have been disappointed——

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I am a little disappointed. My coal of fire seems to be burning more Democrats than Republicans. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw that, Mr. Speaker, and offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. An amendment is pending. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 1, line 11, after the word "employees," insert the words "in the Interstate Commerce Commission."

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word in justice to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and its members. This resolution, which was sent to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, was brought up yesterday afternoon by its chairman [Mr. ESCH]. That committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. ESCH, has been as busy as it could be without holding night sessions. We go there at 10 o'clock in the morning and stay there until the House meets, and take a recess and get back at 2 o'clock, and stay there as long as there is anything to do, which is as late as 5 o'clock almost every day.

Now, it has been utterly impossible to consider all that is before the committee, things of the very highest importance, as expeditiously as they ought to be considered and yet justify the name of "consideration." Mr. ESCH brought this matter up before the committee yesterday afternoon, and kindly and courteously, I am satisfied—because that is the kind of a man he is—wrote Mr. BLANTON and asked him to come before the committee and explain the merits of the resolution and explain what he wanted and what facts he had that would justify the committee in making a favorable report on this resolution; and now, before it was possible for the committee to act, the gentleman from Texas moves to discharge the committee, apparently with the idea that it is willfully refusing to do its duty. The rule provides that all these resolutions shall be officially referred to committees, and if this committee is to be discharged from the consideration of this resolution at this time what was the use of referring it to the committee? I have respect for the committee, and I know it is the honest intention and purpose of the committee to hear Mr. BLANTON fully and also hear anybody else who has anything to say with reference to the resolution, and to report it, with or without amendment.

Now, this is the only one of the resolutions that I know anything about. The committee voted unanimously to treat Mr. BLANTON with all courtesy, and yet he comes in here and says the resolution is so simple that it is unnecessary for him to be heard by our committee. It seems to me the House is treating the matter too much in a spirit of levity and fun. What is the use in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee trying to hear evidence on the resolution, as it ought to be heard, if the House is going to arbitrarily discharge the committee when it had absolutely no time in which to consider it?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out section 3.

Mr MONDELL. No reflection is involved to the effect that any committee of the House has not endeavored to take action. Under the rules the resolution is privileged after seven days. The committee could have acted without hearings if desired. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has the right to call his resolution up, and it is not necessarily a reflection on the committee when he does so.

Mr. SIMS. I admit that he is within his parliamentary rights. I did not mean that he was personally doing anything wrong. But what do we know about the merits of this resolution? There may be justification for this resolution, but I do think that the House ought not to discharge the committee from the consideration of the resolution when the committee is doing everything it can to consider it in a proper way. I think this kind of action will get us nowhere, and bring confusion and troubles to the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to suggest also that the committee took occasion to inquire of the Interstate Commerce Commission what it would cost to get this information that this resolution calls for, and that we have had no opportunity to get a reply from them.

Mr. SIMS. Certainly. We are trying to investigate it on its merits, and to treat the House as it ought to be treated, and to help the gentleman, as far as we can, to ascertain whether there is anything in it justifying the adoption of such a resolution. I think this resolution ought to be voted down, not on the ground that there may not be merit in it, but on the ground that we do not know whether there is or not, that it is a dragnet which may run the Government and the commission into an expenditure of many thousands of dollars, and tie up this commission, by investigating facts as to who has kinfolks in that department or who is receiving some compensation on the outside.

Mr. REAVIS. The resolution calls for kinfolk in any Government department.

Mr. SIMS. That is all right, but nobody can tell how much expense it is going to involve, and before reporting this resolution we were trying to find out about how much expense there will be in getting the replies to this particular resolution according to its terms. It seems to me we ought to have time to do it, because this resolution is not a war emergency or any other kind of an emergency measure. While the gentleman is thoroughly within his parliamentary rights, I think the House ought not to accept the responsibility of acting on this kind of a matter without any information whatever when information is available and can be secured that will be a real guidance for the action of the Members of the House.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I move that section 3, on page 2, be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. There is an amendment already pending, the amendment in line 11, page 1. The question will first be taken on that.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. I move that, on page 2, section 3 be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, strike out all of lines 1 to 6, inclusive.

Mr. BLANTON. I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The amendment must first be voted upon.

Mr. BLANTON. All right.

Mr. STEVENSON. I desire to discuss this amendment for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina——

Mr. MONDELL. Did not the gentleman from Texas move the previous question?

The SPEAKER. He withdrew it.

Mr. BLANTON. No; I did not withdraw it.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman move the previous question?

Mr. BLANTON. I do.

The SPEAKER. The Chair misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. STEVENSON. The stenographic report will show that the gentleman moved the previous question on the adoption of the resolution. That question is not before the House yet, and I do not think it is proper to shut off discussion here in an arbitrary way.

Mr. BLANTON. I have no disposition to shut the gentleman off.

Mr. STEVENSON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to close all I have to say about the little lectures I have received from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. He closed with a very witty remark awhile ago that "when you put a coal on a terrapin's back you always see him move." Now, Mr. Speaker, he evidently referred to me. [Laughter.] Now, I have not voted against his resolution. I am the man who brought the coal in here, and this is the terrapin on whose back it got. [Indicating Mr. BLANTON]. The measure was passed, and up to that time the temperature of the gentleman was about the same as that of the ice water in this House, and in two or three minutes it was as hot as the branch water that we get over in the House Office Building, and he began to reply to me after he had accepted the amendment, after it had been adopted, and after we had passed another resolution. It struck him that that thing was beginning to burn him a little. It took about the right length of time for the coal to begin to heat through the shell of a terrapin, and he is the terrapin, and he is the one that got burned. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. STEVENSON. Wait a minute, Mr. Speaker. As this thing goes along, history grows. The gentleman is apparently denouncing clerks for having kinsfolk in the service of the Government, and since we discussed the fact that at the last session the gentleman was the father of a page in this House, and that he was and still is the father of a clerk in the shape of a 14-year-old boy, it comes out that, bless your soul, he had a clerk in the post office at the same time. Why, Mr. Speaker, he was getting to be

a monopoly. He was violating the Sherman Act, and he ought to have been dissolved by an order of the Supreme Court. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, in final reply to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, I want to say that if there are any pernicious practices carried on in the House of Representatives I want the people of South Carolina to determine who is most responsible, their Representative who has been here for years and years or a new man from Texas who has been here only one term.

Mr. STEVENSON. If you want to submit that to the people of South Carolina, they will give you an answer very quickly, but I am not going to call a meeting to determine whether I shall have a page in the House or not. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on my amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves to strike out section 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The question being taken on ordering the previous question, on a division (demanded by Mr. SIMS and Mr. BARKLEY) there were—ayes 112, noes 2.

Accordingly the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, upon that question I demand the yeas and nays. Then maybe they will quit monkeying with it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused, seven Members, not a sufficient number, seconding the demand.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky demands a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 106, noes 55.

Accordingly the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. BLANTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of House resolution 72.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 72.

Resolved, That the Director General of the United States Railroad Administration be, and he is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts:

(1) The names of all Government employees in the various branches of the United States Railroad Administration who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of service given to such employer, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such outside service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, sister or sisters, or brother or brothers, are in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month, respectively, received by each and all of said relatives.

(3) The amount of annual income, if any, over and above their Government salary received by the Government employees in said department.

Attention is directed to the form of questionnaire in H. J. Res. 5 as one calculated to illicit the information sought.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. There is no debate on the motion. The question is on the motion to discharge the committee.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 73, noes 49.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 11, after the word "employees," insert "in the official offices of the United States Railroad Administration."

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. What does the gentleman mean by "official offices"?

Mr. BLANTON. As distinguished from traffic employees.

Mr. SIMS. They have got "official offices" all over the United States, with officers that used to be in charge of the railroad as managed by private corporations. Every letterhead announces that it is the United States Railroad Administration. There will be an immense amount of trouble and expense incurred under such a resolution as this.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, strike out section 3.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the passage of the resolution as amended.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point that no quorum is present, and evidently there is no quorum here.

Mr. SIMS. Was the question being taken on the previous question or on the passage of the resolution?

Mr. BLANTON. Let me say to the gentleman——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Chair having announced that there is no quorum here, are not gentlemen out of order?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is correct.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas made the point of no quorum and the call of the House follows automatically.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, the Chair had declared the motion for the previous question carried and started to announce that the question was on the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the gentleman is mistaken. The Chair said that the previous question was carried——

Mr. WINGO. And the Chair had started to make the statement that the question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the gentleman from Texas had risen in time to make the point of no quorum and that that was in order. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of the previous question will say "aye" and those opposed will answer "no."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 311, nays 8, answered "present" 3, not voting 107, as follows:

YEAS—311.

Ackerman	Cole	Garrett	Knutson
Alexander	Connally	Glynn	Kreider
Almon	Cooper	Godwin, N. C.	LaGuardia
Anderson	Cramton	Good	Lampert
Andrews, Md.	Crisp	Goodykoontz	Langley
Andrews, Nebr.	Crowther	Graham, Ill.	Lanham
Anthony	Cullen	Green, Iowa	Lankford
Ashbrook	Currie, Mich.	Greene, Mass.	Layton
Aswell	Dallinger	Griest	Lazaro
Babka	Darrow	Hadley	Lea, Calif.
Bacharach	Davis, Minn.	Hamilton	Lee, Ga.
Baer	Davis, Tenn.	Haskell	Lesher
Bankhead	Dickinson, Mo.	Hastings	Lever
Barkley	Dickinson, Iowa	Haugen	Little
Bee	Dominick	Hawley	Lonergan
Begg	Doremus	Hayden	Longworth
Bell	Dowell	Hays	Luce
Benham	Drane	Heflin	Lufkin
Black	Dunbar	Hernandez	Luhring
Bland, Ind.	Dunn	Hersey	McAndrews
Bland, Mo.	Dupré	Hersman	McArthur
Bland, Va.	Dyer	Hickey	McClintic
Blanton	Eagle	Hoch	McCulloch
Boies	Edmonds	Holland	McDuffie
Booher	Elliott	Houghton	McGlennon
Bowers	Elston	Howard	McKeown
Box	Emerson	Huddleston	McKiniry
Brand	Esch	Hudspeth	McKinley
Briggs	Evans, Mont.	Hulings	McLane
Brinson	Evans, Nebr.	Hull, Tenn.	McLaughlin, Mich.
Britten	Evans, Nev.	Husted	McLaughlin, Nebr.
Brooks, Ill.	Fairfield	Igoe	MacCrate
Brooks, Pa.	Ferris	Jacoway	MacGregor
Browning	Fess	Jefferis	Madden
Burdick	Fields	Johnson, Ky.	Magee
Burroughs	Fitzgerald	Johnson, Miss.	Maher
Byrnes, S. C.	Flood	Johnson, Wash.	Major
Byrns, Tenn.	Focht	Johnston, N. Y.	Mansfield
Campbell, Kans.	Fordney	Jones, Pa.	Mapes
Candler	Foster	Jones, Tex.	Martin
Caraway	Frear	Juul	Mays
Carss	Freeman	Kearns	Mead
Carter	French	Kendall	Michener
Casey	Fuller, Ill.	Kennedy, Iowa	Miller
Chindblom	Gallagher	Kincheloe	Minahan, N. J.
Christopherson	Gandy	King	Monahan, Wis.
Clark, Mo.	Ganly	Kinkaid	Mondell
Classon	Garland	Kitchin	Moon
Cleary	Garner	Kleczka	Mooney

Moore, Ohio	Ramseyer	Sinnott	Walsh
Moore, Pa.	Randall, Calif.	Slemp	Ward
Moore, Va.	Randall, Wis.	Small	Wason
Morgan	Rayburn	Smith, Idaho	Watkins
Mott	Reavis	Smith, Mich.	Watson, Pa.
Murphy	Reber	Snyder	Watson, Va.
Nelson, Mo.	Reed, N. Y.	Stedman	Weaver
Nelson, Wis.	Reed, W. Va.	Steele	Webb
Newton, Minn.	Rhodes	Stevenson	Webster
Nicholls, S. C.	Ricketts	Strong, Kans.	Welling
Nichols, Mich.	Riddick	Strong, Pa.	Welty
O'Connell	Robinson, N. C.	Summers, Wash.	Whaley
Ogden	Robsion, Ky.	Sweet	Wheeler
Oliver	Rodenberg	Taylor, Ark.	White, Kans.
Olney	Rogers	Taylor, Tenn.	White, Me.
Osborne	Romjue	Thomas	Williams
Paige	Rose	Thompson, Ohio	Wilson, Ill.
Park	Rouse	Thompson, Okla.	Wilson, La.
Parker	Rowe	Timberlake	Wilson, Pa.
Parrish	Rubey	Tincher	Wingo
Peters	Rucker	Tinkham	Wood, Ind.
Platt	Sabath	Towner	Woods, Va.
Purnell	Sanders, Ind.	Treadway	Woodyard
Quin	Sanders, N. Y.	Upshaw	Wright
Radcliffe	Scott	Vaile	Yates
Rainey, H. T.	Sears	Vare	Young, N. Dak.
Rainey, J. W.	Sells	Vestal	Young, Tex.
Raker	Shreve	Vinson	Zihlman
Ramsey	Sinclair	Volstead	

NAYS—8.

Buchanan	Gard	Merritt	Sims
Curry, Calif.	Hardy, Tex.	Nolan	Sisson

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

	Dewalt	Stillness	Stiness

NOT VOTING—107.

Ayres	Eagan	Kettner	Sanders, La.
Barbour	Echols	Kiess	Sanford
Benson	Ellsworth	Kraus	Saunders, Va.
Blackmon	Fisher	Larsen	Schall
Browne	Fuller, Mass.	Lehlbach	Scully
Brumbaugh	Gallivan	Linthicum	Sherwood
Burke	Goldfogle	McFadden	Siegel
Butler	Goodall	McKenzie	Smith, Ill.
Caldwell	Goodwin, Ark.	McPherson	Smith, N. Y.
Campbell, Pa.	Gould	Mann	Smithwick
Cannon	Graham, Pa.	Mason	Snell
Cantrill	Greene, Vt.	Montague	Steagall
Carew	Griffin	Moores, Ind.	Steenerson
Clark, Fla.	Hamill	Morin	Stephens, Miss.
Coady	Hardy, Colo.	Mudd	Stephens, Ohio
Collier	Hicks	Neely	Sullivan
Copley	Hill	Newton, Mo.	Sumners, Tex.
Costello	Hull, Iowa	Oldfield	Taylor, Colo.
Crago	Humphreys	Overstreet	Temple
Dale	Hutchinson	Padgett	Tillman
Davey	Ireland	Pell	Tilson
Dempsey	James	Phelan	Venable
Denison	Johnson, S. Dak.	Porter	Voigt
Dent	Kahn	Pou	Walters
Donovan	Kelley, Mich.	Ragsdale	Winslow
Dooling	Kelly, Pa.	Riordan	Wise
Doughton	Kennedy, R. I.	Rowan	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. BARBOUR with Mr. AYRES.
Mr. BROWN with Mr. BENSON.
Mr. BURKE with Mr. CALDWELL.
Mr. BUTLER with Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennylvania.
Mr. CANNON with Mr. CANTRILL.
Mr. COPLEY with Mr. CAREW.
Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. CLARK of Florida.
Mr. CRAGO with Mr. COLLIER.
Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. DAVEY.
Mr. DENISON with Mr. DONOVAN.
Mr. ECHOLS with Mr. DOOLING.
Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. EAGAN.
Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts with Mr. FISHER.
Mr. GOODALL with Mr. GALLIVAN.
Mr. GOULD with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. GRIFFIN.
Mr. GREENE of Vermont with Mr. KETTNER.
Mr. HARDY of Colorado with Mr. LINTHICUM.
Mr. HICKS with Mr. MONTAGUE.
Mr. HILL with Mr. NEELY.
Mr. HULL of Iowa with Mr. OLDFIELD.
Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. OVERSTREET.
Mr. JAMES with Mr. PADGETT.
Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota with Mr. PELL.
Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. PHELAN.
Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. POU.
Mr. KIESS with Mr. RAGSDALE.
Mr. IRELAND with Mr. COADY.
Mr. WINSLOW with Mr. DOUGHTON.
Mr. WALTERS with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.
Mr. SANFORD with Mr. HARRISON.
Mr. KAHN with Mr. DENT.
Mr. LEHLBACH with Mr. SUMNERS of Texas.
Mr. MANN with Mr. BLACKMON.
Mr. MCFADDEN with Mr. DEWALT.
Mr. KRAUS with Mr. RIORDAN.
Mr. MCKENZIE with Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana.
Mr. MASON with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia.
Mr. MOORES of Indiana with Mr. ROWAN.
Mr. MUDD with Mr. SCULLY.
Mr. NEWTON of Missouri with Mr. SMITH of New York.
Mr. PORTER with Mr. SHERWOOD.
Mr. RHODES with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.
Mr. SIEGEL with Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado.
Mr. SNELL with Mr. TILLMAN.
Mr. STEVENSON with Mr. VENABLE.
Mr. TEMPLE with Mr. STEAGALL.
Mr. VOIGT with Mr. WISE.
Mr. TILSON with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, I have a general pair with Mr. MCFADDEN. I voted yea. I desire to withdraw that and answer "present."

The name of Mr. DEWALT was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to prefer a request for unanimous consent. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] have convinced me that this Railroad Administration resolution should have a hearing before their committee. Having been convinced by them on that point, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to withdraw the resolution from the consideration of the House and that the motion whereby the committee was discharged from further consideration be vacated, so that the resolution may be sent to that committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that all proceedings had up to this time on the resolution be vacated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EMPLOYEES IN THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to discharge the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service from further consideration of H. Res. 73, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 73.

Resolved, That the Civil Service Commission be, and it is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts:

(1) The names of all Government employees of said department who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of service given to such employer, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such outside service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, sister or sisters, brother or brothers, are in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month, respectively, received by each and all of said relatives.

(3) The amount of annual income, if any, over and above the salary received by the Government employees in said department.

To direct the attention of said department more fully to the particular information requested, reference is made to the form of questionnaire in H. J. Res. 5.

The SPEAKER. The question is on discharging the committee from further consideration of the resolution.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. RUCKER. I desire to discuss the resolution.

The SPEAKER. This is a motion to discharge the committee. No debate is in order under the rules. The question is on discharging the committee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend, on page 1, line 11, by inserting after the word "employees" the words "in the Civil Service Commission."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, after the word "employees," by inserting the words "in the Civil Service Commission."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I think I owe it to my good friend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON], and to the rest of my colleagues, to take enough time to read to you the following statement:

WASHINGTON, D. C.

I, Mrs. C. S. Benton, upon oath state: I am secretary to Congressman BLANTON, in whose employ I have been for two years. Until my marriage to Maj. C. S. Benton, on March 12, 1919, my name was Mrs. Ruby Louis Arceneaux. Prior to March 1, 1919, I have worked quite a great deal at night in various Government departments, working from three to five hours per night, making from $25 to $30 a week for such night work, though I made as much as $9 one night. While in the index card section of the War Risk Bureau, in the Elks' Hall on H Street NW., under Mr. Lawrence Gilnagh as chief, I received a check for $79.79 for two weeks, working those two weeks,

however, from 5 p. m. to 11.30 p. m. I also worked at 119 D Street, in the old Southern Building, in various sections of the War Risk Bureau. I know a number of Government employees who do such extra work at night in order to take advantage of the good compensation paid.

(Signed) Mrs. C. S. BENTON.

Sworn to and subscribed before me, the undersigned authority, on this the 26th day of March, A. D. 1919.

W. W. PICKERING,
Notary Public, District of Columbia.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I can not yield, because I do not want to waste any further time. I move the previous question on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RUCKER) there were—ayes 92, noes 41.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend, on page 2, by striking out all of section 3, and upon that I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, strike out all of lines 1 to 6, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman demands the previous question on the amendment.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to oppose the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, is there no way by which a Member of the House can be heard except the gentleman from Texas to oppose this amendment or any of them?

The SPEAKER. Any Member can be heard if the previous question is not ordered, but the previous question is not debatable. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for not to exceed five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. CRAMTON. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to inquire of the Speaker whether or not it is the policy to be pursued in this House that a man should try on half a dozen different occasions to oppose a resolution but can not get recognition?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BLANTON. Speaker CLARK decided that in the closing hours of the last Congress.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I submit that it is a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman makes a motion to amend his resolution. We demand recognition to oppose the resolution, but the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] to move the previous question and gives no other Member an opportunity to get recognition to oppose the resolution.

Mr. WALSH. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend. The Chair will state the rule. As Members are well aware, the rule is that a Member in charge of a bill or resolution is always entitled to recognition to move the previous question. If the House adopts the previous question, of course, no one else is allowed to debate it; and the Chair is following the universal practice to always recognize the gentleman in charge of a bill to move the previous question.

Mr. BLANTON. And, Mr. Speaker, I asked recognition for that purpose.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRISP. I would like to call the attention of the Speaker to this proposition; I am not familiar with the conditions here. The Speaker stated the proposition exactly, except where the previous question is ordered on a motion where there has been no debate there are 20 minutes' debate on each side.

The SPEAKER. But complaint has been made that the gentleman from Texas had debated the question.

Mr. CRISP. Of course, the Chair is absolutely correct, then——

Mr. BLANTON. And I was asking for recognition.

The SPEAKER. Exactly; and the Chair feels compelled to recognize the gentleman in charge of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. No one is entitled to speak. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CARTER. Debate can be had on this resolution, can it not, if the gentleman from Texas will not insist on the previous question?

The SPEAKER. It could have been, but it is too late now.

Mr. CARTER. I mean when the motion was made.

The SPEAKER. The House has ordered the previous question.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLACK. I think the Chair stated in error when he says we had adopted the previous question on this particular resolution, because we have not.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk so informs the Chair.

Mr. BLACK. I think the Members will agree we have not.

Mr. WALSH. It was adopted.

The SPEAKER. The House has ordered the previous question. The question is on the adoption of the resolution as amended.

The question was taken, and the resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUCKER. Does the Chair think it will do me any good for me to ask for a division?

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

On motion of Mr. BLANTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

EMPLOYEES IN THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department be discharged from further consideration of House resolution 74, and upon that I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves that the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department be discharged from further consideration of the resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 74.

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts:

(1) The names of all Government employees in the various branches of the War Department who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of service given to such employer, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such outside service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, sister or sisters, or brother or brothers are in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month respectively received by each and all of said relatives.

(3) The amount of annual income, if any, over and above their Government salary, received by the Government employees in said department.

Attention is directed to the form of questionnaire in House joint resolution 5 as one calculated to elicit the information sought.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. No debate is in order.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARRETT. On yesterday the House passed a resolution providing for a special committee, and in that resolution there was conferred upon that committee to be appointed all the jurisdiction which under the general rules of the House belongs to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department. Now, my inquiry is, Is this resolution, in view of the action taken by the House yesterday, now privileged, or could it be without being before that new committee, upon which these functions have been conferred by action of the House, for seven days?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recall the exact language, but the Chair's recollection is that the special committee was given the powers of the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department. The Chair's recollection of the language would be that it did not supplant the Committee on Expenditures but that it gave them the same jurisdiction, and if the gentleman wishes to look up the matter, can he refer to it——

Mr. GARRETT. I think I can find it here in the RECORD. The question, I will say to the Chair, I think is somewhat important to be considered at this time. The language is on page 640 of the RECORD. The resolution will be found there.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of the impression that does not mean to supersede the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department. It simply confers on that new committee such additional powers. The Chair would rule that the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department was still in existence.

Mr. GARRETT. The thought that was in my mind, and I am only submitting this because——

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. GARRETT. Because of its possible importance in other matters. I think it probable that the committee was superseded. Certainly its character was to some extent changed; if not its jurisdiction, certainly its personnel. The resolution which was passed, of course, does not say where the personnel of that committee is to come from. That is within the discretion of the Speaker. Of course, it seems to be generally understood that gentlemen who are now members of the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department will become members of this special committee, but that is a matter with the Chair wholly. Now, there is in fact created here a new special committee, and upon that committee there is conferred all of the powers, all of the authority, and all of the jurisdiction that has up until now been exercised by this standing committee of the House.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARRETT. I will.

Mr. TOWNER. Does not the gentleman think that the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, after having acquired jurisdiction, could not have it taken away from them by the subsequent appointment of a committee, even if it included the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department?

Mr. GARRETT. Well, no; I do not think so. I think if, by the action of the House, the character of a committee is changed and the jurisdiction of it is changed—I mean changed to another committee—if that, in fact, has been done, if this resolution be construed to mean that, the reasoning of the gentleman from Iowa would not apply.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I think the Chair is entirely correct in his view that the appointment of the select committee in no wise affected the status or the jurisdiction of the existing committee. Two committees exist; but whether that be true or not can not affect the matter now before the House. This resolution was properly referred to the regular standing committee, and the motion is to discharge that committee. Therefore it matters not what the effect of the later action of the House relative to the appointment of a new select committee may be. A motion to discharge the committee to which this resolution was referred, and properly referred, is in order.

Mr. GARRETT. Provided it was before the committee seven days, which this has been; and, I insist, provided further, that the jurisdiction has not been taken away from that standing committee by action of the House within the seven days.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman would not suggest there was anything in the resolution adopted by the House that took from the regular standing committee its jurisdiction. But whether that be true or not, this resolution was referred to that committee, and if it is now the desire of the House to have that committee discharged for any purpose, either for the purpose of passing the resolution or re-referring it, this motion is in order.

Mr. GARRETT. If the Chair will bear with me just a moment, here is where I think important questions may arise in the future. Will this special committee have all the jurisdiction that under the general rules of the House is conferred upon the Committee on Expenditures? For instance, upon matters other than the investigation which this committee is to make, upon whatever resolutions or bills will be referred to this committee, will they go to the seven Members who constitute the present standing committee of the House, and will the jurisdiction of matters other than this investigation be confined to those seven members, or will that whole committee of 15 have the jurisdiction which heretofore has been exercised by the standing committee?

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. . Will not this be the situation, that matters referred by the Speaker to the select committee will come under the jurisdiction of the select committee, but, on the other hand, a reference to the standing committee would bring the matter under the jurisdiction of the standing committee? I doubt nòt that the Speaker will have that in mind when matters are referred by him.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the question of order raised by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] can readily be settled. The resolution of yesterday requires the Speaker to appoint a committee which, among other things, shall have the powers of the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department. The Chair has not yet appointed such a committee, and therefore it seems to the Chair it is impossible to say that now, before the appointment of such a committee, the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department has been abolished. Therefore it seems clear that a motion to discharge the committee is in order. After the new committee is appointed the Chair will give consideration to the point raised by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I understand the motion to discharge the committee has already been adopted.

The SPEAKER. The motion to discharge the committee has not yet been put. The question is on discharging the committee.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, without further yielding the floor, I wish to say that I never have believed in gagging anybody, and I think I owe it to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] to yield to him to be heard in opposition to this resolution. Therefore I yield such time as he may want, otherwise reserving the floor. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. RUCKER. Ten minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] embarrassed me somewhat when he offered to yield me time. I told him frankly I did not want to accept time from him because I was opposed to his resolution. And he embarrasses me in the speech he just made, in which he disclaims a purpose to gag the membership of the House. The gentleman flatters himself—he can not gag the House except for a brief season, and he can only do that with the aid of Republican Members. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He makes the Republican side act very much like a jumping-jack, and the performance is very ridiculous in the eyes of the world.

What is the proposition? To discharge a committee. What committee? A committee appointed by the present Speaker of this House—a Republican committee—not divided exactly as badly as the one the Chair is going to appoint, not 2 to 1, but to all practical purposes it is just as bad.

Mr. FLOOD. It is 2 to 5.

Mr. RUCKER. That is worse than the other. The effort is to discharge a Republican committee of the House from the consideration of a resolution regularly referred to that committee by a Republican Speaker, and yet you Republicans, when a division is demanded, in order to secure time and opportunity to debate the pending resolution, every one of you stands up here at the behests of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] as if you were proud of your new leadership. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Every one of you votes to do what? To discharge your own committee, appointed by your own Speaker, and to discharge it without debate or consideration. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Oh, gentlemen, your conduct is flimsy and hypocritical. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is playing into your hands, and you think you will gain some political advantage. Nobody objects to the inquiry proposed, but we do object to this spectacular performance put on the stage by the gentleman from Texas, which can result in no good but which will require the useless expenditure of a large sum of money. You Republicans have demonstrated that you will vote to help any turbulent Democrat do a turbulent and foolish thing. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

What is it? Why, the State Department, the War Department, the Interior Department, the Post Office Department, and every other department of the Government, in order to satisfy the inquiries, the inquisitiveness and curiosity of the gentleman from Texas, must investigate, tell the world how many of those

antiquated people down there in the Treasury Department or in the Interior Department or in the War Department how many of those old superannuated ladies and gentlemen have nieces or nephews or cousins or uncles or aunts in these or some other department of the Government. How are you going to get it? Get it from the files? The Lord knows the Government has not room enough in its archives to hold all the files that have been piling up since this abominable practice of civil service—and I want it understood that I mean what I say—since this fraudulent device called civil service was fostered upon the people, and hence you will have to get the information by personal inquiry, if you get it at all. There are some 110,000 or 115,000 clerks in the various departments in Washington.

And the gentleman from Texas asks that a personal inquiry be presented to each and every clerk to ascertain whether he has a brother or a sister or an aunt or a cousin or a stepfather or a stepsister or a stepmother or a stepbrother or some one else of a remote degree of relationship to him somewhere in the Government service; after you get that information what are you going to do about it? The worst condition that can possibly be revealed will not provoke a worse criticism or one more embarrassing and humiliating than the admissions which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has made in this debate. [Applause.]

Oh, you gentlemen talk about economy. You are the most valiant set of economists the world has ever known. You are rabid in your enthusiastic desire for economy. We had an exhibition of Republican economy yesterday and have had for several days while the Agricultural appropriation bill—one of the greatest bills ever considered by this House—was under consideration, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and other good Republicans, exemplars of governmental economy, stood up here and howled and whooped and stormed about the reckless extravagance that had been practiced in the framing of the Agricultural appropriation bill, and denounced the bill. [Laughter.]

That distinguished and flowery orator and statesman from the State of Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], who seldom ever addresses the House, said the bill was the offspring of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER]. Well, if the gentleman from South Carolina is the sire of that bill and the Republican membership is its dam, I am somewhat suspicious of it, although it looks good to me. [Laughter.] But what about the Agricultural appropriation bill? You Republicans confess that you reported the bill of the gentleman from South Carolina bodily, with only two or three amendments, and what are the amendments? Some great change in policy? No. Following the lead of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], as you ought to do if you want to serve your country at all, following the course he has established for you to pursue during the brief term of Republican control in the House, you adopted his bill literally, and the only change you reformers and economists made in its was to increase the amounts appropriated in two or three paragraphs, and yet you have the nerve to talk about economy. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes, with pleasure.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman complain about that?

Mr. RUCKER. No.

Mr. MADDEN. If he does, we will fix it on the next bill so that he can not complain.

Mr. RUCKER. I am making no complaint—I am not in the least surprised, but I am discussing insincerity, and I do not care whether it applies to Illinois or to Texas; if you were sincere, how comes it that every one of you Republicans voted for the Agricultural appropriation bill which so many of you denounced in debate? Your delay of it cost the Government of the United States nearly the amount the bill carries. [Laughter.] I am speaking extravagantly on that perhaps, but a man is liable to become extravagant when he looks into the faces of these distinguished men and great economists on the Republican side of the House and reflects that we must endure them for two long years. [Laughter.] I well remember on my first entry into this House at this session what awe and wonder came over me when I looked over that side of the House and saw all those strange people and missed so many familiar faces of good men on this side. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, personally I like those gentlemen over there very well as individuals, but I object to the number of them. [Laughter.] I would have more confidence in the wisdom of our legislation and be happier if we could subtract about 50 from the Republican side of the House. [Laughter.] The trouble is you have too much power to do wrong, and you exercise it too frequently. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman has referred to a bill. What bill had he reference to?

Mr. RUCKER. The Lever bill, the Agricultural appropriation bill, that you took over from him.

Mr. HAUGEN. Let me say to the gentleman, for his information, that the bill as it passed the House carried nearly $5,000,000 less than the amount carried by it when reported by the Democratic Senate.

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, no good man will hold the House responsible for the action of the Senate. Do not tell me about what the Senate did! How much will the Senate add to the Lever bill, which you accepted and approved and asked the House to adopt last week? [Laughter.]

Gentlemen, I hope the time will come when men everywhere and of every political party will have the courage of their convictions and learn that even yet consistency is a jewel. You Republicans vote to discharge all these committees, and they are of your own creation. Why? What does it mean? Another $100,000 in all probability will be expended in order to ascertain how many cousins and brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law and husbands and wives and uncles and aunts are employed in the Treasury Department, and when you get it what will you do with it? What earthly value will the information be to Congress or to the country? The law permits at least two of a family to hold civil-service positions.

The gentleman from Texas says the joint legislative committee that was recently appointed, Mr. Speaker, by your predecessor, under a law passed by Congress, will not make a report, or if it makes a report there will be nothing in it. Oh, the gentleman's wisdom is perhaps extensive, he is the embodiment of much that is good and all that is bad in Texas [laughter], and he seriously fears the committee may not report everything demanded by his peculiar tastes and notions, his conception of ethics in public affairs, and his ideas of administrating governmental functions.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RUCKER. I have not the time. The gentleman from Texas will demand the previous question within the hour.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Just a question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, how much time would the gentleman like?

Mr. RUCKER. Ten minutes more.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 10 minutes more.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Does the gentleman think that the gentleman from Texas does not have the conviction of his own opinions?

Mr. RUCKER. "Does he not have the conviction of his own opinions?" [Laughter.] The gentleman propounds a conundrum, and I am not good at solving conundrums, therefore I can not answer it. I would respectfully refer the gentleman from Nebraska to my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who perhaps can answer him. I confess I can not answer the inquiry submitted, and as my time is short I hope I will not be interrupted with requests to solve any more Chinese puzzles. [Laughter.]

The gentleman says that the joint committee appointed by the Speaker, composed of three distinguished ex-Members of the House, will not perform its duty. I do not know exactly what accusation the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] made against that commission, because I was not in the room, but I understand he paid his respects to that commission this morning, and that the burden of his song was that that great joint committee—composed of men who certainly are his equals in intellectual attainments, in fidelity to duty, and in integrity of character—had failed or refused to accept and adopt his peculiar method of preparing a questionnaire. Oh, he tells the House, and told it yesterday and the day before, that he had appealed to that commission to insert in the questionnaire a certain question designed to secure information as to what other employments, if any, Government clerks are engaged in, and the commission refused to do it. The gentleman charged that, as I am informed.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman admits my statement is true, and I charge that a half truth is often worse than a falsehood,

because it generally suppresses and conceals facts which ought to be stated in order that the exact truth may be known.

The gentleman knows that the letters he wrote to members of that commission were written three days after every questionnaire had been printed, and that his letter reached the commission on the same day that those printed questionnaires were actually placed in the hands of more than 100,000 clerks in the employ of the Government.

Mr. BLANTON. No; I do not know anything of the kind.

Mr. RUCKER. Well, then, I will tell you something else that you do not know. "There are more things in Heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamt of in your philosophy." [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Sure.

Mr. RUCKER. Let me say to you that the poet correctly described the conduct of some people—I am not going to point out any particular man on that side or this—when he wrote:

> With smooth dissimulation, skilled to grace
> A devil's purpose with an angel's face.

And then another great author dealing with the same sort of a man says:

> And thus I clothe my naked villany
> With old odd ends stolen out of holy writ,
> And seem a saint when most I play the devil.

If that fits anybody here let him wear it. It seems to me so unjustifiable and absurd for one claiming to be a Democrat to raise all this fury and commotion here for the amusement and gratification of the majority party. No one of them would aid or encourage the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] if he did not hope to derive some political advantage from this unseemly and unwise performance.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. For just one question.

Mr. RUCKER. Yes; I gladly yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Did the gentleman expect anybody on that side would weed out of this Government any graft or corruption? It has to come from a Democrat if it is to be done at all.

Mr. RUCKER. I think you are right in that, but they are helping you and I am afraid you do not know what the devil you are doing. Whatever you are trying to do they are all helping you, every mother's son of them. [Laughter.] And as every one of the Republican Members is opposed, according to your own testimony, to any exposure of graft, I think they must be after something else, and you do not seem to know it. You are making political capital for them, and they have sense enough to know it, though you do not seem to know it. I repeat that the vicious tirades of the gentleman from Texas against that commission are unbecoming and unwarranted. Those gentlemen deserve no criticism at the hands of Members of the House. They are performing a great duty, and if this House permits them to finish the work which they are doing they will make a report that will at least be gratifying to Congress and to a hundred million people in this Nation, whether the gentleman from Texas is satisfied or not. Let me tell you it is a big task. There are over 110,000 employees in the Government service under the jurisdiction of that committee. The work can not be done in a minute; but I have reason to believe that conditions have been discovered, and will ultimately be revealed, which will surprise this House and excite deep interest throughout the country. And let me tell you in confidence you gentlemen on the Republican side are responsible for that condition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we had some discussion here a day or so ago about—what do you call that roller thing?

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Steam roller.

Mr. RUCKER. Of course, you gentlemen on the Republican side know what it is because you are familiar with it. If ever I want to get a correct definition or name of any of these modern engines in politics which make men lose their manhood and their individuality, I always go over to the Republican side and there get accurate information, because you know what these things are. But we have heard something about that, and now the steam roller is to do something here that the gentleman from Texas advocates. If the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], recognized as a leader and as one in authority, or if the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the chosen leader of our side of this House, offers a proposition here, you gentlemen become agitated and call for quorums and for divisions and roll calls and raise thunder about it; but when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] asks you to engage in a piece of folly which he hopes will embarrass somebody in administration circles and enable him to return to Congress then you Republicans all vote for it.

Now, I refer again to the steam-roller business which in a few moments will be resorted to. A dozen Democrats have sought to get the floor and, under the rules of the House as construed—and I assume correctly construed by the Speaker—nobody can be heard unless by the grace of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] we are permitted to take the floor. See how ungracious a position it puts me in. I have permission to speak here this evening, not by right of my membership in this House, not because the sovereign people of the greatest Democratic district in America sent me here [laughter]—do not laugh at that for it is true—but because the gentleman allows me to speak. Yes; I am indebted to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] and must doff my hat to him for the poor privilege of standing here and indulging in these desultory remarks.

Mr. HARDY. They will vote for the previous question, and then you do not have any rights.

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, yes; they will vote for the previous question and deny Members an opportunity to speak. They do not want to hear the pending resolution discussed.

Mr. Speaker, I discover my time is up. I thank the gentleman from Texas for the privilege of occupying the floor a few moments.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that on page 1, in the first line of the second section, after the word "employees," the words "in the War Department" be inserted; and also the following amendment, that, on page 2, section 3 be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not offer two amendments at the same time.

Mr. BLANTON. I thought maybe there would be no objection to it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 1, line 5, after the word "employees" insert "in the War Department."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out section 3, on page 2.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 2, strike out section 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. GARNER. And on that, Mr. Speaker, I call for the yeas and nays. I want to know who it is that wants to spend this hundred thousand dollars or more on these resolutions.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 181, nays 109, answered "present" 1 not voting 138, as follows:

YEAS—181.

Ackerman	Emerson	Juul	Quin
Alexander	Evans, Mont.	Kendall	Radcliffe
Almon	Evans, Nebr.	Kennedy, Iowa	Raker
Anderson	Evans, Nev.	Kettner	Ramsey
Andrews, Md.	Fairfield	Kincheloe	Ramseyer
Andrews, Nebr.	Ferris	Kinkaid	Randall, Calif.
Ashbrook	Fess	Kleczka	Randall, Wis.
Ayres	Focht	Knutson	Reavis
Babka	Fordney	Kreider	Reber
Bacharach	Foster	Langley	Reed, N. Y.
Baer	Frear	Layton	Reed, W. Va.
Begg	French	Lea, Calif.	Rhodes
Benham	Fuller, Ill.	Little	Ricketts
Bland, Ind.	Garland	Longworth	Robsion, Ky.
Blanton	Glynn	Luce	Rogers
Boies	Goodall	Lufkin	Rose
Bowers	Goodykoontz	Luhring	Rouse
Brooks, Ill.	Graham, Ill.	McClintic	Rowe
Brooks, Pa.	Green, Iowa	McKinley	Rubey
Browning	Greene, Mass.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sanders, N. Y.
Burdick	Griest	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Scott
Burroughs	Hadley	MacCrate	Sells
Campbell, Kans.	Hamilton	Madden	Shreve
Chindblom	Hardy, Colo.	Magee	Sinclair
Christopherson	Haskell	Mapes	Sinnott
Classon	Haugen	Michener	Smith, Idaho
Cole	Hawley	Miller	Smith, Mich.
Cooper	Hays	Monahan, Wis.	Snyder
Copley	Heflin	Mondell	Stiness
Cramton	Hernandez	Moore, Ohio	Strong, Kans.
Crowther	Hersey	Moore, Pa.	Summers, Wash.
Currie, Mich.	Hickey	Morgan	Taylor, Tenn.
Dallinger	Hoch	Murphy	Thompson, Ohio
Darrow	Houghton	Nelson, Wis.	Tillman
Davis, Minn.	Howard	Newton, Minn.	Timberlake
Dickinson, Iowa	Huddleston	Nicholls, S. C.	Tincher
Dowell	Hulings	Nichols, Mich.	Tinkham
Dunbar	Jacoway	Ogden	Towner
Dunn	Jefferis	Osborne	Vaile
Echols	Johnson, Ky.	Paige	Vare
Edmonds	Johnson, S. Dak.	Peters	Vestal
Elliott	Johnson, Wash.	Purnell	Volstead

Walsh	Wheeler	Wilson, Ill.	Zihlman
Ward	White, Kans.	Wood, Ind.	
Wason	White, Me.	Woodyard	
Webster	Williams	Young, N. Dak.	

NAYS—109.

Aswell	Drane	McDuffie	Rucker
Bankhead	Dupré	McGlennon	Sanders, La.
Barkley	Dyer	McKeown	Sisson
Bee	Eagle	McKinley	Stedman
Bell	Fitzgerald	McLane	Steele
Black	Flood	Maher	Stevenson
Bland, Mo.	Gallagher	Major	Taylor, Ark.
Bland, Va.	Ganly	Mansfield	Taylor, Colo.
Booher	Gard	Martin	Thomas
Box	Garner	Mays	Thompson, Okla.
Brand	Garrett	Mead	Upshaw
Briggs	Hardy, Tex.	Minahan, N. J.	Venable
Buchanan	Hastings	Moon	Vinson
Byrnes, S. C.	Hayden	Mooney	Watkins
Byrns, Tenn.	Holland	Moore, Va.	Watson, Va.
Candler	Hudspeth	Nelson, Mo.	Weaver
Caraway	Hull, Tenn.	O'Connell	Webb
Carss	Igoe	Oldfield	Welling
Carter	Johnson, Miss.	Oliver	Welty
Casey	Johnston, N. Y.	Overstreet	Wilson, La.
Clark, Fla.	Jones, Tex.	Park	Wilson, Pa.
Clark, Mo.	Lanham	Parrish	Wingo
Cleary	Lankford	Platt	Woods, Va.
Crisp	Lee, Ga.	Rainey, H. T.	Wright
Curry, Calif.	Lesher	Rainey, J. W.	Young, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Lever	Rayburn	
Dickinson, Mo.	Lonergan	Robinson, N. C.	
Dominick	McAndrews	Romjue	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Dewalt

NOT VOTING—138.

Anthony	Fisher	Lampert	Sanders, Ind.
Barbour	Freeman	Larsen	Sanford
Benson	Fuller, Mass.	Lazaro	Saunders, Va.
Blackmon	Gallivan	Lehlbach	Schall
Brinson	Gandy	Linthicum	Scully
Britten	Godwin, N. C.	McArthur	Sears
Browne	Goldfogle	McCulloch	Sherwood
Brumbaugh	Good	McFadden	Siegel
Burke	Goodwin, Ark.	McKenzie	Sims
Butler	Gould	McPherson	Slemp
Caldwell	Graham, Pa.	MacGregor	Small
Campbell, Pa.	Greene, Vt.	Mann	Smith, Ill.
Cannon	Griffin	Mason	Smith, N. Y.
Cantrill	Hamill	Merritt	Smithwick
Carew	Harrison	Montague	Snell
Coady	Hersman	Moores, Ind.	Steagall
Collier	Hicks	Morin	Steenerson
Connally	Hill	Mott	Stephens, Miss.
Costello	Hull, Iowa	Mudd	Stephens, Ohio
Crago	Humphreys	Neely	Strong, Pa.
Cullen	Husted	Newton, Mo.	Sullivan
Dale	Hutchinson	Nolan	Sumners, Tex.
Davey	Ireland	Olney	Sweet
Dempsey	James	Padgett	Temple
Denison	Jones, Pa.	Parker	Tilson
Dent	Kahn	Pell	Treadway
Donovan	Kearns	Phelan	Voigt
Dooling	Kelley, Mich.	Porter	Walters
Doremus	Kelly, Pa.	Pou	Watson, Pa.
Doughton	Kennedy, R. I.	Ragsdale	Whaley
Eagan	Kiess	Riddick	Winslow
Ellsworth	King	Riordan	Wise
Elston	Kitchin	Rodenberg	Yates
Esch	Kraus	Rowan	
Fields	LaGuardia	Sabath	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. BRINSON.

Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. CONNALLY.

Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. DOREMUS.

Mr. FRENCH with Mr. CULLEN.

Mr. GOOD with Mr. GALLIVAN.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont with Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. HUSTED with Mr. LINTHICUM.

Mr. KEARNS with Mr. HERSMAN.

Mr. MCKENZIE with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. KING with Mr. LAZARO.

Mr. MCARTHUR with Mr. NEELY.

Mr. MCCULLOCH with Mr. OLNEY.

Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. POU.

Mr. MOTT with Mr. SABATH.

Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. SIMS.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana with Mr. SMALL.

Mr. SLEMP with Mr. SEARS.

Mr. STRONG with Mr. SMITHWICK.

Mr. TREADWAY with Mr. WHALEY.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania with Mr. RIORDAN.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the House and listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. KING. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, instead of being present and listening, I was at my office working.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not qualify.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I can not qualify, but I want to know if I can answer "present."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, I have a general pair with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MCFADDEN. I voted "no," and I wish to withraw that vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. DEWALT was called, and he answered "Present," as above recorded.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. BLANTON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

EMPLOYEES IN THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department be discharged from further consideration of House resolution 75, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 75.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives, at the earliest date practicable, the following facts:

(1) The names of all Government employees in the various branches of the Treasury Department who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of service given to such employer, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such outside service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, sister or sisters, or brother or brothers are in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month, respectively, received by each and all of said relatives.

(3) The amount of annual income, if any, over and above their Government salary, received by the Government employees in said department.

Attention is directed to the form of questionnaire in H. J. Res. 5 as one calculated to elicit the information sought.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas to discharge the committee from further consideration of the resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend on page 1, line 11, by inserting after the word "employees" the words "in the Treasury Department," and on page 2 by striking out section 3.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLANTON: Page 1, line 11, after the word "employees" insert "in the Treasury Department," and, on page 2, strike out section 3.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I think this amendment is a good one and needs no further argument. Therefore I move the previous question on the amendment.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLACK. Is it not in order to divide this amendment and offer a substitute for it?

The SPEAKER. It is in order to separate the amendment. It is in order to offer a substitute unless the previous question is ordered.

Mr. BLANTON. I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it would be in order to offer a substitute unless the previous question is ordered.

Mr. BLACK. I have a substitute that I want to offer.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has moved the previous question.

The SPEAKER. But parliamentary inquiries are being made.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it the gentleman has offered one amendment to line 11 and on that has moved the previous question.

The SPEAKER. As the Chair understands it the gentleman offered one amendment, which embraced two sections, and on that amendment the previous question is demanded.

Mr. WINGO. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. What is the point of order?

Mr. WINGO. It goes to two different sections in one amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows of no rule that forbids that.

Mr. WINGO. Considering one section at a time or considering the whole thing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will excuse the Chair, but perhaps he did not understand.

Mr. WINGO. I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. Oh, certainly; any gentleman can ask for a division of the amendment.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to propound this parliamentary inquiry: Do I not have the right to offer a substitute to the first part of his amendment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the right unless the previous question is ordered.

Mr. BLACK. I offer that substitute.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt the Chair?

The SPEAKER. Certainly.

Mr. GARNER. Does the Chair hold that if the previous question is ordered on the resolution and amendments a substitute for the amendment can not be offered?

The SPEAKER. Yes; the Chair would hold that. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division on the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks for a division on the previous question.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 79, noes 71.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. RUCKER. For a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Louisiana make the point of order that there is no quorum present?

Mr. ASWELL. I withdraw it for a moment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RUCKER. I respectfully ask if it will be in order to move to remove the gentleman from Wyoming and put the gentleman from Texas in as a majority leader.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think that is a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, the gentleman would make a good one.

Mr. RUCKER. I think there is where he ought to be; he ought to be on that side.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution as amended.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to offer a motion to recommit.

Mr. BLANTON. Recommit where?

Mr. BLACK. To the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department. I offer the following motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will first state that the question was taken and the previous question was ordered.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I make the point of order that the committee being discharged from the consideration of the resolution the motion is not in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think the point of order holds.

Mr. BLACK. I make the motion to recommit, and the motion is to recommit the bill to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, with instructions to strike out section 2 of the bill, and report forthwith.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers the motion to recommit, which the Clerk will report. The Chair neglected to ask the gentleman if he is opposed to the resolution?

Mr. BLACK. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLACK moves to recommit the resolution to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, with instructions to strike out section 2 of the resolution, and report forthwith.

Mr. BLACK. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to discuss the question.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, no; the previous question has been ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not the floor; the previous question has been ordered.

Mr. BLACK. Not on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GARNER. No; the previous question has not been ordered on this motion to recommit; it is on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct, but the Chair's recollection is that the previous question is not necessary on a motion to recommit except to prevent amendment and that debate is not permissible.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I can cite the Chair to an instance——

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be glad to have the gentleman do so.

Mr. GARRETT. In which a motion to recommit was made and there was debate, at least I think I can.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is perfectly willing——

Mr. GARRETT. No; the matter my friend here has in mind is not that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the previous question prevents debate. The object of the previous question on a motion to recommit is to prevent amendments. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. RUCKER. Is it in order to ask unanimous consent to give the gentleman from Texas five minutes to discuss it? I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. I object to that; ordinarily I would not object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the Chair was in doubt.

The question was again taken; and there were—ayes 70, noes 103.

Mr. BLACK. On that I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Clearly there is no quorum present. The Sergeant at Arms will summon absent Members, the Doorkeeper will close the doors, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. MAPES. Is it too late to make the point of order that a motion to recommit on a simple resolution is not in order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is too late, the vote having been taken.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 116, nays 162, answered "present" 2, not voting 149, as follows:

YEAS—116.

Alexander	Crisp	Lankford	Rainey, J. W.
Almon	Davis, Tenn.	Lea, Calif.	Rayburn
Ashbrook	Dominick	Lesher	Romjue
Aswell	Drane	McAndrews	Rouse
Ayres	Dupré	McClintic	Rucker
Babka	Evans, Mont.	McDuffie	Sanders, La.
Bankhead	Fitzgerald	McGlennon	Sisson
Bee	Flood	McKeown	Smithwick
Bell	Gallagher	McKinley	Stedman
Black	Ganly	McLane	Steele
Bland, Mo.	Gard	Maher	Stevenson
Bland, Va.	Garner	Major	Taylor, Ark.
Booher	Garrett	Mansfield	Taylor, Colo.
Box	Hardy, Tex.	Martin	Thomas
Brand	Hastings	Mead	Thompson, Okla.
Briggs	Hayden	Minahan, N. J.	Tillman
Buchanan	Holland	Moon	Upshaw
Byrnes, S. C.	Howard	Mooney	Vinson
Byrns, Tenn.	Hudspeth	Moore, Va.	Watkins
Candler	Hull, Tenn.	Nelson, Mo.	Watson, Va.
Caraway	Igoe	Nicholls, S. C.	Weaver
Carss	Jacoway	Nolan	Welling
Carter	Johnson, Miss.	O'Connell	Welty
Casey	Johnston, N. Y.	Oldfield	Wilson, La.
Clark, Fla.	Jones, Tex.	Oliver	Wilson, Pa.
Clark, Mo.	Kincheloe	Park	Wingo
Cleary	King	Parrish	Woods, Va.
Collier	Kitchin	Quin	Wright
Connally	Lanham	Ragsdale	Young, Tex.

NAYS—162.

Ackerman	Currie, Mich.	French	Hulings
Anderson	Curry, Calif.	Fuller, Ill.	Husted
Andrews, Md.	Dallinger	Garland	Jefferis
Andrews, Nebr.	Darrow	Glynn	Johnson, Ky.
Bacharach	Davis, Minn.	Goodall	Johnson, S. Dak.
Baer	Dickinson, Iowa	Goodykoontz	Johnson, Wash.
Begg	Dowell	Gould	Jones, Pa.
Benham	Dunbar	Graham, Ill.	Juul
Bland, Ind.	Dunn	Green, Iowa	Kendall
Blanton	Dyer	Greene, Mass.	Kennedy, Iowa
Boies	Echols	Griest	Kinkaid
Bowers	Edmonds	Hadley	Kleczka
Brooks, Ill.	Elliott	Hardy, Colo.	Knutson
Brooks, Pa.	Elston	Haskell	Kreider
Burroughs	Emerson	Hawley	Lampert
Campbell, Kans.	Evans, Nebr.	Hays	Layton
Chindblom	Evans, Nev.	Hernandez	Longworth
Christopherson	Fairfield	Hersey	Luce
Cole	Focht	Hickey	Lufkin
Copley	Fordney	Hoch	Luhring
Cramton	Foster	Houghton	McArthur
Crowther	Freeman	Huddleston	McCulloch

McKinley	Ogden	Rogers	Tinkham
McLaughlin, Mich.	Osborne	Rose	Towner
McLaughlin, Nebr.	Paige	Rowe	Vare
MacCrate	Peters	Sanders, N. Y.	Vestal
MacGregor	Platt	Scott	Walsh
Madden	Purnell	Sells	Wason
Magee	Radcliffe	Shreve	Webster
Mapes	Raker	Sinclair	Wheeler
Michener	Ramsey	Slemp	White, Kans.
Miller	Ramseyer	Smith, Mich.	White, Me.
Monahan, Wis.	Randall, Wis.	Snyder	Williams
Mondell	Reavis	Stephens, Ohio	Wilson, Ill.
Moore, Ohio	Reber	Strong, Kans.	Wood, Ind.
Moore, Pa.	Reed, N. Y.	Strong, Pa.	Woodyard
Morgan	Reed, W. Va.	Summers, Wash.	Yates
Murphy	Rhodes	Taylor, Tenn.	Young, N. Dak.
Nelson, Wis.	Ricketts	Thompson, Ohio	Zihlman
Newton, Minn.	Riddick	Timberlake	
Nichols, Mich.	Robsion, Ky.	Tincher	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Dewalt Lonergan

NOT VOTING—149.

Anthony	Ferris	Larsen	Sanford
Barbour	Fess	Lazaro	Saunders, Va.
Barkley	Fields	Lee, Ga.	Schall
Benson	Fisher	Lehlbach	Scully
Blackmon	Frear	Lever	Sears
Brinson	Fuller, Mass.	Linthicum	Sherwood
Britten	Gallivan	Little	Siegel
Browne	Gandy	McFadden	Sims
Browning	Godwin, N. C.	McKenzie	Sinnott
Brumbaugh	Goldfogle	McPherson	Small
Burdick	Good	Mann	Smith, Idaho
Burke	Goodwin, Ark.	Mason	Smith, Ill.
Butler	Graham, Pa.	Mays	Smith, N. Y.
Caldwell	Greene, Vt.	Merritt	Snell
Campbell, Pa.	Griffin	Montague	Steagall
Cannon	Hamill	Moores, Ind.	Steenerson
Cantrill	Hamilton	Morin	Stephens, Miss.
Carew	Harrison	Mott	Stiness
Classon	Haugen	Mudd	Sullivan
Coady	Heflin	Neely	Sumners, Tex.
Cooper	Hersman	Newton, Mo.	Sweet
Costello	Hicks	Olney	Temple
Crago	Hill	Overstreet	Tilson
Cullen	Hull, Iowa	Padgett	Treadway
Dale	Humphreys	Parker	Vaile
Davey	Hutchinson	Pell	Venable
Dempsey	Ireland	Phelan	Voigt
Denison	James	Porter	Volstead
Dent	Kahn	Pou	Walters
Dickinson, Mo.	Kearns	Rainey, H. T.	Ward
Donovan	Kelley, Mich.	Randall, Calif.	Watson, Pa.
Dooling	Kelly, Pa.	Riordan	Webb
Doremus	Kennedy, R. I.	Robinson, N. C.	Whaley
Doughton	Kettner	Rodenberg	Winslow
Eagan	Kiess	Rowan	Wise
Eagle	Kraus	Rubey	
Ellsworth	LaGuardia	Sabath	
Esch	Langley	Sanders, Ind.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected:

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. BROWNING with Mr. EAGLE.

Mr. COOPER with Mr. GANDY.

Mr. FESS with Mr. HEFLIN.

Mr. FREAR with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.

Mr. MERRITT with Mr. LAZARO.

Mr. SCHALL with Mr. MAYS.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho with Mr. RANDALL of California.

Mr. STINESS with Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY.

Mr. SWEET with Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina.

Mr. VOLSTEAD with Mr. WEBB.

Mr. WARD with Mr. RUBEY.

Mr. KRAUS with Mr. SEARS.

Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. LEVER.

For balance of day:

Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. LEE of Georgia.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea," but I have a general pair with Mr. MCFADDEN, and I now desire to withdraw the vote of "yea" and answer "present."

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the passage of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The previous question has already been ordered. The question now is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of House resolution 76, and upon that I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 76.

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce be, and he is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts:

(1) The names of all Government employees in the various branches of the Commerce Department who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of service given to such employer, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such outside service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, sister or sisters, or brother or brothers are in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month, respectively, received by each and all of said relatives.

(3) The amount of annual income, if any, over and above their Government salary received by the Government employees in said department.

Attention is directed to the form of questionnaire in H. J. Res. 5 as one calculated to elicit the information sought.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend. The committee has not been discharged. The question is on the motion to discharge the committee.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what became of the amendments to the last resolution. They were never voted on. The resolution has not been passed with the amendments? Are they embodied in the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks they were voted on and passed.

Mr. WINGO. I asked for a division on that, and the gentleman moved the previous question. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] came in with a motion to recommit, and I have sat patiently waiting for a vote on that, because I wanted a separate vote on each of the two amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman is mistaken. The motion was agreed to before the motion to recommit was put.

Mr. BLANTON. That was the case, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is aware that a separation was not made. The gentleman asked the Chair if they could be separated, and the Chair said they could, but no request was made at the proper time.

Mr. WINGO. I think the Chair will find that the reporter's notes will show the question was never put on the amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may be right.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment:

Page 1, line 11, after the word "employees" insert "Department of Commerce," and on page 2, strike out all of section 3.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLANTON: Page 1, line 11, after the word "employees" insert "Department of Commerce," and on page 2 strike out all of section 3.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I think these are good amendments. I do not know that any good would be derived from argument, and I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the amendments.

The question was taken; and the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution as amended.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of no quorum, and the Chair will count. [The Speaker proceeded to count.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, to save time, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not do that while the Chair is counting to ascertain whether or not there is a quorum present. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety-eight gentlemen are present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 185, nays 89, answered "present" 1, not voting 154, as follows:

YEAS—185.

Ackerman	Andrews, Nebr.	Baer	Boies
Alexander	Anthony	Begg	Bowers
Almon	Ashbrook	Benham	Brooks, Ill.
Anderson	Babka	Bland, Ind.	Brooks, Pa.
Andrews, Md.	Bacharach	Blanton	Burdick

Burroughs	Hadley	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Rose
Byrnes, S. C.	Hardy, Colo.	MacCrate	Rouse
Campbell, Kans.	Haskell	MacGregor	Rowe
Casey	Hawley	Madden	Scott
Chindblom	Hays	Magee	Sells
Christopherson	Hernandez	Mapes	Shreve
Clark, Mo.	Hoch	Michener	Sinclair
Cole	Houghton	Miller	Sinnott
Copley	Howard	Minahan, N. J.	Smith, Idaho
Cramton	Huddleston	Monahan, Wis.	Smith, Mich.
Crowther	Hulings	Mondell	Stephens, Ohio
Currie, Mich.	Husted	Moore, Ohio	Strong, Kans.
Dallinger	Jacoway	Moore, Pa.	Strong, Pa.
Darrow	Jefferis	Morgan	Summers, Wash.
Davey	Johnson, Ky.	Murphy	Sweet
Davis, Minn.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson, Wis.	Taylor, Colo.
Dickinson, Iowa	Johnson, Wash.	Newton, Minn.	Taylor, Tenn.
Dowell	Jones, Pa.	Nicholls, S. C.	Thompson, Ohio
Dunbar	Juul	Nichols, Mich.	Tillman
Dunn	Kendall	Nolan	Timberlake
Dyer	Kennedy, Iowa	Ogden	Tincher
Edmonds	Kincheloe	Osborne	Tinkham
Elliott	Kinkaid	Paige	Towner
Elston	Kitchin	Peters	Upshaw
Emerson	Kleczka	Purnell	Vaile
Evans, Nebr.	Knutson	Quin	Vare
Evans, Nev.	Kreider	Radcliffe	Vestal
Fairfield	Lampert	Ragsdale	Volstead
Fess	Layton	Raker	Walsh
Fordney	Lea, Calif.	Ramsey	Wason
Foster	Lonergan	Ramseyer	Webster
Freeman	Longworth	Randall, Wis.	Wheeler
French	Luce	Reavis	White, Kans.
Fuller, Ill.	Lufkin	Reber	White, Me.
Garland	Luhring	Reed, N. Y.	Williams
Glynn	McAndrews	Reed, W. Va.	Wood, Ind.
Goodykoontz	McArthur	Rhodes	Yates
Gould	McClintic	Ricketts	Young, N. Dak.
Graham, Ill.	McCulloch	Riddick	Zihlman
Green, Iowa	McDuffie	Robsion, Ky.	
Greene, Mass.	McKinley	Rogers	
Griest	McLaughlin, Mich.	Romjue	

NAYS—89.

Aswell	Dupré	Maher	Smithwick
Bankhead	Flood	Major	Stedman
Barkley	Gallagher	Mansfield	Steele
Bee	Ganly	Martin	Stephens, Miss.
Bell	Gard	Mays	Stevenson
Black	Garner	Mead	Taylor, Ark.
Bland, Mo.	Garrett	Montague	Thompson, Okla.
Bland, Va.	Hardy, Tex.	Moon	Venable
Booher	Hastings	Mooney	Vinson
Box	Hayden	Moore, Va.	Watkins
Brand	Holland	Nelson, Mo.	Watson, Va.
Briggs	Hudspeth	O'Connell	Weaver
Buchanan	Hull, Tenn.	Oliver	Welling
Byrns, Tenn.	Igoe	Park	Welty
Candler	Johnston, N. Y.	Parrish	Wilson, La.
Caraway	Jones, Tex.	Rainey, J. W.	Wilson, Pa.
Carss	Lanham	Rayburn	Wingo
Carter	Lankford	Robinson, N. C.	Woods, Va.
Collier	Lesher	Rucker	Wright
Connally	McGlennon	Sabath	Young, Tex.
Crisp	McKeown	Sanders, La.	
Davis, Tenn.	McKiniry	Sisson	
Dominick	McLane	Small	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Dewalt

NOT VOTING—154.

Ayres	Esch	Kennedy, R. I.	Rodenberg
Barbour	Evans, Mont.	Kettner	Rowan
Benson	Ferris	Kiess	Rubey
Blackmon	Fields	King	Sanders, Ind.
Brinson	Fisher	Kraus	Sanders, N. Y.
Britten	Fitzgerald	LaGuardia	Sanford
Browne	Focht	Langley	Saunders, Va.
Browning	Frear	Larsen	Schall
Brumbaugh	Fuller, Mass.	Lazaro	Scully
Burke	Gallivan	Lee, Ga.	Sears
Butler	Gandy	Lehlbach	Sherwood
Caldwell	Godwin, N. C.	Lever	Siegel
Campbell, Pa.	Goldfogle	Linthicum	Sims
Cannon	Good	Little	Slemp
Cantrill	Goodall	McFadden	Smith, Ill.
Carew	Goodwin, Ark.	McKenzie	Smith, N. Y.
Clark, Fla.	Graham, Pa.	McPherson	Snell
Classon	Greene, Vt.	Mann	Snyder
Cleary	Griffin	Mason	Steagall
Coady	Hamill	Merritt	Steenerson
Cooper	Hamilton	Moores, Ind.	Stiness
Costello	Harrison	Morin	Sullivan
Crago	Haugen	Mott	Sumners, Tex.
Cullen	Heflin	Mudd	Temple
Curry, Calif.	Hersey	Neely	Thomas
Dale	Hersman	Newton, Mo.	Tilson
Dempsey	Hickey	Oldfield	Treadway
Denison	Hicks	Olney	Voigt
Dent	Hill	Overstreet	Walters
Dickinson, Mo.	Hull, Iowa	Padgett	Ward
Donovan	Humphreys	Parker	Watson, Pa.
Dooling	Hutchinson	Pell	Webb
Doremus	Ireland	Phelan	Whaley
Doughton	James	Platt	Wilson, Ill.
Drane	Johnson, Miss.	Porter	Winslow
Eagan	Kahn	Pou	Wise
Eagle	Kearns	Rainey, H. T.	Woodyard
Echols	Kelley, Mich.	Randall, Calif.	
Ellsworth	Kelly, Pa.	Riordan	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. ESCH with Mr. WEBB.

Mr. FOCHT with Mr. AYRES.

Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. CLEARY.

Mr. KING with Mr. DRANE.

Mr. PLATT with Mr. FITZGERALD.

Mr. SNYDER with Mr. THOMAS.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay," but I have a general pair with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MCFADDEN, and I now wish to change my vote to "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. DEWALT, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced, as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote whereby the House resolution was passed, and move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BLANTON. I move that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves to reconsider?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. What becomes of the gentleman's motion?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's motion is pending. Does the gentleman make it as a motion, or does he ask unanimous consent?

Mr. WINGO. He made it as a motion.

The SPEAKER. I thought he made it as a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BLANTON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves to lay the motion on the table.

Mr. WINGO. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, where an objection is made, he can not make the double motion. Has he made a motion to reconsider?

The SPEAKER. He has made the motion to reconsider, and then the motion to lay that on the table.

Mr. WINGO. Can he make both at the same time where there is objection?

The SPEAKER. He did not make them at the same time. He made one subsequent to the other.

Mr. WINGO. I am not sure; I am asking for information.

The SPEAKER. The motion is not debatable. The motion is to lay the other motion on the table. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EMPLOYEES UNDER THE UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries be discharged from the further consideration of House resolution 77.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves that the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries be discharged from further consideration of House resolution 77, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 77.

Resolved, That the United States Shipping Board be, and it is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts——

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, enough has been read of the resolution to make it apparent that it is not a privileged resolution, and hence the motion to discharge the committee is not a privileged motion; and inasmuch as we have wasted nearly the whole day with this Democratic filibuster, with appropriation bills pending, I make a point of order against the motion, the point of order being that only resolutions addressed to the President and the heads of the executive departments have privilege.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. And I am quoting from the House Manual in section 836. If the Speaker desires anything more in connection with that, I will call his attention to——

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not desire any further suggestions on that line unless somebody desires to be heard against it.

Mr. BLANTON. I admit that the point is well taken.

Mr. ASWELL. The gentleman refers to "a Democratic filibuster." I would like to ask who is supporting the filibuster?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will answer that question by saying that it is entirely a Democratic performance.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to prefer a unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks on the matters that came up to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks already made. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri makes the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4226, being the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4226, the District of Columbia appropriation bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H R. 4226, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, with Mr. TOWNER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 4226, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose last evening there was an amendment pending, offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD], to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$10,000," in line 12, page 9. The question is on that amendment.

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for motor vehicles, $30,700. All of said motor vehicles and all other motor vehicles provided for in this act and all horse-drawn carriages and buggies owned by the District of Columbia shall be used only for purposes directly pertaining to the public services of said District, and shall be under the direction and control of the commissioners, who may from time to time alter or change the assignment for use thereof or direct the joint or interchangeable use of any of the same by officials and employees of the District: *Provided*, That no automobile shall be acquired hereunder, by purchase or exchange, at a cost, including the value of a vehicle exchanged, exceeding $1,500 for one seating four or more persons and $1,200 for one seating less than four persons.

Mr. WALSH Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee the reason for the increase in the limit of cost of these vehicles that can be purchased under this exchange procedure. Last year they were limited to $900 and $700. Now the limit has been increased to $1,500 and $1,200.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I believe the reason is that, although that limit was fixed in the old bill, they had to come to the deficiency committee to get an increase of this amount, and the increase is really now in the law under the deficiency bill.

Mr. WALSH. They could not get suitable vehicles under the smaller limitation?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Absolutely not.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I think the gentleman will find there is a good reason for every one of these increases.

The Clerk read as follows:

For purchase and maintenance, hire of livery, of means of transportation for the coroner's office and the morgue, jurors' fees, witness fees, removal of deceased persons, making autopsies, ice, disinfectants, telephone service, and other necessary supplies for the morgue, and the necessary expenses of holding inquests, including stenographic services in taking testimony, and photographing unidentified bodies, $5,000.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. A signal honor has been conferred to-day upon one of the Members of this House, and I feel that not only the Member himself but the membership of the House are honored, and that the Members should have the opportunity of expressing their approval. Gen. Petain, the great French general, has sent from the French front to Gen. Kuhn, of the Seventy-ninth Division, the decoration of the Croix de Guerre, to be conferred upon our colleague, ROYAL JOHNSON, of South Dakota. [Applause.] Gen. Kuhn has conferred that decoration upon our colleague to-day. I feel it is something that we ought to be proud of. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For enforcement of game and fish laws, to be expended under the direction of the commissioners, $100.

Mr. GARD. I move to strike out the last word of this very inconsequential item for the purpose of asking about the game laws in the District of Columbia. What are the game laws in the District of Columbia? Do they apply to wild game or to the games that flourish in the haunts of peace? Does this apply to the police force, or is there a game and fish protective association or anything like that in the District of Columbia?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I really can not inform the gentleman of all the details as to how they expend this money. I do not think they expend the whole $100. In case some Member of Congress should get on a rampage and go out and hunt wild geese or ducks or chickens, he might be subject to the provisions of the game laws of the District.

Mr. GARD. Does the gentleman mean that there is any laxity of enforcement of the game laws of the District of Columbia, which accounts for this small appropriation? I have made the inquiry in good faith, because I did not know there was any necessity, in this District of 10 miles square, for any very elaborate system of game laws; but after hearing the gentleman's suggestion about chickens I realize that I may be in error. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I am informed that there is some wild game flying over, which occasionally alights out here on the Anacostia Flats, ducks and things of that kind.

Mr. GARD. Ducks?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes; and if anybody shoots them and they fail to inform the authorities—the gentleman will notice that the amount here is pretty large—$100. We have spent out of that some $42.

Mr. GARD. The amount was so inconsequential that I wondered whether there were any game laws at all in the District of Columbia.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. If the gentleman will yield, I notice on the House Calendar there is a bill (H. R. 1199) to prohibit the purchase, sale, or possession for the purpose of sale of certain wild birds in the District of Columbia. That was introduced, I think, by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM]. I am sorry the gentleman is not a member of the deficiency committee, for if this bill goes into effect, as it will, we might have to have a deficiency of $25 or $50.

Mr. GARD. That is to take care of the wild birds.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes; these wild birds alight on the flats of Anacostia. We are going to make a park at Anacostia some day, and we want to prevent the wild birds from encroaching on it.

Mr. GARD. One hundred dollars is sufficient, the gentleman thinks, to maintain the sanctity of the game laws of the District of Columbia, and no more?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes; it was considered sufficient by the subcommittee, after extensive hearings, a few years ago. I think the fact is that a few years ago they had $200, but it was cut down.

Mr. VARE. This sum has been in the bill year after year, has it not?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

For carrying out the provisions of the act approved March 1, 1899, entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes," to pay members of the board of survey provided for therein, other than the inspector of buildings, at a compensation of not to exceed $10 for each survey, and to pay the cost of making safe or removing such buildings upon the refusal or neglect of the owners so to do, the unexpended balance of the appropriation made for this purpose for the fiscal year 1913 is reappropriated for the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee how much will be available under this paragraph and how it happens that the appropriation made for 1913 is still unexpended.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The record shows that the balance available July 1, 1918, will be $1,753.81. That amount is now available, or nearly all of it.

Mr. WALSH. What was the original appropriation?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I can not tell, but it was not a very large sum. That amount is available, and the commissioners think it is all that will be necessary during the coming year.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For purchase of metal identification number tags for horse-drawn vehicles used for business purposes and motor vehicles in the District of Columbia, $15,000.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] if this sum, $15,000, is a misprint. The item, I notice, is increased from $1,500 last year to $15,000 this year.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I think the gentleman is mistaken. I think we had $10,000 in this item last year.

Mr. MAPES. I have the act before me, and it contains $1,500.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Then that is probably a misprint. I think the item was $10,000 last year. There was quite a deficiency, which has been taken care of in the deficiency appropriation bill. The license has been changed recently here so that an increase is occasioned by that.

Mr. MAPES. The langauge is the same. What is this money used for?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Chiefly, and I think wholly, for the purchase of tags that are sold to the owners of automobiles. The number of automobiles is increasing very rapidly, and I think they changed the style of the tag so that they are a little more expensive, but it was deemed advisable.

Mr. MAPES. They have not increased ten times in the last year.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, if my colleague will permit, I might suggest that under a former system an automobile license was permanent, whereas now it is annual. Each year every automobile must acquire a new license tag, whereas before only the new machines were compelled to buy them.

Mr. MAPES. Has that increased the expense from $1,500 to $15,000?

Mr. CRAMTON. It immensely increases the number of tags that must be furnished. Before it was a permanent license, and a man might use one license for five years if he did not get a new car. Now every automobile in the District must have a new license each year.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, in the current law the amount is $10,000, and I am reading now from the official record.

Mr. MAPES. I have the act before me for the year ending June 30, 1918, and in that year it was $1,500.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is the year before.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I would like some information in respect to the rights of a Congressman residing temporarily in the Capital. What is our privilege as an automobile owner? How many tags must we have?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The owner of an automobile registered in another State does not have to take out a license in the District. The tag of that State is recognized in the District of Columbia, except as to automobiles in the very friendly and interesting State of Maryland. There is a state of war as to automobile tags existing between the State of Maryland and the District of Columbia, and because the State of Maryland will not recognize in Maryland a District tag, the District does not recognize a Maryland tag. Otherwise the tag of any State is recognized as good in the District of Columbia.

Mr. FESS. So that an Ohio tag is recognized in the District?

Mr. CRAMTON. I may say that I drive an old car under a Michigan tag, and I drive it in the District under that tag.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inform the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] that recently—within the last year or two—they have required a double tag, one on the fore part of the machine and one on the rear. That is one occasion for the additional expense. That question was asked of Mr. Brownlow by Mr. SISSON, the former chairman of this committee, and Mr. Brownlow said that the extra tag was an extra burden of $5,000, but that it was worth that for purposes of making identification more practical. That is why they increased it $5,000 from the appropriation of $10,000 before.

Mr. FESS. How long could an Ohio man temporarily residing here and having his automobile in the District use it on one tag?

Mr. CRAMTON. One year.

Mr. FESS. My concern is to know whether as a driver there is more than one tag necessary in order to be a law-abiding citizen.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I could not answer that question.

Mr. FESS. I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] has answered that.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of answering further the question asked by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Even with regard to the State of Maryland, I will state to the gentleman that the State of Maryland readily recognizes the State number on any Member's car, no matter from what State he comes. For instance, I have upon my Texas car, upon which I pay a Texas license, and which has been here in the city of Washington for nearly three years, my Texas number on the front and on the rear. I can go all over the State of Maryland, and they readily recognize it. I can go in Virginia or New York or New Jersey or any other State, and there is a certain reciprocity existing between our home States and the District of Columbia and other States, such as passes the car of a Member; they readily recognize your State number, and it is absolutely unnecessary for any Member of Congress to pay the District license tax if he pays a license tax each year in his own State; and therefore I pay my license tax in my own State every year.

Mr. GARD. But it is not a matter of recognizing a man as a Member of Congress, is it?

Mr. BLANTON. No; it applies——

Mr. GARD. If I am a resident of Texas and I come along with my automobile with my Texas license, I am recognized in every State in the Union wherever I may go.

Mr. BLANTON. With this distinction, that Maryland will not recognize the license tax of any car from any State that does not in turn recognize the license tax of Maryland. It is a matter or reciprocity. That is the distinction, and the State of Texas recognizes a Maryland license tax.

Mr. VARE. In other words, Maryland is in favor of reciprocity.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; and every other State does that.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is a little more than that. The District desires to reciprocate with the State of Maryland, but Maryland will not reciprocate with the District, although Maryland does with every other State.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not talking about any petty strife that may exist between the District and Maryland, but I am talking about what exists between other States and Maryland.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I do.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. The gentleman says the State of Maryland will recognize these licenses. Suppose a Member of Congress resides in Maryland during the sessions of Congress. Does the gentleman think he can continue to use the license from his State and not take a license from Maryland, if he remains there over 90 days, say?

Mr. BLANTON. I think a Member of Congress from the State of Maryland ought to pay the license tax in the State of Maryland, and that license tax ought to take him anywhere in the United States where there is a reciprocity existing between the States.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Usually the reciprocity is something of this kind, that the license from an outside State, we will say from Maryland, in—take the case of my State, say Illinois—is good for three months where one comes into the State to reside. Now, the question is where a Member of Congress comes here and resides in the District or in the State of Maryland and resides there three months, is it not compulsory on him to take out a license in the District or in the State of Maryland?

Mr. BLANTON. I think not, where he is taxed for a State license and keeps it up each year. I have had my same car here for nearly three years.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I have taken the chances on it myself.

Mr. FOSTER. I have had this experience recently. I went down and they told me that an Ohio license was good only for one year. Do I understand the gentleman from Texas has been using a license for three years——

Mr. BLANTON. No. I have paid my Texas license every year. I keep the same number and repay my license annually in Texas.

Mr. FOSTER. An Ohio license is good for one year, and they tax $2.50 for a chauffeur's license for the city.

Mr. BLANTON. My annual license tax in Texas costs about $15, something like that, if I remember correctly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Plumbing Inspection Division: To reimburse three assistant inspectors of plumbing for provision and maintenance by themselves of three motorcycles, for use in their official inspections in the District of Columbia, $15 per month each, $540.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman what is the necessity of retaining the language in lines 3, 4, and 5, on page 18? I

understand the elevator inspectors went out the other day on the point of order.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will inform the gentleman that they are doing the work just the same, whether that new language is in there or not. That language is for the purpose of requiring the parties to pay inspection fees to the inspector, but now since that was stricken out on the point of order it is paid just the same, but we pay it instead of the elevators that are inspected.

Mr. GARD. They are doing the work of inspection?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. They have to do so. They are obliged to do so under the law.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Northwest: For paving with concrete Taylor Street, Rock Creek Church Road to New Hampshire Avenue, 30 feet wide, $19,000.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of being afforded some information by the chairman of the committee. I am desirous of knowing the plan followed in the District of Columbia for the improvement and repair of streets. I will state in the very beginning of what I have to say that I favor the very best possible streets, as well as all other public utilities in the city of Washington, but what I am interested in is knowing the legal method of awarding contracts. Or do they do it themselves?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. They award contracts for such work.

Mr. GARD. I notice these different appropriations all come out very nicely—say at $10,000 and $19,000. Is the appropriation made before the contract is awarded?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. These are the appropriations made, and we expect to build these streets within the limit of cost by contract.

Mr. GARD. Suppose they make a contract, for instance, for the paving of Taylor Street, for which an appropriation of $19,000 is made, for $18,254?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The balance would go into the Treasury.

Mr. GARD. Is it ever known that anything went back?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Very much of it goes back, I will inform the gentleman.

Mr. GARD. Take the individual appropriations or the appropriations for the several streets, and are they entirely used, or is there any residuary fund?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Sometimes there is, as I tried to explain to the gentleman here in my opening statement. Heretofore this has been appropriated in a lump sum, and your subcommittee or committee thought it was not advisable. We thought it should be consolidated, and there should be specified on the face of the bill the streets to be improved and the amount to be expended therefor. They may have some little difficulty occasionally with this, but I hardly think they will. But I will say to the gentleman that if they contract for $49,000 and the work is performed for $40,000 the balance would go back into the Treasury.

Mr. GARD. How many so-called contractors are there operating in the District of Columbia?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I can not say; but I think the hearings will disclose that they have considerable competition, especially now. I was informed that a few years ago they did not have; that they had but very little competition; but now they say they have much of it.

Mr. GARD. Can the gentleman tell me whether there is any apportionment to contractors in the city of Washington by which one contractor gets part of the city and another contractor another part?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. There is nothing of the kind now. The lowest bidder gets the contract.

Mr. GARD. There is nothing of the kind now? Do you mean that there have been instances of that kind?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I used to think there had been years ago, but I do not wish the RECORD to say that I really knew anything of that kind. But I used to think probably there was. However, I am satisfied there is nothing of that kind now.

Mr. GARD. Are there more than two competing contractors for paving work in the District of Columbia?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. They are not limited to contractors living in the District of Columbia, but they get them from the outside also.

Mr. GARD. But they do not get them from the outside.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. They try to do so.

Mr. GARD. Do they get them?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I can not inform the gentleman as to that. They have done it, I understand, recently.

Mr. GARD. Can the gentleman inform me if he has any information about any particular street paved within the last year?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I have not that information now, because we had no new streets paved in the last year at all, as the commissioners did not recommend any paving, and the old standard bill contained nothing of that kind.

Mr. GARD. That was on account of the necessity of conserving materials during the war?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes. The cost of materials was great, the shortage of labor was serious, and the expense was simply enormous.

Mr. GARD. When are these contracts for repairing these streets to be advertised?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. As speedily as possible after this law is passed and the money becomes available, as I am informed. The commissioners and the committee are anxious now that we should go on now making what we call permanent improvements, new work, and so forth, both on the streets and schools, which we had to leave out the year before.

Mr. GARD. It is very desirable to do that.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is what we have been attempting to do. We have not been extravagant. We have only gone as far as we could reach.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman a question: Whether or not he has given consideration to the fact that unless there is a clause added to the bill it might to some extent fail to carry out his purpose? In other words, if in any one of these particular contracts the estimates of the contractor or the lowest bidder would exceed the amount the commissioners could not award the contract?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I do not think they could.

Mr. VARE. Now, then, if on another item they had a surplus of a thousand or more dollars, if given some latitude, they could award the contract where there had been a slight shortage without the commissioners coming back to Congress for additional authority. In other words, there ought to be a flexible clause added, so as not to handicap the commissioners.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I know. We do not desire to handicap them, but that might be called new legislation. We are anxious to avoid new legislation. We have a very active District Committee and they are seeking for new work, and we are very willing that they should go out and take up new work. I refer to the new chairman of the District Committee, Mr. MAPES.

Mr. VARE. There is only one period of the year when street paving can be properly done, when the climatic conditions are favorable, and if Congress would not be in session embarrassment might ensue in that regard.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will say to the gentleman that these new streets that we are proposing to improve here constitute what we call "new work." Their improvement is to be upon estimates just made, or made 10 days ago.

Mr. VARE. Are they estimates of the commissioners or are they estimates of street contractors backed up by bonds?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. They are estimates which are new, not a year or a year and a half old. When we prepared these items we did not have an official copy of the estimates before us but a copy. The official estimates did not really get into our hands until we had prepared this bill, and when we had prepared it we found them to be correct, so recent are the estimates.

Mr. VARE. If it is the purpose of the commissioners to do this work promptly, without delay, their estimates would in no wise confine a contractor to the precise sums specified in the bill. He has to finance the operation and he would send his engineers on the work and he will make his own inspection and he will back up his estimate by a bond. Now, if in any one of these cases his opinion would be that the cost would exceed the estimate of the engineer of the District, there would absolutely be no way of having that street paved without the District Commissioners coming back to Congress for additional legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman may be right in that. I think possibly that is a good curb to have on them.

Mr. VARE. I might say, for the benefit of the committee, that I speak from experience. I have seen the same thing

worked out. The estimate of an engineer who has no financial responsibility is one thing, while the estimate of a contractor, who must necessarily carry out the specifications, who must finance his operation, is another thing.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VARE. I do.

Mr. MAPES. I notice a little further along here, on page 22, this language following the items:

In all, $282,300, to be disbursed and accounted for as "Street improvements" and for that purpose shall constitute one fund.

I wonder if the gentleman can tell why that clause is placed there in that way? Would that cover a situation such as the gentleman from Pennsylvania points out?

Mr. VARE. I do not believe it would.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It is to a certain extent a matter of bookkeeping.

Mr. MAPES. Would it cover the condition that the gentleman points out?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The fund will be upon the books of the department down here as a sort of improvement fund.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to the bottom of page 19, line 24, in order to make a typographical correction.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to return to line 24, page 19, for the purpose of making a correction. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. In line 24, on page 19, the spelling of the word "Delaware" should be corrected. I move that the correction be made.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the correction will be made.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk of the committee be authorized to correct any errors of spelling that may occur in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the clerk be authorized generally to correct the spelling throughout the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of calling attention to the remarks concerning unexpended balances and the lapsing of appropriations. There seems to have been an intimation that an unexpended balance might be available for further obligations within certain periods of time. Under an annual appropriation, as I understand it, the appropriation can be obligated under contracts or otherwise within the period of the year for which the appropriation is set apart and for no other time. Unless the contract is executed within the year for which the appropriation is made it can not be bound by any contract executed subsequent to that period. Any unexpended balance, however, in that appropriation will stand for a period of two years thereafter for the payment of any obligation legally incurred within the period of the year for which the appropriation was set apart. If, however, the total authorizations within that year do not equal the total amount of the appropriation, the unexpended balance of that appropriation will lapse into the general fund or into miscellaneous receipts at the end of the third year following. So that if any item unpaid at the end of that third year legally incurred within the first year should be presented for payment an account could be stated and sent to Congress for payment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Disposal of city refuse: To enable the commissioners to carry out the provisions of existing law governing the collection and disposal of garbage, dead animals, night soil, and miscellaneous refuse and ashes in the District of Columbia, including inspection and allowance to inspectors for maintenance of horses and vehicles or motor vehicles used in the performance of official duties, not to exceed $25 per month for each inspector for horse-drawn vehicles, $30 per month for automobiles, and $15 per month for motorcycles; fencing of public and private property designated by the commissioners as public dumps; and incidental expenses, $621,000: *Provided*, That any proceeds received from the disposal of city refuse or garbage shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the United States and the District of Columbia in equal parts: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall not be available for collecting ashes or miscellaneous refuse from hotels, places of business, large apartment or boarding houses.

Mr. VARE. I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee how the District Commissioners provide for the removal of ashes? Is it by contract or is it by the city employees?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. By contract. I think the gentleman is somewhat informed upon the situation of that as a contract. The matter has been satisfactorily adjusted and has gone into the deficiency bill, which is now in the Senate.

Mr. VARE. But the District is still having its ashes removed by contract?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The ashes are still removed by contract, yes; but the garbage is a little different proposition.

Mr. VARE. They are going to continue to have it done by contract?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The District bill gives the commissioners authority to remove the ashes themselves, or by contract—either way.

Mr. VARE. How much increase do they ask for the coming year over the past?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The last contract was for $78,000. The estimate this year, under the general head of disposal of city refuse, for the ashes part of it, was $100,000. They are getting it done now under a broken-down contract, so to speak, with very slight reimbursement, for a good deal less money than that, but it is impossible to do it next year for less than $100,000. They really do not think they can do it for $100,000. Maybe it will take $125,000, but they ask for only $100,000 now. I may state here that this total of $621,000 is composed of the following items:

Garbage	$455,130
Ashes	100,000
Miscellaneous refuse	35,400
Night soil	17,500
Dead animals	3,360
Inspection	9,110
Contingent expenses	500
	621,000

I will say to the gentleman that that matter has been canvassed up and down, by this committee and the deficiency committees of both the House and Senate, and I do not believe that a further examination of three months could cut that down one dollar.

Mr. VARE. I have no thought of asking the committee to cut down the amount. I simply wanted to get the information for the benefit of the committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The experience they have had is going to be very beneficial to the city of Washington.

Mr. VARE. I will ask the gentleman if it is not the fact that notwithstanding the commissioners had a bond filed for the removal of the ashes last year by the contractor, they found it was necessary to have $20,000 in the last deficiency bill in order to partly reimburse him for his losses?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Only very slightly.

Mr. VARE. I say to partly reimburse him.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. They thought it was cheaper to do it in this way.

Mr. VARE. The District had to come to his assistance by making additional appropriations, notwithstanding that the contractor had filed a bond.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. VARE. And there was a reliable surety company on the bond, which the District could have held, and have compelled to finish the job.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It would have doubled, even trebled what the cost was, to enforce the bond.

Mr. VARE. I fully agree with the gentleman. I had no desire to ask the question with the thought in mind that it was possible to reduce the item.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late and we have been struggling through a heated day; the attendance is not very great, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that we could not have read this bill for two or three hours to-day, because of the exigencies of the case, but I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4226, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE WAR EXPENDITURES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following gentlemen members of the Special Committee to Investigate War Ex-

penditures, under House resolution 78, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. MCKENZIE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. REAVIS, Mr. MAGEE, Mr. MCCULLOCH, Mr. BLAND of Indiana, Mr. JEFFERIS, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. DOREMUS, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. LEA of California.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas, indefinitely, on account of illness.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted—

To Mr. LEVER to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of J. W. Riser (H. R. 2470, 65th Cong.), no adverse report having been made thereon.

To Mr. ASHBROOK to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Henry N. Tippett (H. R. 1096), no adverse report having been made thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, June 6, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the chairman of the United States Geographic Board, submitting an estimate of appropriation required by the board for necessary printing, being for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 77), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

CALENDAR OF MOTIONS TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEES—NOTICE.

Paragraph 4, Rule XXVII:

4. Any Member may present to the Clerk a motion in writing to discharge a committee from further consideration of any public bill or joint resolution which may have been referred to such committee 15 days prior thereto. All such motions shall be entered in the Journal and printed on a calendar to be known as a "Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees." Immediately after the Unanimous Consent Calendar shall have been called on any Monday it shall be in order to call up any such motion which shall have been entered at least 7 days prior thereto. Recognition for such motions shall be in the order in which they have been entered. When such motion shall be called up the bill shall be read by title only prior to a second being ordered by tellers, and no such motion shall be entertained as to a bill or joint resolution the title of which contains more than 100 words; after the reading of the bill by title the motion shall not be submitted to the House unless seconded by a majority by tellers; if such motion fails of a second, it shall be immediately stricken from the calendar and shall not be thereafter placed thereon. If a second be ordered, debate on such motion shall be limited to 20 minutes, one-half thereof in favor of the proposition and one-half in opposition thereto. Such motions shall have precedence over motions to suspend the rules and shall require for adoption an affirmative vote of a majority of the membership of the House. Whenever such a motion shall prevail the bill so taken from the consideration of a committee shall thereupon be placed upon its appropriate calendar, and upon call of the committee from which any bill has been so taken it may be called up for consideration by any Member prior to any bill reported by said committee at a date subsequent to the discharge of said committee: *Provided*, No Member shall have upon such calendar more than two motions at the same time.

No. 1.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *June 5, 1919.*

Hon. WM. TYLER PAGE, *Clerk.*

SIR: In accordance with paragraph 4, Rule XXVII, I move to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 466) providing for an additional judge for the district of Arizona, the same having been referred to such committee 15 days prior to this date.

CARL HAYDEN,
Member of Congress.

No. 2.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *June 5, 1919.*

Hon. WM. TYLER PAGE, *Clerk.*

SIR: In accordance with paragraph 4, Rule XXVII, I move to discharge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1695) to amend section 4 of the act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887, as amended, the same having been referred to such committee 15 days prior to this date.

CARL HAYDEN,
Member of Congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. WEBSTER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1706) authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Snake River about 3 miles above its confluence with the Columbia River near Pasco, Wash., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 21); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOCH: A bill (H. R. 4971) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Emporia, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4972) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wamego, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4973) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Marion, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4974) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Westmoreland, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4975) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Peabody, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4976) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Harveyville, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4977) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Yates Center, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4978) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lyndon, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4979) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Burlingame, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4980) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Council Grove, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4981) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Eureka, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4982) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Strong, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4983) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cottonwood Falls, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4984) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Burlington, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 4985) relieving honorably discharged officers and enlisted men from payment of premiums on policies of war-risk insurance for a period of two years from date of such discharge; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 4986) to increase the limit of cost for the proposed new Federal building at Madison, Wis., and the site thereof; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 4987) to provide for the retirement of United States soldiers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 4988) to provide for the purchase of additional land for the enlargement of the site of the public building at Stamford, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JONES of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4989) directing delivery of State war-service records to the States requesting same; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 4990) to establish a bureau for the study of criminal, pauper, and defective classes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4991) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Fort Jennings, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4992) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Fayette, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4993) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Napoleon, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4994) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wauseon, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4995) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Paulding, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4996) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Van Wert, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4997) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bryan, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4998) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ottawa, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4999) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Defiance, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 5000) to allow credit for husbands' military service in case of homestead entries by widows, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 5001) granting annuities to all native or naturalized American citizens 65 years of age and over who have been residents of the country for 20 years and whose income is less than $300 per year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5002) to provide pensions for all soldiers and marines of the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and the Mexican War who now receive pensions at a minimum rate of $50 per month; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 5003) to amend section 4414, Revised Statutes of the United States, to classify and provide salaries for clerks in the Steamboat-Inspection Service; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BABKA: A bill (H. R. 5004) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the city of Cleveland, county of Cuyahoga, State of Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece with carriage captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 5005) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lanesboro, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELSTON: A bill (H. R. 5006) to add certain lands to the Sequoia National Park, Calif., and to change the name of said park to Roosevelt National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 5007) granting citizenship to certain Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5008) to provide for election of Osage tribal officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5009) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5010) to regulate the payment of moneys to Osage Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 5011) to establish a patent and trade-mark office independent of any other department, and to provide for compensation and infringement of patents in the form of general damages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5012) to establish a United States court of patent appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE: A bill (H. R. 5013) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Totowa, county of Passaic, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5014) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Prospect Park, county of Passaic, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5015) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Haledon, county of Passaic, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5016) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of West Paterson, county of Passaic, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5017) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Passaic, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 5018) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Stafford Springs, Conn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5019) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Plainfield, Conn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5020) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Stafford Springs, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5021) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Rockville, Conn., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5022) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Middletown, Conn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5023) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Willimantic, Conn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McGLENNON: A bill (H. R. 5024) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the College of St. Elizabeth, Convent Station, Morristown, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. UPSHAW: A bill (H. R. 5025) to extend existing pension benefits to Confederate soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to the widows of Confederate soldiers, sailors, and marines during the remainder of their lives; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 5026) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Watseka, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 5027) to provide homes for soldiers, seamen, and marines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 5028) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the town of Morton, Pa., captured cannon or fieldpiece and suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD (by request): A bill (H. R. 5029) to provide for the manufacture and sale of alcohol for other than beverage purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5030) making appropriation for the construction and completion of certain public works on the Ohio, Mississippi, and Missouri Rivers; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROSE: A bill (H. R. 5031) to provide for the erection of a public building at Everett, Bedford County, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 5032) to extend the franchise in the parishes and separate congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GOODALL: A bill (H. R. 5033) to provide for an examination and survey of the Saco River, Me., at or near its mouth; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 5034) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the importation of nursery stock and other plants and plant products; to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain quarantine districts for plant diseases and insect pests; to permit and regulate the movement of fruits, plants, and vegetables therefrom, and for other purposes," known as the plant quarantine act, approved August 20, 1912; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RHODES: A bill (H. R. 5035) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hillsboro, county of Jefferson, in the State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5036) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fredericktown, Madison County, Mo., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5037) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ste. Genevieve, Ste. Genevieve County, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5038) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Van Buren, Carter County, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5039) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Greenville, Wayne County, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5040) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Centerville, Reynolds County, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5041) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ironton, Iron County, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5042) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Farmington, St. Francois County, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5043) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Perryville, Perry County, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOULD: Resolution (H. Res. 96) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish the House of Representatives with certain information; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALSH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 99) directing the United States Coast Guard to resume its operations under the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 100) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the city of Lancaster, Wis., tents, cots, and blankets for the use of the World War soldiers in their home-coming celebration July 3 and 4, 1919; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 101) to suspend the requirements of annual assessment work on mining claims during the continuation of the war in which the United States is now engaged and until midnight of December 31 of the year following that in which such war is concluded; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: Memorial from the Legislature of Ohio, requesting the Secretary of War to make provision that all trophies of war captured by Ohio troops be collected and sent to Ohio to be kept as perpetual memorials; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, requesting the Secretary of War to make provisions that all trophies of war captured by Ohio troops be collected and sent to Ohio to be kept as perpetual memorials; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress to advocate independence and protectorate for Armenia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOONEY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, requesting the Secretary of War to make provision that all trophies of war captured by Ohio troops be collected and sent to Ohio to be kept as perpetual memorials; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 5044) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to examine and adjust the account of William R. Little, or his heirs, with the Sac and Fox Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5045) for the relief of the trustees of the Christian Church at Missouri City, Clay County, Mo.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5046) for the relief of the heirs of John G. W. Brooks; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5047) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas Estes; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5048) for the relief of Rueben McKroskie; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5049) for the relief of James W. Murray, jr.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 5050) granting a pension to Ella A. Pollard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5051) granting a pension to William Sommers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 5052) granting a pension to William H. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5053) granting a pension to Nettie B. Shores; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5054) granting a pension to John W. Warman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5055) granting a pension to Sarah C. Mattox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5056) granting an increase of pension to Charles Douthitt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5057) granting an increase of pension to William D. Daniels; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5058) granting an increase of pension to Schyler C. Pool; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5059) granting an increase of pension to Jobe C. Walton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5060) granting an increase of pension to Joe Loudermilk, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5061) granting an increase of pension to John J. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5062) granting a pension to Sarah E. Dillon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5063) granting a pension to Thomas B. Perkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5064) granting a pension to James M. Vint; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5065) granting a pension to James M. Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5066) granting a pension to James E. Yeager; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5067) granting a pension to James Cullivan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5068) granting a pension to Nancy Grider; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5069) granting a pension to Minor Howard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5070) granting a pension to George Eskew; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5071) granting a pension to Casey A. Cox; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5072) granting a pension to Virgil O. Adams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5073) granting a pension to Joseph Bessi; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5074) granting a pension to Frank R. Wall; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5075) granting a pension to Gilbert E. Donnells; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5076) granting a pension to Augustus H. Beecher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 5077) granting an increase of pension to Alexander B. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5078) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Kizzie Gill, widow of Jeremiah Gill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5079) granting an increase of pension to Henry Parrish; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 5080) to correct the military record of John H. Addleman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELSTON: A bill (H. R. 5081) for the relief of J. E. Adams; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5082) for the relief of William O. Linsley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 5083) for the relief of Edward W. Whitaker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 5084) granting a pension to W. W. Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 5085) granting a pension to Margaret Dexter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5086) granting a pension to Ann Bullard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5087) granting a pension to Thomas L. Feyen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5088) granting an increase of pension to James L. Doris; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5089) for the relief of John Dauberman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5090) granting a pension to Amel G. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5091) granting a pension to Frank A. Morton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5092) for the reimbursement of Parnell M. Cameron; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5093) granting an increase of pension to Cicero R. Rhinearson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOCH: A bill (H. R. 5094) to fix the status, for certain purposes, of Elizabeth Dickson as a member of the Army Nurse Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 5095) for the relief of Jacob Meyers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 5096) granting an increase of pension to Daniel J. Slanker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5097) granting an increase of pension to Jesse W. Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5098) granting an increase of pension to George Brenizer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5099) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Dittenhafer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5100) granting an increase of pension to James H. Lockwood; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5101) granting an increase of pension to Raymond E. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5102) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Boffenmyre; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5103) granting an increase of pension to Simon Corl; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5104) granting a pension to Estella R. Wetzel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5105) granting a pension to John George; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5106) granting a pension to Willard Kolp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5107) granting a pension to Harry L. Kepler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5108) granting a pension to Rose Phillips Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5109) to complete the military record of Theodore Silas Steffy and for an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5110) to correct the military record and grant an honorable discharge to Joseph W. Bevard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5111) to correct the military record and grant an honorable discharge to Charles M. Bingham; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5112) to correct the military record and grant an honorable discharge to Adam B. Ackerman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5113) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John S. Ellis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5114) for the relief of John W. Seaver; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5115) for the relief of David B. Turnipseed; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES: A bill (H. R. 5116) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Meredith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5117) granting an increase of pension to Lawson F. Myers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5118) granting a pension to Callie B. Boatright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 5119) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Talley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 5120) granting a pension to Eliza K. Leman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5121) granting a pension to Peter F. Wesner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 5122) granting an increase of pension to William L. Pratt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Joseph E. Silverstein at memorial mass meeting in Rochester, N. Y., relative to persecution of Jews in Poland, and urging our Government to prevent further shedding of Jewish blood; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of F. D. Beyer & Co., planing-mill work, chairman temperance committee, Tyrone, Pa., against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of the Jugo-Slav Gymnastic Society Sokal, protesting against Italian imperialism force in Jugo-Slav territory; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of mass meeting of St. Louis citizens at Moolah Temple, protesting against the persecutions of Jews in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of Peter Ballenbacher, representing Brewery Workers' Union, No. 22, Pittsburgh, Pa., urging repeal of prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BABKA: Petition of Slovenic Progressive Benefit Society, relative to Jugo-Slav affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BACHARACH: Petition of mass meeting of citizens of Atlantic City, N. J., protesting against the atrocities inflicted upon the Jews in Poland, Roumania, and Galacia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: Petition of International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local No. 558, Sheffield, Ala., relative to nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK: Petition of a mass meeting held at Providence, R. I., relative to the persecution of Jews in European countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLE: Petition of First Methodist Episcopal Church and Sunday school, Bucyrus, Ohio, protesting against the repeal of war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Brotherhood of Boiler Makers, Iron-Ship Builders, and Helpers of America, Marion, Ohio, Local No. 336, favoring Government control of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of men's bible class of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, Bucyrus, Ohio, protesting against any repeal of war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Crestline (Ohio) Lodge, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks of America, to provide for Government control of railroads for a period of five years after peace has been declared; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Ohio Retail Clothiers and Furnishers Association, Cincinnati, Ohio., urging the repeal of the so-called luxury-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: Petition of 10 citizens of Butler, Mo., urging retention of war-time prohibition and passage of laws to enforce same; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of sundry citizens of Sycamore, Ill., favoring repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Carnation Milk Products Co., opposing an absolute long and short haul clause to section 4 of the act to regulate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of National Garment Retailers' Association, favoring repeal of section 904 of the revenue act, levying a tax on retail sales; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Public Utilities Commission of Illinois for the immediate return of the telegraph and telephone systems to their owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Wasco (Ill.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, opposing repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Jugo-Slav organization of Oglesby, Ill., concerning the Jugo-Slav-Italian situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition and memorial of the members and friends of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, of Moline, Ill., protesting against lifting the ban on the manufacture and sale of wine and beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition and memorial of sundry citizens of Hancock County, Ill., protesting against the modification of the war-time prohibition act to permit the sale and manufacture of beer and wine, as recommended by the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition and memorial of sundry citizens of Augusta, Ill., protesting against the modification of the war-time prohibition act to permit the manufacture and sale of beer and wine, as recommended by the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition and memorial of sundry citizens of Rozetta Township, Henderson County, Ill., protesting against the modification of the war-time prohibition act to permit the manufacture and sale of beer and wine, as recommended by the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Augusta, Ill., urging a repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Milan, Ill., for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL: Petitions of residents of Smyrna, Walton, Stamford, South Otselic, Delancey, and the vicinity of Norwich, all in the State of New York, for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of American War Garden Committee and the Ansco Co., of Binghamton, N. Y., against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: Petition of Slov-Sloga, stv. 342, relating to Jugo-Slav affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HERSEY: Petitions of Rev. A. E. Morris and 93 residents of Bangor, and G. H. Gove and 49 others, E. C. McLaughlin and 48 others, and E. B. Tetley and 20 others, all of Mapleton, Me., urging continuance of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of Workers' Defense Union, New York City, demanding immediate repeal of the espionage act; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Shaw-Walker Co. and 500 employees, opposing repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of National Pickle Packers' Association, of Chicago, Ill., and of the Crockery Board of Trade, of New York, N. Y., urging retention of zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Metal and Thermit Corporation, of New York, opposing the continuance of the Department of Labor Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of residents of San Francisco, Calif., urging repeal of certain sections of revenue law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of California Federation of Women's Clubs, indorsing the movement for the establishment of a department of education with a Cabinet officer; to the Committee on Education.

Also, resolution of California Federation of Women's Clubs, indorsing rank for nurses in the Army, Navy, and Red Cross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of the American Federation of Arts, urging competent planning of landscape, architectural, and sculptural work in American cemeteries in France; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Providence (R. I.) Housewives' League, urging reduction in food prices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions adopted by Grand Court of Foresters of America for the State of Rhode Island, urging peace conference to apply doctrine of self-determination to Ireland, and also resolution protesting against favorable attitude of American peace delegates to claims of Jugo-Slavs and the entrance of the United States into any entangling European alliances; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Pawtucket (R. I.) Business Men's Association, protesting against proposed repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KETTNER: Resolutions adopted at the eighteenth annual convention of the California Federation of Women's Clubs of California, Mrs. Herbert A. Cable, president, favoring a league of nations, indorsing a national department of education, favoring legislation giving proper recognition and rank to nurses, favoring a change in the citizenship laws affecting women, favoring legislation which will free child labor, and asking for enactment of legislation to withdraw protection of our Government of the United States from any American citizen who engages in traffic of alcoholic liquors in a foreign country; and also resolution of Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, Los Angeles Lodge, No. 602, favoring placing of railroads under Government control for five years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, protests of L. D. Webber, of San Diego, the La Habra Methodist Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church of Calexico, the Riverside County Christian Endeavor Union, Riverside, and the Methodist Episcopal Church of Normal Heights, San Diego, all in the State of California, against the lifting of ban on beer and wine, and also resolution by the San Francisco Labor Council, of San Francisco, Calif., indorsing the recommendation of President Wilson on the subject of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, appeal of Showley Bros. Confectionery, San Diego, Calif., for the repeal of 5 per cent excise candy tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of California Cattlemen's Association, San Francisco, Calif., urging return of railroads to owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of San Francisco Labor Council, San Francisco, Calif., urging early passage of the bill furnishing homesteads to returned soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution adopted at the sixteenth annual encampment, Spanish War Veterans of California, in favor of pensions for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of First Baptist Church, Riverside; Methodist Episcopal Church of Normal Heights, San Diego; Missionary Federation of San Bernardino, all in the State of California, against lifting of ban on beer and wine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of California Cattlemen's Association, of San Francisco, Calif., urging early control and regulation of the unappropriated public domain for grazing purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of sundry patrons of soda fountain and ice cream parlors, protesting against the tax on sodas and creams; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Lumber Exchange of Baltimore, Md., and 15,000 employees, protesting against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of David F. Cramer for the initiative and referendum amendment to the Constitution of the United States; also, the noninterest bond bill, as advocated by Jacob Sechler Coxey, sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Edward S. Apple, of Baltimore, Md., against repeal of daylight-saving law; Louis N. Adler, of Baltimore, Md., against repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of J. D. Virdin, protesting against the Poindexter bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Cohen, Coblen Co. and Hutzler Bros. Co., of Baltimore, Md., for repealing section 904 of the revenue law of 1918; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of A. Roth Shoe Manufacturing Co., Ladies' McKay Novelties, protesting against the persecution of Jews in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Washington Camp, No. 3, Patriotic Order of Sons of America, of Maryland, favoring the Tower-Smith bill for betterment of public schools of United States; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Maryland State Grange, relating to Mondell bill (H. R. 487); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of employees of the Whitaker Paper Co., of Baltimore City, protesting against the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of F. P. Patermal and United States Railroad Administration, and W. W. Widerman and 600 persons, making 755 signers, all of Baltimore, Md., protesting against the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Ellicott Machine Corporation, of Baltimore, Md., protesting against a further appropriation for the continuance of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of Manufacturers and Traders' National Bank, J. T. Snyder (president William Hengere Co.), C. A. Weed & Co., Louis L. Berger, Seegrist & Fraly, J. L. Hudson Co., W. H. Sanford Car & Foundry Co., all of Buffalo; and Frank Faust, manager Depew plant American Car & Foundry Co., Depew, N. Y., opposing the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Stewart Motor Corporation, Buffalo, N. Y., opposing Department of Labor Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Retail Merchants' Association, Johnson Kurtz Co., and Chevrolet Tarrytown Leahy, asking for repeal of luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Alden-Marilla Sunday School Association, urging bill to define intoxicating liquors, all liquors containing more than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of McBriar Class, of Plymouth Methodist Church, 126 men, protesting against any change in the prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of special clerks, members of Branch No. 31, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, of Syracuse, N. Y., protesting against the interpretation of provisions in the Post Office bill so as not to provide

increases to designated special clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Shelton, and the quarterly conference of Westport Methodist Episcopal Church, of Westport, all in the State of Connecticut, opposing the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOONEY: Petition of United National Association of Post Office Clerks, Branch No. 10, Cleveland, Ohio, relative to salaries of post-office clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Slovenic Progressive Benefit Society, Cleveland, Ohio; Soi Naprey Lodge, No. 5, S. N. P. J.; Subenjska Jolind; Slovenian Mutual Benefit Association; Jugo-Slav Republican Alliance, No. 9, relative to Jugo-Slav affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of W. S. Wing, eastern sales manager of the Universal Portland Cement Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of L. C. Letzkus, of the Universal Portland Cement Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of George E. Foss, general secretary Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce, of Harrisburg, Pa., protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURPHY: Affidavits supporting House bill 4718, pension for Winfield S. Handley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Crockery Board of Trade of New York, urging retention of zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, and Soft Drink Workers of America, for exempting 2¾ per cent beer from prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: Petition of Ed Anderson, of Kinderhook, and 44 other citizens of Pike County, and Edwin Batty and 19 other citizens, all of the State of Illinois, against repeal of prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSE: Petition of First Methodist Episcopal Church of Tyrone, Pa., protesting against any modification of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWAN: Letter from Frank E. Laughrum, of New York City, regarding educational affairs; to the Committee on Education.

Also, letter from Alfred D. Hadel, Lilian L. Hadel, Theo. Hadel, and Helena Hadel, of New York City, favoring daylight saving; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of F. B. Overman, Remington Typewriter Co., Rogers-Pyatt Shellac Co., National Automatic Sprinkler Association, Almerall & Co. (Inc.), New Amsterdam Casualty Co., American Cyanamid Co., and letter from Elliott H. Goodwin to chairman of Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and Shaw-Walker Co., executive council of American War Garden Committee, all of New York, favoring daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Paris, Allen & Co., importers, New York City, against prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of T. A. Veckers, secretary National Pickle Packers' Association, of Chicago, Ill., and William F. Dolfinger, of New York City, earnestly urging retention of zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of Newport Lodge of Elks, Newport, Ky., opposing repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of J. E. Sinclair and 58 other residents of Caledonia, Le Roy, and Pavilion, and vicinity, all in the State of New York, urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 81 residents of Oakfield, N. Y., and vicinity, urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 94 residents of Warsaw, N. Y., and vicinity, urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petitions of residents of Troy, Cohoes, and Watervliet, all in the State of New York, protesting against the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment until the United States Supreme Court decides the legality of same; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of residents of Berne, N. Y., favoring the enforcement of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of residents of Cohoes, Troy, Watervliet, and Waterford, all in the State of New York, protesting against the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment until the United States Supreme Court decides on the legality of same; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition by citizens of the seventeenth congressional district of Illinois in behalf of the rights of the Jugo-Slavs under the peace treaty with Austria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of the Pawtucket (R. I.) Business Men's Association, protesting the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of 1,008 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against tax on sodas and ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 359, Carpenters and Joiners of America, asking provision for working conditions service United States Employment Bureau; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of United Housesmiths and Bridgemen's Union of Philadelphia, asking provision for working conditions service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of citizens of Philadelphia, against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WASON: Memorial of Sunapee Lake Grange, No. 112, South Newbury, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Dorchester Grange, No. 280, of Dorchester, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Bear Hill Grange, No. 39, of Henniker, N. H., asking for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: Petition of Insley A. Bean and 46 residents of Lewiston, Me., urging the continued enforcement of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINGO: Petition of Slov-Delavsko organization of Jenny Lind, Ark., relating to the controversy between Italy and Jugo-Slavs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of John Mohas, president, and others of Hartford, Ark., regarding controversy between Italy and Jugo-Slavs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Frank Dominick, president, and others of Hartford, Ark., regarding controversy between Italy and Jugo-Slavs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of John Zimmerman and others of Hartford, Ark., regarding controversy between Italy and Jugo-Slavs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *June 6, 1919.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, every thought of Thy name is an ennobling thought. Meditation upon Thy name is the inspiration and uplift of the spirit of man. We begin our day's toil thinking upon Thee and seeking Thy guidance and Thy blessing, that we may pitch our life and our service upon a plane that is well pleasing in Thy sight and at the close of the day have the comfortable satisfaction that we have honored Thy name and advanced the interests of Thy people. We pray Thy guidance this day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of Post Office Clerks' Union No. 125, National Federation of Postal Employees, of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the reclassification of salaries of postal clerks, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. MOSES presented petitions of Local Union No. 558, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, of Sheffield, Ala., setting forth their grievances with the War Department regarding conditions, etc., at Muscle Shoals, Ala., which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of Local Lodge No. 839, Order of B'nai B'rith, of Manchester, N. H., remonstrating against the massacre of Jews in Poland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McCUMBER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Stanton, Tyner, Hensler, and Bottineau, all in the State of North Dakota, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of Local Union No. 558, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, of Sheffield, Ala., setting forth their grievances with the War Department regarding conditions, etc., at Muscle Shoals, Ala., which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. STERLING presented petitions of Local Branch No. 17, of Newark, N. J.; Local Branch No. 14, of Pittsburgh, Pa.; Local Branch No. 12, of New Orleans, La.; Local Branch No. 9, of Cincinnati, Ohio; Local Branch No. 3, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Local Branch No. 834, of Peoria, Ill.; Local Branch No. 983, of Albany, N. Y.; Local Branch No. 617, of Wheeling, W. Va.; Local Branch of Providence, R. I.; Local Branch No. 32, of Worcester, Mass.; Local Branch No. 1029, of Springfield, Mass.; Local Branch No. 112, of Portland, Me.; Local Branch No. 89, of Harrisburg, Pa.; Local Branch No. 1018, of Norfolk, Va.; Local Branch No. 803, of Grand Rapids, Mich.; Local Branch No. 903, of Little Rock, Ark.; Local Branch No. 10, of Cleveland, Ohio; Local Branch No. 35, of New Haven, Conn.; Local Branch No. 4, of Baltimore, Md., and Local Branch No. 1, of New York City, N. Y., all of the United National Association of Post Office Clerks, praying for the readjustment of salaries of postal clerks, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Edgemont, Parker, Tyndall, Fulton, Hitchcock, Beresford, Winner, Redfield, and Sioux Falls, all in the State of South Dakota, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PENROSE. I present a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, petitioning the Congress of the United States to establish a national system of highways, and to cooperate with the States of the Union in carrying out plans for the development of such a system, together with the provisions of the Federal aid act, or any amendment or amendments thereto. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Hamilton, Mont., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of Local Lodge No. 374, B. Z. P., of Butte; of St. George Society Branch No. 68, N. C. S., of Anaconda; of Local Lodge No. 384, National Croatian Society, of Roundup; and of Local Lodge No. 43, J. S. K. J., of East Helena, all in the State of Montana, praying for the independence of the Jugo-Slavs and for justice and fair dealing in connection with peace deliberations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LODGE presented a memorial of the Municipal Council of Gloucester, Mass., remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. KENYON presented petitions of Local Lodge No. 328, Slovenic National Benefit Society, of Madrid; of Local Lodge No. 69, Slovenic Workingmen's Benefit Aid Union, of Madrid; and of Local Lodge No. 104, H. Z. Ill., of Scandia, all in the State of Iowa, praying for the independence of the Jugo-Slavs and for justice and fair dealing in connection with peace deliberations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Garden Grove, Iowa, praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Le Mars, Iowa, remonstrating against any modification of war-time prohibition permitting the manufacture and use of wine and beer, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a resolution of Local Union No. 262, International Association of Machinists, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, favoring an amendment to the war-time prohibition act permitting the manufacture and use of wine and beer, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 12, Slovenic Progressive Benefit Society, of Sublet, Wyo., praying for the independence of the Jugo-Slavs and for justice and fair dealing in connection with peace deliberations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a resolution in the nature of a petition adopted by the Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of Florida, favoring the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JONES of Washington presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from sundry citizens of Tacoma, Wash., remonstrating against the deportation, after the expiration of their terms of imprisonment, of Gopal Singh and three other subjects of India, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

ARTICLES OF WAR.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. At the request of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs I desire to submit a report in his absence. From that committee I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 1373) to amend the Articles of War, and I submit a report (No. 10) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

TREATY OF PEACE.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, without amendment, Senate resolution 64, submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution submitted by Mr. HITCHCOCK on the 4th instant was read, as follows:

Whereas the Senator from Idaho, Mr. BORAH, has stated in the Senate that certain interests in the city of New York have secured copies of the peace treaty with Germany while the American people have been unable to secure one; and

Whereas the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. LODGE, has stated in the Senate that he knows of four such copies of said treaty of peace with Germany now in New York and that the only place where it is not allowed to come is the United States Senate; and

Whereas the Senator from Idaho, Mr. BORAH, has stated that the interests now having possession of said copies of said treaty are peculiarly interested in the treaty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be, and it hereby is, authorized and directed to investigate the matter with a view to ascertaining the facts, and particularly to ascertain and report to the Senate the names of the persons, corporations, or interests which have secured copies of said treaty and from whom they were secured and by what methods, and also to ascertain and report to the Senate in what manner and to what extent said interests are "particularly" interested in said treaty. For these purposes the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and it is, authorized to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with the same, the expenses thereof, including the cost of travel, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in the general excitement caused by the presentation of that resolution I think but very little attention was given to its form. I know I gave very little attention to it. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG], whom I do not see in the Chamber at the moment, prepared a substitute, which is much better in form. I should like to have the resolution go over for the present, that the Senator from Minnesota may have an opportunity to present the amendment.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I understand it is the report of the committee which has just been read.

Mr. LODGE. It is open to amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me make a suggestion to the Senator.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Would the Senator object to its consideration to-day?

Mr. LODGE. I should like to have the resolution go over until there is an opportunity for the Senator from Minnesota to present his substitute, which he showed me yesterday and which I thought much better in form.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator object to the chairman of the committee who made the report asking unanimous consent that it be withdrawn? Then he can present the report later in the day with the amendment, if agreed to by the committee. Or does the Senator want to have the resolution go to the calendar?

Mr. LODGE. I want to have an opportunity to make an amendment in the form of the resolution, if necessary. On examination it seems to me to have been hastily drawn, and it ought to be in a different form. The Senator from Minnesota has one to offer. The resolution can be called up at any moment. There is no need to send it back to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses to approve the substitute.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply thought that course would be the easiest way out.

Mr. LODGE. The resolution is open to amendment, of course, before it goes to the Foreign Relations Committee. I under-

stand there is a motion to send it to the Foreign Relations Committee, but I may be mistaken.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the request is for immediate consideration.

Mr. LODGE. Very well, then; I ask that it may go over.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought it would be very much better to have it go back to the committee and let them consider the suggested amendment, and adopt it if they saw proper, and report it out and ask unanimous consent for its consideration.

Mr. LODGE. I want to get the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota before the Senate. It relates to the form. It has nothing to do with the expenditure of money; it is simply the form.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTINGENT EXPENSES.

Mr. CALDER, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported the following resolutions favorably without amendments, and they were considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

Resolution No. 17, submitted by Mr. JONES of Washington, May 20, 1919:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and it is hereby, directed to investigate and ascertain the facts relative to the suspension by the board of education of the District of Columbia of Miss Alice Wood, a teacher in the schools of the District, and report the same to the Senate, with its recommendations; and the committee, or any subcommittee conducting such investigation, is authorized to subpœna witnesses, send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and take all steps necessary to ascertain the facts, and to employ such stenographic help as may be necessary at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate in conducting such investigation.

Resolution No. 59, submitted by Mr. SPENCER on the 3d instant:

Resolved, That the Committee on Claims, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized, during the Sixty-sixth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost of not exceeding $1 per printed page to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

Resolution No. 61, submitted by Mr. NELSON on the 3d instant:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to hold hearings, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not to exceed $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee; to sit and act at such times and places as it may deem necessary during the sessions or recesses of the Senate, the expenses thereof, including the cost of travel and subsistence of the members of the committee or any subcommittee thereof incident to any hearings which may be held in places other than Washington, D. C., to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Resolution No. 62, submitted by Mr. PAGE on the 3d instant:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY.

Mr. CALDER, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 73), and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized, during the Sixty-sixth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee; the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANT CLERKS.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 49 for the employment of an assistant clerk to the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report it favorably, with an amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment was, in line 4, to strike out the words "until otherwise appropriated by law" and to insert "during the present session of the Sixty-sixth Congress," so as to read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be, and is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk at the rate of $1,800 per annum, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate during the present session of the Sixty-sixth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. CALDER. I report back favorably with amendments, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, Senate resolution 42, authorizing the Committee on Claims to employ an assistant clerk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments were, in line 3, to strike out "$2,500" and in lieu to insert "$2,200," and in line 5 to strike out "until otherwise provided for by law" and insert "during the present session of the Sixty-sixth Congress," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Claims of the United States Senate be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk at the rate of $2,200 per annum, to be paid out of the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate during the present session of the Sixty-sixth Congress.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 1442) to provide for the establishment of a national employment system and for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such system and to regulate the expenditure of moneys that shall be appropriated for such purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 1443) to amend section 81 of chapter 321, volume 35, part 1, Public Laws, relating to the naturalization of aliens; and

A bill (S. 1444) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States, and establishing the Bureau of Naturalization," approved June 29, 1906; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 1445) to equalize the effects of an act approved March 4, 1915, entitled "An act to provide for recognizing the services of certain officers of the Army and Navy in connection with the construction of the Panama Canal" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

A bill (S. 1446) for the relief of Ellen M. Willey; and

A bill (S. 1447) to correct the naval record of Fred C. Konrad; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1448) for the relief of Jacob Nice;

A bill (S. 1449) for the relief of Charles Raudenbush;

A bill (S. 1450) to correct the military record of John L. McGregor;

A bill (S. 1451) for the relief of William Thomas Winstanley;

A bill (S. 1452) for the relief of Christian M. Otto;

A bill (S. 1453) for the relief of Adolph F. Hitchler;

A bill (S. 1454) for the relief of John F. Kelly; and

A bill (S. 1455) for the relief of John L. O'Mara; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1456) for the relief of Rinald Bros., of Philadelphia, Pa.;

A bill (S. 1457) for the relief of Joseph W. Skill;

A bill (S. 1458) for the relief of Sylvester Bonnaffon, jr.;

A bill (S. 1459) for the relief of the estate of David B. Landis, deceased, and the estate of Jacob F. Sheaffer, deceased;

A bill (S. 1460) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Kate Reaney Zeiss, administratrix of William B. Reaney, survivor of Thomas Reaney and Samuel Archbold, against the United States;

A bill (S. 1461) for the relief of Morris Dietrich; and

A bill (S. 1462) for the relief of Rose McIlwain; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1463) granting a pension to Cornelius Branning;

A bill (S. 1464) granting a pension to Cornelius Branning;

A bill (S. 1465) granting a pension to Milton M. Lile;

A bill (S. 1466) granting a pension to George H. Hauf; and

A bill (S. 1467) granting a pension to Julia A. Hoffner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 1468) granting an increase of pension to Florence B. Eldred (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 1469) to create a Federal home loan board and home loan banks for the purpose of aiding in financing the construction of homes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 1470) to donate war trophies to the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON:

A bill (S. 1471) authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to deliver to each of the several county seats in the State of Mississippi captured German cannons, cannon balls or shells, and gun carriages, condemned United States cannon, cannon balls or shells, and gun carriages; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1472) to prohibit immigration for a period of five years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. SWANSON (for Mr. MARTIN):

A bill (S. 1473) granting pensions to certain members of the former Life-Saving Service; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1474) for the relief of Richard J. Easton; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1475) to reimburse the estate of Gen. George Washington for certain lands of his in the State of Ohio, lost by conflicting grants made under the authority of the United States; to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

A bill (S. 1476) providing for the improvement of the roadway from the railroad depot at Fredericksburg, Va., to the national cemetery near Fredericksburg; and

A bill (S. 1477) to establish the Fredericksburg and adjacent national battle fields memorial park, in the State of Virginia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1478) for the relief of W. T. Brogdon;

A bill (S. 1479) for the relief of the estate of Moses M. Bane;

A bill (S. 1480) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Edward I. Gallagher, administrator of Charles Gallagher, deceased;

A bill (S. 1481) to execute the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the heirs of William Pollock, deceased;

A bill (S. 1482) for the relief of E. Scott Arrington;

A bill (S. 1483) for the relief of Ida Banks; and

A bill (S. 1484) for the relief of William Allman and others; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1485) granting a pension to Elmer E. Dickey;

A bill (S. 1486) granting an increase of pension to Grace Boggs;

A bill (S. 1487) granting an increase of pension to Susan Riley;

A bill (S. 1488) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Turner;

A bill (S. 1489) granting a pension to George E. Harrison;

A bill (S. 1490) granting a pension to Roland B. Horsley;

A bill (S. 1491) granting a pension to R. H. Catlett;

A bill (S. 1492) granting a pension to Joseph H. Mayo;

A bill (S. 1493) granting an increase of pension to Oliver J. Johnson;

A bill (S. 1494) granting a pension to James Mickian;

A bill (S. 1495) granting a pension to Floyd B. Daugherty;

A bill (S. 1496) granting an increase of pension to Sophie M. Walker;

A bill (S. 1497) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Rebecca (Taylor) Jones; and

A bill (S. 1498) granting a pension to James W. Ruffin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BECKHAM:

A bill (S. 1499) for the relief of John McGovern; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1500) granting an increase of pension to Leo V. Burchetts;

A bill (S. 1501) granting a pension to Arabella G. Walker;

A bill (S. 1502) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Evans;

A bill (S. 1503) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Y. Featherston;

A bill (S. 1504) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Kelly;

A bill (S. 1505) granting an increase of pension to Breckenridge Wash;

A bill (S. 1506) granting an increase of pension to William W. Ferguson;

A bill (S. 1507) granting an increase of pension to Isaac W. Durham;

A bill (S. 1508) granting an increase of pension to David Britton;

A bill (S. 1509) granting an increase of pension to Harlin L. Clark;

A bill (S. 1510) granting an increase of pension to Albert L. Newland;

A bill (S. 1511) granting a pension to W. H. Odum;

A bill (S. 1512) granting a pension to James L. Graham;

A bill (S. 1513) granting an increase of pension to James M. Gibbons; and

A bill (S. 1514) granting a pension to Charles William Vogler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 1515) to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to exclude and expel from the United States aliens who are members of the anarchistic and similar classes," approved October 16, 1918; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(By request.) A bill (S. 1516) for the regulation and improvement of grazing on the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 1517) to correct or amend the commission issued to Ansel Griggs Wineman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 1518) granting an increase of pension to John W. Breau (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 1519) making appropriations for expenses incurred under the treaty of Washington; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 1520) granting an increase of pension to Matthias V. Bridges; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 49) authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to provide for the restoration and completion of the historical frieze in the Rotunda of the Capitol; to the Committee on the Library.

REPEAL OF DAYLIGHT-SAVING LAW.

Mr. DIAL submitted an amendment proposing to repeal the so-called daylight-saving law, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. MOSES submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $2,000,000 to carry out the purposes mentioned in section 3 of the act of March 1, 1911, to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States or with the United States for the protection of watersheds of navigable streams, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. McCUMBER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $676 to reimburse Benson County, N. Dak., for money actually paid by that county to the State of North Dakota for the care of three insane Indians, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the investigation and improvement of cereals and methods of cereal protection from $432,505 to $532,505, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PRECEDENTS OF THE SENATE.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 71), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the Precedents and Decisions on Points of Order in the United States Senate, revised and indexed to and including the Sixty-fifth Congress, be printed in one volume as a Senate document, and that 1,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 72), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has any Senator a resolution coming over from a previous day?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The resolution reported by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was up for consideration, and I understand the Senator from Massachusetts objected to the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. LODGE. I asked that it might go over, because I wish to have an amendment offered to it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator stated yesterday that he was ready for its consideration.

Mr. LODGE. I did, but I have come to the conclusion that the form of the resolution is very bad.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Can the Senator now state what amendment he thinks should be made?

Mr. LODGE. I told the Senate that the Senator from Minnesota drafted one, which he showed me yesterday, and on examining it I think it is in a much better form.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I regret very much to notice that the enthusiasm of the Senator for this investigation is oozing out so prematurely.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator need not be disturbed. He will get all there is in the investigation. It is a perfectly silly thing, anyway.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The resolution was introduced day before yesterday——

Mr. LODGE. And held up by you for a day.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It was before the Senate all day yesterday and there was no intimation that it was not an effective resolution to produce the result. The statement was made that there would be a unanimous report, and now when it is brought in on the report the Senator objects to its consideration.

Mr. LODGE. I want to have an opportunity to amend it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We are willing to have the Senator take the opportunity if he will do it, only we want to have present consideration.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. CURTIS. I call for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is demanded. Is there further morning business?

Mr. BORAH. The resolution in reference to the peace delegates securing a hearing for the Irish representatives went over. Is it now on the table, or did it go to the calendar? My understanding was that it went over. Did it remain on the table?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. My recollection of the matter is that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] objected to the immediate consideration of the resolution and it went over under the rule for a day. It is now on the desk of the Vice President, under the rule, as a resolution coming over from a previous day, and the Senator from Idaho can call it up if he wishes to do so, as I understand it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is on the calendar. It was talked out yesterday until 2 o'clock.

Mr. BORAH. Not this resolution. This resolution was not talked on at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has gone to the calendar.

Mr. BORAH. I do not think there will be any debate upon it, and I ask unanimous consent to call up the resolution for consideration.

Mr. CURTIS. If there is to be any debate whatever, I shall object. I do not think the resolution is as important as the appropriation bills. We must get the appropriation bills through. I am ready to call up the Indian appropriation bill. It is a privileged motion, and if the morning business is closed I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. BORAH. The morning business is not closed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	France	Knox	Overman
Beckham	Gay	La Follette	Page
Borah	Gronna	Lenroot	Penrose
Brandegee	Harris	Lodge	Phelan
Calder	Harrison	McCormick	Phipps
Capper	Hitchcock	McCumber	Pittman
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	McKellar	Pomerene
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	McNary	Ransdell
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Moses	Sheppard
Dial	Kellogg	Nelson	Sherman
Dillingham	Kendrick	New	Simmons
Elkins	Kenyon	Newberry	Smith, Ariz.
Fall	King	Norris	Smith, S. C
Fletcher	Kirby	Nugent	Smoot
Spencer	Sutherland	Walsh, Mass	Watson
Stanley	Swanson	Walsh, Mont.	Williams
Sterling	Underwood	Warren	

Mr. FLETCHER. My colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL], is detained by illness.

Mr. KIRBY. I announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] on public business. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. BORAH. I renew my request for unanimous consent to consider Senate resolution 48, Order of Business No. 7 on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho asks unanimous consent for the consideration of Senate resolution No. 48, being No. 7 on the calendar. Is there any objection?

Mr. CURTIS. If I can have the assurance that there will be no debate on the resolution, I shall not object; otherwise, I shall object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair can not guarantee that there will be no debate.

Mr. CURTIS. Well, I object.

Mr. BORAH. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate resolution No. 48, being No. 7 on the calendar.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I move that we take up the Indian appropriation bill, which is a privileged motion.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I make the point of order that the motion is not amendable by a substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. We are getting nowhere. The motion of the Senator from Kansas is not in order during the morning hour and before 1 o'clock, until the conclusion of morning business.

Mr. SMOOT. Is morning business over, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; morning business is not yet disposed of.

Mr. BORAH. Then I will wait until it is disposed of, Mr. President.

TREATY OF PEACE.

Mr. KELLOGG. I offer an amendment to the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to strike out all of the resolution down to and including the words "interested in said treaty," on page 2, line 4, and to insert what I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota will be read.

The SECRETARY. In the resolution of Mr. HITCHCOCK it is proposed to strike out all down to and including the words "interested in said treaty," on page 2, line 4, and in lieu thereof to insert:

Whereas it has been stated in the Senate that the proposed peace treaty, which has been delivered to Germany, is being sold upon the streets of Berlin and openly circulated in Germany and other countries; and

Whereas it is claimed that certain people or interests in the city of New York have also received from members of the American peace commission copies of said treaty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Foreign Relations Committee be, and it hereby is, directed and authorized to investigate said charges and report to the Senate its findings, and if said charges are true, to ascertain in what manner and by whose authority copies of said peace treaty have been furnished private citizens and denied the Senate of the United States.

Mr. KELLOGG. I desire to say that I shall be very glad if the Senator from Nebraska will call up his resolution, accept that amendment, and have it passed at once.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, providing it is debatable. I do not wish to be forced to vote in this way without an explanation as to the changes which are proposed. Otherwise I should like to wait until 1 o'clock.

Mr. CURTIS. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is objection. Is there further morning business?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have the assurance that if I renew my request for unanimous consent the objection will not be made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any further morning business? If there be none, morning business is closed.

REPRESENTATIVES OF IRELAND AT PARIS.

Mr. BORAH. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of Senate resolution 48, being Calendar No. 7.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I had intimated to the Senator previously that I preferred that this matter should not come up by unanimous consent. I think it is ill-advised legislation. I can not consent to its coming up by unanimous consent. Let it come up in the regular way, and then I shall satisfy myself merely by voting against it.

Mr. BORAH. I understand that I am unable to make the motion to take it up before 1 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can make the motion now.

Mr. BORAH. Then I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate resolution 48, No. 7 on the calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 48) urging the American peace commission to secure a hearing for the representatives of the Irish Republic.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. JONES of Washington. In connection with the resolution I simply ask to have printed in the RECORD a petition in behalf of the United Irish Societies of Seattle, Wash., for the passage of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 5, 1919.*

Hon. WESLEY L. JONES,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I take pleasure in forwarding to you for presentation to the Senate the following petition:

Resolved, That the United Irish Societies of Seattle respectfully petition the Senate of the United States that the resolution presented by Hon. WILLIAM E. BORAH, requesting the American delegation at the peace conference to recommend to that body that a hearing be granted to the representatives of the Irish people chosen to plead for self-determination be adopted and forwarded to Versailles at the earliest practicable moment.

WM. O'MULCHAY, *President.*
J. O'CONNOR, *Secretary.*

With kind personal regards,

M. J. COSTELLO.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I offer an amendment to the resolution as proposed to be amended by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts will be read.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the resolution as reported, it is proposed to add the following:

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States express its sympathy with the aspirations of the Irish people for a government of its own choice.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I ask for the reading of the resolution as reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 48) as proposed to be amended, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States earnestly requests the American peace commission at Versailles to endeavor to secure for Edward De Valera, Arthur Griffiths, and Count George Noble Plunkett a hearing before said peace conference in order that they may present the cause of Ireland.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, in so far as I am permitted to do so, for myself I accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish to suggest, first, to the Senator from Idaho that I think the title of the resolution will require some amendment.

Mr. BORAH. That can be done later.

Mr. LODGE. That, of course, can be done later; but some amendment will be required to make the title conform to the resolution as amended by the committee.

Mr. President, I voted with great pleasure for the resolution as it was reported by the committee, because I have always felt that every man is entitled to his day in court, and every nation, on that principle, is entitled to its day before the peace conference. I have done what little I could—and it was very little—to try to get hearings for the Albanians, the Koreans, and some other people who wished to be heard, and I was very happy, therefore, to join in asking for a hearing for the representatives of Ireland.

My colleague [Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts] has presented an amendment containing a general statement of sympathy of a character which I know appeals to all of the American people. We have always as a Nation desired that all people should go on peacefully under a government of their own choice.

When, however, Mr. President, the conference first met, ostensibly to make peace with Germany, I think everyone realized that the nations associated in the war against Germany had gathered at Paris in order to present to Germany a treaty for Germany to sign, putting an end to the war, and, if possible, putting an end to Germany's power for evil, and that it would be utterly impossible for those nations, acting together and in that way, to inquire into and interfere with each other's affairs.

I think that position was an entirely sound one, and it might have been used there to exclude even a resolution exciting such general sympathy in the United States as that offered by my colleague; but, Mr. President, that objection can no longer exist. The peace conference at Paris has passed far beyond their primary business of making peace with Germany and thereby bringing peace to the world. They have made omnipotence their province and have occupied the entire sphere of national and international relations the world over. More than that, they have deliberately entered upon the settlement of a question which is wholly ours—the Monroe doctrine.

In the first draft of the treaty which was presented to us the Monroe doctrine was left somewhere among the voices heard in the air and the visions that are seen by capable visionaries, and we were told that the doctrine was safe, because it had been extended to the whole world, which took away its entire meaning and all its characteristics. Now, however, there comes back a second draft with a direct statement in regard to the Monroe doctrine, putting it in a far worse position, in my judgment, than it was under the first draft, and that was bad enough.

Article 21 in the new draft reads as follows:

> Nothing in this covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements, such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings, like the Monroe doctrine, for securing the maintenance of peace.

The President, when he was presenting the treaty to the conference, simply said that article 21 was a new article—an accurate, if not an extensive, statement. The British delegates, however, put out an explanation of the new league as well as the President. They published a summary of the whole of the new covenant. Unfortunately, that explanation in its entirety has not come here; parts of it were sent, but we have never been favored with the whole of the British analysis. We have, however, had sent to us their explanation of article 21 relating to the Monroe doctrine, and this is what the British delegates declared their understanding of its terms to be; that is, this is the interpretation which their Government puts upon article 21. I now quote:

> Article 21 makes it clear that the covenant is not intended to abrogate or weaken any other agreements, so long as they are consistent with its own terms, into which members of the league may have entered or may hereafter enter for the assurance of peace. Such agreements would include special treaties for compulsory arbitration and military conventions that are genuinely defensive.
>
> The Monroe doctrine and similar understandings are put in the same category. They have shown themselves in history to be not instruments of national ambition, but guarantees of peace. The origin of the Monroe doctrine is well known. It was proclaimed in 1823 to prevent America from becoming a theater for intrigues of European absolutism. At first a principle of American foreign policy, it has become an international understanding, and it is not illegitimate for the people of the United States to say that the covenant should recognize that fact.
>
> In its essence it is consistent with the spirit of the covenant, and, indeed, the principles of the league, as expressed in article 10, represent the extension to the whole world of the principles of the doctrine—

Now—

> While, should any dispute as to the meaning of the latter ever arise between the American and European powers, the league is there to settle it.

Mr. President, in the first place, the Monroe doctrine is not an international engagement, and never has been. At the last Hague convention our delegates specifically reserved it. It never has been formally accepted and acknowledged by any nation. It is not a regional understanding. I do not know who invented that strange phrase, but it is not what the Monroe doctrine is. If you set up a sign on some property you hold and state on it that "trespassing and shooting are forbidden on this property under penalty of law," that is not a regional understanding; and the Monroe doctrine is not a regional understanding, and never was anything like it. The Monroe doctrine was our policy, and never anything else. Our fellow Republics to the south have sometimes attacked it and have sometimes run to it with great enthusiasm for shelter; but it is not their doctrine. It is ours, and it rested, in the first place, upon the broad principle of self-preservation. That is the bottom of the Monroe doctrine. It is all ours; and now it is carried into this league of nations. It is already interpreted by England, although it is wholly our affair, and it is to be determined in the future by the league of nations.

Mr. President, any question which arises in regard to the Monroe doctrine, in my judgment, should be decided by only one power, and that is the power that has declared, interpreted, and maintained it—the United States.

I do not mean at this moment to enter into any elaborate discussion of this point; but I bring it up because my colleague has offered an amendment, for which I shall vote, which might have been objected to in the past on the ground that those nations associated against Germany should not look into each other's affairs; but when it comes to those nations taking the Monroe doctrine, our doctrine, our policy, and foisting it on the league of nations, and then telling us that they are going

to interpret it, I think they have carried their flight so far that if we choose to make a few suggestions about other matters it is quite legitimate and courteous to do it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I have an additional reason for supporting this resolution, which under ordinary conditions would not receive my support.

Under my interpretation of the proposed league of nations, if there arose at any time in the future a revolution in Ireland, the British Government, under the distinct terms of the proposed league itself, on its own motion, could take the matter before the league of nations. If this action were not taken by Great Britain any other country a member of the league could present the matter to the league of nations. To my mind, the language is perfectly clear. The language used in various sections of the different articles—not in one alone, but in others—is almost the identical language used in the Troppau protocol to the Holy Alliance, to which the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] so eloquently called attention a few days since in this body, under the terms of which Austria became the mandatory for the Holy Alliance and put down the rebellion in the Kingdom of Naples, and France became the mandatory for the Holy Alliance and put down the rebellion led by the Spanish Cortez in Spain. The Troppau protocol simply provided that should anything arise which might threaten the peace of the world the Holy Alliance should deal with it; and the Holy Alliance was more nearly a league of nations than is proposed by this document which the President has sent to the Senate, and—as suggested by a Senator, and I approve his suggestion—in better form.

Under the terms of the protocol adopted in Troppau, using exactly similar language to that which is insidiously inserted in various sections of this document known as the draft of the league of nations, which we have here, the Holy Alliance undertook to interfere on this hemisphere; and against the league of nations the only country that dared lift its voice was this country, which is now asked to head a similar league of nations.

Mr. President, I do not pretend at this time to discuss the legal meaning, the inevitable conclusion, which must be arrived at by anyone who understands the meaning of words, in considering this document which I have here before me containing a draft of the league of nations. The time is too short. I shall not trespass upon the time of the Senate. In my judgment, however—and I shall undertake to explain more fully at some later period—in the event that a revolution arose in Ireland, or in any other country, it would become the duty of the league of nations, upon the ground that the peace of the world might be threatened, to lend assistance to put down that revolution, exactly as France acted as mandatory and as Austria acted as mandatory for the Holy Alliance in 1822 and 1823.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, very briefly, I do not see any parallel between the Holy Alliance and the proposed league of nations, and therefore the Senator has expressed unnecessary apprehension that smaller nations in rebellion might be prevented by the league from carrying out their purpose. George Washington was called an illustrious rebel, and rebellion is the ultimate right of all peoples. I do not see in the league that there is any provision by which, acting in concert, rebellions would be put down. The only authority is article 10 of the proposed draft:

> The members of the league undertake to respect and preserve, as against external aggression—
>
> External aggression—
>
> the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league. In case of any such aggression, or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

I understand that in the deliberations of the congress in Paris this contention came up, and the words "external aggression" were put in in order to clarify the very question which the Senator from New Mexico has raised.

The Holy Alliance was organized not by free States but by autocratic States, and its avowed purpose was to put down the democratic movement in Europe at that time and to restore to the Spanish Crown its rebellious Provinces in South America. The league is organized for freedom; the league is organized by the great free countries of the world—because I will classify England, Italy, France, and the United States as the great free countries of the world—and those countries dominate the league, and, by the constitution of the league, shall remain in control. It is inconceivable, therefore, that the machinery of the league ever would be used to suppress internal revolution. That will be the duty of that nation that is more particularly interested in subjugating her rebellious subjects, if you please; and it is not the duty, either in the proposed draft or in international law or in ethics or in morals, of any nation, no matter how friendly, to assist a nation whose subjects are in rebellion to put down that rebellion. There is no authority contained under the draft of the league of nations to justify the statement made by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. PHELAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMICK. Will the Senator allow me to call his attention to the next to the last paragraph but one in article 3?

> The assembly may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the league or affecting the peace of the world.

It was to that paragraph, I think, that the Senator from New Mexico alluded.

Mr. FALL. Because almost similar language is used in the Troppau protocol of the constitution of the Holy Alliance.

Mr. PHELAN. The Senator from Illinois calls attention to the last paragraph but one of article 3:

> The assembly may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the league or affecting the peace of the world.

I contend that a rebellion in any State is not within the sphere of action of the league—that is the very point I made.

Mr. McCORMICK. I think the Senator has omitted a word toward the end of that penultimate paragraph, "*or* affecting the peace of the world."

Mr. PHELAN. I was just going to come to that—"or affecting the peace of the world." A rebellion in Ireland would possibly, in the judgment of the Senator, affect the peace of the world and justify the intervention of the league of nations. It is preposterous.

There was a disturbance in New Orleans, by which certain violent acts were practiced upon the helpless nationals of another country, and the United States had some difficulty, the Senator will recollect, in getting State action. I should like to ask him—and that is an extreme case—would the league of nations be justified in intervening, where the nationals of one country had received bad treatment in the United States, with a view of maintaining the peace of the world, or would it be a matter of negotiation and settlement between the two countries affected, as in that case, Italy and the United States?

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, the President of the United States is quoted as having addressed the representatives of the smaller powers in Europe to make it clear that under the league armed forces would intervene to protect the rights of racial minorities, whether in Ireland or in certain Southern States of the United States, I suppose, as well as in central or southern Europe.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion along that line?

Mr. PHELAN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FALL. Answering the Senator's question, I say that clearly under the terms of the league, should the Italian Mafia murder citizens here in the United States, and a mob hang them, it would be the duty of the league itself, upon Italy notifying the council that negotiations for reparation had failed, to take up the matter and force the United States to abide by the decision of the council.

Now, Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me a moment, I should like to call his attention to another article.

One of the articles which I have reference to has been very clearly expounded by the Senator from Illinois. The Senator, of course, speaks as an international lawyer. He has referred to international law. He knows, of course, that should the belligerents of any party in Mexico or in Ireland be recognized by Germany or any country outside of the league, under international law a state of war would exist, the belligerency having been recognized; and, without belligerency having been recognized, if the revolution amounted to a sufficient disturbance to constitute war, then, under the strict terms of the constitution itself, it would become the duty of the league to take cognizance of it and to settle it.

Now, it is proposed, as I understand, to leave Germany out. It is very likely that Germany being left out, other neutral nations will remain out, exactly as they have now notified the Allies that they will remain out of a blockade of German ports in the event Germany does not sign. Notice has already been served by Norway and Sweden and Switzerland and Holland and Denmark, as I understand, that in the event the Germans refuse to sign they will not be parties to the proposed blockade of German ports.

I can see readily they would say, "If you leave Germany out of this league, if she is not invited to become and does not become a member of the league, immediately we, the neutral nations that have taken no part in this war, will continue to maintain our neutrality and refuse to enter the league." Upon the recognition of belligerency by any party war exists exactly as was the case in our Civil War. It was an international war and so declared by the Supreme Court of the United States and by all international authorities, although it was a revolution. Under those facts it becomes the duty of the league of nations to deal with exactly that condition under article 11 of the proposed constitution.

Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the members of the league or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole league, and the league shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations.

Mr. PHELAN (continuing the reading)—

In case any such emergency should arise the secretary general shall, on the request of any member of the league, forthwith summon a meeting of the council.

It is also declared to be the fundamental right of each member of the league to bring to the attention of the assembly or of the council any circumstances whatever affecting international relations which threatens to disturb either the peace or the good understandings between nations upon which peace depends.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will pardon me, I wish he would emphasize that language. "Between nations," is the language.

Mr. PHELAN. The Senator from Mississippi desires that the language be emphasized, and I will repeat it:

It is also declared to be the fundamental right of each member of the league to bring to the attention of the assembly or of the council any circumstance whatever affecting international relations—

"International relations," I emphasize—

which threatens to disturb either the peace or the good understanding between nations—

I emphasize "between nations"—

upon which peace depends.

Mr. FALL. May I interrupt the Senator? He has emphasized the terms under the suggestion of the Senator from Mississippi. May I ask him for his own opinion as a lawyer? Does he not believe the emphasis upon the latter clause which he has just read shows that international relations were not referred to in the first clause?

Mr. PHELAN. I will repeat it.

Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the members of the league or not—

Mr. FALL. Exactly. That does not refer to international relations.

Mr. PHELAN (reading)—

is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole league, and the league shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations.

Mr. FALL. That is the point. If the Senator will allow me, the first clause does not refer to international relations and makes it the business of the league to consider any question of war. The second clause which the Senator is emphasizing does refer to international relations.

Mr. PHELAN. Civil society is a compact between individuals, but the league of nations is a compact between nations. Hence we must construe everything that appears here as being of an international character. It can not therefore be contended that a revolutionary party arising in one State, threatening the authority of the government of that State, should be a sufficient cause to call on the league to put down the revolution. This league of nations, as such, is not concerned in internecine or civil war. They are only concerned in a war between nations; and hence if there were a revolution in Ireland or in Mexico, it would be beyond the power of the league under this constitution to intervene without exceeding its authority.

Mr. FALL. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. PHELAN. I yield.

Mr. FALL. May I suggest to the Senator that we take the case of Cuba for instance. The President of the United States recommended intervention by the United States in the Cuban revolution because the revolution threatened the peace of this country, and the Congress of the United States declared war upon Spain upon the message of the President of the United States, one of the grounds of which was that the conditions existing in Cuba threatened the peace of this country, and therefore we were justified in intervening, and under international law the Senator knows we were justified in intervening.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator from California will pardon an interruption there, that same right would still remain.

Mr. FALL. I do not agree with the Senator. That is the difference between us.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It would be a right growing up outside of the covenant to keep the peace of the world. It would grow up out of the right of the United States in that case, or any other nation under similar circumstances. It is not a right coming under the league. It is a right existing outside of the league.

Mr. FALL. May I suggest that the Senator from Mississippi always closes a subject by asserting something dogmatically, with which others of course do not agree to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have asserted nothing dogmatically, because the President of the United States did assert this right when there was no league, and that very fact proves that the right existing outside of any league, it is not a right which depends upon the league.

Mr. FALL. The point I am attempting to make is that with the league the United States could no longer assert this right.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, in the case of Cuba Spanish atrocities drew the attention of the people of the United States to the conditions of a neighboring people, and war was precipitated by an emotional wave following the sinking of the *Maine*. I am not disposed to agree even with the President of the United States in his message, if it is correct as stated, that the internal or internecine war in Cuba in any way affected the peace of the United States or the peace of the world. The people probably should have been allowed to win their independence by the sword, as the Cuban revolutionists were in a fair way of doing, without the assistance of the United States. But the United States intervened, not under any compulsion but that of sentiment, and an alleged attack by Spain upon its warship, and there were a great many men in Congress who were very much opposed at that time to intervention.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. PHELAN. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to inquire of the Senator whether he is in favor of the pending resolution. I have not been able to deduce his position on it from the debate.

Mr. PHELAN. I see a certain unanimity in the Chamber, much to my surprise, in favor of the pending resolution, and that drives one to the necessity of discussing some other subject. I am discussing the subject that was raised by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]. I do not believe, I wish to reiterate, that the league of nations will have any authority under the proposed draft to intervene where there is a revolution, because, in the case of Ireland, I am disposed to believe that it will now and again be in revolutionary state, and I would be loath to believe the league of nations, which I am disposed to favor, would assert its authority in denying people the privilege of fighting for their freedom.

I think my position is fortified by the application made by the Japanese Government to the conference in Paris for the recognition of free immigration and racial equality. The conference in Paris denied the request of the Japanese Government for such recognition. What does that signify? That by no construction can it be said that the league of nations would have the authority or the warrant, by the terms of the constitution or otherwise, to question the right of the United States to deny free immigration, which we grant to all other people, if you please, and to deny race equality to the orientals; and therefore it could not, as domestic policy, be construed as threatening the peace of the world.

Mr. FALL. Will the Senator yield just a moment?

Mr. PHELAN. I yield.

Mr. FALL. We disagree so fundamentally that I want to see just how badly I am wrong in my construction. I would like to ask the Senator what is his construction of article 14? I will state the case to the Senator as I understand it. He seems to think, as I gather, that the Japanese immigration question would not be a subject of consideration by the league of nations. That is putting it in a few words. Is that the contention of the Senator?

Mr. PHELAN. That is my contention.

Mr. FALL. Then what does the Senator believe to be the meaning of the provision of article 13, that—

disputes as to the interpretation of a treaty, as to any question of international law, as to the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of any international obligation, or as to the extent and nature of the reparation to be made for any such breach, are declared to be among those which are generally suitable for submission to arbitration.

Mr. PHELAN. To what article does the Senator refer?

Mr. FALL. It is in article 13. If the Senator will yield me his attention for a moment——

Mr. PHELAN. I am listening.

Mr. FALL. I may entirely misunderstand the contention of Japan and the questions between Japan and this country.

Under our immigration laws the citizens of other countries, except those definitely excluded, are granted equal privileges in this country. In the Japanese treaty, while the right of Japanese citizens to come here and become citizens of the United States or to acquire property or to attend public schools is not specifically set forth, there is the favored-nation clause, under the terms of which, as the Senator well knows, rights granted citizens of any other country under treaties dealing with the same subject would be extended to the Japanese. That, in short, is the claim that the Japanese Government has made with reference to the treatment of Japanese citizens in this country. It becomes directly a question of treaty right whether they are entitled to come in here with the privileges and immunities of citizens of other countries, guaranteed them under the favored-nation clause.

Mr. PHELAN. I do not desire to prolong the discussion. I should like to address myself to the Senate on the subject of the Japanese and their treaty rights on some other occasion. But as a general proposition of international law, the most-favored-nation clause would not apply whatever to the rights of naturalization and citizenship in the absence of specific provisions. Our treaty with Japan of 1911 was a treaty of commerce and navigation, and it gives Japan commercial privileges, the right to erect, for instance, a business house upon a city lot, not the ownership of agricultural lands which other nationals enjoy, and it has never been contended seriously in international law that where one nation is excluded by statute from the right of naturalization by reason of the color of the skin, that the favored-nation clause by itself would repeal the statute. I do not believe that has ever been contended.

Mr. FALL. It has been contended. However, I understood the Senator to say that the league of nations would have nothing to do with our immigration laws, not with our naturalization laws, but our immigration laws or treaties.

Mr. PHELAN. I still contend that the favored-nation clause as expressed in the Japanese treaty of 1911 gives no such right of free immigration, the Senate having modified it to cover that point, and there is a misunderstanding concerning the significance and scope of the favored-nation clause in this respect in the mind of the Senator. It does not convey to one nation all the rights to its nationals possessed by another nation. It is limited and confined to the subject matter of the treaty in which it is contained, and the Japanese treaty, by attached memoranda, protects us and removes possible misunderstanding.

Mr. FALL. Then, if there is such a misunderstanding of the situation and conflict of opinion under section 13, it is clearly the duty of the league of nations to settle it.

Mr. PHELAN. I do not desire to interfere with the consideration of the resolution which is now before the Senate and which interests me very much. I am in favor of the resolution, I will say in answer to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], and I trust that it shall prevail.

I may say for the information of certain Senators who have worried as to the propriety of the Senate of the United States passing a resolution of this kind, that from the very beginning of the Republic there are illustrious precedents, which I could cite if the question should arise, showing that it has been the policy of the Senate and of Congress in every way to encourage the people struggling for freedom to possess their freedom—and that is the spirit of the league of nations—and I will also inform the Senate that in correspondence with certain Englishmen of liberal mind they believe that any public opinion created by the American press or by the American Congress in favor of better treatment for Ireland will be welcomed by the present administration of Great Britain. It requires reinforcement. There is a disposition over there to permanently settle the Irish question, but the George administration is supported by a large body of Tories and reactionaries who are without sympathy in a matter of this kind, and Lloyd-George can not afford, having no party of his own, to alienate the support of any faction. I am credibly informed that the George administration would welcome the creation of a sound public opinion in America on this subject, and one of the ways of creating public opinion is for public bodies, from the humblest chamber of commerce to the Senate of the United States, to clearly express their sympathy and their sentiments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments of the committee will be reported.

The SECRETARY. The committee proposes to strike out all the paragraphs of the four whereases found on page 1 of the printed resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be agreed to, without objection.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 3, after the word "Versailles," insert the words "to endeavor."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be agreed to, without objection.

The SECRETARY. After the words "to secure," in the same line—line 3—strike out the words "if possible."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be agreed to, without objection.

The SECRETARY. In lines 3 and 4 strike out the words "the representatives chosen by the people of Ireland, to wit."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be agreed to, without objection.

The SECRETARY. In line 6, at the end of the line, strike out "said representatives" and insert "they."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be agreed to, without objection.

The SECRETARY. In lines 7, 8, and 9 strike out the words "and ask international recognition of the Government, republican in form, established by the people of Ireland."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be agreed to, without objection.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

Mr. BORAH. I ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the final passage of the resolution.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when Mr. DILLINGHAM'S name was called). I desire to announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. He is paired with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "yea."

While on my feet I wish to announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] is absent on account of illness and that he is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT].

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]. As he is absent, I transfer that pair to the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] and vote "yea."

Mr. McCORMICK (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON]. As he is absent, I transfer that pair to the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and vote "yea."

Mr. NEWBERRY (when Mr. TOWNSEND'S name was called). I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] is still detained from the Chamber by serious illness. He is paired with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. If the senior Senator from Michigan were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT], which I transfer to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], and vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. My pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has already been announced, but I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] and vote "yea."

Mr. CALDER (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY]. If he were present, he would vote as I have done on this question. Therefore I will let my vote stand.

Mr. HARRIS. My colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], is detained by illness.

Mr. KIRBY. I wish to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], is necessarily absent on important business. He is paired with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND].

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD];

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN];

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD];

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL]; and

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS].

The result was announced—yeas 60, nay 1, as follows:

YEAS—60.

Ashurst	France	La Follette	Ransdell
Beckham	Gay	Lenroot	Reed
Borah	Gronna	Lodge	Sheppard
Brandegee	Harris	McCormick	Sherman
Calder	Harrison	McKellar	Simmons
Capper	Hitchcock	McNary	Smith, Ariz.
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	Moses	Smith, S. C.
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Smoot
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	New	Spencer
Curtis	Kellogg	Newberry	Sterling
Dial	Kendrick	Norris	Sutherland
Dillingham	Kenyon	Nugent	Swanson
Elkins	Keyes	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Fall	Kirby	Phelan	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Knox	Pittman	Watson

NAY—1.

Williams

NOT VOTING—35.

Ball	Harding	Owen	Stanley
Bankhead	Henderson	Penrose	Thomas
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phipps	Townsend
Edge	King	Poindexter	Trammell
Fernald	McCumber	Pomerene	Underwood
Frelinghuysen	McLean	Robinson	Wadsworth
Gerry	Martin	Shields	Warren
Gore	Myers	Smith, Ga.	Wolcott
Hale	Overman	Smith, Md.	

So the resolution was passed.

TREATY OF PEACE.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator yield to me, in order that I may ask unanimous consent to bring up a resolution?

Mr. CURTIS. I will. I did not object to the consideration of the other resolution, and so I shall consent to the consideration of this one.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask unanimous consent that Senate resolution No. 64, submitted by me on the 4th instant, and which has been reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, directing the Committee on Foreign Relations to investigate whether copies of the peace treaty with Germany are in the city of New York, by whom and how they were obtained, and so forth, be taken up for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Chair lays the resolution before the Senate.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 64), as follows:

Whereas the Senator from Idaho, Mr. BORAH, has stated in the Senate that certain interests in the city of New York have secured copies of the peace treaty with Germany, while the American people have been unable to secure one; and

Whereas the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. LODGE, has stated in the Senate that he knows of four such copies of said treaty of peace with Germany now in New York, and that the only place where it is not allowed to come is the United States Senate; and

Whereas the Senator from Idaho, Mr. BORAH, has stated that the interests now having possession of said copies of said treaty are peculiarly interested in the treaty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be, and it hereby is, authorized and directed to investigate the matter with a view to ascertaining the facts, and particularly to ascertain and report to the Senate the names of the persons, corporations, or interests which have secured copies of said treaty and from whom they were secured and by what methods, and also to ascertain and report to the Senate in what manner and to what extent said interests are "particularly" interested in said treaty. For these purposes the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and it is, authorized to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with the same, the expenses thereof, including the cost of travel, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

Mr. KENYON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President: How many more resolutions of this character are there? Is this the last one? I am not objecting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is the last one until 2 o'clock. Then another resolution comes up.

Mr. KENYON. Another resolution comes up at 2 o'clock?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Another one comes up at 2 o'clock.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. This is a resolution which we have all been told would go through by unanimous consent.

Mr. KENYON. I hope it may. There are some bills on the calendar which are of a great deal of importance, one particularly affecting the soldiers, and I have been waiting for the speakers to get through, so that we might take it up. I am raising no objection to the resolution, but I hope there will be speedy action on it.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] has an amendment pending to the resolution, and I think it would be proper that he should be here. I make the point that there is no quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	Lenroot	Ransdell
Beckham	France	Lodge	Reed
Borah	Gay	McCormick	Sheppard
Brandegee	Gronna	McKellar	Simmons
Calder	Harris	McNary	Smoot
Capper	Harrison	Nelson	Spencer
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	New	Sutherland
Culberson	Johnson, Calif.	Newberry	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Walsh, Mont.
Dial	Kellogg	Nugent	Watson
Dillingham	Kenyon	Page	Williams
Elkins	Knox	Phelan	
Fall	La Follette	Phipps	

Mr. FLETCHER. I wish to announce, and let the announcement stand for the day, that my colleague [Mr. TRAMMELL] is absent on account of illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT].

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to say that my colleague [Mr. POINDEXTER] was absent yesterday and is absent to-day on important business at the Naval Academy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I renew my request for unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate resolution 64.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unanimous consent has been given. The question is on the amendment heretofore offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG].

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, just a word on the amendment. I offered this amendment because I thought it was broader than the original resolution. I had a resolution ready to offer at the time the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] offered his resolution, but he was recognized first and offered his resolution, and I could not, of course, present mine at that time. His resolution simply recited that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] made statements relative to the delivery of the treaty to certain interests or persons in the city of New York and asks that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to investigate the matter. The amendment which I have offered does not name the Senator from Idaho nor the Senator from Massachusetts. I have no doubt they have no objection to being named; they are fully capable of taking care of themselves; but they are not the only Senators who have charged, not only in the Senate but outside, that the treaty is in New York in the hands of private citizens and that it is being circulated publicly in Germany. I wish the whole subject to be investigated.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. Is there any doubt that under the resolution offered by the Senator from Nebraska we can enter into the whole field of investigation? I understood when the resolution was read that, while the preamble recited the statements of the Senator from Massachusetts and myself, nevertheless the authority was sufficiently broad to cover the field.

Mr. KELLOGG. The resolution offered by the Senator from Nebraska simply recites the charge that the treaty has been furnished to certain people in this country. It does not purport to investigate its broadcast circulation in foreign countries.

Mr. BORAH. That it is being published in foreign countries I think is a conceded proposition. The only question which was in my mind when I made the statement was that the treaty was in this country, and I think that is practically conceded now; but how it got here, and so forth, is a question which we want investigated, and I understand that that can be done under the resolution offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. KELLOGG. Furthermore, I think we should know to what extent it is being published in foreign countries. I think we should know why it is given out in foreign countries and to certain citizens of this country and denied to the Senate.

There is one clause in the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska that I omitted that I should be very glad to add, and I ask to perfect my amendment by adding at the end thereof the following:

And also to ascertain to what extend said interests are "particularly" interested in said treaty.

I shall be glad to include that clause, and I intended it should be part of the resolution.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I am amazed at the position now taken by the Senator from Massachusetts. Yesterday he wanted immediate action.

Mr. LODGE. I want it now; and if the Senator will stop talking, we will pass this resolution.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yesterday, and day before yesterday, he was for this resolution—this identical resolution; the resolution

which was introduced day before yesterday, which was printed, and which was before the Senate all day yesterday.

Mr. LODGE. Let me save the Senator's time. I will admit that I was inconsistent. I will admit that I thought that resolution would do. I think now this is a better one. I am perfectly willing to put in my name, and I know the Senator from Idaho will vote the same way, if it will please and soothe the Senator; but let us have a vote on it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; I propose to have a vote, and I propose to have it this afternoon; and I propose to have the country understand that the Senator who was so anxious to stand here upon the floor of the Senate and upon his own responsibility charge that copies of the peace treaty were in New York, in the hands of New York interests——

Mr. LODGE. I never said that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK (continuing). Is now anxious to have somebody else investigated, and somebody else's statement investigated.

Mr. LODGE. Not in the least.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] takes the proper position. He came in here upon his responsibility, and he made certain allegations. He is ready to go before an investigating committee and have his statements investigated. But the Senator from Massachusetts, after having this printed resolution before him all day yesterday; after having known exactly what its phraseology was; after having had all the experience of many years as a legislator, suddenly, during the night, has seen a new light, and he wants an investigation in some general terms of matters already admitted.

What do we care whether the printed copies are on sale in Germany or not? If they are on sale in Germany, that is a German matter. What we are interested in knowing is this: Are those copies in New York? Are they in the hands of interests in New York that have no legitimate right to their possession? Was the Senator from Massachusetts justified when he came in here and charged that they were in New York?

That is what we want to know, and my resolution provides for finding out. My resolution provides for finding out whether they are there. My resolution provides for finding out how they got there. My resolution provides for finding out who put them there. There is no possible reason for amending that resolution, except to escape the direct responsibility which the Senator from Massachusetts assumed when he brought this matter in here.

The Senator from Idaho is satisfied. He has made grave charges, and is ready to stand by them. He does not want his name eliminated. He does not want a resolution brought in here in vague terms.

Let me read some language from this resolution:

Whereas it has been stated in the Senate—

This is the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] at the request of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Whereas it has been stated in the Senate that the proposed peace treaty, which has been delivered to Germany, is being sold upon the streets of Berlin and openly circulated in Germany and other countries—

What do we care whether Germany is selling the peace treaty upon her streets or not? That is not the question. The question is the integrity of the American Government and officials of the American Government. Have our representatives in Paris permitted interests in New York to get possession of these copies of the peace treaty for their own selfish use? Did the Senator from Massachusetts see such a copy in New York, and spend an hour and a half in reading it?

Mr. LODGE. I have said so, and I decline to repeat it. Does the Senator question the truth of what I have said?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I say that the statement the Senator made upon the floor of the Senate is one which I have a right to ask to have investigated. If he objects to having it investigated, let him take the responsibility.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection to its being investigated, and it shall be investigated. I have said it here, and what I say is the truth. Does the Senator deny it?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then why does the Senator ask for these amendments eliminating his name?

Mr. LODGE. When the Senator stops talking I will tell him.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I hope the Senator will wait until I get through.

We do not care anything about the first clause. It is not the subject in which the American people are interested. We want to know whether our representatives in Paris have allowed, through illegitimate means or any other means, business interests in New York to get possession of this treaty which belongs only to the Government.

Whereas it is claimed that certain people or interests in the city of New York have also received from members of the American Peace Commission copies of said treaty—

Who claims it?

Whereas it is claimed—

My resolution shows who claims it. My resolution shows that two Senators of the United States have claimed it and asserted it upon the floor. Why resort to vague terms? Why not be specific? There is nothing of any dignity to investigate except these two solemn charges, made upon their own responsibility by two Senators of the United States.

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Foreign Relations Committee be, and it hereby is, directed and authorized to investigate said charges——

What charges? Not the charge of the Senator from Idaho; not the charge of the Senator from Massachusetts. Their names are eliminated. We ought to have another investigation, really, to find out what it is that has happened in 24 hours, what new light has burst upon the consciousness of certain Senators, that makes this resolution, which was so good yesterday, which they were so anxious to have immediately passed yesterday, out of date and out of order to-day.

Now, you can beat this resolution of mine; you can make that vague substitute if you please; but the American people and public opinion in the United States will not be satisfied with that procedure.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota yesterday showed me a form of resolution which I thought much better as a resolution for investigation than the loose, ill-drawn thing that had been presented to us. I am going to ask him to withdraw it, however. I have not delayed this resolution one minute. The Senator from Nebraska delayed it a whole day. He put it over to begin with.

Mr. President, let it pass as he introduced it. Nobody can object to anything that is asked there. I stated on the floor that I saw, and had in my hand and looked over for an hour and a half, a copy of the treaty; and I did. If anyone desires to deny that, he has his opportunity. I heard also of three other copies. They had nothing to do with any interest, so far as I knew, or any financial body of any kind; and if there has been bribery and corruption, which the Senator talks about, who was bribed? Who could have been bribed to give it up? Nobody but the agents of the administration in Paris. There has been no bribery or corruption about it. They have been sent over here and sent quite freely, in my opinion. I only know of the existence of four.

I hope this resolution will pass, and we will take it up and investigate it. I am going ask my friend the Senator from Minnesota to withdraw his amendment, which I think a much better one, so that it may stand and that the Senator from Nebraska may feel soothed about having the name of the Senator from Idaho and my name there, which, of course, is a matter of the most total indifference to me. I will take my chance with public opinion. I have taken it for a good many years; and I will ask the Senator from Minnesota to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. KELLOGG obtained the floor.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. KELLOGG. I will.

Mr. FALL. I had hoped that the Senator was going to congratulate the people of the United States upon discovering another mouthpiece who knew their sentiments so well as the Senator from Nebraska has announced that he does.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, well, that of course is a natural attribute of the part.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield while I make a statement in withdrawing this amendment?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. KELLOGG. I am perfectly willing to accommodate the Senator from Massachusetts and withdraw the amendment, but in doing so I should like to make a brief statement.

I think it will be of interest to the American people to know that a treaty denied to the Senate of the United States is being sold in bookstalls all over Europe.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. President, the Associated Press has received a bulletin that the German Government has mailed copies of the treaty to the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. KELLOGG. It is charged, not alone by the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Idaho but in the Associated Press, that this treaty is being published broadcast in Europe. It has not reached this country except through the channels apparently created by members of the peace commis-

sion. I want to ascertain why it is denied to the Senate and published abroad. Furthermore, when it becomes known that the Senate, which is entitled to know the contents of the peace treaty, has been ignored, while the text has been furnished individuals in this country and furnished broadcast in Europe, this fact will be deeply resented. I have not any doubt that the Senator realizes this, and he has tried to gloss the situation over by evincing great indignation toward the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Idaho because they have stated an undisputed fact in the Senate.

I do not understand why that statement should so arouse his indignation unless it is directed mainly against the men who have furnished the copies and denied them to the Senate. If the Senator thinks he can make political capital by that sort of talk to the people of this country, let him do so. I desire a full investigation. I prepared the resolution for introduction, but the Senator succeeded in presenting his resolution first. He did so because he thought he could make some political capital out of it. I am willing to withdraw this amendment and let the original resolution pass and have the subject fully investigated.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I say just a word before this resolution passes? We have 10 minutes yet.

It is my judgment that this entire matter could be investigated under either resolution. I have not, therefore, seen any necessity of offering an amendment. So far as I am concerned, I am deeply interested to know why it is, if I have been correctly informed, that certain interests in New York are and have been in possession of this document. My primary desire is to have the document. That is of the utmost concern to me. My second desire is to know why it is that certain interests in New York are so peculiarly interested in this matter as, through either honest or dishonest means, to secure this treaty in advance of the body which has to deal with it. I think before this debate closes, 60 days from now, whether this investigation goes on or not, I will demonstrate to the satisfaction of some people in this country why it is that certain interests in New York are so peculiarly active in this matter.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to make an inquiry. I will say by way of preliminary that I want this resolution passed, but I want to have it broad enough so that the evidence can be brought here as to the circulation of this instrument in Europe. That is a fact separate and independent from the question as to who made these charges or as to the particular interests in New York that may have obtained possession of copies.

If the thing I desire can be done under the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska, I am entirely content. There is, I notice, in the preamble this language which possibly will cover it, and if it will be so construed then I have nothing to ask. The language is this: It is found in the second "whereas":

And that the only place where it is not allowed to come is the United States.

If that would be construed in a broad enough way, of course, it would raise the question, Has it been circulated in other countries, and if so, to what extent?

I should like to ask the Senator who offered the resolution if he thinks the evidence could be introduced under that language?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. As a member of the committee, I shall favor placing that construction upon the resolution.

Mr. REED. I am content, then, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The resolution was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2480) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be read for Senate amendments, the amendments of the Senate committee to be considered first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, under the head of "Relieving distress, etc.," on page 6, line 16, after the word "sanatoria," to strike out "$375,000" and insert "$410,000," so as to read:

For the relief and care of destitute Indians not otherwise provided for, and for the prevention and treatment of tuberculosis, trachoma, smallpox, and other contagious and infectious diseases, including transportation of patients to and from hospitals and sanatoria, $410,000, of which $10,000 shall be used to care for old and indigent Indians in western Washington, and of which sum $25,000 shall be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 19, before the word "bridges," to insert "roads and," so as to read:

For construction, lease, purchase, repair, and improvement of school and agency buildings, including the purchase of necessary lands and the installation, repair, and improvement of heating, lighting, power, and sewerage and water systems in connection therewith, $335,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of salaries and expenses of persons employed in the supervision of construction or repair work of roads and bridges and on school and agency buildings in the Indian Service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 20 on page 11.

TREATY OF PEACE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, Senate resolution No. 12.

The Senate resumed the consideration of Senate resolution 12, submitted by Mr. JOHNSON of California on the 20th of May, as follows:

Whereas the peace treaty has been completed and has been delivered to the representatives of Germany; and

Whereas a synopsis only of the treaty has been given publicity in the United States, and our people are entitled to know its full contents and to what, if any, engagements they may have been committed; and

Whereas it is reported in the press that the entire treaty has been cabled to the State Department and is now in the possession of the State Department: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, forthwith to transmit to the Senate the full text of the treaty of peace completed at the Paris conference and delivered to the representatives of Germany.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask the Senator from California if he will not agree to temporarily lay aside the resolution. I think we can pass the Indian appropriation bill in half an hour, or in an hour at the outside.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I regret exceedingly that I can not comply with the request of the Senator from Kansas, but I think we can pass the resolution within an hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations. [Putting the question.] The noes seem to have it. The noes have it, and the motion is not agreed to. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2480) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill at line 21, on page 11.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, under the head of "Indian Service inspectors," on page 14, line 2, after the word "field," to insert "away from home or designated headquarters, $25,000," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of six Indian Service inspectors, exclusive of one chief inspector, at salaries not to exceed $2,500 per annum and actual traveling and incidental expenses, and not to exceed $3.50 per diem in lieu of subsistence when actually employed on duty in the field away from home or designated headquarters, $25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Miscellaneous," subhead "Suppressing Contagious Diseases Among Live Stock of Indians," on page 17, line 10, after the words "period of," to strike out "three years" and insert "one year," and in line 11, after the word "March," to strike out "1918" and insert "1919," so as to make the clause read:

That all of the provisions of an act entitled "An act for the relief of Indians occupying railroad lands in Arizona, New Mexico, or California," approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. L., p. 1007), as extended by the act approved April 11, 1916 (39 Stat. L., p. 48), be, and the same are hereby, extended for a period of one year from and after the 4th day of March, 1919.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, under the head of "Arizona and Nw Mexico," on page 21, line 21, after the words "amount of," to strike out "$42,500" and insert "$47,500," so as to make the clause read:

That the amount of $47,500 appropriated by the Indian appropriation act approved March 2, 1917 (39 Stat. L., p. 975), for the construction of two bridges over the Little Colorado and Canyon Diablo Rivers, near the Leupp Indian Agency, Ariz., is hereby reappropriated for the same purposes as provided in said act, reimbursable as provided in said act, and to remain a charge and lien upon the lands and funds of the Navajo Tribe of Indians until paid.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 5, to insert:

For reimbursement of Yuma County, Ariz., for traveling and other expenses incurred by its county officers in the arrest, prosecution, and commitment of four Indian youths of the Colorado River Reservation to State institutions, $167.75, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 10, to insert:

The Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John Flanigan the sum of $300 for a team of horses lost and destroyed in a flood in 1914 while said horses were being used by the employees of the Indian Bureau in the survey of Indian land in Arizona.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 17, to insert:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, and under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to cause to be issued to The Gospel Missionary Union, which has been engaged in mission work among the Navajo Indians since 1896, a patent in fee for that particular tract of land on the Western Navajo Reservation in Arizona, not exceeding 160 acres in area, which it has continuously used and occupied for mission purposes from a date prior to the Executive order of January 8, 1900, withdrawing from sale and settlement the lands which now constitute the said reservation; said patent in fee to be issued on a legal description of the lands so used.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, under the head of "California," on page 25, line 4, after "$3,500," to strike out "in all, $27,500" and insert "for construction of employees' cottage recently destroyed by fire, $3,500; in all, $31,000," so as to make the clause read:

For support and education of 100 Indian pupils at the Fort Bidwell Indian school, Calif., including pay of superintendent, $24,000; for general repairs and improvements, $3,500; for construction of employees' cottage recently destroyed by fire, $3,500; in all, $31,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 6, under the head of "Kansas," on page 26, line 23, after "$15,000," to strike out "in all, $167,600," and insert "for water and fire-protection system, $20,000; in all, $187,600," so as to make the clause read:

SEC. 6. For support and education of 750 Indian pupils at the Indian school, Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kans., and for pay of superintendent, $152,600; for general repairs and improvements, $15,000; for water and fire-protection system, $20,000; in all, $187,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 8, under the head of "Minnesota," on page 32, after line 17, to insert:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States, at his discretion, the sum of $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the principal sum on deposit to the credit of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota, arising under section 7 of the act of January 14, 1889, entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota," and to use the same for the purpose of promoting civilization and self-support among the said Indians in manner and for purposes provided for in said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 3, to insert:

The Secretary of the Treasury is directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Chippewa Indians of the State of Minnesota, proceeds of the final judgment obtained in the Court of Claims against the United States in case No. 30447, entitled "The Mille Lac Band of Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota *v.* The United States," the following sums: To Wah-we-yea-cumig and Ain-dus-o-geshig, Mille Lac chiefs, each $5,000; to Mege-zee, a Mille Lac chief, $500; to the heirs of Go-gee, a Mille Lac chief, $500; to the heirs of Nay-gwa-nay-be-ke-wain-zee, a Mille Lac chief, $500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 9, under the head of "Mississippi," on page 33, line 23, after the words "Secretary of the Interior," to insert:

Provided, That any unexpended balance of said appropriation may be used for relief of distress of said Indians and paying the salary and expenses of one special agent, who shall be a physician, one farmer, and one field matron.

So as to make the clause read:

SEC. 9. That the unexpended balance of the appropriation of $75,000 for the full-blood Choctaw Indians of Mississippi in the Indian appropriation act of May 25, 1918, is hereby reappropriated for the same purposes for which originally appropriated and for aiding the common schools attended by the children of said Indians under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That any unexpended balance of said appropriation may be used for relief of distress of said Indians and paying the salary and expenses of one special agent, who shall be a physician, one farmer, and one field matron.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 10, under the head of "Montana," on page 36, line 12, after the words "Secretary of the Interior," to insert:

Provided, That not to exceed $25,000 of this amount shall be available for expenses incurred during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

So as to make the clause read:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States the sum of $150,000 of any tribal funds on deposit to the credit of the Crow Indians in the State of Montana, and to expend the same for making necessary improvements to the irrigation systems in the Big Horn Valley on the Crow Reservation in Montana, said sum, or such part thereof as may be used for the purpose indicated, to be reimbursed to the tribe under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That not to exceed $25,000 of this amount shall be available for expenses incurred during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 15, to strike out:

That so much of the Indian appropriation act of March 1, 1907 (34 Stat. L., 1015, 1035), as relates to the disposal of surplus unallotted lands within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation in Montana, is hereby repealed, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make allotments under existing laws within the said reservation to any Indians of said Blackfeet Tribe not heretofore allotted, living six months after the approval of this act, and thereafter to prorate all unallotted and otherwise unreserved lands therein among the Indians who have been allotted or may be entitled to rights within said reservation: *Provided*, That of the lands so allotted 80 acres of each allotment shall be designated as a homestead by the allottee and be evidenced by a trust patent and shall remain inalienable until Congress shall otherwise direct: *Provided further*, That the Blackfeet tribal rolls shall close as of six months after the approval of this act and thereafter no additional names shall be added to said rolls: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to repeal the grants of land made by the act of March 1, 1907, to religious institutions and to the State of Montana for school purposes, nor repeal the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of any land within said reservation suitable for town-site purposes, as provided by that act: *Provided*, That the State of Montana in making indemnity school selections shall be confined to nonmineral and nonirrigable lands: *Provided further*, That the provisions of the act of March 1, 1907, which require a division of the funds received from the sale of the surplus lands immediately upon the date of approval of the allotments of land are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That the lands within said reservation, whether allotted, unallotted, reserved, set aside for town-site purposes, granted to the State of Montana for school purposes, or otherwise disposed of, shall be subject to all the laws of the United States prohibiting the introduction of intoxicants into the Indian country until otherwise provided by Congress: *Provided*, That the lands may be leased by the allottee for mineral purposes, under such rules and regulations and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided further*, That allotments herein provided for shall be made under such rules and regulations as the said Secretary may prescribe, and trust patents shall be issued therefor as provided by the aforesaid act of March 1, 1907, except as to the homestead hereinbefore mentioned.

And insert:

That so much of the Indian appropriation act of March 1, 1907 (34th Stats. L., pp. 1015, 1035), as relates to the disposal of surplus unallotted lands within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation in Montana, is hereby repealed, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make allotments under existing laws within the said reservation to any Indians of said Blackfeet Tribe not heretofore allotted, living six months after the approval of this act, and thereafter to prorate all unallotted and otherwise unreserved lands therein among the Indians who have been allotted or may be entitled to rights within said reservation: *Provided*, That of the lands so allotted 80 acres of each allotment shall be designated as a homestead by the allottee and be evidenced by a trust patent and shall remain inalienable and nontaxable until Congress shall otherwise direct: *Provided further*, That the Blackfeet tribal rolls shall close six months after the approval of this act and thereafter no additional names shall be added to said rolls: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to repeal the grants of land made by the act of March 1, 1907, to religious institutions and to the State of Montana for school purposes, nor repeal the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of any land within said reservation suitable for town-site purposes, as provided by that act: *Provided*, That the State of Montana in making indemnity school selections shall be confined to nonmineral and nonirrigable lands: *Provided further*, That the provisions of the act of March 1, 1907, which require a division of the funds received from the sale of the surplus lands immediately upon the date of the approval of the allotments of land are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That the lands within said reservation, whether allotted, unallotted, reserved, set aside for town-site purposes, granted to the State of Montana for school purposes, or otherwise disposed of, shall be subject to all the laws of the United States prohibiting the introduction of intoxicants into the Indian country until otherwise provided by Congress: *And provided further*, That any and all minerals, including coal, oil, and gas, are hereby reserved for the benefit of the Blackfeet Tribe of Indians until Congress shall otherwise direct, and patents hereafter issued shall contain a reservation accordingly: *Provided*, That the lands containing said minerals may be leased under such rules and regulations and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided further*, That allotments herein provided for shall be made under such rules and regulations as the said Secretary may prescribe, and trust patents shall be issued therefor as provided by the aforesaid act of March 1, 1907, except as to the homestead hereinbefore mentioned.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, may I ask the chairman of the committee if these items are exactly the same as the provisions

in the bill which was before the Senate at the last session and which did not pass?

Mr. CURTIS. There are two provisions added, one exempting from taxation the property allotted to the Indians, which was left out of the House provision and which should have been put in, and the other item added reserves the mineral lands to the Indian tribes until further determined by Congress.

Mr. GRONNA. It is not reserved in the name of the Government but reserved to the Indians?

Mr. CURTIS. To the Indians, because it belongs to the tribe.

Mr. GRONNA. I agree with the Senator. Those are the only two changes?

Mr. CURTIS. The only two changes.

Mr. GRONNA. I have no objection to the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 6, page 46.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, on page 46, at the end of the items for North Dakota, I ask that an item be inserted; I will say to the chairman of the committee that I think the matter was overlooked. It was not in the original estimate, but it is in the supplemental estimate, and it was incorporated into the bill of last year.

Mr. CURTIS. I asked unanimous consent that the committee amendments should be first considered, and that consent was granted.

Mr. GRONNA. This has the force of a committee amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. It is not a committee amendment; but if the Senator will wait until we get through with the reading of the bill, I will gladly go back and consider the Senator's amendment.

Mr. GRONNA. Then I ask that all the items for North Dakota may go over.

Mr. CURTIS. Rather than do that, I will consent to the consideration of the Senator's amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). The Senator from North Dakota asks unanimous consent for the consideration of an amendment at this time. Is there objection? There being no objection, the amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 46, after line 6, add the following:

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $676, to reimburse Benson County, N. Dak., for money actually paid by said county to the State of North Dakota for care of three insane Indians—Mary Josephine Pejihutaskana, Alfred Littlewind, and Joseph Langer, in the North Dakota State Insane Asylum.

Mr. CURTIS. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, in section 17, under the head of "Oklahoma," on page 46, line 14, after the words "sum of," to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$30,000," so as to make the clause read:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States, at his discretion, the sum of $30,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the funds on deposit to the credit of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma, for the support of the agency and pay of employees maintained for their benefit.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 25, to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$40,000," so as to make the clause read:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States, at his discretion, not to exceed the sum of $40,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the money on deposit to the credit of the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma, to be expended for the support, education, and systematic vocational instruction of Osage children: *Provided*, That the expenditure of said money shall include the renewal of the present contract with the St. Louis Mission Boarding School, except that there shall not be expended more than $300 for annual support and education of any one pupil.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, after line 8, to strike out:

That the Council of the Osage Indians in Oklahoma be authorized to elect or appoint a general tribal attorney to represent them in all legal matters affecting said tribe: *Provided*, The salary of said attorney, to be paid out of the tribal funds, shall not exceed $10,000 per year: *And provided further*, That the Commissioner of Indian Affairs shall be denied the right to approve or overrule the election of said attorney.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 1, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$35,000," so as to make the clause read:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States, at his discretion, not to exceed $35,000 of the funds on deposit to the credit of the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma and to pay out the same for necessary expenses in connection with oil and gas production on the Osage Reservation, including salaries of employees, rent of quarters for employees, traveling expenses, printing, telegraphing and telephoning, and purchase, repair, and operation of automobiles.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 18, under the subhead "Five Civilized Tribes," on page 51, line 1, after "$205,000," to insert "of which sum $20,000 shall be available for expenditures from April 1, 1919," so as to read:

For expenses of administration of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, and the compensation of employees, $205,000, of which sum $20,000 shall be available for expenditures from April 1, 1919.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 21, on page 51.

Mr. CURTIS. On page 51, line 3, the word "reports" should be report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that change will be made.

Mr. CURTIS. On page 51, line 15, the parentheses should be withdrawn from the word "hereafter."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that change will be made.

The next amendment was, on page 51, after line 21, to insert:

For payment of interest upon certain interest-bearing trust funds belonging to the Cherokee Nation, which funds arose from the judgment of the Court of Claims of May 18, 1905, in favor of said nation, and were paid into and retained in the Treasury of the United States, as follows, to wit: On the amount of the fund which arose from item 1 of said judgment as such amount was determined and paid to the Secretary of the Interior on July 2, 1906, to be by him credited to the principal of the Cherokee school fund, interest at 5 per cent per annum from July 2, 1906, to and including May 26, 1910; on the amount of the fund which arose from item 4 of said judgment, as such amount was determined and paid to the Secretary of the Interior on July 2, 1906, to be by him credited to the principal of the Cherokee national fund, interest at 5 per cent per annum from July 2, 1906, to and including May 26, 1910; on the original principal sum of item 4 of said judgment, interest at 5 per cent per annum from July 1, 1893, to July 1, 1903, and on the amount of the interest thus accruing interest at 4 per cent per annum from December 29, 1905, to May 14, 1906; and on the aggregate of the sums of the interest for the last two periods hereinabove mentioned, interest at 5 per cent per annum from July 2, 1906, to the date of the passage of this act; and the sum of $27,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay the interest above allowed, is hereby appropriated and authorized to be paid to the Cherokee Nation: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay the amount arising from item 4 of said judgment, with interest thereon as hereinabove provided for, to the agent appointed by the Cherokee Nation acting through its principal chief to receive the same, said payment to be made immediately upon the approval of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, after line 23, to insert:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to pay out of the tribal funds of the Chickasaw Nation to Geo. D. Rodgers the sum of $367.30 as reimbursement for expenses incurred and paid by him from February 21, 1910, to April 21, 1910, inclusive, in connection with his services as tribal attorney for said Indian nation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, after line 5, to strike out:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Stuart, Lewis, Gordon & Rutherford, out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States belonging to the Creek Nation, the sum of $7,000, being in full settlement of the claim of the said Stuart, Lewis, Gordon & Rutherford against the said Creek Nation for legal services rendered the said Creek Nation employed by authority of an act of the national council of the Creek Nation, approved January 7, 1898, the said sum of $7,000 having been appropriated in payment of said services by an act of the national council of the Creek Nation approved October 18, 1900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 20, under the head of "South Dakota," on page 62, line 12, after the word "superintendent," to strike out "$80,750" and insert "$82,750, of which $2,000 shall be available for expenses necessarily incurred since May 1, 1919"; and in line 15, after the words "in all," to strike out "$90,750" and insert "$92,750," so as to make the clause read:

SEC. 20. For support and education of 350 Indian pupils at the Indian school at Flandreau, S. Dak., and for pay of superintendent, $82,750, of which $2,000 shall be available for expenses necessarily incurred since May 1, 1919; for general repairs and improvements, $10,000; in all, $92,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 22, under the head of "Washington," on page 69, line 5, after "1916," to insert:

Provided further, That the funds hereby appropriated shall be available for the reimbursement of Indian and white landowners for improvements and crops destroyed by the Government in connection with the construction of irrigation canals and drains of this project.

So as to make the clause read:

For continuing construction and enlargement of the Wapato irrigation and drainage system, to make possible the utilization of the water supply provided by the act of August 1, 1914 (38 Stats. L., p. 604),

for 40 acres of each Indian allotment under the Wapato irrigation project on the Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash., and such other water supply as may be available or obtainable for the irrigation of a total of 120,000 acres of allotted Indian lands on said reservation, $500,000: *Provided*, That the entire cost of said irrigation and drainage system shall be reimbursed to the United States under the conditions and terms of the act of May 18, 1916: *Provided further*, That the funds hereby appropriated shall be available for the reimbursement of Indian and white landowners for improvements and crops destroyed by the Government in connection with the construction of irrigation canals and drains of this project.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 23, under the head of "Wisconsin," on page 72, line 20, after the words "payment of," to strike out "$50" and insert "$40," and in line 25, after the word "Indians," to insert:

Provided further, That from the sums heretofore appropriated for said Pottawatomie Indians the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay to Erik O. Morstad, of Laona, Wis., who has lived with and cared for said Indians for many years, the sum of $5,000.

So as to make the clause read:

For the support and civilization of those portions of the Wisconsin Band of Pottawatomie Indians residing in the States of Wisconsin and Michigan, and to aid said Indians in establishing homes on the lands purchased for them under the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 30, 1913, $15,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, said sum to be reimbursed to the United States out of the appropriation, when made, of the principal due as the proportionate share of said Indians in annuities and moneys of the Pottawatomie Tribe in which they have not shared, as set forth in House Document No. 830, Sixtieth Congress, first session, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make a per capita payment of $40 to said Indians out of said funds: *Provided*, That no further expenditures be authorized or made under appropriations heretofore enacted making provisions for the purchase of land and the clearing of same for said Pottawatomie Indians: *Provided further*, That from the sums heretofore appropriated for said Pottawatomie Indians the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay to Erik O. Morstad, of Laona, Wis., who has lived with and cared for said Indians for many years, the sum of $5,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I ask the chairman of the committee what this $5,000 is for?

Mr. CURTIS. It is for services rendered by this man in securing the payment of a very large claim these Indians had against the Government of the United States. The money was placed to the credit of the Indians and he was never paid. The payment is recommended by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, by the Secretary of the Interior, and by the Senators from his State, who well know of his services. The committee have carefully considered the item a number of times. It comes out of the funds of these Indians, and this is about the last appropriation that will be made to this band of Indians.

Mr. McKELLAR. It does not state on its face it is for that kind of services. It says, "Who has lived with and cared for said Indians for many years." It is really for legal services.

Mr. CURTIS. He is not a lawyer. It was service of the kind mentioned and advice. This man helped to secure testimony, and the case was settled without ever having gone to the Court of Claims. It was settled in the department, and the department recommends payment to the man as having rendered this service and states it is well worth this sum allowed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is this in full for all services rendered?

Mr. CURTIS. In full for all services, and there is no money they can get outside of this appropriation.

Mr. OWEN. I will ask the Senator in charge of the bill whether any compensation was ever made to the estate of Belt?

Mr. CURTIS. The Belt estate was paid, and when the Belt estate was paid this item was left out for some reason.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, after line 3, to insert:

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000, to be expended under the supervision of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in the purchase of subsistence supplies in relieving cases of actual distress and suffering among those needy St. Croix Indians of Wisconsin whose cases are referred to in report of January 30, 1915, transmitted by the Secretary of the Interior to the House of Representatives March 3, 1915, pursuant to the provisions of the act of Congress of August 1, 1914 (38 Stat. L., 582–605), and printed as House Document No. 1663, Sixty-third Congress, third session.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, after line 15, to insert:

That to carry out the provisions of the Chippewa treaty of September 30, 1854 (10 Stat. L., 1109), there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $141,000, in full settlement of the claims against the United States of the St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin whose names appear upon the final roll prepared by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the said act of August 1, 1914, and which final roll is contained in the said report of the Secretary of the Interior, March 3, 1915, and in said House Document No. 1663.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 74, to insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to distribute said fund of $141,000 per capita among said Indians appearing upon said final roll, or, in his discretion, the per capita share of each of said Indians may be credited to him and expended by said Secretary for his benefit in such manner, including the purchase of land, as he may deem proper: *Provided*, That no part of the funds hereby appropriated shall be paid to any person or persons as attorney's fees: *Provided further*, That where any of said enrolled Indians have died since enrollment the Secretary shall ascertain and pay their pro rata shares to their proper distributees, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe: *And provided further*, That one-half of said sum shall be expended in the purchase of land in northern Wisconsin for agricultural purposes, such land to be allotted to said St. Croix Chippewa Indians, each Indian to receive land to the value of one-half of his distributive share in the fund appropriated by this act, patents therefor to be issued in accordance with the general allotment laws of the United States. The land so selected shall be situated in organized school districts, and not be purchased in bodies of more than one section, and said bodies shall not adjoin each other. Such land shall be selected by an agent of the Indian Office familiar with lands in northern Wisconsin and an agent to be selected by said St. Croix Chippewa Indians. If these two disagree as to the value or desirability of any particular tract of land, they shall agree upon a third person, who shall act with the two agents aforesaid in determining such matter of disagreement. No land shall be purchased hereunder unless and until the purchasing agents, together with said third person so selected, shall in person go upon each tract so purchased.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, after line 6, to insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to strike from said final roll the name of Maggie Staples, No. 39 thereof, and also strike therefrom the name or names of any other Indians who shall hereafter be found to have received an allotment of land on any Indian reservation: *Provided*, That no part of the money hereby appropriated shall be paid to any of the persons whose names shall be so stricken from the final roll by the Secretary of the Interior.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, after line 15, to insert:

For the construction of a road from the village of Odanah, in the Bad River Reservation, to the south line of said reservation, $20,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, said sum to be reimbursable under such rules, regulations, and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the construction of said road.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, after line 23, to insert:

That the relinquishment executed on the 8th day of May, 1914, at Hayward, Wis., by John Stone, a member of the Lac Court d' Oreilles Band of Chippewa Indians, by which he relinquished all his right, title, interest, and inheritance to the allotment of Maggie Grover, deceased, allotment No. 761 of said band of Indians, and described as follows: The west fractional half of the northwest quarter of section 18, in township 39 north, of range 8 west of the fourth principal meridian, Wisconsin, containing 74 acres and seventy-three one-hundredths of an acre, be, and the same hereby is, validated, and that the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized to issue a patent to the above-described land to Steve Grover, the father of the aforesaid Maggie Grover, deceased.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 25, under the head of "Wyoming," on page 78, line 15, after the word "Indians," to insert "reimbursement to the United States of the expenditures from reimbursable appropriations," and in line 20, after the words "not exceeding," to strike out "$2,175,000" and insert "$2,509,895," so as to make the clause read:

That in addition to the Indian tribal and treaty funds, the expenditure of which is specifically authorized elsewhere in this act, and such sums as may be required for equalization of allotments, education of Indian children, per capita and other payments to Indians, reimbursement to the United States of the expenditures from reimbursable appropriations, and expenditures for the Five Civilized Tribes, in accordance with existing laws, the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to expend not exceeding $2,509,895 from funds held by the United States in trust for the respective tribes, for support and civilization of the Indians under the jurisdiction of the following agencies, to wit.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 15, after the word "Crow," to strike out "$151,000" and insert "$250,000," so as to make the clause read:

In Montana: Blackfeet, $51,920; Crow, $250,000; Flathead, $40,000; Fort Belknap, $41,000; Fort Peck, $9,000; Rocky Boy, $21,000; Tongue River, $25,394.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 21, after the word "Jicarilla," to strike out "$100,105" and insert "$282,000," and in line 22, after the word "Mescalero," to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$75,000," so as to make the clause read:

In New Mexico: Jicarilla, $282,000; Mescalero, $75,000; San Juan, $2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 26, on page 86, line 22, after the words "United States," to insert "in Arizona or New Mexico," so as to make the clause read:

That hereafter no public lands of the United States in Arizona or New Mexico shall be withdrawn by Executive order, proclamation, or otherwise, for or as an Indian reservation except by act of Congress.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I rise to inquire whether other than committee amendments are now in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is a committee amendment, and it would be in order to amend the committee amendment.

Mr. KING. I move to amend the committee amendment by inserting the name "Utah."

Mr. CURTIS. I have no objection to that, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Utah will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 86, line 22, after the name "Arizona," it is proposed to insert the name "Utah."

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, if legislation of that kind is necessary, I think it ought to cover the other States as well.

Mr. CURTIS. I am advised that such legislation is not necessary; and there are conditions in some of the States where there are Indians whom it may be necessary to place on public lands where I think we had better leave the matter to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment which has been offered by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. JONES of Washington. I should like to know what special reason there is for making these States an exception?

Mr. CURTIS. The Senators from Arizona and New Mexico probably could inform the Senator better than I can. There have been some Executive order reservations set aside in those two States, and a year ago a provision was inserted in the Indian appropriation bill which, I think, covers this amendment. Therefore, as a member of the committee, I did not oppose the amendment, because I thought it was already covered by the act of the last Congress. Conditions in Arizona and New Mexico are very different in reference to the Indians than they are in any other States. There are many thousands of Indians there, and they have had many acres set aside by Executive order. The reservations there now are exceedingly large; larger than those in any other State. The object of this provision is to prevent any other reservation being set aside by Executive order in those States.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am not making any objection to that. What I am really objecting to is confining it to Arizona and New Mexico.

Mr. CURTIS. I should dislike very much to see the legislation made general, because, as I stated a moment ago——

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is what I want to get a reason for.

Mr. CURTIS. There are a large number of homeless Indians in different States. There are several thousand in the State of California and there are a number in other States, and it may become necessary for the President to set aside a small reservation by Executive order in order to take care of those Indians; and we want that discretion left in the hands of the President of the United States.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me a minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. FALL. Does not the Senator think that in a case of that kind the Congress of the United States would unhesitatingly grant any request of the Secretary of the Interior? I, of course, am satisfied to have New Mexico excluded, but I am entirely in accord with the suggestion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. I do not think the Secretary of the Interior should have this power which has been exercised. I do not care to go into a discussion of the matter as it has affected us, but I will say that the Santa Fe Railroad and other great railroads have profited to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars by this power being left in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior, not that the Secretary intended to benefit those roads, but other parties represented to him that it was necessary to add on year after year. There have been included in the Navajo Indian Reserve, the Jicarilla Indian Reserve, and in other Indian reservations in the State of New Mexico alternate sections of land belonging to certain railroads, and it has then been perfectly easy for the railroads to get such land exchanged for lands which were worth some three, five, or ten times as much as those that were included in the withdrawal. That is one of the evils of which we complain.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I have a recollection, though it is not distinct, that when Mr. Roosevelt was President of the United States a law was passed including many of the Western States—I think Colorado, Wyoming, and probably Utah——

Mr. SMOOT. No; Utah was not included.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. There were quite a number of States which were included. The reason I remember it so well is that after Congress passed a bill preventing any reservations being made by Executive order the President made the reserves in these different States and then signed the bill, after which no such reservation could be made.

Mr. PITTMAN and Mr. SMOOT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I have concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. PITTMAN. The amendment that is now before the Senate was offered by me to a bill which came from the other House, providing for the opening of Indian reserves for mining purposes under certain conditions. The amendment as presented at that time was in these words:

That hereafter no public lands of the United States shall be withdrawn by Executive order, proclamation, or otherwise for or as an Indian reservation except by act of Congress.

It is not applicable to any particular State at all. It was simply a declaration of policy on the part of the Senate. The Senate adopted that amendment; it was also agreed to in the House of Representatives, as I recollect, when it went over there. That policy has already been adopted by this body in another bill; and I do not see why, having adopted a policy after unlimited debate, we should now attempt to change it. If it is in order—I do not know the parliamentary situation—I offer an amendment to strike out——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests that the proper course would be to disagree to the committee amendment.

Mr. SMOOT rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah wish the floor?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I wish to say a word.

Mr. PITTMAN. I desire to ask, Is an amendment now in order, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment to the committee amendment would be in order, but the object which the Senator seeks to accomplish may be brought about by disagreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. PITTMAN. It will then be open to further amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. PITTMAN. I simply want to repeat, as I have already stated, that this matter was argued at length before this body; it was discussed and unanimously adopted as a policy. While I have the utmost confidence in the Secretary of the Interior and in his department—for the amendment was not presented by me because of any suspicion that the matter would be mismanaged—I think this general policy should be adopted.

Mr. CURTIS. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield to the Senator with pleasure.

Mr. CURTIS. If the Senator is correct—I have just sent for the statute to see if I can find the provision on the subject—why would not the question be covered by the Senator moving to strike out lines 21, 22, 23, and 24, leaving the existing law in force?

Mr. SMOOT. It is not the existing law. It passed this body, but I think it failed in the other House.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. It passed here, but it did not become a law, according to my memory.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield the floor?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator is through, I desire to speak.

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. SMOOT. There seems to be some misunderstanding in relation to the statement just made by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN]. As I remember, the legislative action was just as the Senator from Nevada has stated it, that in a bill which passed this body there was a provision similar to the one which passed the House of Representatives in the Indian appropriation bill; and, if so, there is no need of this provision in the bill.

Mr. PITTMAN. It did not fail there, as I am informed, but the House agreed to the amendment in conference, though the Indian appropriation bill died before the Senate at the last session. The conference report, however, retained that provision, and it was accepted and adopted by the House.

Mr. SMOOT. But it is not the law.

Mr. PITTMAN. It is not the law by reason of the failure of the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. SMOOT. My recollection is that it passed the House.

Mr. PITTMAN. The House adopted it.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, Mr. President, I am willing to support the amendment, although I think it ought to apply to all the States alike.

The act referred to by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] passed back in 1905 or 1906, as I remember, and provides that no land within the States of Wyoming, Montana, Oregon, and one or two other States should be withdrawn for a reservation without an act of Congress.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I think, if I refresh the Senator's memory, he will conclude that that was true only as to forest reserves. Subsequently we placed on the general leasing bill a provision so that it might apply to all reserves; but the law as it stands, according to my recollection, applies only to the withdrawal of public lands for the purpose of forest reserves in the States the Senator has enumerated.

Mr. SMOOT. Be that as it may, Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to have the State of Utah included in this bill if there are going to be any exceptions made at all; but, really, I think that the amendment ought to be disagreed to. I think the House provision should stand; in other words, that it should read:

That hereafter no public lands of the United States shall be withdrawn by Executive order, proclamation, or otherwise for or as an Indian reservation except by act of Congress.

That is what I think ought to be done at this time and that we should make no exception whatever to it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the senior Senator from Utah yield to his colleague?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. KING. Do I understand that the provision which my colleague has just read is found now in the House bill?

Mr. SMOOT. It is in the House bill, and the committee proposes to amend it by limiting it to Arizona and New Mexico. Then my colleague offered an amendment adding "Utah," so that it would apply only, if agreed to, to the three States named. It seems to me that the law ought to be general and that the House provision is the proper one.

Mr. McKELLAR. Should it not apply to the whole country?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Can that object not be accomplished by simply voting down the amendment which confines it to Arizona and New Mexico?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; by disagreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let us disagree to the amendment, and that will make it general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an amendment to the amendment pending.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, just a word. During the last session I introduced an independent bill to prohibit the executive department of the Government—the President, the Secretary of the Interior, or any other agency—from withdrawing any lands for forest purposes or for military purposes or for any other purposes; in other words, restricting the power of withdrawal and leaving the matter entirely to Congress. I felt that there had been an abuse by the executive department of the power which Congress had granted and that Indian reservations and forest reservations had been created and enlarged when there was no reason for so doing, to the detriment of the people and to the serious injury of the public-land States. Therefore, as I have stated, I offered measures for the purpose of correcting the abuse and the evil. Those bills to which I have referred were offered as amendments to measures which were before the Senate, and upon one or two bills the amendments were added. I think that a better way now would be to disagree to the committee amendment, and, if there is in the bill a provision prohibiting the executive department from making withdrawals, to enact that provision as a part of the bill, because it will cover the situation. I therefore withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah withdraws his amendment. The question is now on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and call the attention of the chairman of the committee to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 24, line 4, at the end of the Arizona items, it is proposed to insert:

For an investigation by the Secretary of the Interior of the conditions on the Salt River Indian Reservation, in Arizona, with respect to the necessity of constructing, for the use of the Indians, a bridge across the Salt River, on said reservation, near Lehi, Maricopa County, Ariz., and the said Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to cause plans, surveys, and reports to be made, together with an estimated limit of cost of said bridge and to submit his report thereon to Congress on the first Monday in December, 1919, $2,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, the tribe of Indians referred to in the amendment live on both sides of the Salt River, and whenever the river is up, which is very frequently during the early spring and summer, it is impossible for them to get across from one side of the river to the other. The amendment is merely designed for the purpose of having an investigation made as to the desirability of constructing a bridge there, the usual report to be made by the Secretary.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MYERS. I offer an amendment, which I ask may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 35, at the end of line 12, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a comma and the words "to remain available until expended," so that the paragraph will read:

For continuing construction, maintenance, and operation of the irrigation systems on the Flathead Indian Reservation, in Montana, $375,000 (reimbursable), to remain available until expended.

Mr. CURTIS. I have no objection to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STERLING. I offer the following amendment: On page 63, line 22, strike out the figures "$9,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$12,000."

Mr. CURTIS. I have no objection to that amendment; but if the Senator has any justification for the amendment I wish he would put it in the RECORD, for consideration by the conference committee.

Mr. STERLING. I shall do so. In support of the amendment I submit a letter from the Indian agent, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
UNITED STATES INDIAN SERVICE,
YANKTON INDIAN AGENCY,
Wagner, S. Dak., June 2, 1919.

Hon. THOMAS STERLING,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am writing you with reference to the Indian appropriation bill, and more particularly that portion of it which refers to this agency.

For years there has been a special appropriation known as Yankton Sioux support, amounting to $14,000, but I learn that this amount was reduced in the last bill, which failed to pass at the last session, to $9,000. There is absolutely no justification for this reduction, and it will be impossible for us to conduct the affairs of this agency on the reduced amount. I have never learned why the reduction was made, but if it is not corrected it will mean the crippling of this agency to such an extent that its affairs can not properly be administered.

Senator JOHNSON promised to see that the old amount was restored in the bill this session, but I learn that he has not yet returned to Washington. I also learn that the bill has passed the House and is now before the Senate. Can you help us? The Indian Office, I am sure, desires the old amount restored. If you can do anything it certainly will be appreciated.

Thanking you for any assistance you can give us and assuring you that we will be pleased to reciprocate whenever the opportunity offers, I am,

Very respectfully, A. W. LEECH.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STERLING. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 86, after line 20, it is proposed to insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to issue a patent in fee simple to the duly authorized missionary board, or other proper authority, of any religious organization engaged in mission or school work on any Indian reservation for such lands thereon as have been heretofore set apart to and are now being used and occupied by such organization for mission or school purposes.

Mr. CURTIS. I have no objection to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was was agreed to.

Mr. PITTMAN. I suggest to the chairman of the committee that it might be better if the sections of the bill were numbered a little differently. For instance, in the case of the amendment which we have recently been discussing in regard to the withdrawal of lands for Indian purposes, would it not be better if that were numbered "section 27" and the succeeding section, now numbered 27, numbered 28?

Mr. CURTIS. I have no objection to changing the number of the sections.

Mr. PITTMAN. I offer that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The sections will be changed in accordance with the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CURTIS, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. ASHURST conferees on the part of the Senate.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF DISABLED SOLDIERS.

Mr. KENYON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1213, being Calendar No. 3.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1213) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, which had been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor with amendments.

The Secretary read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, be hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. That every person enlisted, enrolled, drafted, inducted, or appointed in the military or naval forces of the United States, including members of training camps authorized by law, who, since April 7, 1917, has resigned or has been discharged or furloughed therefrom under honorable conditions, having a disability incurred, increased, or aggravated while a member of such forces, or later developing a disability traceable in the opinion of the board to service with such forces, and who, in the opinion of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, is in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of such disability, shall be furnished by the said board, where vocational rehabilitation is feasible, such course of vocational rehabilitation as the board shall prescribe and provide.

"The board shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to furnish the persons included in this section suitable courses of vocational rehabilitation, to be prescribed and provided by the board; and every person electing to follow such a course of vocational rehabilitation shall, while following the same, be paid monthly by the said board from the appropriation hereinafter provided such sum as in the judgment of the said board is necessary for his maintenance and support, and for the maintenance and support of persons depending upon him, if any: *Provided, however*, That in no event shall the sum so paid such person while pursuing such course be less than the amount of his monthly pay for the last month of active service.

"No compensation under article 3 of the act entitled 'An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department,"' approved October 6, 1917, shall be paid for the period during which any such person is being furnished by said board a course of vocational rehabilitation and support as herein authorized: *Provided, however*, That in the event any person pursuing a course of vocational rehabilitation is entitled under said article 3 to compensation in an amount in excess of the payments made to him by the said board for his support and the support of his dependents, if any, the Bureau of War Risk Insurance shall pay monthly to such person such additional amount as may be necessary to equal the total compensation due under said article 3 of said act.

"There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, available immediately and until expended, the sum of $6,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be used by the Federal Board for Vocational Education for the purpose of making the payments prescribed by this section and for defraying the administrative expenses incident thereto."

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I wish I might prevail upon those Senators who are present to interest themselves in this bill. This is not the bill that was before the Senate a few days ago. It is a bill with relation to vocational rehabilitation for men discharged from the military and naval forces. It is a bill of immediate importance, urged by the Secretary of the Treasury in a letter which is attached to the report, which I hope Senators will read, and urged likewise by the Vocational Educational Board.

It is designed to meet this situation: There are over 4,000 soldiers now living in different parts of the country who can not secure the vocational training necessary to rehabilitate themselves, as Congress has provided, because of conflicting decisions between the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and the Board of Vocational Education. I say to Senators—to the 10 or 12 who, now that the speech-making time has gone by, are settling down to business—that the condition of mind these soldiers are getting into who have gone across the sea and given their arms and their legs and who were willing to give their lives to the service of their country is a very important one. They have been waiting around two or three months, getting no compensation from the Bureau of War Risk Insurance—and I am not saying this in a critical way—but wondering when the Government, for which they were willing to give their lives, is going to deal justly with them.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. KING. As I understand the statement of the Senator, the unfortunate and brave soldiers to whom he has just referred are not receiving any compensation or pension or any contribution whatever from the Government. My recollection of the act which is now the law is that it makes provision for some compensation to persons in the condition referred to.

Mr. KENYON. Let me explain to the Senator. Under the act which was approved June 27, 1918, which is commonly known as the soldiers' vocational rehabilitation act, it was provided:

SEC. 2. That every person who is disabled under circumstances entitling him after discharge from the military or the naval forces of the United States to compensation under section 3 of the act—

And so forth.

The War Risk Insurance Bureau, having charge of this matter, interprets these words to mean not what seems to be the plain purport of the words—that is, if a man is disabled under circumstances entitling him to compensation he may have vocational training—but they go further and hold that he must be actually receiving compensation in order to get the training. The determination of the question of compensation is quite a long matter. The bureau has to investigate the soldier's history, his relationships, his dependents, and it is a matter of several months. The applications are coming in now at the rate of 100 a day; the peak will be reached about July 1, but, under the construction of the War Risk Insurance Bureau, the disabled soldiers can not get this training until the compensation is actually being paid to them. Now, the Secretary of the Treasury——

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, they are receiving pensions or compensation under a former act that was passed by Congress, are they not?

Mr. KENYON. No; not in these cases. If they are entitled to compensation and are being paid compensation, then they can have the vocational training. If they are not being paid compensation they can not have such training, and some of them have not been paid any compensation for three months. The question of their compensation has not yet been determined.

Mr. McKELLAR. As a matter of fact, they are in the Army still and drawing their regular pay, but they are receiving no compensation at all, and it is really costing the Government an additional sum by reason of this delay. They will have to pay them compensation, and they are paying them their regular pay.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if I remember the act—and I am not sure which act it is—there is a provision that persons who go into the service shall receive a certain amount for the support of their families during the period they are in the war.

Mr. KENYON. Yes; they have been supposed to.

Mr. KING. And there is a further provision that in the event of injury they shall receive certain compensation. I had in mind that statute and was wondering if they were not receiving the amount provided in an act of Congress for compensation to be paid for persons who were injured in the Army.

Mr. KENYON. No; that is the very point in question.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. KENYON. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I was on the subcommittee that had this legislation in hand, and I remember it very well; and I really can not understand why a soldier who is disabled is not being paid by the Government of the United States what the law provides.

In the act of October 6, 1917—by the way, that was not the first act that was passed—specific provision is made for soldiers receiving disability, and it is found in section 300 of that act. It reads as follows:

That for death or disability resulting from personal injury suffered or disease contracted in the line of duty, by any commissioned officer or enlisted man or by any member of the Army Nurse Corps (female) or of the Navy Nurse Corps (female) when employed in the active service under the War Department or Navy Department, the United States shall pay compensation as hereinafter provided; but no compensation shall be paid if the injury or disease has been caused by his own willful misconduct.

Section 301 provides for the rates to be paid in case of the soldier's death.

Section 302 provides for the rates to be paid to the soldier in case of disability, and they are as follows:

If he has neither wife nor child living, $30.
If he has a wife but no child living, $45.
If he has a wife and one child living, $55.
If he has a wife and two children living, $65.
If he has a wife and three or more children living, $75.
If he has no wife but one child living, $40, with $10 for each additional child up to two.
If he has a widowed mother dependent on him for support, then, in addition to the above amounts, $10.

Do I understand the Senator to say that in the case of men who have lost their arms, and are disabled, the Government is not paying them the compensation provided for here?

Mr. KENYON. I say yes; it is not paying them until it determines the question of whether they are entitled to the compensation. They must be hurt in the line of duty and not through their own willful misconduct. Those are questions requiring investigation, and they are behind to the extent of about 55,000 cases.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, of course, it is not on account of the law; it is on account of the collapse of the War Risk Insurance Bureau.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it is——

Mr. KENYON. Let me say to the Senator——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KENYON. I should like to get a chance to explain this matter; but go ahead.

Mr. McKELLAR. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. KENYON. No; go ahead. I shall be glad to have the Senator make his statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. I just want to say that they come in so rapidly that they are 4,000 soldiers behind now—soldiers who have been wounded and who are entitled to vocational education. They just have not been able to keep up with them. There are I forget how many thousand, but a great many thousand, perhaps over 100,000, applications for the benefits of this act, but there are 4,000 of them that need vocational education and want it and are just waiting for it and can not get it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator is perfectly aware of that, and I do not want the Senate to get the impression that I am not in favor of taking care of these wounded soldiers. That is not what I rose for. Then I was going to continue by asking the Senator another question, and he can answer them both at once.

The bill that is before the Senate at this time provides:

That in no event shall the sum so paid such person while pursuing such course be more than $75 per month for a single man without dependents, or for a man with dependents $75 per month, plus the several sums prescribed as family allowances under section 204 of Article II of the war-risk insurance act.

It appears to me—and I want to know if this is the fact, because I have not had time to go into it as I should—that if this bill passes a soldier who is single will be paid $75 a month, providing he has no dependents.

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. But if he is a married man, then he is paid $75 per month and whatever the law allows him as an additional amount, as provided under the law, when he has dependents.

Mr. KENYON. That is correct.

Mr. SMOOT. As I remember, the law provides that——

Mr. KENYON. The Senator has read section 302.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. KENYON. Not to exceed $50 per month.

Mr. SMOOT. Not to exceed $50 per month is correct; but that is section 204. That is $50 per month, plus the several sums prescribed as family allowances under section 204 of Article II of the war-risk insurance act. I did not read that. That is another provision of law. They get that whether they are injured or not, under section 204; and that provides——

Mr. KENYON. That family allowance under section 204 is limited by what follows. You can not exceed the $50 per month.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is correct on that; but what I was going to ask the Senator was this: Suppose this bill becomes a law and they are paid the $75, plus whatever amount is granted them for dependents. The Senator from Tennessee says the applications are coming in so fast now that they can not take care of them. Is this in addition to what they are receiving to-day, that they have not yet been paid by the Government?

Mr. KENYON. During the time they receive the allowances under this amendment to section 2 they will receive no compensation under the war-risk insurance act.

Mr. SMOOT. That is as I understood it.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is in lieu of it.

Mr. KENYON. The average time of training of these men is 10 months. It will be a heavy burden during the 10 months; but this whole plan of rehabilitation of the soldiers will not cost this Government over $12,000,000, while Canada is spending $25,000,000 on the same proposition, due largely to the fact that in Canada they are constructing buildings. We do not have to do that. We have this apparatus and all of this machinery now to carry on the work.

Mr. SMOOT. In Canada they make other donations, do they not, directly to the soldiers?

Mr. KENYON. Yes; they make direct donations to the soldiers.

Mr. SMOOT. I think that is the great bulk of the cost, although I am not sure of that.

Mr. KENYON. I will say to the Senator that this will be finished in about three years. It will not require over three years.

Mr. SMOOT. For instance, say it will cost $500 for each soldier, I should judge, on an average. Many of them are single, and in that case they would not have, more than likely, dependents upon them; but if they did, it would not be more than a mother or father. There would be no children or wife.

Mr. McKELLAR. It would cost more than that. It would probably cost a thousand or nine hundred dollars for 10 months—$750 at least.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, for 10 months.

Mr. KENYON. Getting away a little from that question, the average number of men in training during the fiscal years 1919 and 1920 will be approximately 7,000. That is the best estimate they can give. At the rate of $75 a month, the support of these men will require $525,000 per month, or $6,300,000 in a year. That is the way those figures are reached.

I want to say to the Senator, as to the number of these men, that the Federal board conformed to the requirements of the bureau, and up to May 10 of this year submitted for the determination of the bureau, as to compensability, applications for compensation of 26,814 disabled men. Of these applications through the Federal board, 8,622 were the cases of men already surveyed by the district officers of the board and recommended by the district boards to the central office for training. They have actually in training something like 3,200 men now, and the result of this ruling of the War Risk Bureau, which I will agree with the Senator has gone largely to pieces—of course it has been hard worked as a result of this situation—has been the raising of funds by private institutions.

The Elks have raised a fund of $200,000—to the great credit of the Elks—that has been loaned out to these boys, so that they can carry on this vocational training which they want and live in the meantime. The Knights of Columbus have done some of that work also, and the Red Cross.

I have here some most interesting documents. Here are checks sent back to the Elks's fund from these soldier boys who have lost arms and legs, in the sum of $10 and $50, and post-office orders sent in for small sums, paying back this money that has been loaned to them, and every one of them apparently is endeavoring to pay this money back. I say it is a shame that these boys, who have done what they have and want vocational training, so that they can go into some vocation to make a living, because of the physical condition in which they are, are dependent upon private charity to do the work that their Government ought to do. It is a national disgrace. That is what this bill is aimed to correct.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator right there that I am in full sympathy and accord with all that he says with relation to the assistance of these most unfortunate American boys. What I wanted to get at was to have an understanding, so that there could be no ruling of any bureau of the Government that would cut them out of whatever they are entitled to hereafter; and in order to do that I thought we ought to know just exactly what each soldier was to receive, as far as it was possible, and what change there was in existing law to-day, and the reasons for it. I think that if it is going to cost $100 a month

for each soldier on an average, the $6,000,000 provided for here will be consumed, of course, in the 10 months.

Mr. KENYON. Oh, yes.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not any doubt about that.

Mr. KENYON. It may not be sufficient. It depends on how many of these boys there will be. They estimate that there will be 10,000 at the highest peak of the number for training.

Mr. SMOOT. That will be $10,000,000.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. KENYON. I do.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I should like to ask the Senator if I have a correct understanding of the reason for this bill and its purpose.

First of all, no soldier can receive the benefits of vocational education unless he has been honorably discharged, and, secondly, unless he is disabled. Those tests are passed upon by the Board for Vocational Education. A third requirement is one of having the compensation fixed. That is passed upon by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. The result has been so much red tape and dealing back and forth between these two boards that great delay and great inconvenience have been suffered by disabled soldiers. The purpose of this bill, as I undertand, is to do away with that red tape, is agreed to by both boards, and is to promote and hasten action so that the disabled soldiers speedily and quickly can get the benefit of vocational education. Is that the situation?

Mr. KENYON. That is the situation; and the Secretary of the Treasury, as will be seen by the letter attached to the report, warmly indorses this proposition. The War Risk Bureau is under his department of the Government. He feels that this should be done. The Assistant Secretary came before the committee and urged it. The Vocational Board feel that it should be done. It takes this work away from the War Risk Bureau and puts it entirely in the hands of the Vocational Board.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me to make a statement right along this line at this time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KENYON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The fault of the situation is in the law more than in its administration. The law provides that the Vocational Board shall examine into every applicant's eligibility for training under the act, and if they find him all right they accept him; but the same law provides that before they can give him this training he must be receiving compensation under the insurance act.

Mr. KENYON. That is the construction that the War Risk Bureau places on the law.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the construction that they have placed upon the law, and I assume that that construction is right. I think it is right. And, of course, that means delay. The purpose and object of this bill is to do away with that delay by changing the law and putting it in the power now of the Vocational Board to determine when these men shall be given the training, and the result of this change of the law will be simply to permit the Vocational Education Board to pass upon the eligibility of its own applicants and give them the training at once. There are 4,000 of these applicants who are not receiving the training when they ought to receive the training, simply because of the fault in the law and not the fault of anyone else. This removes that obstacle.

Mr. KENYON. It will not alter the expense of the Government, except in one particular. The money that is now paid will be paid by the board. There will be that much less money needed for the War Risk Insurance Bureau, except that there may be a few cases where the Board of Vocational Training may hold that a man is entitled to this training where the War Risk Insurance Bureau might have held otherwise. There will be a few, but not many.

Mr. McKELLAR. If so, it is an error in the right direction. Surely if there is a man who is maimed and in such a condition that vocational training will help him, even if he should not be entitled to the compensation fixed by the war-risk insurance act, he ought to have the training, anyway. It will be an error that ought to be made.

Mr. KENYON. I do not want to agree with the Senator's proposition that the fault is in the law. There is really not much use in discussing that. I can not conceive how the Bureau of War Risk Insurance have interpreted this law in the way they have, but lawyers always differ on construction of the law.

Mr. McKELLAR. It has been so interpreted by all connected with it on both sides. There can not be any mistake about it. The error is with the law, and not with the administration of it at all.

Mr. KENYON. Well, let it go that way. I do not agree, however, with the proposition.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that I think there was great wisdom in the law as it was framed, if we had had preparation, and the soldier could have immediately gone into the school for rehabilitation. Then I think the law as written was correct, and ought to have applied only to those who were receiving compensation from the Government. But coming back here, as they did, with no preparation, they either had to remain in the Army or else, under the law, lose the benefits to which they were entitled. But if we had been prepared to take every disabled soldier and put him into the training that we now are undertaking to do, then the law, as written, was a very wise provision.

Mr. McKELLAR. At all events, we all agree now that this amendment ought to be enacted, and these boys ought to be put in school.

Mr. KENYON. And I will say that this board have informed me that they can take care of all of these boys within a week. It ought to be passed at once.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let us pass the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will.

Mr. KING. I was rather curious to know what will be the result if this bill shall pass. Does it repeal pro tanto the provisions of the act to which attention was just called by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], under which disabled soldiers receive compensation; or do the two acts run along parallel, so that the soldier receives compensation up to $100 a month, or perhaps more if he is married, under this bill, and compensation under the act of 1917?

Mr. KENYON. Let me illustrate that to the Senator, and I can make it clearer, premising that by saying this is a substitution for section 2 of the act.

Mr. KING. Of which act?

Mr. KENYON. Of the vocational rehabilitation act, not of the war-risk insurance act. Now, let us take a man who is entitled to rating of complete disability on account of loss of both eyes or loss of both hands, to $100 a month; but he has no dependents. Under this he would receive the $75 a month, and then the War Risk Bureau would still have to pay the $25 a month more; but that is a matter that they can take their time to determine. It may take two or three months to determine his case. In the meantime he is going right along with this training; so the two acts operate and intertwine together.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will still indulge me——

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. KING. Under the act of 1917, the disabled soldier would receive compensation the aggregate amount of which I do not now carry in my mind; and under the measure which is now before the Senate for consideration he will receive a certain amount up to $75 a month if single, and a larger amount if he is married. The question I am interested to have answered is whether or not, in view of obtaining the amount provided by the bill under consideration, it diminishes the aggregate sum to which he would be entitled under the other act, assuming that he did not avail himself of the vocational training?

Mr. KENYON. Oh, it does not apply at all if he does not avail himself of the vocational training. It has nothing to do with the situation. He goes right ahead and has his compensation. We are only talking about vocational training. Now, where he takes his vocational training, if he gets his $75 a month, he gets nothing else unless he is entitled by total disability to more than $75 a month; but if he does not take the vocational training, he goes right ahead under the war-risk insurance act and draws the compensation for injury, just as he would if this law were not in existence. The two things have nothing to do with one another, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. KING. As I understand, then, he may avail himself of all of the provisions of the act of 1917, no matter how much he might obtain there, and, in addition, obtain the $75 a month here?

Mr. KENYON. No; not exactly that. Do I not make it clear to the Senator when I take the case of a boy who is suffering from absolute disability? He would be entitled to $100 a month, and we will say there is no vocational training law of any kind. That is what he would get.

Mr. KING. Under the act of 1917?

Mr. KENYON. Yes. Now, there is a vocational training law. He has a right to this vocational training. He will receive, during that time, what has been estimated to be necessary

to support him—$75 a month. Now, there is $25 a month more coming to him, but not $100. Do I make that plain?

Mr. KING. I comprehend. Then, the two acts do not run along parallel. This is a repeal, pro tanto, of the other act?

Mr. KENYON. To that extent. You could hardly call it a repeal. It simply provides there shall be no compensation under that act while he is receiving his allowance under this act.

Mr. KING. Let me put one other question, and perhaps that will answer it. As I understand the Senator, under the act of 1917 the maximum amount which he might receive would be $100. The maximum amount under this bill, if he were single, would be $75.

Mr. KENYON. If he had no dependents.

Mr. KING. Can the Senator conceive of a case where the man would get $175?

Mr. KENYON. No; I do not think I can. I can perhaps conceive of a case where he would get $150.

Mr. KING. Then the two acts run along substantially parallel?

Mr. KENYON. Yes. If he had dependents—a father and a mother dependent upon him, or a wife and a child dependent upon him—I think it would run up to something near $150 a month.

Mr. KING. Was it not intended that the amount provided under this bill should be subtracted from the amount which he might obtain under the other bill?

Mr. KENYON. Oh, practically so during the time of the training, yes; during the time of the training; but if he would secure less under the other bill—another ruling of the War Risk Bureau; they allowed the basic pay of $30 a month—he could receive the larger allowance under this. Now, the Vocational Training Board had to come along and supplement that with $35 or $45 more a month that the man needed in order to live. He could not live on $30 a month. The private would be allowed $30 per month, his pay in his last month, while the captain would be allowed something like $200 a month; but it was the intention, I think, that the amount taken for vocational training would not be held down to the basic pay, because as a private soldier he had subsistence, he had perquisites in matters that the board have taken into consideration; and they rather stretched the law, section 4 of this vocational act, in allowing to that man $35 or $40 more per month. So they are now paying $75 a month to all of these men to enable them to live, and they tell me that a man can not get along for less in any kind of reasonable and decent comfort.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. KENYON. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to my colleague that under no circumstances can a soldier receive more than $125 per month under this provision. It says:

That in no event shall the sum so paid such person while pursuing such course be more than $75 per month for a single man without dependents, or for a man with dependents $75 per month plus the several sums prescribed as family allowances under section 204 of article 2 of the war-risk insurance act.

Section 204 of article 2 of the war-risk insurance act provides certain allowances to the wife or the dependents of a man, but in no case shall the allowance be more than $50 a month. So all any soldier can get under this provision is the $75 directly provided for and the maximum allowed under article 2 of section 204 of the war-risk insurance act. So $50 is the maximum and $75 is the direct allowance, making $125 maximum of both. It can not be more than that.

Mr. KENYON. I think that is true. I spoke inadvertently, not thinking of the section limiting the amount to $50 a month. One hundred and twenty-five dollars would be the maximum.

Mr. POMERENE and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. KENYON. I yield first to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. I am not sure that I have heard any explanation of the matter to which I want to direct the attention of the Senator from Iowa. I assume, of course, that in the administration of this law, even though the board had serious or substantial doubts, I will say, as to the capacity of the soldier to receive the vocational training he desired, those doubts would be resolved in favor of the boy?

Mr. KENYON. I am afraid not.

Mr. POMERENE. They ought to be.

Mr. KENYON. Yes; they ought to be.

Mr. POMERENE. That leads me to another question. Assuming, for the sake of the argument, that there were these uncertainties, but later on it became apparent to the board that a further effort to rehabilitate the crippled soldier would be unavailing, how long would this course of training continue?

Mr. KENYON. I will say to the Senator that is entirely within the option of the board. They have some boys in a two-year law course. That seems pretty extravagant; but I know one boy, who lost both legs, a boy of strong mentality, whom they put in a law course for two years. They put some in medical courses. It is entirely with the board, but the average period of time is 10 months.

Mr. POMERENE. What rule controls this board in the determination of the fact as to whether a young man should receive this vocational training?

Mr. KENYON. They try to visit the boys in the hospitals. They have regular men, the best men they can get for this purpose, who talk it over with the boy, who visit with the boy, see what he wants to do, examine him, and talk to him as to what they may think, and advise him, and proceed in a friendly way to try to secure that thing for the boy he seems capable of doing and that he desires to do.

Mr. POMERENE. Why does the Senator say if there was any doubt on this question it would be resolved against the young man?

Mr. KENYON. I thought the Senator said it had been resolved in favor of the young man.

Mr. POMERENE. Oh, no.

Mr. KENYON. I think it will be resolved in favor of the soldier, but I think it has not been so resolved.

Mr. POMERENE. That relieves my mind very materially.

Mr. KENYON. It relieves my mind if the Senator misunderstood me. There have been cases where a man lost an arm and had gone and tried to do the same work or taken the same job that he had before. The Bureau of War Risk Insurance has written to him and found out he was earning wages and doing the same thing he had previously done, and have denied him compensation, holding that where a man could go back to the same work he has been doing he was not entitled to compensation. Under that ruling he could not secure vocational training. That was another ruling that made great difficulty. Those things perhaps we had better bury. They are past.

Mr. POMERENE. The Government ought to do the very best it can for these boys.

Mr. KENYON. Yes. I think there is no apparent objection to this bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield for just a moment? I want to say to the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], who raised the question of $75 a month and the other compensation that might go to a soldier, that the board very carefully, as shown by the hearings, looked into the matter. They tried $65 a month for these boys at first, and were obliged to raise it. Under no circumstances will the boy, even though he may have dependents or as many dependents as he might have, receive more than $125 a month. At all events it runs on an average of only 10 months. It will not be long; and surely such doubts as those referred to ought to be resolved in favor of the boy. I hope the Senator from Utah will withdraw his objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the committee.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 1, before the word "then," strike out the word "less" and insert the word "more," and after the word "than" strike out "the amount of his monthly pay for the last month of active service" and insert "$75 per month for a single man without dependents, or for a man with dependents $75 per month plus the several sums prescribed as family allowances under section 204 of article 2 of the war-risk insurance act," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, however, That in no event shall the sum so paid such person while pursuing such course be more than $75 per month for a single man without dependents, or for a man with dependents $75 per month plus the several sums prescribed as family allowances under section 204 of article 2 of the war-risk insurance act.

Mr. POMERENE. Allow me to call the attention of the Senator, if I may, to what seems to be somewhat of a differentiation here. On line 1 it is provided that while pursuing such course the amount he is to receive can not be more than $75 per month.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is perfectly clear.

Mr. POMERENE. Why should not the same language be used in line 4, so that it would read also that in no event should he get more than $75 per month?

Mr. KENYON. The Senator will bear in mind that in line 2 the $75 per month is for a single man without dependents. The balance of the proviso is for a man with dependents. A man with dependents has more than $75 a month.

Mr. POMERENE. I understand.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there is a great deal of legislation before the committees of the Senate, and I think time can be saved by the Senate adjourning until Monday, in order that the committees may consider the legislation which is before them.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator from Utah, I assume, is going to make a motion to adjourn until Monday?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I rose for that purpose.

Mr. KENYON. I heard a number of Senators say they are desirous of going ahead with the business of the Senate, and they do not know of any particular reason why we should adjourn until Monday. There are other important bills here. I have another bill I would like to take up, but I have given way to my colleague for a bill which, I understood, he would bring up. I do not see why we should not stay here and work to-morrow, and if it is not the desire to take up the bill of which my colleague has charge I would like to move to go ahead with No. 2 on the calendar, which is the bill (S. 18) to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from Iowa there are a number of Senators who have spoken about Senate bill No. 18 who want to be here when it is brought up for consideration. There seemed to be an understanding that it would not be taken up to-day, and I advised one or two Senators that the bill would not be taken up to-day. I thought it would save time, and I believe it will, to adjourn until Monday, if there is no real objection to the adjournment.

Mr. KENYON. I am not going to raise an objection. We spend the first two hours every day apparently in oratory upon resolutions, and then those who participate in the oratory are in favor of adjourning. These important bills ought to receive attention here. We should go ahead and attend to the business of the Senate. I am ready to go ahead.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why can we not go on this afternoon?

Mr. KENYON. I assured the Senator from Utah I would not ask the Senate to go ahead this afternoon.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator if I had not understood, of course, that Senate bill No. 18 was going over I would have been perfectly willing to have gone on and considered it to-day. Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate do now adjourn until Monday next.

Mr. OWEN. Will the Senator withhold his motion for just a moment?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly, I will withhold the motion.

EXPORT TRADE.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I have called attention several times to a matter, and I would like to ask the Senators present to listen to its presentation again. Our commodity balances are now running to the extent of $400,000,000 per month in excess of what Europe and the outside world are shipping to us. We are not going to be able to continue to make the shipments unless credits, and long-time credits, are arranged for the European countries. There must be some organization for that purpose.

The War Finance Corporation act required, as a condition of extending credits, that individual American banks and individual American export houses should themselves underwrite the credits. They are not willing to do so. They can not afford to tie up their liquid assets in long-time investments. The consequence is that month after month has gone by without affording this relief. I have called it to the attention of various authorities of the Treasury Department, urging them to take some action. I called it to the attention of the Secretary of Commerce. I have a letter from him, which I will ask to have printed in the RECORD, where it may be seen, bearing upon this question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, June 3, 1919.

Hon. ROBERT L. OWEN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have given some thought to the matter which you kindly presented to me orally and through the draft of your proposed measure. The subject, I need hardly say, is a large one. Something is necessary that will do the work for which you plan. We must provide means promptly for the sale of the securities of foreign nations, foreign corporations, municipalities, utilities, industries, etc., in the United States. This is necessary now and for the future in order to provide credits in this country against which our war associates and other nations may buy, thus maintaining the movement of our export trade. The maintenance of this export trade is of essential value to us now. Some may say the export trade is but a small fraction of the domestic trade; why care so keenly for it? This leaves out of the account certain facts. During the war, for obvious reasons, we greatly increased our productive capacity, until to-day it is far larger than ever before. Yet before the war—that is to say, before this increase—it was necessary to sell abroad in order to keep our factories running full time, because the absorptive capacity of the country is not large enough continuously to take the full output of all our industries running steadily at full time. This was so before the war; it is more so now. Lacking an outlet for the products thus made by a greater producing capacity, the result must be either the suspension of certain industries, with the consequent effects upon both capital and labor, or else the congestion of products lacking a sufficient market, which would mean a sudden collapse in prices—perhaps of all possible economic events the one which would be most greatly to be deplored. Now, it would mean widespread disaster. This is from the domestic side, but equally cogent reasons apply from the foreign side.

The nations of the world have needs which we can and should supply. Present conditions, however, do not permit purchasing save at ruinous cost. We receive frequent letters protesting against embargoes in one or another country against purchasing in the United States. The conditions, however, which cause these restrictions are supremely exigent. In Italy to-day, for example, the difference of exchange causes a tax of 40 to 60 per cent on merchants who would buy from the United States. In a lesser degree this is true elsewhere. The nations that need our supplies, both of raw materials and finished goods, can not pay us in gold, can not render adequate services in payment, and can not fully pay us in goods. This applies both to past and present debt and to present and future purchases. We can meet this problem by purchasing their securities, and, so far as I know, this is the only key adequate to unlock the problem.

This course, furthermore, has a threefold economic advantage; we receive interest upon the investment; we obtain the business normally arising out of the operations conducted by American capital, thus adding to our export trade upon a safe basis; and we develop the wealth of the countries in which these operations are carried on, thus adding alike to their power to pay their present debt to us and to make further purchases from us.

But we lack facilities for bringing about this desirable condition. The situation is new to us; we do not know what the foreign securities are that we can safely buy, nor even where we can readily go to learn their character. There is no established market for them.

It has been suggested that the credits authorized through the War Finance Corporation offer sufficient means for meeting the export necessities of the country. They do, in a certain way, but not in the way we are considering. They enable American exporters to give long credits, and thus contribute, doubtless, to solving that particular phase of the problem. They do not (and this is the crux of it) provide buying power on the other side, nor do they directly help to forward the development of the wealth of those countries nor give to us any control, however indirect, over their purchases.

In a general way, export trade can be divided into two large classes, which we may call the competitive class and the constructive class, or we may style them the trading class and the development class. The credits of the War Finance Corporation may care for the competitive or the trading class of foreign trade; they are not so well able to care for the constructive or the development class of that business. The former is a matter of six or nine months' credit, or even a year or two. The latter involves a more or less permanent investment and a market must be provided, in order that the securities based on these investments may be readily sold. The two conditions are therefore radically unlike, and the medium wisely provided and ably directed for one was not intended for the other.

We therefore recur to what the mechanism should be for furnishing knowledge of and a market for the foreign securities which we shall have to buy if our foreign trade, so necessary to our domestic prosperity, is itself to prosper. I am not sure about the Government's direct part in it. It seems to me more consonant with our principles and our practice in the past that this matter should be handled purely by private enterprise and capital. Yet I recognize that we can not apply the reasoning of the past to the problems of the present, for that experience and those principles were based upon traditions and conditions which have ceased to be. It is with some force urged that in order to secure public confidence in this novel business of buying foreign securities we must have the assurance that would come not merely from the oversight but from the actual participation by the Government in the ownership and direction of the organization which is to perform so novel and yet so necessary a function. I find myself increasingly inclined to the belief that this may be desirable and to the acceptance of the thought that it may be necessary. If this is so, the rest is a detail. Yet I should be glad if, instead of making the Department of Commerce the sole Government agency, the major part could be given to the Treasury Department, though I think it proper and right that at least one director and some definite participation should be given to the Department of Commerce, which, it is well to remember here, is the only department charged by law with the duty of fostering, promoting, and developing the commerce of the United States.

Concerning the other details, I am not at the moment specially interested, and I take it that you do not care for me to intrude longer upon your time and thought. The principle is, doubtless, what you desire at the time to establish. I assume that the draft of a measure which you have prepared was intended to act as a stimulus to thought rather than to be exactly accurate in every detail. It would seem right and wise, if the Government has one-fourth of the capital stock of the organization, that it should be limited to an equal proportion of the board of directors. However, all these things will be worked out in time. I trust I have for the moment sufficiently met all the things which are in your mind.

Before any final draft of the measure were prepared it would seem to me wise that a conference should take place between yourself and such other legislators as might be immediately concerned, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Federal Reserve Board, the War Finance Corporation, and representatives of the Department of Commerce, and possibly you would feel that representatives of the Department of State should also be invited.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,
Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. OWEN. I wish to emphasize and to impress upon the Senate, and upon the Republican Members of the Senate particularly, their responsibility in protecting the commerce of this country. If they do not do it, it will be their fault. I have called their attention to it time and again. I am willing to cooperate with them along any reasonable line that will afford this relief, but if they do not do it and they run into a panic in the matter of exchange, it will be their own fault.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Oklahoma that in the closing days of the last session of Congress there was a bill passed authorizing a million dollars for this very purpose.

Mr. OWEN. Yes; and it was tied up so that it could not be used.

Mr. SMOOT. I recognize, Mr. President, that even though it were usable it is not sufficient to take care of the commerce that we are expecting to have with foreign countries. I am in full sympathy with what the Senator has said, and I am quite sure that the majority Members of this body begin to realize the importance of that legislation.

Mr. OWEN. I do not think they do realize it.

Mr. SMOOT. I hope a bill along the lines he has just suggested—and others have already suggested it, too—will be reported from the committee at an early date and that it will pass this body.

Mr. OWEN. It ought to be acted upon promptly, because this matter is already doing very great harm to the commerce of the United States.

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE CONTROL.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I move in behalf of my colleague, now occupying the chair, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 120) to repeal chapter 154 of the act of the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, being the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918. I make the motion merely to have the bill become the unfinished business.

Mr. POMERENE. I hope the bill will be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY.

Mr. SMOOT. I send to the desk a resolution which has been passed by the Senate. Since that resolution was passed another resolution has been passed by this body adding certain provisions to it. I ask for a reconsideration of the vote by which the former resolution was passed, and then I shall ask that it be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah moves that the vote by which Senate resolution 53 was adopted be reconsidered. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SMOOT. I now move that the resolution be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the resolution be read.

Mr. SMOOT. It is merely a resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any subcommittee thereof, to send for persons and papers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be indefinitely postponed.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 9, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *June 6, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, who art in heaven, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, great men reach great conclusions and strive to follow in the way of truth; but other men refute the truth in their acts; hence science, religion, and the simplest precepts of life fall into disrepute; hence accidents which we witnessed yesterday in a mining community, which swept out of existence many lives, maimed others, left widows and orphans in despair.

To know truth and follow its precepts and the simplest rules of life is to follow Thee, do Thy will, and live now and evermore. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want an entry made nunc pro tunc, extending leave of absence beginning yesterday until next Monday for the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. He is absent on account of the severe illness of his little son. He wrote me in plenty of time if I had received the letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the leave of absence will be granted.

There was no objection.

NATHAN HALE.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on Nathan Hale, a Revolutionary hero. To-day is the one hundred and sixty-fourth anniversary of his birth.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on Nathan Hale. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRINTING OF RESOLUTIONS IN THE RECORD.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the resolution of protest against the Polish atrocities adopted at a mass meeting in Richmond, Va., June 2, 1919.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the resolutions referred to. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, I do not think we ought to have these various resolutions that are being adopted printed in the RECORD. There is a way provided by dropping them in the basket, and the RECORD will contain notice that they have been filed. Is there any particular reason why this resolution should be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am not apprised just what are the reasons appertaining to similar resolutions in other sections of the country. This was a largely attended mass meeting, representative in character, and there is a great desire by the participants that there be a record of it.

Mr. WALSH. A great many people think that by putting things in the RECORD it gives them great publicity, while others believe that it is interring them. I object.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege. Mr. Speaker, there appears on page 9 of this morning's edition of the Washington Post a false statement concerning me, as follows:

In large headlines there appears—

Has three sons in pay of House. Representative BLANTON is charged as subject to antitrust law.

I submit that to the Speaker, as I want to show that it is false.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of the opinion that if it really charges the gentleman with a breach of the law it is a question of privilege.

Mr. BLANTON. To a lawyer's mind it might not, but to the ordinary reader of a newspaper, to the layman's mind——

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is a question of privilege. How much time does the gentleman wish?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House give me an hour, but I am not going to take up very much time if my colleagues do not interrupt me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, concerning the practice of patronage, it is as old as the House of Representatives itself. It is well known to the membership of this House, if it is not known to all the people of the United States, that the party in power in Washington has patronage positions. When I came here that system was in vogue, and it happened that my party was in power, and the leaders of my party who had the distribution of the patronage belonging to this House told me, in writing, that I had the right to name a page in the House of Representatives. At the same time it told me that I had the right to put a post-office clerk in the post office. I also had the right to employ a clerk in my office, and that the Government would allow me at that time $1,500 a year, and later it was changed to $2,000—changed not by my vote but by the vote of a preceding Congress before I came here, if you please. Now, I had the right, as there was no law against it, to appoint my son, I had the right to appoint my daughter, I had the right to appoint my wife or any relative as clerk in my office if I saw fit. There may be no particular harm in it, where a relative is qualified and there is no law against it.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I refuse to be interrupted; we have more important business before this House than interruptions just now. I do not yield at all right now. There may be no harm in appointing a relative, if there is no law against it, providing the relative does good work, and there is no law against it. I have made no such point——

Mr. CARTER. Did not the gentleman make the point in his resolution?

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Oklahoma ought to have been in the House long enough to observe the rules. If a man refuses to yield, he should keep his seat and not interrupt.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman did not refuse to yield to me.

Mr. BLANTON. I told the Speaker I refused to yield to anybody.

Mr. CARTER. I did not understand any such thing; that is all.

Mr. BLANTON. If I had put some one on the roll as my clerk at $1,500, or when the law thereafter was changed to $2,000, that clerk would have the right to have drawn the money. I represented a big district—59 counties, 556 miles across it. You can imagine how much correspondence I received every day. There is no one clerk alive who could have done the work of my office, and in order to employ a necessary and efficient office force and to be able to control that $1,500, which after July was raised to $2,000, so that I could employ, if need be, two or more clerks by paying the extra amount necessary out of my own pocket, I put my son's name on the roll as my clerk. Did not I have the right to do it? If I did not, I yield to any man in this House to get up and say I did not. I want to see the countenance of a Democrat or the countenance of a Republican who has got the nerve to stand up here and tell me I did not have the right to do it. No; not even the gentleman from South Carolina. [Laughter.]

But my son has not drawn a dollar of Government money since his name has been on the roll, not a dollar. I paid him out of my pocket, because a man ought to pay his son for work in order to encourage him. He has done work for me and I paid him out of my pocket. There has not been a month since I have been in Congress that I have not paid others more than the amount that I have received from Congress. How about the pageship? I did put my son here. Did you expect me, my good friend from South Carolina, to appoint as page some Republican boy from Boston? No; however much I respect my good Republican friends, I would rather appoint my son a page than your son. [Laughter.] You are going to do the same way. My son has not a chance to be page in this House of Representatives now when your Republican friends have got the patronage. Has he? [Cries of "No" on the Republican side.] No, sir. How about the clerk in the post office? I could have put my boy in there the very day that patronage was given me, but did I do it? No. I sent down to Jones County, Tex., and got Mr. Guy R. Holcomb, a splendid gentleman who had a wife and child, and brought him to Washington and put him in the post office. He stayed there until he resigned voluntarily and went back to Texas. When he resigned did I put my son in? No. I could have done it; there is no law against it. If my good friend from South Carolina considers it unlawful, why did not he introduce a bill to make it unlawful? Why did not he do that? When he put in the RECORD yesterday, in his extension of remarks, the fact that I drew 20 cents a mile, why did not he be fair enough to put in there that in the last session he drew $480 mileage from this Congress?

Mr. STEVENSON. Because it is untrue. I draw $160 mileage per session, being the mileage allowed by law. I draw mileage for 400 miles, and the railroads charge me for 412, and if you make any other statement I will hold you responsible.

Mr. BLANTON. You drew $480, did you not?

Mr. STEVENSON. I draw $160, to which I am entitled as mileage, and no more.

Mr. BLANTON. If you take three times $160 it will be $480. You drew $160 each for the three sessions of the Sixty-fifth Congress, making a total of $480 mileage drawn during the Sixty-fifth Congress by you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend. He must confine himself to the question of privilege.

Mr. BLANTON. I am.

The SPEAKER. The Chair believes the gentleman is not.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order, in the interest of good order in the House only, that the gentleman is not discussing the question of personal privilege.

Mr. BLANTON. I am.

The SPEAKER. The Chair believes the gentleman is not.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order, in the interest of good order only, that the gentleman is not discussing the question of personal privilege.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker. I make the further point of order that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] have been addressing each other in the second person, violative of the rules of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. I will apologize to the House for the slight indiscretion frequently indulged in both by my Republican friends on the other side as well as by Democrats on this side.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It is not a slight indiscretion to violate the rules of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. Did I put my son in when Mr. Holcomb resigned? No; I sent to Texas and got Mr. Halbert Keifer to come up and hold that position in the post office, and he held it until he resigned voluntarily and went back to Texas. He resigned a few months before the last Congress adjourned, at the time when the Post Office Department down here in Washington was clamoring for clerks. They said they were short a hundred clerks that were needed in order to get mail distributed; that it was impossible to get sufficient clerks anywhere in the Postal Service here in Washington. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has in it notice of this shortage of post-office clerks here in Washington. I did let my boy go in there, and I am not ashamed of it. He could have been there all the time. It was my patronage. Is there a man here that will say it was not right? Now, if my good friend from South Carolina——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the gentleman from Texas ought to be referring to Members of the House who are sitting in their seats and keeping still and attending to their own business. I understand perfectly well that personal privilege gives a pretty wide limit, but that kind of performance is calculated to provoke a breach of the peace.

Mr. BLANTON. I know it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman ought not to do it, then.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will caution the gentleman that the Members whose rights are not included in his question of personal privilege ought not to be referred to.

Mr. BLANTON. In view of my regard for the Democratic leader, I will desist from any further reference to any gentleman. I will say this, if you want to break up this practice of patronage now—and it is a pretty mean time for a Democrat to propose it, when he is not in—but if you want to break it up, here is one man who will vote with you to the limit to do away with it. If you want to make it a violation of law, if you want to make it nepotism, here is one man who will vote with you to make it nepotism to appoint the relative of a Congressman to any position. The employment of my sons ended when the Sixty-fifth Congress adjourned, and no son of mine has had Government employment since.

So far as the mileage is concerned, I had a bill in the last Congress and have introduced it again in this Congress, to reduce the mileage to actual expenses. I hope this bill will be passed.

In what I did yesterday I know I had the disapprobation of lots of my colleagues on the Democratic side. I am sorry they did not have good enough judgment to act with me when I needed votes to pass good measures, and forced me to go over and get some Republican votes in order to pass them. God Almighty taught me a long time ago that when you want to do anything—and God puts certain instrumentalities in your hands with which to do it—to use the instrumentalities to do it. And I am sorry I had to use Republican votes. [Laughter.] I wish I could have used all Democratic votes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the fact of a Democrat using Republican votes is not a question of personal privilege. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair sustain the point of order. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Now, gentlemen, I am done, but it would not be fair for me to quit if some good Democrat or Republican wants to ask me a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman be good enough to state to the House how many sons he has?

Mr. BLANTON. Well, sir, not quite as many as Jacob.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We could not quite make out from the gentleman's statement whether he had three sons or one.

Mr. BLANTON. I have four, if it will furnish any information to the gentleman. Is there any other question? [Laughter.]

Mr. CARTER. Has the gentleman still one off the roll? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. I have just stated that I have none on the roll; absolutely none.

Mr. CARTER. But the gentleman had three, had he not?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I had only two at one time, covering my patronage of page and clerk in the post office, the latter for a few months only, every other Democrat here possessing the same amount of patronage accorded me.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not now talking to a matter of personal privilege. He is merely delaying the real business of this House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Oklahoma is very solicitous now about Members of Congress putting somebody on the roll. I presume I have the right to refer to him inasmuch as he has interrupted me. Now, if you want to break up this system of patronage, I am ready to vote to do it. Just as sure as you live you are going to find lots of Republican boys on the patronage roll, and they are going to be kin to Congressmen.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was about to——

Mr. BLANTON. I am not going to take up further time, but I am going to yield the floor and allow the appropriation bill to be taken up. [Applause.]

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas submits a privileged report, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, from the Committee on Rules, submits the following report:

The Committee on Rules, to which was referred House resolution 97, submit a privileged report on said resolution, with the recommendation that the resolution be agreed to.

House resolution 97.

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives, or any subcommittee thereof, in the preparation of such legislation as may be advantageous and necessary to promote the advancement of the American merchant marine, be authorized to sit during sessions of the House and the recess of the Congress, to compel the attendance of witnesses, to send for persons and papers, and to administer oaths to witnesses."

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. On that, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there is a desire to have limited discussion on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries is confronted with the task of outlining a policy and presenting legislation to the House that will enable this Government in some way to utilize or dispose of $4,000,000,000 worth of property. Our merchant fleet has cost the Government in the neighborhood of that amount. There is now no definite policy as to how this fleet shall be utilized, whether by the Government, whether by leasing, or by sale. Many questions will arise in the preparation of such legislation as may be necessary in arriving at a conclusion as to what shall be done with our merchant fleet, and it is to meet the unusual situation that confronts the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries that this unusual resolution is offered. The committee is empowered to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to sit during the recess of Congress, which are in addition to the usual privileges of this committee. The Committee on Rules thought that the facts warranted a favorable report upon this resolution and submitted it to the House.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. This resolution provides for the swearing of witnesses, and that contemplates, I imagine, the summoning of witnesses from various portions of the United States. How are we going to pay them?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That will be a matter for the House to determine later on.

Mr. GARNER. But if the House determines now to authorize the committee to summon witnesses before it, it certainly obligates itself to pay for the attendance of those witnesses, and mileage, and so forth. Has the gentleman any information as to the probable cost of the proposed investigation?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. None whatever.

Mr. GARNER. It occurs to me that the House ought to have some estimate or some prospective idea at least as to the amount. Under this resolution you can summon all the witnesses in the United States and swear them, and it is the duty of the Congress, then, to appropriate the money to pay for their attendance and mileage and the cost of having them summoned, and so forth. It occurs to me that the House ought to have some knowledge as to the proposed investigation and its probable cost.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I will state, in answer to the gentleman from Texas, that it is fair to assume that the committee thus empowered will use good judgment in making liabilities for which the House is responsible.

Mr. GARNER. So far as I can recall now, I do not remember in my experience in the House of a case where that was not done.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. If I may be permitted further to answer the gentleman from Texas, it is expected that many of the witnesses—perhaps all of the witnesses who will be called upon—will neither have to be sent for nor be required to bring their papers, but will volunteer to do it. But it may be that as the matter develops it will be necessary, in some instances, to send for the witnesses, with the papers; and it was for the purpose of enabling the committee to meet such an emergency that this resolution was drawn in the manner in which it is presented.

Mr. GARNER. So far as I know, this is the first time that a resolution of this kind has been brought in, unless there was a clear estimate of what the expenses would be, and the whole matter laid before Congress. The gentleman says he has no idea of the amount of probable expense?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I have no recollection of any privileged resolution submitted to the House that did estimate the amount of probable expense.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Do I understand from the gentleman from Kansas that the purpose of the exercise of the powers conferred by this resolution is to be confined exclusively to examinations as to the policy to be pursued hereafter in relation to the merchant marine?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The purpose of the resolution is very clear. I could not add to or detract from its language, and the interpretation of it is open to the view of the gentleman from Alabama. My judgment is that the resolution would be confined to legislation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to ask the gentlemen whether, in clothing this committee with this authority and power under this resolution, it is intended that the committee shall go into an investigation of the activities of the Shipping Board during the recent emergency, as to its contracts and as to its official actions?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. There is in contemplation a thorough investigation of the Shipping Board by a separate committee, under a resolution fully authorizing such a committee to make an investigation. It is not intended that such an investigation shall be made under this resolution.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I assume, then, under the statement of the gentleman as to the purpose of the committee, if the committee should undertake activities of that character, they would be beyond the purview and spirit of this resolution?

Mr. CAMPBELL or Kansas. The minority members could make the point of order that the committee was exceeding its jurisdiction.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I happen to be a member of this committee and, as far as I am concerned, the new committee has never met. Therefore, I am asking purely for information, because I do not know what the majority members of the committee are contemplating. If I understood the gentleman, it is in contemplation to have a special committee, independent of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, for the purpose of investigating thoroughly the activities of this shipbuilding proposition during the war.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I stated that that matter was under consideration. There are, however, qualifications to be made to that statement. If it should develop during the consideration of that question that another body or a joint committee should make such an investigation, a special committee of the House probably would not be appointed.

Mr. KINCHELOE. If the gentleman has the information from the majority members of the committee, notwithstanding the committee has never met, I wish he would tell us what scope and extent is within the purview of this resolution and what is contemplated in the investigation that we shall make under this resolution.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I did not state that the contemplated investigation was to be made by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I understand that.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Or that it was to be inaugurated by that committee.

Mr. KINCHELOE. But the information I should like to get, if I can, is as to how far the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries contemplates going under this rule?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Simply to the operation of the ships, the disposition of the merchant fleet that we have acquired that has cost us in the neighborhood of $4,000,000,000, to arrive at some policy.

Mr. KINCHELOE. And not an investigation of past activities?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Except so far as to show what can be done with these ships.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Kansas, of course, realizes that under this resolution there must be such investigation as is essential to inform the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries as to the cost of the plant and the character of the plant we have and, of course, such inquiry with regard to the use of these ships as is necessary to inform the committee with regard to legislation. Their investigation is an investigation necessary to lay the foundation for legislation.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I want to reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] is entitled to 20 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I confess that I have been wholly unable to fathom the motive which inspires the passage of this resolution at this time, and because I have not understood the motive I have been somewhat hesitant in taking a position in regard to it.

We are assured by the gentlemen of the majority, and were assured in the Committee on Rules when this matter was under consideration, that it is not the purpose under this resolution to proceed with an investigation as to contracts, expenditures, and so forth. In other words, whatever smelling is done is going to be done by another committee, either joint or special, or whatever the majority may determine upon. If it were the purpose to go into that under this resolution, I will say very frankly to the gentleman that I should not oppose it. I think I can assure the gentlemen of the majority that it will not be the policy of the minority to oppose any investigating resolutions that the majority may see fit to offer. We shall insist upon the rights of the minority in these matters, but the gentlemen of the majority may lay down whatever policy they choose in regard to that. But now, since it is not for that purpose, since it is purely for legislative purposes, I repeat I can not see the necessity at this time for this resolution conferring this extraordinary power upon this committee. I realize the importance of the question which the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries is to determine. It is, in my opinion, next to the railroad question, the most important domestic question confronting the country. I sympathize with the desire of gentlemen to reach a sound conclusion upon matters of policy, but that is what they are to determine. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] has been a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries for 20 years. He has been its chairman before and is its chairman now. He has been a profound student of merchant-marine problems. Surely he does not need to bring a man before that committee and swear him in order to determine what his policy is going to be.

Now, gentlemen of the House, I know of only one precedent—certainly there has been but one occasion during my term of service in the House—when such extraordinary powers were conferred upon one of the legislative committees for use for legislative purposes. During the Sixtieth Congress, the Congress preceding the one which passed the Payne tariff bill, the Committee on Ways and Means were clothed with authority by the House to make preliminary investigations. They sat for some months during the recess of the Sixtieth Congress. When the Congress reconvened on the first Monday in December, Mr. Payne, the then chairman of the committee, came before the House and asked unanimous consent for the consideration of a resolution upon which, I presume, this has been modeled, giving to the Committee on Ways and Means the authority to summon witnesses and swear them.

But the necessity for that had been demonstrated before it was requested, and it was not for the purpose of determining questions of policy. The questions of policy were well defined in the minds of the different members of that committee. The minority had its ideas and the majority had its ideas. The purpose was to enable them to ascertain facts.

Now, this Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries must first determine its policy, and what the necessity is for giving that committee authority to summon witnesses and to swear them I do not see. I confess I can not understand it, and it seems to me that it is making a very dangerous precedent. I do not know what committee to-morrow will conclude that it must swear witnesses in order to help them determine the question of policy. For that reason, because I am unable to see the necessity for it, absolutely unable to see the necessity for it, and because it seems to me it sets a dangerous precedent, I am opposed to it.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I will.

Mr. TOWNER. The gentleman is talking about the determination of a policy. I believe that the expression was used by the chairman of the committee. However, I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that it is not contained in the resolution. The language of the resolution is "in the preparation of such legislation as may be advantageous and necessary to promote the advancement of the American merchant marine."

Now, if the gentleman will pardon me, I think the stricture might be partly justified in consideration of the policy to be determined from the testimony of witnesses. But certainly the gentleman sees that the business to be done with regard to the merchant marine can be partially determined by the testimony of witnesses. It may be necessary to enforce their presence, and if that be the case the resolution is justified.

Mr. GARRETT. If the situation should arise, if the committee would go on like other committees of the House must go on, and like committees of the House always have gone on, until they reach a point where it was demonstrated that they had to have the power to summon witnesses and swear them, I should not then object to giving the power.

But just see what this will lead to. The rules of the House make provision as to the payment of witnesses summoned before committees. It is a small amount, but you pay them $2 a day and mileage. If this policy is entered into this precedent can be easily taken and spread out to every committee of the House, and you will reach a point where you will be paying every man who appears before a committee to discuss a question of policy. I am objecting to the precedent. I am not objecting to the committee having whatever assistance it may need.

Mr. TOWNER. I think the gentleman is hardly justified in saying that this will be considered as a precedent. It is an exceptional case; it is one of the most important matters Congress will have before it, one of the most puzzling propositions that Congress will have. Does not the gentleman believe that this will be treated as an exception?

Mr. GARRETT. Through all the history of the country committees have got along in determining their legislative attitude without having to swear men to tell them what they think the proper policy should be.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I will.

Mr. GARNER. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that, supposing the Ways and Means Committee had asked for the same kind of a resolution, all the people that appeared before that committee would ask for a per diem and mileage, a very natural thing for them to do. In other words, we are to change the entire custom of Congress in that they come before Congress without pay and now we are going to pay them. I think it is a very dangerous precedent.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time, and I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries has jurisdiction of all legislation affecting the American merchant marine. It has the power, as have other committees of the House, to name days, give notice, and have public hearings. It has never been the policy of Congress to subpœna a person be-

fore a committee of Congress to express his views on legislation, and if it is the purpose of the committee to summon gentlemen who have interest in legislation, subsidies, or the farmers of the country, who are in favor of Government ownership and operation, or other interests who are in favor of private ownership and operation, to express their opinions, then, I say, that is a useless expenditure of public money, as it would be absurd to ask them to express their opinions under oath.

On May 22 and May 23 the United States Shipping Board held a conference relative to the future of the American merchant marine. All the interests of the country were invited to appear at that conference. They did appear. I have a list here of the names of the representatives of every interest in the country—farmers, manufacturers, mining interests, labor interests, shipbuilding interests, shipowning interests, commercial interests—all appeared before the board. Their statements were reduced to writing. Those hearings are now in the process of being printed, and I was told by the chairman of the Shipping Board they will be available to the membership of the House within a day or two. More than that, the Shipping Board in a few days will present to the Congress in the form of bills what they suggest as legislation to carry out the policy of the Government as regards our merchant marine. I have suggested to Mr. Hurley, the chairman of the Shipping Board, when the bills are ready to place them in the hands of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE], my esteemed colleague for many years on the committee, to be introduced in the House, and I hope the chairman will do so whether he approves them in all respects or not.

They will be referred to the committee in due course, and we then can begin hearings on the concrete propositions presented by the bills and can approve or modify or reject them, as we think best.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries during years past has always reserved to itself the privilege of recasting any legislation proposed to that committee, and during each year that I was chairman of that committee we have never divided on partisan lines, except once and on the shipping bill, and on only two propositions in that bill. As the ranking minority member on that committee I think I can express the sentiment of the minority and say that we intend to cooperate with the majority in every possible way to frame a sensible, sane shipping policy in the light of present conditions, so that these Government-owned ships, built with the people's money at such great cost, may be taken over and controlled or disposed of in some way in the interests of the people, whether it shall be under Government ownership and operation or under private ownership and operation, with the Government control provided by the shipping act. These are questions about which I do not think there will be any serious division in the committee. I assume that we will all undertake to report out legislation that will accomplish the great objects that all of us have in mind.

I assume the next step of the chairman of the committee, if this resolution is agreed to, will be to go before the Committee on Accounts and ask for additional clerks for the committee and ask for counsel to advise the committee. All that will involve expense and is absolutely useless.

I do not want to be placed in the attitude of opposition. If the chairman of this committee thinks it is necessary, in order for him to carry forward the work of this committee, to give him this additional power, well enough, but from my viewpoint it is absolutely unnecessary.

It will be time enough to grant the committee the extraordinary powers asked for when it is made plain to the House that the occasion or necessity has arisen.

No reason has been given thus far by the chairman of the Committee on Rules for this useless expenditure of money, nor were any good reasons given in the hearings before the Committee on Rules for the adoption of this resolution.

Until that is done I do not see any occasion for the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDMONDS].

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Speaker, extraordinary times bring the need for extraordinary measures. Gentlemen on the minority side seem to be afraid that the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries is going to use this power recklessly in expending the money of the Government. They know well that the committee will not expend any more money than is absolutely necessary.

The question of policy has been brought up. I have not much time to expound what I intended to, but I want to say this: I want to tell the House a few of the things that this committee will have to look into under the head of policy. In the first place, we have legislation on the books which allows the Shipping Board to have certain control over freight rates. With their present experience in running ships it will be absolutely necessary to take up the question of how that legislation is going to be handled in the future; whether it needs amendment; whether it needs extension. Upon this will depend a great deal whether this country is going to build up a merchant marine. A great many of the ship authorities are opposed to this freight supervision. It may be right, it may be wrong, and through an investigation of this important question it is going to be necessary, possibly, to bring some interested witnesses before us.

It means looking into the postal subvention law of 1891 to see why it did not build up a merchant marine, and whether an amendment to that law is necessary. It means an investigation into the subsidy question and all the different ramifications of a subsidy. It means an investigation into the necessity of the discontinuance of the insurance bureau, and also why the American insurance companies do not get the insurance on the ships. It means an investigation and inquiry into the necessity of continuing the law which admits foreign-built ships into American registry. It means an investigation into the policy of continuing the right of foreign ships to operate in our coastwise trade. It means legislation necessary to insure the manning of these ships and the very important feature of this work that will be. It means an investigation into the necessary improvements of our ports and harbors, so that freight can be handled economically. It means also an investigation into the relations of the railroads to these ships, to see whether some joint action can not be taken in respect to freight rates to keep these ships on the sea.

All of these things are going to require a great deal of time and a great deal of labor, and, in answer to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER], the former chairman of the committee and ranking minority member on the committee, I will say that I have always found that men who are interested in legislation come before you, and that as a general thing you do not get the man you want. He may be too busy, or he may not want to come for some reason or other.

I think the committee should have full power to utilize that power in case they find it necessary. They should have every power that is possible for this House to give them. There has not been since I have been before this House a question that is of larger import to the future business and the future interests of this country than the question that is now before us.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. EDMONDS. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. What is the money value of the Government's holdings in the present merchant marine, both in executed contracts and those to be executed?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to extend my remarks, and in that extension I shall endeavor to put the information for which the gentleman asks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] asks how many ships there will be when the program is completed. On April 26 of this year there had been delivered completed to the Shipping Board 4,239,706 tons of shipping, and the entire program as at that time outlined in Director General Piez's report contemplated, when completed, a fleet of 2,464 ships, with a dead-weight tonnage of 14,113,336 and an expenditure of $3,119,093,138. This, of course, is actual expenditure for ships and does not include yards and plants, housing, transportation, nor overhead expenses.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request—that I may be permitted to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Five minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Does the gentleman desire me to proceed now? If so, I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I think I can oppose the passage of this resolution with entire propriety, and

without reflecting in the slightest degree upon the fairness or correctness of the intentions of the majority members of that committee. I think the resolution may well be opposed upon the ground already stated, that there has not been shown any real necessity for the conferring of the extraordinary powers sought by this resolution. I submit that statement, Mr. Speaker, from my slight experience of two years as a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, when we certainly had under investigation some very serious and pressing public questions. I am sure that it will be the testimony of each member of that committee that in those investigations of great and prime importance which we had during the last session that instead of having any difficulty in procuring the attendance of witnesses whose opinions we sought, that our chief difficulty was to confine the testimony, to weed out and limit the testimony, of the great number of witnesses who appeared in those investigations and made statements there; and I feel reasonably assured that in the scope of the enlarged investigation of these great problems that, as has already been stated by the gentleman from Tennessee, this committee will have to look into they will experience no difficulty and no obstacles in procuring the voluntary attendance of men who are experts—men who are deeply and vitally interested in every phase of the development of our merchant marine. This is in the nature of a new precedent we are seeking to establish here, and in the absence of a showing of some paramount necessity for the invocation of this extraordinary power, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it would be unwise on the part of the House to establish this precedent. If you authorize this committee to summon one witness by the distinguished chairman of the committee in the beginning of our investigation that would be a precedent; and as we have got to expect human nature to operate in these matters, every man who subsequently comes before the committee, whether from the Pacific coast, or from the southern country, or from the far northeast, will expect and positively demand, as a matter of equity to him, his per diem and mileage, and possibly his expenses. So, for these reasons, and in the absence, at least up to the present time, of any showing for the necessity for the powers conferred, it seems to me this resolution ought to be defeated. If, after we get into an investigation of these matters, it develops that there are some recalcitrant witnesses who do not desire to appear and disclose things peculiarly within their knowledge, then, it seems to me, gentlemen of the House, it will be full time to come back here and ask for the passage of a resolution of this character. But upon the face of the failure to show this necessity, in view of the fact that this committee has at all times had the benefit of the gratuitous appearance, the voluntary appearance, of witnesses who are acquainted with facts we had under investigation, and in view of the fact it seems to be an unwarranted and possibly, in its ramifications in the future, a dangerous precedent, it seems to me, without any disrespect to the majority members of the Merchant Marine Committee—because I am sure we will all cooperate in the spirit of harmony—on the basis of the showing already made for the necessity of the resolution, that the majority members ought to be willing not to press it at this time.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Does the gentleman think it would be at least essential, and not be so premature, if the committee had been called together one time at least to decide upon this policy and determine whether it was unanimous or not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Well, that is a question of propriety with which I do not desire to take issue. I believe that is all I care to say, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I see no reason for alarm in this resolution. In the first place, it does not set a precedent. One has already been set for the resolution, and even if it did the Members of the House should not fear setting a precedent. It is not necessary to follow it in the future unless conditions arise that make it necessary. Gentlemen make use of the statement that witnesses will voluntarily appear, that such parties will come before the committee. True, it has been stated that interested parties have volunteered to appear before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the past. That is true, but this is also true, that those interested witnesses have not enabled the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries to develop a plan by which in the future it would handle in the neighborhood of $4,000,000,000 worth—not worthless property but property that has cost the Government in the neighborhood of $4,000,000,000—for the purpose of arriving at a just and a wise conclusion as to how much of that $4,000,000,000 will have to be written off before these ships can be operated by our Government or by private individuals under lease or sale. So it becomes necessary for a very wide investigation into the cost of the ships and into the future policy of their operation.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. FESS. Is not this the first specific time that the Congress has been making an effort to establish a policy as to the merchant marine?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I think the gentleman's question answers itself. This is the first time that it has been contemplated that a policy should be developed, whether Government ownership or Government control, or whether we shall lease these ships or sell them, or how much shall be written off in the cost of these ships. I hear it stated that in the neighborhood of 50 cents on the dollar will have to be written off. If so, we will have to throw away at the outset in the neighborhood of $2,000,000,000.

Those are some of the questions that confront this committee. And in arriving at a just conclusion it will not always be safe to follow the advice of some interested party. It may be necessary to send for an important party that is not interested.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield for a question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why did not the chairman of the committee call his committee together and consult about this thing before coming in with this resolution? What is the committee for?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Does the gentleman refer to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is exactly what I do.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I understand they had a hearing on this resolution and agreed to it substantially.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have been informed they never did.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The minority members were not present.

Mr. ALEXANDER. There has not been a meeting of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The majority members of the committee are not a committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. But the responsibility of the legislation they shall bring out will be upon them in the future.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That may be true. I am objecting to the juggling performance of the majority members of the committee acting for the whole committee. They may have the responsibility.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The responsibility rests upon the majority members of the committee and on the majority of this House for the policy to be pursued.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The responsibility rests on the majority of the whole committee.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that the minority members were invited to appear before the Rules Committee by the chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know; but I am not talking about the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee has one form of action and this Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries has another, and the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries should get together the whole committee to consider this question as to what they want to do, and work out a plan and bring it in here and submit it to the House sitting as a jury in the case.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] permit me to ask the gentleman from Missouri a question?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The question has not been put to the House. I suggest that the vote be taken, and the absence of a quorum suggested afterwards.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. Obviously, no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of the passage of the resolution will, as their names are called, answer "yea," and those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 184, nays 133, answered "present" 3, not voting 109, as follows:

YEAS—184.

Ackerman	Freeman	Lufkin	Robsion, Ky.
Anderson	French	Luhring	Rodenberg
Andrews, Md.	Fuller, Ill.	McArthur	Rogers
Andrews, Nebr.	Fuller, Mass.	McCulloch	Rose
Anthony	Garland	McKenzie	Rowe
Baer	Glynn	McKinley	Sanders, Ind.
Begg	Good	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sanders, N. Y.
Benham	Goodykoontz	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Scott
Bland, Ind.	Gould	McPherson	Sells
Blanton	Graham, Ill.	MacCrate	Shreve
Boies	Graham, Pa.	MacGregor	Sinclair
Brooks, Ill.	Green, Iowa	Madden	Sinnott
Brooks, Pa.	Greene, Mass.	Magee	Slemp
Browning	Greene, Vt.	Mapes	Smith, Idaho
Burdick	Hadley	Merritt	Smith, Mich.
Burroughs	Hamilton	Michener	Snyder
Campbell, Kans.	Hardy, Colo.	Miller	Stephens, Ohio
Chindblom	Haskell	Monahan, Wis.	Stiness
Classon	Haugen	Mondell	Strong, Kans.
Cooper	Hawley	Moore, Ohio	Summers, Wash.
Copley	Hays	Moore, Pa.	Sweet
Cramton	Hernandez	Mott	Taylor, Tenn.
Crowther	Hersey	Mudd	Thompson, Ohio
Curry, Calif.	Hickey	Murphy	Timberlake
Dallinger	Hicks	Nelson, Wis.	Tincher
Darrow	Hoch	Newton, Minn.	Tinkham
Davis, Minn.	Hulings	Newton, Mo.	Towner
Denison	Husted	Nichols, Mich.	Treadway
Dickinson, Iowa.	Jefferis	Nolan	Vaile
Dowell	Johnson, S. Dak.	Ogden	Vare
Dunbar	Johnson, Wash.	Oliver	Vestal
Dunn	Jones, Pa.	Osborne	Volstead
Dyer	Juul	Paige	Walsh
Echols	Kearns	Parker	Wason
Edmonds	Kendall	Peters	Watson, Pa.
Elliott	Kennedy, Iowa	Platt	Webster
Elston	King	Purnell	Wheeler
Emerson	Kleczka	Radcliffe	White, Kans.
Esch	Knutson	Ramsey	White, Me.
Evans, Nebr.	Kraus	Ramseyer	Williams
Fairfield	Kreider	Randall, Wis.	Wilson, Ill.
Fess	LaGuardia	Reavis	Wood, Ind.
Focht	Lampert	Reber	Woodyard
Fordney	Langley	Rhodes	Yates
Foster	Layton	Ricketts	Young, N. Dak.
Frear	Luce	Riddick	Zihlman

NAYS—133.

Alexander	Doughton	Linthicum	Robinson, N. C.
Almon	Dupré	Lonergan	Romjue
Aswell	Evans, Mont.	McAndrews	Rouse
Babka	Evans, Nev.	McClintic	Sanders, La.
Bankhead	Fields	McDuffie	Sims
Barkley	Fisher	McKeown	Sisson
Bee	Flood	McKinley	Smithwick
Black	Gallagher	McLane	Steagall
Bland, Mo.	Gandy	Maher	Stedman
Bland, Va.	Ganly	Major	Steele
Box	Gard	Mansfield	Stephens, Miss.
Brand	Garner	Martin	Stevenson
Briggs	Garrett	Mays	Taylor, Ark.
Brinson	Hardy, Tex.	Mead	Thomas
Buchanan	Hastings	Minahan, N. J.	Thompson, Okla.
Byrnes, S. C.	Hayden	Montague	Tillman
Byrns, Tenn.	Heflin	Moon	Upshaw
Candler	Hersman	Mooney	Venable
Cantrill	Holland	Moore, Va.	Vinson
Caraway	Huddleston	Nelson, Mo.	Watkins
Carss	Hudspeth	Nicholls, S. C.	Watson, Va.
Carter	Hull, Tenn.	O'Connell	Weaver
Casey	Igoe	Oldfield	Welling
Clark, Fla.	Jacoway	Olney	Welty
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Ky.	Overstreet	Whaley
Cleary	Johnson, Miss.	Park	Wilson, La.
Coady	Jones, Tex.	Parrish	Wilson, Pa.
Collier	Kettner	Phelan	Wingo
Connally	Kincheloe	Pou	Woods, Va.
Crisp	Lanham	Quin	Wright
Davis, Tenn.	Lankford	Rainey, H. T.	Young, Tex.
Dickinson, Mo.	Lazaro	Rainey, J. W.	
Dominick	Lee, Ga.	Raker	
Doremus	Lesher	Rayburn	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Ayres	Dewalt	Kitchin

NOT VOTING—109.

Ashbrook	Dale	Howard	Moores, Ind.
Bacharach	Davey	Hull, Iowa	Morgan
Barbour	Dempsey	Humphreys	Morin
Bell	Dent	Hutchinson	Neely
Benson	Donovan	Ireland	Padgett
Blackmon	Dooling	James	Pell
Booher	Drane	Johnston, N. Y.	Porter
Bowers	Eagan	Kahn	Ragsdale
Britten	Eagle	Kelley, Mich.	Randall, Calif.
Browne	Ellsworth	Kelly, Pa.	Reed, N. Y.
Brumbaugh	Ferris	Kennedy, R. I.	Reed, W. Va.
Burke	Fitzgerald	Kiess	Riordan
Butler	Gallivan	Kinkaid	Rowan
Caldwell	Godwin, N. C.	Larsen	Rubey
Campbell, Pa.	Goldfogle	Lea, Calif.	Rucker
Cannon	Goodall	Lehlbach	Sabath
Carew	Goodwin, Ark.	Lever	Sanford
Christopherson	Griest	Little	Saunders, Va.
Cole	Griffin	Longworth	Schall
Costello	Hamill	McFadden	Scully
Crago	Harrison	McGlennon	Sears
Cullen	Hill	Mann	Sherwood
Currie, Mich.	Houghton	Mason	Siegel
Small	Strong, Pa.	Tilson	Winslow
Smith, Ill.	Sullivan	Voigt	Wise
Smith, N. Y.	Sumners, Tex.	Walters	
Snell	Taylor, Colo.	Ward	
Steenerson	Temple	Webb	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. PELL.

Mr. GOODALL with Mr. BELL.

Mr. WINSLOW with Mr. SCULLY.

Mr. WALTERS with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. MANN with Mr. BLACKMON.

Mr. BOWERS with Mr. NEELY.

Mr. MCFADDEN with Mr. DEWALT.

Mr. LEHLBACH with Mr. SUMNERS of Texas.

Mr. IRELAND with Mr. SEARS.

Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. SANFORD with Mr. HARRISON.

Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana with Mr. RIORDAN.

Mr. BACHARACH with Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. CAREW.

Mr. BROWNE with Mr. CULLEN.

Mr. BURKE with Mr. DAVEY.

Mr. BUTLER with Mr. FERRIS.

Mr. CANNON with Mr. GALLIVAN.

Mr. COLE with Mr. BENSON.

Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CRAGO with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.

Mr. CURRY of California with Mr. GRIFFIN.

Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. BOOHER.

Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. CALDWELL.

Mr. GRIEST with Mr. DONOVAN.

Mr. HULL of Iowa with Mr. DOOLING.

Mr. JAMES with Mr. DRANE.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. DENT.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. PADGETT.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania with Mr. FITZGERALD.

Mr. KIESS with Mr. EAGAN.

Mr. KINKAID with Mr. EAGLE.

Mr. LITTLE with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. MCGLENNON with Mr. JOHNSON of New York.

Mr. MASON with Mr. RAGSDALE.

Mr. MORGAN with Mr. LEVER.

Mr. PORTER with Mr. RUBEY.

Mr. REED of West Virginia with Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado.

Mr. TILSON with Mr. WISE.

Mr. WARD with Mr. ROWAN.

Mr. VOIGT with Mr. RANDALL of California.

Mr. TEMPLE with Mr. WEBB.

Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania with Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. STEENERSON with Mr. SHERWOOD.

Mr. REED of New York with Mr. SMALL.

Mr. SIEGEL with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. SNELL with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. SABATH.

Mr. SCHALL with Mr. LEA of California.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay," but I have a general pair with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MCFADDEN, and I desire to change my vote from "nay" to "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present, and the Doorkeeper will open the doors.

On motion of Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4226, being the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, with Mr. TOWNER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4226. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bathing beach: Superintendent, $720; 2 watchmen, at $500 each; temporary services, supplies, and maintenance, $4,500; for repairs to buildings, pools, and upkeep of ground, $1,780, to be available immediately; in all, $8,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the words "to be available immediately."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts will please state the point of order. It is on the ground of new legislation?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] say?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I think perhaps it is subject to the point of order; but all these appropriations, I believe, will be immediately available anyhow.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARD: Page 28, line 11, after the semicolon, insert "life saving and resuscitating appliances, $1,000."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I am influenced to offer this amendment because of the fact that the bathing beach in the city of Washington is used by a great number of people, and used most beneficially by nearly all. But I think no one can go by this great public convenience and utility in the summer time without being convinced of the necessity of safeguarding the place against the loss of human life more than it is now safeguarded. At the present time there is no telephone connected with the bathing beach and no means of communicating with a physician in the event of finding one half drowned or ill. There is no pulmotor or any other instrument for artificial respiration for those partly overcome in the water.

The amendment I have in mind is in connection with the supplies and maintenance and has for its purpose the installation in this bathing beach of a pulmotor and such other life-saving and life-resuscitating appliances as are necessary to safeguard human life. I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will not insist upon his reservation of the point of order against the amendment.

Only the other day a man, I believe, from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing or the Government Printing Office, was drowned there. His absence from his companions was not discovered and his body was not recovered until, with the facilities they had at hand, it was impossible to bring back the spark of life. It has been said in the newspapers that had sufficient appliances been available down there at this bathing beach, had there been a pulmotor, had there been sufficient life guards, had there been any appliances for resuscitation, this man's life might have been saved.

Now, to say that any appropriation, no matter how much it may be within reason, should be stricken out here is entirely untenable, because it is a provision for the safety and preservation of human life. The amendment which I offer has for its purpose the carrying into the best effect of what is undoubtedly the intent of those who have this bathing beach in charge. Therefore, I offer the amendment, and should the gentleman from Massachusetts insist upon his point of order I will ask to be heard upon that. But I trust that the gentleman will not insist upon his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts insist upon his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I make the point of order.

Mr. GARD. What is the point of order made by the gentleman?

Mr. WALSH. The point of order is that this is an appropriation not authorized by law and is, in effect, legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by me is really supplementary to the phrase "temporary services, supplies, and maintenance, $4,500." It is intended to take its place between the item of "temporary services, supplies, and maintenance" and the item for "repairs to buildings, pools, and upkeep of grounds, $1,780." Of course, if the amendment obtains, an increase of $1,000 will be necessary to the final amount. But the point that I make is that it is not legislation upon an appropriation bill unless it is new matter to be inserted, since it pertains merely to the specifications of that which must be held to be applied as maintenance for the bathing beach.

It is idle to say that if a municipal corporation authorizes the use of a beach, a place where people are in the water, that that municipal corporation must not attend that bathing beach with every possible safeguard, and when the legislative provision calls for supplies and maintenance it is not an embarkation upon new legislation or legislation upon an appropriation bill when an extension is made for not only the convenience and comfort of the people but the safety of the people. Therefore I contend, Mr. Chairman, upon the point of order as made by the gentleman from Massachusetts that it is not legislation upon an appropriation bill and it is not new matter incorporated; that it is merely legislative description and definiton and extenson of necessary articles in the conduct of this bathing beach and is in no wise subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The facts stated, in the judgment of the Chair, constitute new matter and new legislation. If it is the desire of the gentleman merely to increase the amount stated for a specific purpose, of course he might present that in the form of an amendment. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GARD. I did not understand what the Chair said.

The CHAIRMAN. In the course of the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio he said this is merely a restatement in other form of some of the provisions already provided for in the paragraph. If that be true, the proper method for reaching the gentleman's purpose would be to increase the amount of the appropriation rather than to insert new language. The Clerk will read.

Mr. GARD. Under the suggestion made by the Chair I offer an amendment to strike out the figures "$8,000," in line 12, on page 28, and to insert in lieu thereof the figures "$9,000," to carry into effect the purposes I have mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, line 12, strike out "$8,000" and insert "$9,000."

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I was satisfied that the gentleman's amendment was subject to a point of order, I did not make the explanation which I will now make. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that the matter he desires to cover in his amendment applies to what is called the Tidal Basin, and the appropriation for that is carried in the sundry civil bill and has nothing whatever to do with the item now under consideration. There is a concrete pool down on the Mall which this applies to, but the matter to which he refers is carried in the sundry civil bill.

Mr. GARD. I am not talking about the concrete pool on the Mall.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is what this item refers to here.

Mr. GARD. Where is this place called the bathing beach?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is down in the Mall near the Monument, across from the new War and Navy Building—a concrete pool.

Mr. GARD. A pool?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. GARD. It is not the place in the Tidal Basin which was newly opened the other day?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. No.

Mr. GARD. Then I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. TREADWAY. In view of the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio in reference to the Tidal Basin, which was the item he supposed was under discussion, but which appears not to have been the subject referred to in the bill, I wish to supplement what the gentleman from Ohio has said in criticism of the methods of conduct of the Tidal Basin bathing beach, so called. Two or three days ago I had occasion to give the matter some inquiry, and I called to the attention of Col. Ridley, who, I believe, has the Tidal Basin bathing beach in charge, the same matter which I am now about to state.

During the past few days, when the weather has been so extremely hot, there has been a large influx of people desirous of using that beach. I get it on the best of information that the manner in which the beach has been managed is grossly negligent. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] referred to one drowning.

Information reaches me that two days ago a young lady who was bathing there came very near losing her life because of the fact that the guards stationed there were absolutely incompetent; and had it not been for the presence of a former member of the Navy, who rescued the girl and took her to the

shore, she certainly would not have been in a condition to be resuscitated when she reached land.

The accommodations have been overtaxed, and there is a feature which appears to me to be extremely dangerous, namely, that just beyond the life lines the depth goes very quickly over anyone's head, and if a person should venture beyond the life line he is liable to be in immediate danger of drowning unless he is an expert swimmer. The service given by the attendants there has been wretched, I am credibly informed, and some features of the sanitary conditions are very bad. Two days ago I called to the attention of Col. Ridley these same matters which I have now stated, and he promised to make an immediate inquiry into the conditions I named. Since then I have heard nothing from them. I make no criticism of him or of his management, but I make this statement in view of the statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD], which supplements it, for the purpose of calling sufficient attention to these conditions to protect the public in going to that beach in such large numbers as they have been doing during the past few days. It is a condition that ought not to be allowed to continue, and whoever is responsible for it certainly ought to give it immediate attention, because the information that I have endeavored to convey to the House can be substantiated on the very best evidence. Therefore I think it is up to Congress to know of these facts and to see that some remedy is quickly found in order to accomplish the purpose the gentleman from Ohio referred to, namely, the saving of lives at the Tidal Basin. It is not with a view of offering any criticism that I am making this statement, but in the hope of a correction of the condition.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries: Supervisor, $2,500; inspector of playgrounds, $1,200; clerk (stenographer and typewriter), $1,200; to be employed not exceeding 10 months—22 directors of playgrounds or recreation centers at $75 per month each, assistant director at $60 per month, general utility man at $60 per month; to be employed not exceeding 7 months—3 assistant directors at $60 per month each, 4 assistant directors at $50 per month each; to be employed not exceeding 4 months—5 guards or swimming teachers at $60 per month each; to be employed not exceeding 3 months—4 assistant directors at $60 per month each, 22 assistants at $50 per month each; to be employed 12 months—22 watchmen at $50 per month each, clerk (who shall be a bookkeeper) at $75 per month; for services of extra directors at not exceeding 35 cents per hour, $800; for services of extra watchmen at not exceeding 25 cents per hour, $600; in all, $45,980.

Mr. WALSH. I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. What authority is there for employing five guards or swimming teachers at $60 per month each for not exceeding four months?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I do not know that there is any specific authority for it, but it has been carried in the bill for several years. It is in the current law.

Mr. WALSH. Where?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. For five guards or swimming teachers for four months, at $60 per month each, $1,200.

Mr. WALSH. Under what item is that?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Under the item of playgrounds.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Lighting: For purchase, installation, and maintenance of public lamps, lamp-posts, street designations, lanterns, and fixtures of all kinds on streets, avenues, roads, alleys, and public spaces, and for all necessary expenses in connection therewith, including rental of stables and storerooms, livery and extra labor, this sum to be expended in accordance with the provisions of sections 7 and 8 of the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1912 and with the provisions of the District of Columbia appropriations act for the fiscal year 1913, and other laws applicable thereto, $415,000.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, on page 31, line 23, the word "therewith" is incorrectly spelled. I ask to have it corrected.

Mr. GARD. I think that yesterday, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON], the Clerk was authorized to make typographical changes in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Officers: Superintendent, $6,000; assistant superintendents—1 $3,500, 1 $3,000; director of intermediate instruction, 13 supervising principals, supervisor of manual training, and director of primary instruction, 16 in all, at a minimum salary of $2,200 each; secretary, $2,000; financial clerk, $2,000; clerks—1 $1,600, 1 $1,400, 1 $1,200, 3 at $1,000 each, 1 (to carry out the provisions of the child-labor law) $900; 2 stenographers, at $1,000 each; messenger, $720; in all, $62,520.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to make an inquiry of the chairman of the committee relative to the item "clerk, $900 to carry out the provision of the child-labor law." I hold in my hand the law conferring on the Commissioners of the District of Columbia the regulation of the employment of child labor in this District. It provides that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to appoint two inspectors to carry out the provisions of that law at a compensation of $1,200. I assume that all these appointments have been made, and I therefore rise to learn if this clerk attached to the office of the superintendent is merely for clerical work involved in the report the different inspectors may make to the school authorities. My observation is that the child-labor law of the District of Columbia is not sufficient either in its text or in its administration. No one can read what the law is and observe the general conditions in Washington and have any idea that there is anything but the slightest pretext of carrying out the child-labor law.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that one of the great measures of the country to-day is in the conservation of child life, in seeing that every child within its years of childhood has an opportunity for education and play so that it may grow up to be a healthy, useful, and intelligent citizen. Therefore all States are united in condemning the evil of child labor, and to say that in the District of Columbia there should be no greater provision made for the inspection in all the different positions where children are employed than to have two inspectors at a salary of $1,200 is to say that the child-labor law and its administration is almost negligible in the District of Columbia.

I realize, of course, that I am speaking somewhat outside of the record on this appropriation bill, since it is a matter primarily for the concern of the Committee on the District of Coumbia. But I am concerned, as I think every good citizen should be concerned, in this question of child labor, the furnishing of proper schools, the question of playgrounds in connection with their health, and so I make the inquiry whether or not this $900 clerk is to afford any assistance in carrying out the child-labor law in the District of Columbia.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will inform the gentleman somewhat as to his inquiry. I am reading from volume 36, Statutes at Large, page 990:

The major and superintendent of police shall hereafter detail two privates of the Metropolitan Police for the enforcement of the provisions of the act "To regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia, approved May 28, 1908."

This $900 clerk is for clerical labor in connection with the child-labor law. That is all there is to it. The $900 is for clerical assistance to keep track of these matters.

Mr. GARD. Is there any provision in the law except this clerk for the board of education, or school officers, and the assignment of two persons at a salary of $1,200 each for the administration of the child-labor law in the District of Columbia?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I know of none; I have read all the law on the subject. If the gentleman objects to this $900 clerk, he can make the point of order.

Mr. GARD. Oh, I do not object; what I am objecting to is because they do not have more. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Class 5, 136 at $950 each, including vocational and trade instructors.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I wish to offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SISSON. I will state to the committee that the basic salary by law of these teachers of this grade is $800. I think class 5 is $800.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will state to the gentleman that we have not made any change in class 5. The next salary to class 5 is $960.

Mr. SISSON. Not under the longevity law.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes. We did not change class 5, I will inform the gentleman. It has not been changed since the Fifty-ninth Congress.

Mr. SISSON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order, because it is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska: Page 34, line 23, after the word "and," strike out the word "thirty" and insert the word "forty" in lieu thereof, and at the end of line 24 add the words "and 10 librarians in high and normal schools."

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, this involves a transfer from the following page 36. This amendment proposes the transfer of 10 librarians from the positions noted on page 36 to be entered with class 5, page 34, among the teachers, instead of among the clerks. As these librarians render con-

siderable service as teachers, they should be classed among the teachers instead of among the clerks. Moreover, the volume of work they do as teachers, from my understanding of the question, entitles them to a classification along with the teachers on the same basic salary, $950, as is proposed here. It will be understood by those who have inquired into the matter that these librarians are educators in the strict sense of the word. They help the high and normal school students in their studies very materially. Anyone who has occasion to study the question, and especially who has been a teacher, knows full well that the person who aids the student in gathering knowledge is quite as important as the teacher.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands, the gentleman from Mississippi made the point of order.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. I wanted the gentleman to have an opportunity to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desired to know whether the gentleman from Nebraska was discussing the point of order.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I was discussing the amendment, and understood the gentleman from Mississippi simply reserved the point of order. As I was about to say, a librarian teacher is one of the most useful persons in guiding the work of the students, and in the library the students are taught how to discover knowledge, are aided in their work so that the volume of work done by those librarians in their capacity as teachers, along with the work of librarian, I think clearly entitles them to the same grade and classification as those in class 5, with a basic salary of $950.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to be heard?

Mr. SISSON. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that he thinks it is not subject to the point of order.

Mr. SISSON. Then I would like to be heard. The salaries of all the teachers in class A, class 5, class 4 are fixed by the longevity law. Librarians are not in that longevity class, and it is clearly legislation to put the librarians in class 5 with the longevity law.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will notice the statement made by the gentleman from Nebraska, he stated that on page 36 the librarians are included in class 5, so that there would not be a change in classification to transfer them from that item to the present item.

Mr. SISSON. It would then be subject to a point of order, because you are raising the salary of the librarians from $840 to $950. You are increasing the salary of the librarian by the amendment. I think that makes it clearly subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the $840 on page 6 the statutory law?

Mr. SISSON. That is the current law. We have not yet reached that item. I could not, of course, raise the point of order on that item until it is reached. It embodies, of course, the same point of order that might lie against the $840. My recollection is that the salary of the librarians has been increased by the committee, and we carry an increase of salary there which would also be subject to the point of order, but this is clearly subject to the point of order because it raises the salary above the $840.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the point of order is well taken, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to make a few observations which I think are pertinent here upon the situation of the teacher. In doing so, I am not offering any criticism of either the committee or of the school situation in the District of Columbia. I notice that the number of teachers given in the District is 2,035. I read in a report of a hearing yesterday that the average salary of the teacher in the District is $1,100. That is a very good showing in comparison with the average salary of the teachers throughout the country. I called up the Department of Education to ascertain whether they had the exact figures for the average salary of the teacher throughout the country, and they said that they had not anything more recent than 1916. At that time the average salary was $563. I saw a statement that I do not offer as accurate, because I have had no opportunity to verify it, that the average salary throughout the country in 1919 is $630. The Bureau of Education was not able to verify that statement.

I also asked the bureau whether they had figures upon the number of teachers called into the service by the war, and they said that from the secondary schools 170,000 were taken, and if you include the colleges and universities and normal schools, and so forth, it would reach 200,000. The number of teachers throughout the United States is about 650,000, and you can readily see what proportion of the entire number went into the service. The proportion of male teachers to the entire number is about 20 per cent. Twenty per cent of 650,000 would be less than the total number that went into the service. Therefore, that figure included women teachers who have been called to Washington and elsewhere to enter the service of the Government during the war.

The problem now is to induce teachers who have gone into the service to return to the teaching profession. If any Member of Congress will consult with his friends who went out of the profession into the service he will be impressed with the desire not to return to the teaching business. I have made a little investigation along that line and I find that the service in the military realm has very much dissatisfied the teacher for the work he or she was in before the war. We have a severe problem there.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. KREIDER. Does the gentleman know what the average length of service per year is? How many months?

Mr. FESS. The average length of term for the year in the States varies greatly. In Ohio the minimum is nine months, and in the gentleman's State I think it is eight months. In some States it is much less.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. At the point at which the gentleman closed just before asking for an extension of time the gentleman from Ohio was discussing the average length of the school year. It was ascertained by the Committee on the District of Columbia yesterday from the Superintendent of Public Instruction that for the District of Columbia the scholastic year is 180 days.

Mr. FESS. One hundred and eighty days of school work. I thank my friend for that information. I think the questioner wanted a nation-wide answer, which I have not now in mind.

Mr. KREIDER. Because the gentleman quoted the average wage, I was anxious to have the average length of time as applied to wages.

Mr. FESS. Now, let me have your attention just a moment on that particular item. There is some little opposition to a fairly good salary to teachers on the basis that they do not teach all the year. Let me say to the membership here that that is one of the most unfortunate features of school work, that there is an enforced vacation without the option of the teacher of a good portion of the year that is hurtful to him rather than helpful, and they have attempted to cure that in some places by hiring a teacher for 12 months, with a tenure in teaching for 9 months, and giving a monthly salary that will carry the teacher through his vacation. It is a serious situation, gentlemen, and let me state again I am not finding fault either with the committee or with what is going on in this District. The committee has done well and the District is doing, I think, creditably on behalf of the teachers, but I want to know under the exigencies of the time what are we going to do for the schools of the country unless we make an appreciation of some sort in the way of remuneration. Let me suggest some facts that I am sure the Congressman has not in his mind. A teacher to enter the high schools of this District—I have not looked up the ruling, but I am absolutely certain I am correct, for I do not go in the statement beyond what are the requirements of the high school in the States and I know that the District of Columbia is not in its demands below the average State—a teacher to enter the high-school service throughout the States must have the qualifications, first, of a high-school education, which means four years after the grades; a normal school education in many States, which means not less than two years and in some States four years beyond the high school, and, my friends, the distinguished gentleman from the third district of Ohio [Mr. GARD] has cities in his district that will not accept any teacher in any high school who has not a college diploma. What is true in his case is true in many States of the Union. A man or woman can not get into a first-class college without a first-grade high-school diploma, and a first-grade high-school diploma means mathematics up to the point of trigonometry and in language, four years of Latin and a certain amount of modern language and even some colleges include Greek. Greek, however, is being dropped out, but Latin is not. This suggests the time and money as well as energy required to teach in a high school. If you put the wage of one who needs no training above the teacher, would any teacher spend the four years in the high

school and from two to four years in normal school and four years in a college or university and summer terms in our universities in order to get a salary less than paid for a man or woman who needs no training of any sort?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GARD. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARD. Does the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FESS. I will yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. GARD. With reference to the argument which the gentleman is making on this very pertinent matter I have simply to say that I saw a statement in the press the other day that hod carriers are now making $6 a day.

Mr. FESS. A statement which I think is true, and which represents a general fact in the range of remuneration.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. BEE. What is the qualification for a teacher in the schools of Washington, must he first have a high-school education——

Mr. FESS. I have not looked that up, but, of course, I am sure the high school requires specially trained teachers.

Mr. SISSON. They require in the District a diploma from a college or a normal school. The District of Columbia have accredited schools from which they take teachers from outside the District.

Mr. BEE. What is the average compensation and what is the lowest compensation paid to a teacher?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It is $800.

Mr. FESS. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We had quite extensive hearings upon the question now suggested by the gentleman from Ohio, and a very bright teacher made the following statement in response to a question by myself:

> As you understand, a teacher in the high schools of the District of Columbia has to have a college degree to begin with, the standard college degree—an A. B. or B. S. degree.

Mr. FESS. That is my understanding. It is the general rule throughout the North and West.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is for a high-school teacher at the present time. Now, I do not wish to encroach upon the time, but I think I can—perhaps I had rather wait until the gentleman finishes, and then I will make a little further explanation in regard to the present salaries of the teachers of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BEE. That is what I wanted to find out—what the lowest salary was.

Mr. FESS. The observation I want to make to Members, not suggesting there will be any change in this bill, because I think under the general conditions throughout the country the committee has done fairly well, but in order that we may see with eyes open the situation facing the school work of the country.

I can not for my life see how you can enlist the type of men and women that we ought to have to preside over the most precious, if not the greatest, source of wealth of the country, namely, the childhood of the Nation, at the rate we are paying for a man or woman teacher unless the teachers are subject to such an altruistic impulse that they are wanting to give their time as a sacrifice and who otherwise would be foolish to go on to make all the sacrifices in order to meet all the requirements of all the years to get ready to do a work that pays a salary so much below that commanded by other work that requires absolutely no training. [Applause.] This is a problem that faces me and you, and I wanted to get the facts before the Congress with the hope that in the period of high prices, as to the teachers, whose salaries are fixed and are suffering under a situation as if their salaries have been cut in two, because they get the same but pay twice for what they live on, there might be a movement to either bring the cost of necessaries down, if we know how to do it, or else lift the salaries of the teachers to a place where they can meet the increased cost. For you can not secure the type of character to direct the plastic mind of the youth so as to grow not wealth nor to multiply dollars, but to grow men and women of strong heart power and strong will power—for they must come out of the schools of the country—at these low salaries. I dislike to know that we are paying more for brawn than we are for brain, and we should show a little appreciation for the development of the future citizens in their ability to do the work that the country will demand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended one minute, so that I may ask him a question.

Mr. FESS. I will yield for one minute if the time is extended.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman will remember that when we passed the bill to establish a minimum wage of $3 for laborers in the District I offered an amendment that we should at the same time establish a minimum wage of $4 for every day in the year for teachers, and the gentleman will remember what happened to that amendment by the vote of the House. I think $4 should be a minimum of wage for teachers.

Mr. FESS. Replying to my friend, my mind is not refreshed on that subject as he mentions it. The only thing I have in mind is as to how a man or woman can continue in such line of training at such salary as $563 per year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, prior to the year 1918, prior to the 1919 law, which is in force at the present time, the basic salaries for the low-grade teachers were as follows under, of course, the longevity system: Class 1, the lowest-paid teacher, was $500 per annum; class 2 was $600 per annum; class 3 was $650 per annum; class 4, $800 per annum; class 5, $950 per annum; class 6, $1,000 per annum. That was the basic salary up to the current law, which is the law of 1919.

Mr. BEE. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I think I will answer the gentleman's question. I would not suggest these things now if we had not gone by the opportunity to make a point of order.

Mr. FESS. That is why I did not raise the question.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. In the bill that failed to become a law, when my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] was chairman, we raised the basic salaries as follows: Class 1, of $500, we raised to $750. Mind you, that is the law. Class 2, of $600, we raised to $750; class 3, of the $650 class, we raised to $800, and class 4, the $800 class, we raised to $850.

Now, we have raised in this bill—and we have gotten beyond the point of order—all of the lower class $50 apiece more. So at the present time the lowest-paid teacher in the District of Columbia gets $800 salary and $240 bonus, or $1,040 in all, if this bill becomes a law; and I believe it will, since we have gone beyond the point of order. Have I answered the gentleman's question as to the low-grade teachers?

Mr. BEE. Yes, sir. Here is what I wanted to suggest to the gentleman: I think the committee is to be congratulated upon its raising the salaries, but may I express the hope—and I think that is rather a familiar sound—that the next time the committee reports it will report a basic salary of not less than $1,200 for every teacher in the public schools in Washington.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will say this in response to what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] has said. He asks the question, and a very pertinent question, as to what we are going to do to get teachers. That is a conundrum. I will simply say this, that before the war and up to, as I say, the first or second year of the war, the low-grade teacher was getting only $500 a year. Now, if you gentlemen will be kind enough to pass this bill, and we succeed in getting it through the Senate, we will have a little more than doubled it. As to whether that will keep the teachers here or not is a conundrum. I think my esteemed friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], will be better able to answer that than I can. But we have done the very best we could under the conditions. In other words, we have $40 more than doubled the price of pay of the low-grade teachers since the war began. Whether that is enough or not I can not say. But that is what we submit to you gentlemen here. I am in favor of paying the teachers a good living always, because I am satisfied they earn it—of course, they work only nine months a year—and that has been demonstrated by the gentleman from Ohio to my satisfaction.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

As to what my colleague has said about the salary of teachers, the current law raises the salary for the lowest grade teachers from $500 to $750, plus the bonus. Under the present bonus and present salary, in two years a teacher's salary, in the low grades, has been increased over 100 per cent. It seems to me that is going some. But the chairman of the committee has not told you all the story. He did not tell you that the very next year the teacher who enters on a basic salary of $1,040 now will get a bonus of $240.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. If the gentleman will permit me, the reason I did not tell that was that in my enthusiasm for the teachers I forgot it.

Mr. SISSON. Yes. You can not tell what a teacher's salary is by reading this bill. If you will look over here and see that something like $500,000 is carried in this bill to cover longevity pay, you will then begin to understand that in addition to the item of $1,000,000 you must carry nearly $500,000 to pay this longevity pay. In other words, the teacher who teaches a year gets the next year a longevity increase, and the next year an increase over that, and so on for 10 years, the increase being $50 each year.

Now, when the basic salary has been increased and the teacher has been teaching for 10 years, that longevity pay amounts to something like $500, so you must add that $500 to the $540—made up of the $300 and the $240, which makes $540—and longevity pay added makes $1,040, which, of course, is more than is carried on the face of the bill for the teacher if she has been teaching 10 years.

Now, I do not think anyone could complain of what the District subcommittee has done for the school-teachers of Washington. There are thousands of school-teachers in the city and country schools all over this country who would be most happy, indeed, to be treated half as well as we treat them in the city of Washington.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I stated that the average teacher throughout the country received $560.

Mr. SISSON. Yes; and I understand the gentleman does not condemn this. But I have heard so much complaint in the newspapers and oral complaint in Washington about the pay of the teachers that I thought this was the time and the occasion when this subcommittee and this Congress might defend itself against the unwarranted charges that have been brought against it.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. BEE. Reiterating my admiration for the committee for their splendid work in this line, I should like my friend from Mississippi to explain the method of the longevity pay.

Mr. SISSON. Well, my friend the chairman of the subcommittee wants to get through this bill as speedily as possible. But if you will get the law and read it over you will find the provisions regarding longevity pay all written out. For instance, they provide a basic salary—that is, the entrance salary—and the second year they get additional pay. We will take, for example, class 2 or class 3. In that case the additional pay is $50, so that if the basic salary is $800, the next year they get $850, and the year after that they get $900, and the year after that $950, and so on.

Mr. BEE. That answers the question.

Mr. SISSON. I am sure the Board of Education and the Auditor of the District, as well as the members of your subcommittee, have never yet been able to figure out accurately what the longevity pay would amount to in any one year.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. KREIDER. Does the District of Columbia have a teachers' retirement fund so that when they reach a certain age they can continue to draw pay?

Mr. SISSON. No; there is nothing of that here.

Mr. KREIDER. We have that in Pennsylvania. I just wanted to know.

Mr. SISSON. They have no pensions here; but I think in view of what the committee has done for the teachers here, Members of Congress ought to be willing at least to say to the people when they go back home, "We have done more for the teachers of the District of Columbia than we are doing for you teachers at home," because that is true. [Applause.] The highest basic salary in the United States to teachers is in Boston and Philadelphia. Cleveland has a very good basic salary. I will not worry you with figures, but here they are. But when you add the longevity pay to the teachers in the lower grades, the teachers of the District of Columbia are found to head the list of them all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Since the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] has been talking about longevity pay, I will say it is something that I have never yet been able to fathom myself, and never yet have I found anybody who was able to fathom it satisfactorily to anybody else. But I hold in my hand a document which I ask leave to insert in the RECORD, the May pay roll for the teachers of the District of Columbia, upon an annual basis, the actual pay roll. This, however, only includes the $120 bonus, and not the $240 bonus which they will get next month, after the 1st of July; and it does not include on the lower grade the $50 that you have put in here.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. In other words, the statement that the gentleman proposes to put in the RECORD is a statement of the money that was actually paid to the teachers of the District of Columbia for the month of May, reduced to an annual basis?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes. But, as I say, this includes only the $120 bonus, and on the 1st of July they will be entitled to an additional $120; and, of course, added to this for the month of July, if we pass this bill, will be the $50 additional which each one of the low-grade teachers will receive.

Now, with that explanation, I ask permission to put in the RECORD the May pay roll of the teachers of the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the statement he refers to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the statement referred to:

MAY PAY ROLL ON AN ANNUAL BASIS.

Memorandum of salaries of teachers of public schools of the District of Columbia by classes.

Figures given include basic salary, longevity allowance, allowance to principals of grade schools for session rooms, and increase of compensation provided by law:

CLASS 1.

Number.	Salary per annum.
25	$870
25	895
12	920
9	945
19	970

CLASS 2.

86	870
86	895
40	920
36	945
109	970

CLASS 3.

97	870
79	895
35	920
36	945
55	970
34	995
19	1,020
25	1,040
12	1,070
13	1,095
122	1,120
1	[1] 1,160

CLASS 4.

7	920
13	950
9	980
17	1,010
19	1,040
46	1,070
37	1,100
38	1,130
22	1,160
22	1,190
224	1,220
1	[1] 1,130
1	[1] 1,190
1	[1] 1,220
1	[1] 1,250
1	[1] 1,280
1	[1] 1,310
3	[1] 1,340
3	[1] 1,430
6	[1] 1,460
3	[1] 1,490
4	[1] 1,520
1	[1] 1,580

CLASS 5.

4	1,070
4	1,110
2	1,150
7	1,230
2	1,270
5	1,310
3	1,350
4	1,430
6	1,470
1	[1] 1,290
1	[1] 1,350

[1] Includes allowance to principals.

Number.	Salary per annum.
1	[1] $1,390
1	[1] 1,460
1	[1] 1,480
1	[1] 1,530
1	[1] 1,540
2	[1] 1,550
1	[1] 1,560
1	[1] 1,590
1	[1] 1,610
1	[1] 1,650
1	[1] 1,670
1	[1] 1,680
10	[1] 1,710
14	[1] 1,740
14	[1] 1,770
9	[1] 1,800
6	[1] 1,830
2	[1] 1,860
2	[1] 1,890
3	[1] 1,920
2	[1] 1,950
7	[1] 1,980
1	[1] 2,040
2	[1] 2,070
1	[1] 2,100
1	[1] 2,130
1	[1] 2,160
1	[1] 2,250
1	[1] 2,520
CLASS 6A.	
34	1,120
6	1,220
15	1,320
13	1,420
18	1,520
5	1,620
11	1,720
10	1,820
219	1,920
CLASS 6B.	
7	2,020
1	2,120
2	2,220
23	2,320

NOTE.—Salaries given based on pay roll for the month of May, 1919.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. This was made out by the auditor of the District, Mr. Tweedale, who audits all the expenditures of the District of Columbia. It was made out last month.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. BEE. I want to ask the chairman if he does not think the committee does itself an injustice, and the Congress as well does itself an injustice, in not having these items show that the $800, for instance, the lowest pay, is not in fact $800, but $1,040? It goes out to the country as $800, and unless I had asked the question and it had been answered, I would have supposed that every teacher was receiving only $800, when in fact they are receiving $1,040. Does not the committee do itself an injustice in not putting that in the bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is true. This is only the basic salary that is placed in the bill.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be much difficulty in understanding in these discussions on this bill what "longevity" really means. I am not sure if the gentleman understands it; I am not sure that I do or not. But would it not be a good plan if, in the course of his remarks, he would put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the provisions of this longevity-pay law in a concise form, so that we might see just what is meant by "longevity pay" and what its application is?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Does the gentleman mean to insert the law on the subject?

Mr. GARD. Yes; that is what I mean. I note here on page 37 it refers to the act of June 20, 1906, as amended in 1908, 1910, and 1912.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I have it here before me, and it is five closely printed pages.

Mr. GARD. So much as that?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. So much as that, and the language of it is such that I question very much whether anyone except an expert can fathom what it means. I know I am unable to do so.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman then inform me where the longevity-pay law may be found?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Volume 34, Statutes at Large, beginning on page 316.

Mr. GARD. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Night schools: For teachers and janitors of night schools, including teachers of industrial, commercial, and trade instruction, and teachers and janitors of night schools may also be teachers and janitors of day schools, $50,000.

[1] Includes allowance to principals.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman, Is there any plan devised by which teachers and janitors of night schools are paid?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We appropriate $50,000 for that purpose here.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I am speaking of them individually and not collectively.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The janitors run all through this bill. We have a kind of standardized pay for janitors running all through the bill.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Is there any reason why the night teachers should not be paid more than the amount specified under this section?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I know of no reason why they can not pay them more. The only question is the advisability of paying more.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Then under this bill night teachers can be paid any amount that the board of education deems proper?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That rests with the board of education. We have a very large, intelligent, and trustworthy board of education.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Do you not also have the same board of education for the day schools?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We do.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. If your committee regulates the pay as to the day schools, why does it not regulate it as to the night schools?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I think we do.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. There is no regulation here.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. There is nothing said about it here.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman admitted that under this bill the night teachers could be paid any amount that the board of education might deem proper.

Mr. FOCHT. Time and a half.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I can give the gentleman the schedule for the pay of night-school teachers. Principals of high schools $54 per month for three nights a week——

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Under what authority?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It is in the law.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Not in this bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Not in this bill; principals of high schools, $54 a month for three nights a week, $72 a month for four nights a week, $90 a month for five nights a week.

Principals of graded schools, $45 a month for three nights a week, $60 a month for four nights a week, $75 a month for five nights a week.

Teachers, $30 a month for three nights a week; $40 a month for four nights a week; $50 a month for five nights a week.

Janitors, $15 to $30 per month for three nights a week; $20 to $40 for four nights a week; $25 to $50 per month for five nights a week; and the rate varies according to the size of the building and the number of classes in the building.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. How long has that law been in force?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. This is an estimate made up by the school board, and this is what they are acting upon now. That is the basis of the $50,000 appropriation which we carry in this bill.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Does the chairman of the committee think that after a teacher instructs pupils all day that same teacher can give the proper efficiency teaching at night? Do the pupils get as much attention from teachers who instruct all day?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I should hardly think so. I think excessive labor tends to weaken the quality of the labor.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Then is it wise to have day teachers instruct the night pupils?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is a question of policy which, as I say, the very large and distinguished school board of this District have determined upon, and I do not care to put my judgment against theirs. My judgment would amount to nothing when they really carry it into effect.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Have we no power to change that?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We have, but not on an appropriation bill. The longevity law was reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia and not the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I will.

Mr. FESS. The day school is more wearing upon the teachers, because of the discipline. I think any school-teacher will say that the wearing process of teaching is not the teaching of the pupils so much as the maintaining of the esprit de corps of the class. The night school is attended by a different class of pupils, and the discipline there cuts no figure, because those who are there at night know what they are there for, while the pupils in the day school are there because the law requires them to be there; and the teacher who devotes an hour or more to the night school will not suffer the fatigue that he would in the daytime.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I think I can straighten it out in the gentleman's mind. The day teachers are not of necessity night teachers. It is optional with them, if they desire to do so.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I understand that.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. And in many instances teachers from the outside come in and teach in the night schools, especially in the manual training and kindergarten departments.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I was thinking of the mental and physical advancement of the night pupils. When they come at night they have worked all day and are tired, and they do not want a teacher who is also fatigued and perhaps irritable.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Miscellaneous: For rent of school buildings and grounds, repair shop, storage and stock rooms, $16,500, to be available immediately.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the words "be immediately available." In this connection I would like to ask why we are renting school buildings and grounds and repair shops and stock and storage room instead of having school buildings erected.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I can answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. MADDEN. Why do we not build them?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We are building as fast as possible.

Mr. MADDEN. As fast as we appropriate the money.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. No; it is difficult to get labor and material. The authorities assert that they can not get the material and it is difficult to get labor.

Mr. MADDEN. We are building buildings elsewhere.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Well, we are building now, but we have not built for two years.

Mr. MADDEN. I think I asked the gentleman the other day what percentage of children who attend the schools are only able to attend half a day.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I can give the gentleman the information. The present enrollment is 57,000; 49 one-half time classes above the second grade total more than 2,500.

Mr. MADDEN. All the other children in the District have sufficient school facilities?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. They do.

Mr. MADDEN. My understanding is that they have nothing like the number of school buildings that they need.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We have 60 portable buildings to fill out the emergency.

Mr. MADDEN. Are these portable buildings being used?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes; and then they are building as fast as needed. The gentleman must remember that the schools are crowded; there ought not to be over 40 in a class, and in some of the classes there are 55 and some 60, but the children are being taught. They could be taught better if we had more buildings.

Mr. MADDEN. We seem to have plenty of money in the District. They raise a sufficient amount in taxes and then they have our contribution from the Federal Treasury to do all that is necessary in the District in a proper way. I think one of the most important functions of the municipal government is to supply education to the growing manhood and womanhood in this country.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I believe that 434 other Members of Congress are of the same opinion.

Mr. MADDEN. Then why do we not appropriate?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We appropriate as fast as the school board and the commissioners recommend it and as fast as they can furnish material and labor. Your committee has gone as far in that direction as the board desires.

Mr. MADDEN. It seems to me the board ought not to decide the question when it is evident on its face that they are not making such recommendations as ought to be put into effect. If the board of education and the commissioners are lax in the performance of their duty——

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That raises a new question. I do not say that the gentleman is censuring the board of education. They are fine men. They are appointed by the justices of the Supreme Court of the District instead of by the commissioners or being elected by the people, as they probably ought to be. We had a provision in the bill to permit the board of education to be appointed by the commissioners, but it was stricken out on a point of order. If the gentleman is censuring the board he is censuring Congress in striking out the provision, and censuring the people of the District for wanting to retain the appointment of the board in the hands of the supreme court.

Mr. MADDEN. Let me say to the gentleman that I had something to do with the writing of that law. I think I was one of three men who drew the law requiring the board of education to be appointed by the court. I think it has been the most beneficent law we have had on the statute books. I do not think the board should be appointed by the District Commissioners, because I do not think they are the men best qualified for that purpose. I do not think they ought to be elected by the people. I think somebody sufficiently far away from the turmoil of District management, who can see the needs of education and not be affected by the clamor for places, a body like the supreme court, should have the power to appoint.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I desire five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The remarks that I have made were along the theory that the gentleman from Illinois thought the board of education was not properly performing its duty.

Mr. MADDEN. I say if the board fails to perform its duty I do not say that it does, but if it does fail——

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. How are you going to get rid of them?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not want to.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Is it not possible and probable that the unusually large attendance during this time produces the condition of which the gentleman complains?

Mr. MADDEN. We are not likely to have that condition changed. I remember that before the war began we had 28,000 civil employees in the District of Columbia outside of the War and the Navy Departments. To-day we have at least 120,000. And if the present indications mean anything we are liable to have them for a long time to come. Even when we had 28,000 we did not have school facilities enough to meet conditions. It makes no difference what the board of education recommends, if they fail to perform their duty to the extent they should we have the power to override their recommendations.

I think we should have vision enough and interest enough in the education of the coming generation to see to it that facilities are supplied. If we did not have the money, if it was impossible to raise the money, that might be a good reason for not doing it; but they do raise it, they have the money, they can put the buildings up, and they have the lots upon which there are no buildings now. It is true they have been putting up movable buildings, frame structures, to a very limited extent. I do not think they have used all those that they have erected. They have not even been erecting them as quickly as they should, and the education of the children of the District has been in a large measure neglected.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I have some children here. Do I understand that my children may not get a full year's education here in the public schools?

Mr. MADDEN. It depends upon their age.

Mr. FOSTER. They are of the high-school age.

Mr. MADDEN. I think likely they will be able to crowd in some place within the walls of the school, but whether they will have sufficient facilities that will give them the kind of education they ought to have under the present plan I do not know.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I better send them back to God's country in Ohio.

Mr. MADDEN. That is a pretty good place, but this is not a bad one. Ohio, of course, is in the public eye. Everybody recognizes that as the magnet to which all of the people of the Union should go.

Mr. FOSTER. Seriously, I want to suggest this: I have great confidence in the gentleman, and I would like to follow him, if something can be done to remedy this condition.

Mr. MADDEN. It ought to be done, and I am simply saying what I have said for the purpose of calling it to the attention of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations hav-

ing charge of the District appropriations, for they have the power, regardless of what recommendations may be made by the board of education or the District Commissioners, and they should exercise it.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. FESS. The chairman of the committee referred to 49 classes on half time. I want to know whether that half time is due to the fact that we do not have room or whether this is the part-time system of school work, where a pupil spends half the time in study and the other half in some industry somewhere?

Mr. MADDEN. That is due to the fact that we have not the school facilities, because children who attend in the forenoon are not permitted to attend in the afternoon, and the classrooms occupied by those in the forenoon are occupied by others in the afternoon.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. My information is just to the contrary.

Mr. MADDEN. I happen to know, because I happen to have children that have been required to go for a half day. One month they are required to go in the forenoon and the next month in the afternoon, and the room that is occupied by those children in the forenoon is occupied by a lot of other children in the afternoon, not because they are at work, because they are not able to work, as they have not yet reached that age.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. Does the gentleman insist upon the point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; on the language "to be immediately available."

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to concede that the point of order is well taken, but I thought the gentleman wanted this money available immediately so that the commissioners could go to work as speedily as possible.

Mr. MADDEN. This is for rent.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. All right; but they need the money.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, every session of Congress, when the District of Columbia appropriation bill is under consideration, we hear much about the lack of school facilities and the overcrowded schools. Some four or five years ago I got the Commissioners of the District to furnish me with a map of the District of Columbia, and to mark every schoolhouse on that map with a red star. When they had done so, I counted them, and found there were 299 permanent public school buildings in the District of Columbia, and many have been built since.

Originally the District of Columbia was 10 miles square. In 1845 that part of the District which was on the other side of the Potomac River was taken off, leaving the District about 7 miles square. Ten per cent of that is water and the rest is land. You have more than 300 permanent schoolhouses upon those 7 square miles, and interspersed all through them you have parochial and private schools in great numbers. A flying machine could hardly go over the District of Columbia and drop a bomb without hitting a schoolhouse somewhere. Yet year after year we hear that we are lacking in school facilities.

They talk about 59,000 pupils being enrolled in the District of Columbia. That is about correct; but two-thirds of them do not attend the public schools. The others go to the parochial and to the private schools, and many do not go at all. Some schools are overcrowded and others are almost empty. Why? Because children will go on the street cars, with the consent and approval of their parents and the consent of the Board of Education, and ride by two or three schools to get to the one that they prefer.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Then does not the gentleman from Kentucky think there ought to be an equalization by direction of the Board of Education of the schools at which attendance should be required?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Certainly there ought to; but that would interfere with another plan. You know the great game in the District of Columbia is real estate speculation and promotion. Every time that a man goes out into the country and opens up a primeval forest and maps it out on paper with town lots, the first thing he must get is an engine house and a police station and a school. To do what the gentleman suggests would stop the building of those schools in order to promote the selling of town lots in some of the suburbs here, as I said, in unbroken forests. I advisedly call them unbroken forests. You have rural routes here in the District of Columbia that are lighted by electric lights. This thing of not having plenty of school accommodations in the way of houses in the District of Columbia is all bosh. There are plenty of accommodations here. I have seen statements in the newspapers in the last few years gone by about schoolrooms being overcrowded, and the very next day I, with others, would go to those selfsame schoolrooms and find them half empty. This is newspaper bosh that a lot of you have been reading, and it is not supported by the facts at all.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield for just a moment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. My attention has been called to what Gen. Knight said. He said:

The War Industries Board limited us to the number of 20 of our portable school buildings. That is all we have got out of 80.

The War Industries Board is another thing that prevented the building of more, and I wish to insert that in the RECORD. That is one reason why we did not build all the schools. That, however, has been removed, and they are proceeding as rapidly as possible.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Another matter, where one of these school promoters will go to a newspaper, to a committee room, or to gentlemen who are to come upon this floor and explain their notions and their ideas about schools, is that they invariably mention the great number of children enrolled in the schools of the District of Columbia. They never tell the number of children who actually attend, and I know beyond peradventure that there is ample school room.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will.

Mr. BEE. Is there any rule or law in the District of Columbia that requires children to attend within the school district?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No; and the school board in recent years ought to have written such a regulation.

Mr. BEE. In other words, to require the children in this area to go to this school and not be permitted to go to a school over here except by transfer. If they would do that then they would not have some schools empty and some schools full.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will say to the gentleman, some years ago when Mr. Roosevelt was President and his children attended one of the public schools here, after he started his children to that school that schoolhouse, which was doubly ample for all the school children within reasonable reach of it, was overcrowded to an extent that they tell me that more than half the time they could not get within a square of where the schoolhouse was; they all wanted to go right there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, in reference to the school buildings we have had some trouble always in getting the facts as to exactly the amount of space needed, and when Mr. Burleson, the present Postmaster General, was chairman of the District subcommittee there was a great hue and cry raised in the District about the crowded conditions of the schools. At his suggestion the Engineer Commissioner of the District measured the school floor and air space in the District of Columbia at some considerable trouble, and the schoolroom space in the District of Columbia at that time was a greater number of square feet per pupil and a greater number of cubic feet air space per pupil than any city in the United States and perhaps in the world. Now, that is the engineer's report after an accurate survey. Since that time there have been built a number of palatial school buildings, among them the Central High School, which is looked upon as being one of the greatest public school plants in the world, and then the colored school on M Street has been built, another very palatial and magnificent building. Those buildings cost averaging a million dollars each. Those have been built since the survey was made, and then additions have been made in the way of 8, 10, and 12 rooms and 3 or 4 rooms since that time, and since my friend, the present chairman of this subcommittee, and I have been on the subcommittee, and numbers of these school buildings were put up under Mr. PAIGE'S administration as chairman, and your subcommittee has not been at all niggardly in supplying school facilities for the District of Columbia. The present chairman is a very strong advocate of the best school system. I refer to the present chairman of the subcommittee, not only for fair treatment to school-teachers but to the school children, so no criticism can be lodged against the chairman of the committee because he has been most zealous and most active in the interest of better schools and more school buildings in the District of Columbia. But he has his limitations; we all have our limitations. There is a certain amount of money that can be well and reasonably expended in the District of of Columbia. Not only that, but the testimony before this committee at the present time by the architect was that owing to the conditions of labor and the conditions of material there was just a certain amount of material to work with that could

be gotten and that could be economically used within the next current fiscal year, and your subcommittee gave them the money, all that could be economically used.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. I will.

Mr. BEE. Has this committee the power to subdivide the children of Washington into school districts?

Mr. SISSON. No; not this committee.

Mr. BEE. Has the Congress that power?

Mr. SISSON. The Congress has that power.

Mr. BEE. That ought to be done.

Mr. SISSON. Now, the school board has ample authority to decide and say which school children shall attend and confine them within that area. That was gone into some time back. The condition that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] speaks of got to be quite acute here at one time. Children would desire to follow some school-teacher or go to some particular school which they thought happened to be a little better or had a little better building than a near-by school, and at that time there was a readjustment of the matter, and an effort was made to relieve the situation, so that evil possibly in the public-school system can not be traceable either to the subcommittee or to Congress. There are a certain amount of administrative duties that devolve upon the school board here, and if there is a fault to it, it is not our fault.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent to address the committee for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I have just said that everybody here who wants to get ground purchased for a school building and wants another school building erected somewhere in order to promote real estate transactions invariably speaks of the great number of enrolled children, and they always speak of them as "children."

The school rolls of the District of Columbia stand a better chance to be padded than the school rolls of any other place on the American Continent, for the reason that there is no maximum school age. A few years ago I went into the ages of those who were attending schools here, and I found that they ranged from 5 years to 66 years. That is a positive fact. Now, then, whom do they enroll? At what age do they stop the enrollment in order to get 60,000 enrolled pupils? They do it for a purpose. It is not beneficial to the school system. I just wanted to invite attention to that fact. I will say that I looked into the ages of the students at one of the schools at that time, some five or six years ago, and the average school age at that school was 24½ years.

Mr. BEE. May I ask the gentleman a question? Do they not take a census of the school children of this District at all?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Somebody does. I do not know who. When they say it is 60,000 I presume they would not say so unless they took some sort of a census.

Mr. BEE. How do they arrive at the enrollment at all, then, if you know?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. By determining in advance the number they want.

Mr. BEE. And the amount of money they need?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes, sir.

The Clerk read as follows:

For equipment of temporary rooms for classes above the second grade, now on half time, and to provide for estimated increased enrollment that may be caused by operation of the compulsory education law, and for purchase of all necessary articles and supplies to be used in the course of instruction which may be provided for atypical and ungraded classes, $5,000.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for just a minute and not to consume time. We have the half-time provision in this paragraph.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. This is for equipment.

Mr. FESS. I am concerned whether or not the District provides for half-time equipment, not because there is a lack of facility either in schoolrooms or in teachers but in order to meet that exigency that we meet in some places in the night school and in other places in the part-time school. The chairman of the committee is exceedingly familiar with the legislation we have had throughout the country on the provision for the part-time schools, and if the city of Washington does not have a provision in its school system to make it possible for a pupil to study or attend school one half the time and work the other half, the city of Washington is not keeping up with the movement of the educational reforms of the country. And I am asking the chairman of the committee whether the system does not include the part-time school as well as the all-day school?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I think it does.

Mr. FESS. I am glad to have that information.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For furniture, including clocks, pianos, and window shades for additions to buildings; equipment for kindergartens; and tools and furnishings for manual-training, cooking, and sewing schools, as follows: Three kindergartens, $2,400; two sewing schools, $520; one housekeeping and cooking school, $800; one cooking school, $580; two manual training shops, $1,480; portable schools, $12,500; in all, $18,280, to be available immediately.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the words "to be available immediately."

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For payment of necessary expenses connected with the organization and conducting of community forums and civic centers in school buildings, including equipment, fixtures, and supplies for lighting and equipping the buildings, payment of janitor service, secretaries, teachers, organizers, and clerks, and employees of the day schools may also be employees of the community forums and civic centers, $30,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What is the reason that the appropriation for this purpose has been increased 100 per cent?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Originally we had $15,000 in the District bill, and the deficiency act contained $6,000 additional, making $21,000, and we have increased it $9,000 because, as we claim, of increased work and activity in the community forums and the increase in the expense of paying janitor services, and one thing and another.

Mr. WALSH. Have they increased the number of the forums?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I think they have, and want to increase them many more. They wanted, I think, $60,000, but we kept them down to $30,000. But the expense of maintaining them has increased considerably. They have to pay certain expenses, such as for janitors, and so forth. We have increased that only $9,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

The children of officers and men of the United States Army and Navy stationed outside of the District of Columbia shall be admitted to the public schools without payment of tuition.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. Do I understand that if there are officers of the Army who are on duty in Baltimore or in Virginia, they can send their children in here to Washington and have tuition without charge, the families not living in the District at all?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The principal object of this new legislation, if you so call it, is to take in the children of officers over here at Fort Myer. That is chiefly the reason. They made it general. I do not think that it will catch any who are living in Baltimore, so far as that is concerned, but those around on the edge of the District, living in Maryland, and particularly at Fort Myer. It is in the current law.

Mr. WALSH. That does not take it out of the reach of the point of order.

Mr. SISSON. If the gentleman will yield, I myself objected to this language before, for the reason that the language is broad enough to enable a naval officer living anywhere in the United States to put his children in school here. As I understand the purpose for which it was put in the bill, it was that the children of officers stationed at Fort Myer and near-by places might have school facilities. But the language is entirely too broad. If the bill would restrict the language so as to include the children of Army officers stationed at Fort Myer, where they do not happen to have any near-by school facilities, there would be no harm in it. But I do not think it is abused at all now. I think only the children of officers attend who do not have those facilities near where they reside.

Mr. WALSH. I assumed from the hasty examination of the appropriation act that this was a seeming war-emergency provision that was put in.

Mr. SISSON. I do not think so. It was carried in the bill prior to that.

Mr. WALSH. Not long.

Mr. SISSON. There was some objection to it, but we were requested to put it in the bill, and it was put in.

Mr. BEE. My understanding of that proposition is this: We have a large cantonment near San Antonio. An officer may be at a station far removed from the railroad, while his family may be in Washington, and this is to permit those children to attend the schools. We have the same provision in our city. If an officer is living at a post, his children may attend the schools in the city, because they have no fixed habitation.

Mr. WALSH. That is true. But a number of Army officers who have established homes elsewhere are sent to various camps and cantonments all over the country, and while they are there, particularly during the social season, their families come to Washington and hire an apartment or live in a hotel, and send their children to the high school or various other institutions. I think that if this is intended for Fort Myer or a near-by reservation, you ought to be specific. I make a point of order on the language.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter the board of education is authorized to use all necessary floor and room space in the Franklin School Building for office purposes.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that paragraph for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I believe I can satisfy the gentleman in just a moment that the gentleman ought not to make a point of order on the paragraph. The Franklin School contains at the present time the following officers:

Officers located in Franklin School: Superintendent of schools. Two assistant superintendents of schools. Secretary board of education; superintendent of janitors. Medical inspection; school nurses. Division of primary instruction. Division of intermediate instruction. Supervisor of manual training. General secretary of community centers. Financial official board of education. Board of examiners. Child-labor office. Statistician. Director of special activities.

The bureau of education and agriculture department are temporarily using two rooms: Assembly hall and board room.

Number of rooms	25
Number used for offices	19
Number used for teaching	4

It is the intention to use all available space for administrative purposes but not to disturb the four rooms for teaching.

Persons employed in offices in the building: Fourteen general administrative officers; 25 assistants and clerks.

The Franklin School Building is at present in a very crowded condition. The number of rooms used for teaching is only four. It is not the intention to take these four rooms away at all until we can construct other buildings in place of the four rooms that are now being used. I have that on the express statement not only of the superintendent of schools but of the Board of Education. They are very much in need of additional room. If the gentleman makes the point of order, I wish him to be advised that not a single pupil will be deprived of school attendance by virtue of this item, and it is only after we shall have obtained additional facilities that these four rooms will be used for purposes other than as schoolrooms.

Mr. PLATT. I notice there is some apprehension concerning this language among people interested in the schools, lest these four rooms should be taken from the pupils.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. After hearing this matter thrashed out for several years, I am thoroughly convinced that there is no ground whatever for apprehension.

Mr. PLATT. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York withdraws his point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky renews the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. We have just heard the cry of lack of school facilities, which is unfounded, however. The Franklin School Building, if I am correctly advised, is on Thirteenth Street, between I and K?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Where would those children go to school now if this house is taken away from them?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I do not know. I can not say. But they would go to the nearest school, provided we furnished rooms and buildings for them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Where is that?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I can not locate it now geographically. Perhaps my colleague [Mr. SISSON] could.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Over on Nineteenth Street, not very far from Pennsylvania Avenue, is an old engine house. It is a nice piece of property in a fine neighborhood. Some years ago a society here which some people call the "Cliff Dwellers," but which calls itself the "Society of Oldest Inhabitants"——

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Not "the Smart Set"——

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do not know whether it is called "the Smart Set" or not. The editor of the Washington Star, I believe, is the president of it. Now, that house, occupying a great deal of floor space, both on the ground floor and above, something like 10 years ago, by act of Congress, was given to that society; or rather the use of it was given to that society. Now, instead of depriving the children of a schoolhouse in the midst of a thickly populated neighborhood, why not undo that act and take that engine-house property over there which this society, the "Oldest Inhabitants," is now using, and let some of these officers go there? Does not the gentleman think that would be better, now that rents are so high? The United States Government is renting property at all kinds of fabulous prices here, and the District of Columbia itself is renting property at fabulous prices, and yet it is giving away valuable pieces of property of its own. Is it not a good time now to correct that?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The chief reason I suggest in opposition to the gentleman's argument is that in my opinion the school officers, the heads of all the departments, should be in one building. No doubt the suggestion of the gentleman is good. No doubt that property ought to be taken away. If I am chairman of the subcommittee framing the next bill, and the gentleman will come before that committee, I will not only listen to him but I will encourage him in producing evidence to warrant the taking over of that "Cliff Dwellers" building if possible.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, to still further stimulate the movement in the right direction, in order that the property now occupied by the "Cliff Dwellers" may be taken back, I make a point of order against this item.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For instruction of blind children of the District of Columbia, in Maryland or some other State, under a contract to be entered into by the commissioners, $7,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That all expenditures under this appropriation shall be made under the supervision of the board of education.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. FESS. I desire, Mr. Chairman, at this stage to offer a word of congratulation to the committee for the recognition they have given of the valuable school work in the Capital of the country. I do not care to take the time just to consume it, but I really think that in view of what has been done in other parts of the country on school matters, there is a word of congratulation due to the Congress for its attempt to appreciate education here.

I think that the Capital has among its buildings the finest school equipment of any city, probably, in the world. I doubt if there is any city anywhere that has a finer institution in the way of public education than the Central High School and the other school that was mentioned for the colored children. If there be a crowded condition of the school population, I could understand it by the great influx of population induced by the war. While it is true that those who have come add to the population about 100,000, as I understand, yet they would not all represent families, and therefore would not increase the school population in anything like that rational proportion, and yet they would increase the school attendance in a degree. That would make imminent a crowded situation that would be more or less temporary, and thus the rental method would have to be resorted to, rather than permanent buildings.

A good deal has been said about the manner of the appointment of teachers. I do not share in the criticisms of some of our best friends of education we have here in this Congress, on the manner of the selection of the school board. I think one of the most important features of a good school system is to have a board that can act fairly independently. I am not afraid of the pressure that would be brought upon a board, but you can see, all of us recognize, that some little incident comes up and a tremendous storm will soon be brewing against the school board or school authorities, and it might not be anything more than temporary, if not a mere trifle. One of the things that a good school system must have is a fairly independent board, to act for the interests of the school children without reference to any particular prejudice or influence coming from any source. While I was not in Congress when this plan was adopted, I have looked upon it as being one of the sources of a splendid school system in our Capital. I want to take this opportunity to say again that I think our Capital ought to be an object lesson for all the country of what our schools should be—first, in the character of the teaching; secondly, in the character of the equipment; and, thirdly, in all that goes in the way of physical requirements for buildings, conveniences, and so on. If there is any feature of a modern school system that is not provided for in the city of Washington, I have failed to detect it. I think this much ought to be said to this committee by a practical school

man, whose life has been devoted to school work, because it is due not only to the committee but to the Congress. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary expenses of inspection of dairy farms, including amounts that may be allowed the health officer, assistant health officer, chief medical inspector in charge of contagious-disease service, and inspectors assigned to the inspection of dairy farms, for maintenance by each of a horse and vehicle at not to exceed $25 per month, or motor vehicle at not to exceed $30 per month, for use in the discharge of his official duties, and allowances for such other inspectors in the service of the health department as the commissioners may determine, of not to exceed $15 per month for maintenance of a motor cycle each, or of not exceeding $25 per annum for the maintenance of a bicycle each, for use in the discharge of their official duties, and other necessary traveling expenses, $7,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should like to ask the reason for making an allowance of $15 per month for the maintenance of a motor cycle and then an allowance of $25 a year for the maintenance of a bicycle? What maintenance is there of a bicycle that would run up to $25 a year?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I really can not tell the gentleman, except that has been the established amount. It is the current law and has been the established amount ever since I have been on the District Committee. I can not tell what expenditures there can be for a bicycle amounting to $25 a year, but nevertheless it is urged all the time.

Mr. SISSON. There is an allowance of $15 a month for the maintenance of a motor cycle, or of $25 a year for the maintenance of a bicycle. Of course, the maintenance of the motor cycle is more expensive on account of the cost of gasoline and tires.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I understood the gentleman's question was concerning the maintenance of a bicycle.

Mr. WALSH. That is correct.

Mr. SISSON. That is $25 per annum, which is a little over $2 a month. That is for tires and repairs. The inspector furnishes his own bicycle. The District does not furnish it.

Mr. WALSH. He furnishes his own bicycle?

Mr. SISSON. He furnishes his own bicycle. It costs about $2 a month to pay fines and keep the bicycle in repair and buy new tires and about $15 a month to maintain a motor cycle—$180 a year for the motor cycle and $25 for the bicycle, both of which are owned by the employee.

Mr. WALSH. They use these on inspecting trips?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Throughout the District?

Mr. SISSON. Yes; attending to Government business. Of course, when they are not on Government work they use their bicycles and motor cycles as they please, but they are on duty six days a week and eight hours a day, working all the time for the District.

Mr. WALSH. I suppose they have somebody who inspects the bicycles to differentiate between the wear and tear when bicycles are used on Government business and when they are used for personal business.

Mr. CRAMTON. That inspector probably has an automobile. [Laughter.]

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the maintenance of a dispensary or dispensaries for the treatment of persons suffering from tuberculosis and of persons suffering from venereal diseases, including payment for personal service, rent, and supplies, $12,500: *Provided*, That the commissioners may accept such volunteer services as they deem expedient in connection with the establishment and maintenance of the dispensaries herein authorized: *Provided further*, That this shall not be construed to authorize the expenditure or the payment of any money on account of any such volunteer service.

Mr. WALSH. I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I should like to inquire about the last proviso. We make an appropriation of $12,500 for the treatment of persons suffering from tuberculosis and venereal diseases, and then say—

That this shall not be construed to authorize the expenditure or the payment of any money on account of any such volunteer service.

Now, if you have some volunteer physicians and nurses, who go into this dispensary and treat people, under this proviso they can not use any of the supplies that are purchased under this appropriation, as I construe the second proviso.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I do not think so. That is intended to prohibit the payment of any money for services.

Mr. WALSH. It says on account or for any such volunteer service. It seems to me that that language would prevent the use of any supplies bought out of the $1,200 appropriation.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is not the purpose. It is to prevent the paying of money out for volunteer service. That is the intention.

Mr. WALSH. I think instead of the words "on account of" the word "for" would be preferable, so that it will read, "The expenditure or payment of money for any such volunteer service." Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order and offer an amendment, in line 16, page 59, striking out the words "on account of" and inserting the word "for."

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MAGEE). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 59, line 16, after the word "money," strike out the words "on account of" and insert in lieu thereof the word "for."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, referring to the hospital situation here, I notice that there are only two hospitals referred to, the Garfield Memorial and the Providence Hospital. My question is what hospitals in the city are provided for in this bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. There are many that follow on subsequent pages. These only pertain to the isolating wards.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hospital for the Insane: For support of indigent insane of the District of Columbia in St. Elizabeths Hospital, as provided by law, $500,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice that we have the lucky number of 13 Republicans on that side in the consideration of this bill. I would like to know if the chairman expects to finish this bill to-night.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I do not expect to fully finish it, but I want to read along a little further.

Mr. BLANTON. And the gentleman does not desire a larger audience?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. No; we have a fair audience. I notice on the other side the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] watching pretty closely, and I am glad they are.

Mr. GARD. We make up in quality. [Laughter.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses of camps, including hire of horses for officers required to be mounted, and such hire not to be deducted from their mounted pay, and for the payment of commutation of subsistence for enlisted men who may be detailed to guard or move the United States property at home stations on days immediately preceding and immediately following the annual encampments, damages to private property incident to encampments, instruction, practice marches and practice cruises, drills and parades, fuel, light, heat, care, and repair of armories, offices, and storehouse, practice ships, boats, machinery and dock, dredging alongside of dock, telephone service, horses and mules for mounted organizations, street car fares (not to exceed $200) necessarily used in the transaction of official business, and for general incidental expenses of the service, $24,000.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, in line 18, page 81, the word "storehouse" should be "storehouses."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Can the gentleman, chairman of the committee, give some explanation for the extraordinary increase in this item—$7,500 to $24,000?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I know the reason why it was put in. The parties interested, and I will say that I am interested myself by being a National Guard man, state that before the war broke out we were expending more than double this amount. When the war broke out it broke up the National Guard organization, and they are trying to reconstruct it. They wanted a much larger sum; they wanted $50,000 or $60,000, and we gave them this small amount of $24,000. I think it is absolutely necessary if you are going to reorganize.

Mr. WALSH. And the effort is to reorganize it on prewar conditions?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I do not know as they want to do that; I do not know that they want to go that far, but they have a rifle range, and they want to reestablish that on a reasonable basis.

The Clerk read as follows:

For emergency fund, to be used only in case of a serious break requiring immediate repairs in one of the more important aqueduct or filtration-plant structures, such as a dam, conduit, tunnel, bridge, building, or important piece of machinery, $5,000; all expenditures from this appropriation shall be reported in detail to Congress.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Minnesota if from the concluding words of this paragraph we may infer that the other appropriations of the bill are not reported in detail to Congress?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Not at all. This is one of those complex, divided propositions about which I tried to inform the gentleman in my opening statement. The Washington Aqueduct here is under the War Department, and they get the

water into the city. After it comes here we take care of it and meter all the premises and handle the water. We wanted to make sure that the War Department would report in detail their expenses, and I think it is a very good provision.

Mr. WALSH. Is there not a report in detail for the operation of the aqueduct?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I do not wish to criticize along that line, but I would like to have a little more detailed and itemized statement of the expenditure of this money.

Mr. WALSH. But it is particularly important that this $5,000 emergency appropriation should be reported in detail because of the complexity of the situation and the possible conflict of authority.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I think if the gentleman will read that carefully, he will see it is intended that the entire expense of the Washington Aqueduct shall be covered by that.

Mr. WALSH. No; I do not think it bears that construction. It says $5,000 for this emergency fund, and then we find the language:

All expenditures from this appropriation shall be reported in detail to Congress.

I submit, of course, that would apply to the paragraph in which the language is found.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, before the Clerk reads I move to strike out the last word of the preceding paragraph, for the purpose of asking the chairman how long he proposes to run to-night?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, my purpose is, unless interfered with, to read just another page, over to section 7, and then have the committee rise.

Mr. FESS. It is now about 5 o'clock, and it has been pretty hot to-day.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We will then have gotten through all of these matters and will have come to some new matter. I want to give the House full opportunity to discuss the items following that, if it is desired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That the commissioners are authorized to employ in the execution of work the cost of which is payable from the appropriation account created in the District of Columbia appropriation act approved April 27, 1904, and known as the "Miscellaneous trust-fund deposits, District of Columbia," all necessary inspectors, overseers, foremen, sewer tappers, skilled laborers, mechanics, laborers, special policemen stationed at street-railway crossings, 1 inspector of gas fitting, 2 janitors for laboratories of the Washington and Georgetown Gas Light Cos., market master, assistant market master, watchman, horses, carts, and wagons, and to incur all necessary expenses incidental to carrying on such work and necessary for the proper execution thereof, such services and expenses to be paid from said appropriation account.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, simply for the purpose of directing the attention of the committee to the manner in which the present bill has received consideration from the Committee of the Whole and to compliment the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and his colleague upon the minority side and the other members of the committee upon the measure which they have produced, and which, as has been shown, has withstood all attacks upon some of the items that have been made on both sides of the aisle. I further express the hope that when this measure returns to the House from a voyage away from here, we will find that the appropriations have not been inordinately increased, and that the committee may be able to see to it, if the measure goes to conference, that they, having in mind the support accorded them by this vast assemblage during the consideration of the bill, will stand for economy in expenditures.

I believe there is a general disposition to be liberal in the appropriations for the District of Columbia, and the committee in presenting this bill has followed a procedure which I think is to be commended. It has not been satisfied to take the bill simply as it passed the House in the last Congress and report it without further consideration, but has held supplemental hearings upon several of the items and estimates, and in that particular it has not followed the precedent set by another great and powerful committee of this body.

It is pleasing to note the harmony existing between the former chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] and the present chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS]. I think from the support that has been given them on the part of Members on either side of the aisle the people of the country can rest assured that this measure, although it has somewhat of a perilous path before it, will still continue to be air-tight and iron-clad.

I wanted to assure the gentleman that the inquiries which I have had the temerity to propound have not been for the purpose of criticism or to consume time, but to simply fully understand some of the changes that have been made. I assume the gentleman before taking up another section of the bill, which may be subject to a point of order, may desire a little time to fortify himself upon the point, if it should be made, and I assume will now ask that the measure go over until to-morrow.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, in view of the very complimentary words of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], for which I thank him not only for myself but, I hope, on behalf of the whole subcommittee; and in view of the harmony that now exists, and which I feel exists on both sides of the House in regard to this bill, and not wishing to tax the patience of the committee any longer, I now move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4226, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. RODENBERG, for five days, on account of delivering an address at a returning soldiers' celebration.

To Mr. DRANE, for Friday and Saturday, June 6 and 7, on account of important business.

To Mr. SEARS, for 15 days.

To Mr. RUBEY, for 10 days, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. WISE, indefinitely, on account of serious illness in his family.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. ZIHLMAN was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Jennie Smith, widow of Peter Smith, Company H, One hundred and ninety-fourth Pennsylvania Infantry, Sixty-fourth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce to the House that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] has resigned as a member of the Committee to Investigate War Expenditures, and that Mr. C. J. THOMPSON, of Ohio, has resigned as a member of the Committee on Claims. Without objection, the resignations will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint in place of Mr. HAMILTON, of Michigan, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I think it will be of general interest to Members of the House to inquire of the gentleman from Wyoming what bill he will probably bring in after we finish the consideration of this particular measure?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House may conclude the District bill and maybe consider one or two bills from the Committee on Accounts, one with regard to clerk hire of Members, if possible, and possibly one or two other small bills, nothing especially important. We also hope to have a report from one, and possibly two, of the appropriating committees to-morrow in order that the reports may be printed and the bills taken up on Monday—one or the other of them.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman will recall in a private conversation he stated it was the expectation to bring in the railroad administrative bill at an early date, and I was wondering——

Mr. MONDELL. I will say to the gentleman it is not certain at this time which bill will be received first, the railroad or the military bill, but we hope to receive a report on one of them to-morrow, possibly both.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What time to-morrow does the gentleman expect to receive it?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, reasonably early we hope.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is the gentleman going on with one of them to-morrow?

Mr. MONDELL. We do not expect to go on with the bills to-morrow, simply to receive the bill and reports for printing under the rule.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Saturday, June 7, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Valley Creek, Jefferson County, Ala. (H. Doc. No. 78); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a clause of legislation submitted by the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for insertion in the paragraph providing for salaries of employees of the bureau for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 79); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Kenosha Harbor, Wis. (H. Doc. No. 80); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 5123) to prevent transmission through the mails of advertisements relating to the treatment of venereal diseases and certain sexual disorders; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 5124) to provide for the manufacture and sale of high-proof spirits for other than beverage purposes, and to insure an ample supply of alcohol and promote its use in scientific research and in the development of the fuel, dye, and other lawful industries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 5125) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Salem, in the county of Washington, in the State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5126) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mitchell, in the county of Lawrence, in the State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5127) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Charlestown, in the county of Clark, in the State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 5128) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Richmond, Va., a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 5129) to provide for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other benefits and purposes in connection therewith; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5130) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Ransom, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 5131) to further provide for the celebration of the victory of peace and to create a commission to secure plans and designs for a monument or memorial to the memory of the Negro soldiers and sailors who took part in the late European conflict and who fought in the wars of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: A bill (H. R. 5132) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make necessary surveys and provide plans for the construction and maintenance of an irrigation and colonization system in the States of California and Nevada, to be known as the "Tahoe reclamation system," and to provide farms and employment for returned soldiers and sailors, and appropriating funds for the same; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BROOKS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5133) to provide for the erection of a public building at Effingham, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 5134) to provide pensions for all soldiers and marines of the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, the Mexican War, and war with Germany who now receive pensions at a minimum rate of $50 per month; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 5135) to provide for the entry and patent of mining claims containing disseminated ore deposits and for the annual labor to be expended thereon; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. RIDDICK: A bill (H. R. 5136) to increase the limit of cost for the Federal building and site thereof at Billings, Mont., and to authorize the provisions of quarters for United States courts in said building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 5137) to repeal section 630 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 5138) to increase the compensation of bookbinders in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 5139) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Alonzo Palmer Post, No. 170, Department of Wisconsin, Grand Army of the Republic, for use in the military division of the Greenwood Cemetery, Superior, Wis., one medium cannon or fieldpiece, together with a sufficient number of cannon balls to form a pyramid; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 5140) to increase the pension of the blind who served in the War with Mexico or in the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASKELL: A bill (H. R. 5141) to fix the salary of the United States marshal for the eastern district of New York; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 5142) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Dubuque, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5143) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Eagle Grove, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5144) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Waverly, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5145) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Waterloo, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5146) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Independence, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5147) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Waverly, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 5148) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of McAlester, Okla., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5149) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Madill, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5150) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Talihina, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5151) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Durant, Okla., three German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5152) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Atoka, Okla., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5153) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fort Towson, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5154) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ardmore, Okla., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5155) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Atoka, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5156) for the purchase of a site and erection thereon of a public building at Madill, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5157) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Hugo, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5158) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Poteau, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5159) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Wilburton, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5160) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Antlers, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5161) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Idabel, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5162) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Marietta, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 5163) authorizing the Klamath Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 5164) to supplement existing legislation relative to the United States Court for China and to increase the serviceability thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 5165) to amend the war-risk insurance act and to increase and to more definitely fix the rate of compensation thereunder to be paid for certain injuries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARLAND: A bill (H. R. 5166) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wilkinsburg, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5167) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wilkinsburg, Pa., one American cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 5168) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the city of Peotone, Ill., one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured from the German Army in the recent war, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5169) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the city of South Elgin, Ill., one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage and suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5170) to provide for the erection of a public building at Jeannette, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5171) to provide for the erection of a public building at Latrobe, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5172) to provide for the erection of a public building at New Kensington, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 102) directing a survey for a military road along the boundary between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 103) requesting the Committee on Agriculture to prepare legislation with a view of transferring the duties of the Food Administration to the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 104) providing for the appointment by each Member of the House of Representatives of one secretary and one clerk, whose names shall be placed on the rolls and paid in monthly installments; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BEGG: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Ohio, requesting the Secretary of War to make provision that all trophies of war captured by Ohio troops be collected and sent to Ohio to be kept as perpetual memorials; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAJOR: Memorial from the Missouri Legislature, favoring the same treatment to officers and men of the National Guard as to the National Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 5173) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Tittle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5174) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Schlaffer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 5175) for the relief of Samuel H. Butler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 5176) granting a pension to Charles A. Hartley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5177) granting a pension to Robert Noble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5178) granting a pension to Marjorie A. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5179) granting a pension to Susan Holmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5180) granting an increase of pension to James L. Norris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5181) granting an increase of pension to David R. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5182) granting an increase of pension to James R. Cowgill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5183) granting an increase of pension to John W. Willis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5184) granting an increase of pension to Stamford W. Rife; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5185) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5186) granting an increase of pension to Aries Butcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5187) granting an increase of pension to Zachariah Blake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5188) granting an increase of pension to Levi H. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOODALL: A bill (H. R. 5189) for the relief of Leonidas Sawyer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 5190) granting an increase of pension to Orra F. Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 5191) granting an increase of pension to John F. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5192) granting a pension to Anson B. Countryman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 5193) for the relief of the Eastern Transportation Co., of Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 5194) to correct the military record of Alfred Rebsamen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5195) for the relief of Albert H. Campbell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5196) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel Singletary; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5197) granting an increase of pension to Robert S. Parker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 5198) granting a special pension to George Baldwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAJOR: A bill (H. R. 5199) granting an increase of pension to Phebe E. C. Priestley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 5200) granting a pension to George Roeder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARRISH: A bill (H. R. 5201) granting a pension to James D. White; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5202) granting a pension to Ewell V. Osborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5203) granting a pension to Walter G. Abner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5204) granting an increase of pension to James F. Peters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5205) granting an increase of pension to Terel Hamlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWAN: A bill (H. R. 5206) for the relief of Edward N. Carr; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5207) granting an increase of pension to Abner D. Rutherford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 5208) for the relief of the legal representative of George W. Soule; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local No. 558, relating to nitrate plant No. 2, Muscle Shoals, Ala.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

Also, petition of National Pickle Packers' Association, urging retention of zone advances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of citizens of Milwaukee, asking for immediate investigation of Jewish-Polish affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Associated Jewish Societies of Derby and Shelton, Derby, Conn., relating to massacres of Jews in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Drustvo Javornik Stev., No. 160, S. N. P. J., of Newark, Ohio, relative to the differ-

ences of the Jugo-Slavs and Italians; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of Women's Christian Temperance Union and St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Fresno, Calif.; Women's Christian Temperance Union, of Ceres, Calif.; First Methodist Episcopal Church, of Hughson, Calif.; Easton Methodist Episcopal Church, of Fresno, Calif.; Women's Christian Temperance Union, of Dinuba, Calif. (indorsed by nine churches of Dinuba); Women's Christian Temperance Union, of Lemoore, Calif.; and Women's Christian Temperance Union, of Corcoran, Calif., protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK: Resolution of the Rhode Island Grand Court, Foresters of America, protesting against the favorable action of the American peace delegation toward the Jugo-Slavs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Pawtucket Business Men's Association, opposing the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition of sundry citizens of Illinois, against repeal of war prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE: Petition of Fostoria (Ohio) Council, No. 1197, Knights of Columbus, that the rights of self-determination can not be denied to Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COPLEY: Petitions of Jolietska Zavednost, No. 115, and the Sv. Ana Society, of Joliet, Ill., urging justice to the Jugo-Slavs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of L. C. Schmidt and other residents of Naperville, Ill., and Thomas Lawton and other residents of Hinsdale, Ill., protesting against any modification of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: Petition of 10 citizens of Butler, Mo., for retention of war-time prohibition and passage of laws to enforce the same; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 10 citizens of Bates County, Mo., against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of Famous & Barr Co., of St. Louis, Mo., asking for repeal of luxury taxes without delay; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Wheeler & Motter Mercantile Co., of St. Joseph, Mo., against repeal of the zone advances on advertising pages in periodicals; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of John Deere Plow Co. and Lund Mauldin Co., both of St. Louis, Mo., opposing repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Anti Mazuranic Society, of St. Louis, Mo., relating to Jugo-Slav affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of the grievance committee of International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, relating to nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local No. 558, relating to nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals, Ala.; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Workers' Defense Union of New York City, demanding immediate repeal of the espionage act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of National Pickle Packers' Association, urging retention of zone advances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of 106 citizens of the township of Flora, Boone County, Ill., opposing repeal or modification of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Chicago Insulated Wire & Manufacturing Co., opposing repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of National Pickle Packers' Association, opposing repeal of the zone law for second-class mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition and memorial of the Viresco Bible Class of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Moline, Ill., expressing regret over the President's recommendation for the repeal of the war-time prohibition act as applied to beer and wine, and petitioning Congress to retain the law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERSEY: Petition of Rev. J. B. Ranger and 70 members of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Presque Isle, Me., urging no change be made in war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Petition of H. A. McKittrick and others as a grievance committee of the electrical workers of Sheffield, Ala.; to the Select Committee on War Expenditures.

By Mr. IGOE: resolution adopted by citizens of St. Louis, protesting against Jewish massacres; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of National Cloak & Suit Co., of New York, favoring daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Monte Sano, Wash., indorsing the proposed waterway to connect the waters of Puget Sound and Gray Harbor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KENDALL: Petition signed by the members of the Ministerial Association of Meyersdale, Pa., not to repeal war-time prohibition, as recommended in the President's message; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Frances Willard Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Waynesburg, Pa., not to repeal war-time prohibition, as recommended in the President's message; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a petition signed by the citizens of Brownsville, Pa., not to repeal war-time prohibition, as recommended in the President's message; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of W. Valentine Welsau, first lieutenant, One hundred and seventeenth Infantry, of Rockville, Md., urging that the National Guard Reserve Corps and National Army officers be retired on the same status as Regular Army officers incapacitated for active service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Davison Chemical Co., Baltimore, Md., opposing repeal of daylight-saving bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of L. M. Anderson, protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of New York Clothing House, Baltimore, Md., urging against furnishing Army and Navy uniforms at cost; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of David Davidson, relating to persecution of Jews in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLE: Petition of Thomas Shannon and other citizens of Fort Scott, Kans., for Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of New York Central System and allied lines, public service commission, second district, Albany, for retention of wires and railroads by the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Davis-Schultz Co., Buffalo, N. Y., against repeal of the zone system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of Oil Seeds Co., New York, and Sowers Manufacturing Co., Buffalo, N. Y., against the continuance of Federal Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Lantz Bros. & Co., Buffalo, N. Y., and Buffalo Produce Exchange, relating to the long-and-short haul clause in railroad appropriation bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of members of the Aratus Club, Buffalo, N. Y., and C. Person's Sons, wine and liquor merchants, opposing prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Brost Bros., automobile dealers, Depew; J. W. Jarvis, optician, Buffalo; Eugene A. Kieffer, Buffalo; Syrcher Optical Co., Buffalo; Retail Merchants' Association, Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, Irving M. Rosenblat, and Parisian Furriers, all of New York State, opposing so-called luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Glenn C. Woodward, secretary Wyandale Grange, No. 1369, requesting repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., relating to development of chemistry by Analine & Chemistry Co.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of J. N. Adams & Co., Buffalo; Buffalo Chamber of Commerce; Stewart Motor Corporation; Oil Seeds Co., New York; Sikes Chair Co.; Erie County Savings Bank; and William H. Walker & Co., all of New York State, opposing repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of many residents of Onondaga County, N. Y., requesting the repeal of the tax in the revenue law on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of many residents of Cortland County, N. Y., requesting the repeal of the daylight-saving act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of many residents of Cortland, N. Y., protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: Petition of citizens of Nebraska, asking for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of sundry citizens of Greenwich, Conn., protesting against the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: Resolutions of protest against Polish massacres adopted at a mass meeting in Richmond, Va., June 2, 1919; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Petition of citizens of Shell Lake, Wis., against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petitions of R. J. Caldwell and National Cloak & Suit Co., New York City, against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolution adopted by the Placer County Interdenominational Sunday School Union, favoring the league of nations covenant, submitted by H. A. Snelling, president, Penryn, Calif.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution opposing the Government ownership or operation of marketing facilities by the California Cattlemen's Association, San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution favoring increased meat production by California Cattlemen's Association, San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: Petition of Methodist Church of Altadena and Pasadena Study Circle, of Pasadena, Calif., against repeal of war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES: Petitions of Methodists of Trinity Church, Doe Run, Mo., and ninth district Christian Endeavor Convention, of Fredericktown, Mo., protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Soda Fountain Association of New York (Inc.), protesting against tax on sodas, soft drinks, ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Columbia Graphophone Co., New York, protesting against the continuance of Department of Labor Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the public service commission, second district, Albany, relative to wire systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of department of education, city of New York, against war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of National Federation of Button Manufacturers, New York City, asking for early consideration for tariff legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of R. J. Caldwell, F. A. Brady (Inc.), and National Cloak & Suit Co., New York City, favoring daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 4738; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Association Opposed to National Prohibition, relating to prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of 700 members of the church and congregation of Corn Hill Methodist Episcopal Church, of Rochester, N. Y., protesting against a repeal of the war prohibition law, and urging the passage of a law defining as intoxicating liquors any containing one-half of 1 per cent or more of alcohol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the congregations of the Baptist churches of Cowlesville and Bennington, N. Y., protesting against the repeal of the war prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: Protests by citizens of Kenmare, N. Dak., against lifting of the ban on beer and wines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, letter from the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of North Dakota, indorsing the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, indorsement by the State high-school conference of North Dakota of the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition of citizens of the seventeenth congressional district of Illinois, protesting against modification of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of members of First Methodist Episcopal Church of Gouverneur, N. Y., protesting against the repeal of the prohibition of the manufacture of light wines and beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of members of Brier Hill Grange, No. 744, Hammond, N. Y., protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of residents of Frankfort, N. J., for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the West Winfield (N. Y.) Grange and the Clinton (N. Y.) Grange for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of the Amalgmated Lithographers of America, Local No. 14, asking provision for working conditions service, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of several Philadelphia women's organizations, favoring provision for Federal Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Methodist Episcopal ministers' meeting for Philadelphia and vicinity, protesting against the recommendation to amend the provisions of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WASON: Memorial of Fruitdale Grange, No. 106, of Mason, N. H., asking the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Retail Clerks' International Protective Association, urging the continuance of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of citizens of Millbury, Mass., protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *June 7, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father Almighty, source of all that is true, and pure, and noble, we thank Thee that the people of the District of Columbia have set apart this day to express their gratitude to the brave soldiers who answered gallantly to the call for humanity, and were ready at home and abroad to throw themselves in the way of an organized force whose object was to rob humanity of all that we hold dear—freedom, liberty, truth, justice.

May the good men and women of the District count nothing lost in the way of sacrifice for the soldiers living and the soldiers dead.

Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. May it be ours to watch, and fight, and pray, and the battle ne'er give o'er until a brotherhood shall be established as broad, and deep, and pure, as the love of God our Father; and we will give all praise to Thy holy name, through Him who died that men might live and enjoy all the blessings of life. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 2480) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, had requested a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. CURTIS, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. ASHURST as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed Senate bill 1213 to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval boards of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

REFERENCE OF RESOLUTION.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I introduced House resolution 104 on yesterday, and I will state that it was referred to the Committee on Appropriations when it should have been referred to the Committee on Accounts. I ask unanimous consent that it be referred to the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. What is the title?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It is House joint resolution 104.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is it about, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state. The gentleman asks that it be rereferred from the Committee on Appropriations to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will state to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] that it is for the purpose of fixing the

manner of paying the clerk hire of Representatives. It is practically the same bill that was introduced by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] during the closing hours of the last session and failed in the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is it that you wish to do with it?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I am asking that it be referred to the proper committee for consideration.

Mr. SIMS. It ought to be done, anyway. It is a legislative proposition and not an appropriation.

Mr. GARNER. The Committee on Accounts is not a legislative committee, and you can not give this a privileged status by taking it from the Committee on Appropriations and referring it to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It can not come from the Committee on Appropriations, because it is legislation that does not carry any appropriation.

Mr. GARNER. Likewise the Committee on Accounts can not consider any proposition except for a certain purpose.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The appropriation is already provided.

Mr. GARNER. You propose to send it to the Committee on Accounts to legislate on a subject. You can not do that.

The SPEAKER. This is all by unanimous consent.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. This is a matter of very great urgency.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some question as to what committee of the House has jurisdiction over this matter. Clearly the Committee on Appropriations has no jurisdiction, as it has no authority to report legislation. Strictly speaking, the Committee on Accounts has no jurisdiction over this bill, but the Committee on Accounts could report it. It would not be privileged, it is true, after that is done, but the Committee on Appropriations does not care to exceed its authority, and should not exceed its authority, by reporting the bill. The Committee on Accounts could report it.

Mr. GARNER. This is a proposition changing legislation carried in an appropriation bill?

Mr. MONDELL. It is, but the Committee on Appropriations has no authority to legislate. Let me say to the gentleman from Texas that if we would not be taking advantage of gentlemen who are not here, it would be perfectly satisfactory to me, if it would be to all of these other gentlemen, to take the resolution up and pass on it now by unanimous consent. The House has once passed on the matter in exactly the same form.

Mr. GARNER. Is this what is known as the old Humphreys resolution?

Mr. MONDELL. It is the old resolution.

Mr. GARD. From what committee did it come before?

Mr. MONDELL. From the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the Committee on Accounts has any jurisdiction over this.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Why not let the Committee on Appropriations incorporate that in one of the appropriation bills and let the Committee on Rules make it in order?

Mr. MONDELL. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Missouri that the Speaker in the last Congress referred this bill to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know, but I do not like to be held responsible for everything I did in the last Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. SIMS. Then I most emphatically object to it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] that the reference be changed from the Committee on Appropriations to the Committee on Accounts. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 2480, the Indian appropriation bill, be taken from the Speaker's table, that the amendments be disagreed to, and the House agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER], the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, asks unanimous consent that the Indian appropriation bill H. R. 2480 be taken from the Speaker's table, that the Senate amendments be disagreed to, and that the conference asked for by the Senate be granted.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman whether or not there has been any rider placed upon this bill by the Senate making appropriations for the United States Employment Service?

Mr. SNYDER. There is not.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2480) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the year ending June 30, 1920.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees Mr. SNYDER, Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, and Mr. CARTER.

ADDITIONAL PAGE.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan presents a privileged report from the Committee on Accounts, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 88.

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to appoint an additional page for the remainder of the present Congress, to be paid compensation out of the contingent fund of the House at the rate of $82.50 per month, said appointment to date from the opening of the present session.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, a resolution similar to this was passed in the last two Congresses for the purpose of providing a page to be assigned to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL] who, as is known, is blind.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. GARNER. This page is to be assigned?

Mr. MAPES. Yes; the same as heretofore.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CASE OF VICTOR L. BERGER.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I present another privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan presents another privileged report from the Committee on Accounts, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 94.

Resolved, That the expenses incurred and to be incurred by the special committee on the case of Victor H. Berger shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House; and the Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized to pay out of the contingent fund of the House such sums as said committee may deem necessary for said purpose, and said committee shall submit vouchers for the expenditure of all sums of money disbursed under its order in the execution of this resolution, which disbursements and vouchers shall be subject to the approval of the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. MAPES. There is a committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 2, after the word "Victor," strike out the letter "H" and insert the letter "L."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is that the only amendment?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

GEORGE C. HORSNELL.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, to George C. Horsnell, clerk of the late Hon. Carl C. Van Dyke, a Representative in Congress from Minnesota at the time of his death, May 20, 1919, the sum of $166.66, being an amount equal to one month's salary of a clerk of a Representative in Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4226, being the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4226, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, with Mr. TOWNER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4226, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That the commissioners and other responsible officials, in expending appropriations contained in this act, so far as possible shall purchase material, supplies, and equipment, when needed and funds are available, from the various services of the Government of the United States possessing material, supplies, and equipment no longer required because of the cessation of war activities. It shall be the duty of the commissioners and other officials, before purchasing any of the articles described herein, to ascertain from the Government of the United States whether it has articles of the character described that are serviceable. And articles purchased from the Government, if the same have not been used, shall be paid for at a reasonable price not to exceed actual cost, and if the same have been used, at a reasonable price based upon length of usage. The various services of the Government of the United States are authorized to sell such articles to the municipal government under the conditions specified and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt: *Provided*, That this section shall not be construed to amend, alter, or repeal the Executive order of December 3, 1918, concerning the transfer of office material, supplies, and equipment in the District of Columbia falling into disuse because of the cessation of war activities.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota what this Executive order of December 3, 1918, is?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. If the gentleman is in no hurry, I will read the Executive order.

Mr. WALSH. Just the purport of it; I do not care for the entire language.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It is pretty dangerous for me to attempt to give the gentleman from Massachusetts or this House the purport of an Executive order coming from the Chief Executive. I desire to be exact, and therefore if the gentleman wants to know the exact purport of it, I will read it.

Mr. WALSH. Well, perhaps it would be better if it were read, because it may be one that ought to be repealed.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. In view of the fact that we have a reading clerk whose voice resounds all over the Hall, and very melodiously, I ask that the Executive order be given to the Clerk and that he may read it in my stead.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE ORDER.

Whereas the present emergency has created a condition whereby large quantities of office material, supplies, and equipment now in the hands of the executive departments and other establishments of the Government in the District of Columbia will fall into disuse because of the cessation of war activities, or for other reasons, it hereby is ordered that all such office materials, supplies, and equipment not required for use by the executive departments and independent establishments be transferred hereafter to the Secretary of the Treasury, to be handled through the General Supply Committee for the benefit of the municipal government and the governmental service in the District of Columbia in the following manner:

1. The several executive departments and independent establishments and the municipal government in the District of Columbia shall not purchase any of the classes of material described herein unless the Secretary of the Treasury has certified that there is not in the possession of the Government material, equipment, or supplies that are serviceable.

2. No executive department, independent establishment, or the municipal government of the District of Columbia shall be permitted to obtain any of the classes of material, supplies, and equipment described herein from the Secretary of the Treasury unless such services have an appropriation available for the procurement thereof.

3. All material obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury shall be paid for by transfer of appropriation from the purchasing service to the selling service and the proceeds covered into the Treasury in accordance with existing law.

4. All material, supplies, and equipment purchased hereunder by one service from another, if the same has not been used, shall be sold at actual cost, and if the same has been used, at a cost based upon length of usage, but in no instance to be less than 75 per cent of cost.

5. Material of the classes herein described which is condemned as unfit for use may be disposed of otherwise than to governmental services by the Secretary of the Treasury. And usable material remaining unsold to other services of the Government shall be held by him for disposition by law.

6. The Secretary of the Treasury shall keep a record of all material received and disposed of by him hereunder and the price at which disposed of, and shall prescribe the regulations necessary to carry this order into effect.

7. This order shall supersede the Executive order of November 29, 1918, dealing with the same subject matter.

THE WHITE HOUSE, WOODROW WILSON.
3 December, 1918.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the purport of this paragraph apparently is to confer authority similar to that granted by the Executive order. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee under what authority the President issued such an order as that, relating to the disposal of Government property purchased under appropriations by the Congress, and also prescribing the method by which the municipal authorities should acquire or dispose of municipal property?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman wants to know what authority the President had for issuing that order; is that the point?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; if the gentleman knows.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I can not say, except by virtue of his being President of the United States.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, well——

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman knows that quite frequently the President issues Executive orders. Now, as to his legal authority, I assume that he has it or he would not issue the order. As to what the basis of that authority is I am unable to state.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman evidently seeks to perpetuate that Executive order in the proviso in this paragraph. Of course, this paragraph, in my view, is clearly legislation. Now, I think we should know why it is necessary to legislate if this subject has been provided for by an Executive order.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will say to the gentleman that in all the appropriation bills that have been passed, as far as I know, a clause almost identical, if not exactly the same as this, has been passed. The District of Columbia is the only branch of the Government I know of that has not been given authority to purchase from this supply committee by legislative action.

Mr. WALSH. Apparently it is given that authority by Executive order.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That may be true to a certain extent. Nevertheless, the gentleman has sat here for a long time when similar legislation has been passed with regard to the other branches of the Government, and I can see no reason why this should not be extended to the District of Columbia.

Mr. WALSH. I did not catch the last part of the gentleman's remark.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I say the gentleman has been here on the floor, and he is good and faithful in his attendance——

Mr. WALSH. I do not care for that part of it.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I am simply stating what is true, and the gentleman has permitted this provision to go through on all these other bills, and I can see no reason why it should not go through on this.

Mr. WALSH. Most of these other bills that had the language of section 7 in them passed the House before December 30, 1918. Now, since that time the President apparently has issued a supplemental Executive order supplanting that of November 29, and it apparently covers the same character of property, the same exchange, and transfer that is provided for in the gentleman's proposition.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. None of these bills became laws until late in February or early in March.

Mr. WALSH. They may not have become laws, but they had gone through the House of Representatives and most of them had gone from the Capitol and were awaiting, either on the shores of France or on the bosom of the wide ocean, the signature of the Executive. This deals with materials that are no longer necessary and which will fall into disuse because of the cessation of war activities. Now, it seems to me it is idle for Congress to provide legislation on an appropriation bill if the Executive is going to issue an order covering this same subject, whether he has authority under some general war act we have passed or whether he has not.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The object of this particular legislation is to enable the District to purchase materials which, if it were not authorized by law to purchase, might go upon the junk heap. The supply commission has vast quantities of this material, office furniture, and so forth, on hand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYER. May I ask how much time the gentleman from Pennsylvania desires?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not desire any time, except in due course, when I may ask for it in the regular way.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. There is at least $1,000,000 worth of this property that is absolutely useless as far as many of the great departments of the Government are concerned. It must be disposed of in some manner. We seek to purchase some of that material, and no doubt it will be purchased at cheaper rates than we could purchase it from outside dealers. If we did not purchase it this supply committee would have to let this property go upon the junk heap, at a great loss to the Government. That is the object of the legislation that we are now trying to pass, to give the District authorities the power to purchase some of this property.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Commending the gentleman from Minnesota for his desire to get for the District of Columbia cheaper supplies than it has heretofore obtained, what does the gentleman say to the proposition of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] that the President must have had under existing law the authority to issue the order with regard to the sale of supplies? Prior to the war the President certainly would not have had power by Executive order to direct that property be sold. He could not by Executive order direct that a piece of ground be sold or that some junk be sold. That would be regulated by law. I am as much interested as is the gentleman from Massachusetts in finding out, if possible, where the President obtained the authority to order goods sold.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman will have to apply to some other source of information than the chairman of this committee. I am unable to tell him where the President gets his authority for issuing this Executive order, and I am surprised that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, whom we consider a great authority upon all matters of this kind, should now ask information from a man who to a certain extent, compared to himself, is a novice.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is very nice of the gentleman from Minnesota, who is a thoroughly well equipped and experienced Member of this House, although still a very handsome one. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Thank you.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The President probably gets his authority by reason of certain war powers that we may have granted to him.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I am very much obliged to the gentleman for the information.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think the question of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is entirely pertinent, and that in peace times neither the President nor any other executive officer should have the power to direct that property of the Government be sold in this way.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I am not questioning the right of the gentleman from Massachusetts to make that inquiry at all.

Mr. WALSH. I make the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. SISSON. I will ask the gentleman to withhold the point.

Mr. WALSH. I will reserve the point of order and yield the floor.

Mr. SISSON. I want to state in answer to the question asked by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] that under the Overman Act, so called, the President was given the right and the power to consolidate departments and transfer property from one department to another and reorganize the departments.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I assume that to be the fact.

Mr. SISSON. Under that act the President issued this Executive order. We wish to call this to the attention of the District Commissioners. This paragraph is just like the legislative provision placed on other bills for the purpose of calling the attention of the District Commissioners to the law. I think, under the Executive order made in pursuance of the Overman Act, the President had the authority to issue that order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The President had no such authority prior to the war?

Mr. SISSON. Absolutely not, except the general power that he might have to give direction as President to the heads of departments.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman state that the President, under the Overman Act, had the authority to issue this order concerning property which will fall into disuse because of a cessation of the war activities?

Mr. SISSON. I think so.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. If we assume that the President had the power, about which there seems to be some controversy, what would be the object of duplicating the power by the enactment of this section?

Mr. SISSON. As I stated, it calls the attention of the District Commissioners in this act to the law.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman assume that the commissioners are not aware of an order issued by the President of the United States?

Mr. SISSON. I would not be surprised if the commissioners were as ignorant of that order as some Members of Congress are of the laws passed by Congress. The purpose of the act and of this section is to get as nearly full value for this property as is possible. In other words, if the District of Columbia was situated as other departments are, it would be taking it from one pocket and putting it into another. It would simply transfer the charge from one department to the other, and no money is appropriated. Therefore the Government is getting full use of all of this enormous amount of property which was purchased for the use of the various departments during the war. The committee has had the matter up repeatedly, and it unanimously decided that it was the proper thing to do to enable the department to get these things from other departments.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. I will.

Mr. FESS. I am in sympathy with what the gentleman wants to do, but I would like his opinion as a lawyer. If this authority is exercised under the war power, then the authority would not extend beyond that time?

Mr. SISSON. I think we are still at war, technically.

Mr. FESS. But we will not be after the President declares that it is over?

Mr. SISSON. After the peace treaty is signed and the President makes his proclamation, we no longer are at war.

Mr. FESS. And this authority will not be any authority after that date?

Mr. SISSON. The Executive authority would not, but this would extend it after the proclamation of peace; this would bring it in order after the President's order ceased to exist. I want to say in my judgment this is nothing more than a limit upon the expenditure of the money in this bill. I do not believe it puts any extra burden on the District Commissioners, but is simply a direction by Congress as to how the money appropriated shall be expended. It is nothing but a limitation. Even if it had not been placed on any other bill, even if the Overman bill had not been passed, if the Executive order had not been issued, I think it would be in order to place it on this bill to limit expenditures of the money in purchasing new supplies, to say that there must be no supplies purchased if they are on hand elsewhere in any other department of the Government. Congress has always reserved the right to give direction as to how moneys which are appropriated shall be expended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISSON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself to the Chair on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order has not yet been made.

Mr. SISSON. No; but it has been reserved. I do not think the point of order is well taken, because I think a careful reading of the law will convince the Chair that it is a mere limitation on the expenditure of money in the bill. In my judgment, it is not subject to a point of order. I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will not press the point of order, because it is clearly within the line of economy and the retrenchment of expenses, and half of it will be saved to the Federal Treasury. Not only that, but it is a proposition in order under the Holman rule providing for the reduction of expenses. Unquestionably if they shall purchase from another department of the Government the furniture they want, no money is to be appropriated out of the Treasury; and under the provisions of this act one-half of the money contributed on the part of the Government toward the purchase would not have to be paid, and therefore it is manifest that this is in the nature of retrenchment and saving money and saving expense to the Government.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would the commissioners have the power in this paragraph to purchase food supplies?

Mr. SISSON. No; it does not enlarge their powers of purchase; it simply states that the money which we have appropriated in this bill for certain purposes, such as buying furniture and typewriters, they shall first use in trying to get such supplies from the other departments of the Government.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Of course it is their duty to purchase food supplies for the various institutions.

Mr. SISSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Could they purchase food supplies under this?

Mr. SISSON. They might perhaps purchase food supplies if the Government had them on hand in some other department of the Government and has no need for them there.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have been thinking this thing over, and it seems to me there is some merit in the paragraph, if it goes so far as to enable the commissioners to buy food supplies for prison or reformatory or for hospital use.

Mr. SISSON. To be frank with the gentleman, I do not think that idea had ever occurred to me, and I do not know whether it occurred to the members of the committee or not; but if the Government of the United States in any of the departments—the War or the Navy Department or under the Food Administration—has supplies which it is going to sell, then I am inclined to believe that under the language carried in this bill the District Commissioners would be authorized to purchase from the Government without its having to go through the process under the law or having it offered for sale and auction off.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am inclined to think that this would not apply only to the purchase of desks and letter files and penholders, and such stuff as that, but that the language is sufficiently comprehensive to enable the commissioners to purchase all supplies, including food supplies, for it says that they shall, and so forth, so far as possible, "purchase materials, supplies, and equipment, when needed and sums are available, from the various services of the Government." Would this not mean that, if the War Department had stored up tons and tons of food supplies, which might not be readily sold to individuals, but which could be sold to institutions, being canned goods very largely, the commissioners, under this provision could buy those supplies from the War Department and store them up for the purposes of these various institutions at prices that might be favorable?

Mr. SISSON. I am inclined, since the gentleman has raised that question, to think that that language is perhaps broad enough to do that, but, to be frank, that matter had not occurred to me, and I do not know whether it occurred to any member of the subcommittee or the full committee or not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If I thought the paragraph went that far, I would certainly urge the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who reserved the point of order, to permit us at least to discuss it for a little time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, may I be recognized upon this matter?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania for five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, we read almost daily now of large quantities of canned goods, particularly meats, that are stored up here and abroad by the War Department, and possibly by the Navy Department, that are no longer usable for war purposes, and we hear on the floor of the House the suggestion that the War Department and the Navy Department are practically aiding the canners, the packers, or whatever instrumentality produces these food products, by not disposing of them for public use, because of the possibility of reducing the price to the consumer and affecting the present market status. I am inclined to think that some international understanding was had on this subject—a very important one to the consumers, and a very serious one to the poor people in the great congested communities who are almost deprived of meat now, because of the high price of beef and pork and supplies of that kind. I say I am inclined to think that there may have been an international understanding upon this question. At any rate it is almost time for us to consider whether we shall enter a wedge here in the interest of the United States that will break this combination, whatever it may be, and help our own people obtain cheaper food.

For a time there was a suspicion that our allies, by reason of their war necessities, were able to obtain and sell to their consumers, not to their armies, but to their consumers in civil life, meat supplies and food supplies generally much more cheaply than we could sell them to our consumers in the United States. We had considerable evidence before us from time to time that you could buy meat cheaper in London than you could buy it in New York.

Mr. HULINGS. American meat.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; American meat. It certainly was true in regard to flour and certain other food products. But I read this morning that Great Britain evidently is wincing under the high prices that prevail there, and that there might, after all, be something to this suggestion of an international understanding—or in the abrogation thereof—for Great Britain has demanded of New Zealand that it come to the assistance of Great Britain to beat down the packers' prices in the United States. I am not contending especially against the packers. I do not know about their situation, but I have observed for two or three years that there seems to have been a complete understanding between the great meat producers of the United States and our allies on the other side. If there is a break now and our allies and their consumers are to receive the advantage of low meat prices, I think it is fair that the consumers in the United States were also considered. [Applause.] If we have stored up in our warehouses under the direction of the Army and Navy untold tons of food supplies that the people might use, it is a grave question whether we should permit the hoarding to go on. We can make a start here in the District of Columbia by providing that our public institutions that have to be supported by the common people may buy some of these surplus materials that the War and Navy Departments can not use, and which they seem to be storing up against the public for some reason that we do not understand. I am inclined to think the paragraph, if it applies to foodstuffs, is a good one and ought to stand, and I trust when the matter is thought over the point of order will be withdrawn. I hope we may be able to vote to permit institutions of the District of Columbia to obtain these cheaper foodstuffs, and that ultimately the people of the land, the consumers, who are now going without meat because of the high prices, may also have a chance.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I agree fully with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I want to ask him, if he has any doubt about the authority to buy food supplies, if it would not be advisable to add an amendment after the word "supplies," in line 14, by inserting the words "including food supplies."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes. If the point of order is withdrawn and the paragraph stands, and the gentleman from Illinois does not do so, I shall offer that amendment cheerfully.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, on the point of order clearly this Executive order could not, I think, have been issued under the provisions of the Overman Act, because that act merely provided for the consolidation of executive offices and the transfer of their supplies, property, and equipment, and that that act is limited to a period of six months after proclamation of the treaty of peace, or such earlier time as the President might designate, but this order which was issued was concerning property that will fall into disuse because of the cessation of war activities, and it is apparent upon its face that it is to continue after the cessation of war unless the President himself should alter or repeal it. Now, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] during the course of his remarks stated that he believed this paragraph was put in here by way of limitation, and that it would result in a decrease of the expenditures of the public money. Well, let me ask him if he thinks that the sentence at the top of page 91, authorizing the various services of the Government to sell articles under the conditions specified and the proceeds to be covered into the Treasury is in any way a limitation?

Mr. SISSON. Is the gentleman addressing himself to me?

Mr. WALSH. I am asking the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SISSON. Yes. I think if it is not a limitation that under the clause of the Holman rule it tends to reduce the expenditures of the Government. The authority to sell this property, of course, and any property of the Government, so far as I know, there is no law authorizing it to be sold in the manner prescribed here. There is a manner in which property which is not used by the Government may be sold, but the gentleman understands that that is sold at auction.

Mr. WALSH. Well, Mr. Chairman, we have not yet heard the authority for this Executive order which it is sought in this paragraph not to modify or amend.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I will.

Mr. WINGO. Has the gentleman a copy of the Executive order?

Mr. WALSH. I have, and it has been read.

Mr. WINGO. I was not in the Hall when it was read.

Mr. WALSH. It was read.

Mr. WINGO. Does this Executive order—I was not in the room when it was read—undertake to cite the authority upon which it was issued?

Mr. WALSH. No; the authority apparently is the emergency whereby large quantities of supplies will fall into disuse.

Mr. WINGO. Does not the gentleman recognize this: That as a matter of fact, coming down to practical results, the effect of this section 7 will be a limitation of expenditures in that we must take knowledge of the fact that when you undertake to sell this stuff it is nothing more than salvage, and the Government always gets less than it gave? That has been the experience of the Government always, and Congress will certainly take judicial knowledge, so to speak, of that fact. Then, that being true, if we authorize one Government agency to go and purchase from another governmental agency any of this salvage property and cover the proceeds into the Treasury, will not that be in effect a saving to the Treasury?

Mr. WALSH. Well, I assume there is a good deal of truth in the gentleman's contention, but it is curious to note that the appropriations for supplies and equipment all through this bill have been increased, and upon inquiry we have been told that the reasons for those increases were that prices had gone up, that it costs more for material and labor. Now, certainly, if they are going to buy them from these various departments at a cheaper price than the Government paid for them there is no warrant for increasing the appropriations for those items.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. I want to propound a question in order to get a legal answer from a lawyer——

Mr. WALSH. I am afraid the gentleman had better ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, perhaps.

Mr. FESS. I want to ask the gentleman who is on his feet, Will the writing of this authority referred to here in the Executive order, that the point of order will lie against if anyone makes it, extend authority in peace time which without this would stop with the war?

Mr. WALSH. Well, that is the question which I had in my mind. I doubt—I do not recall any of the various war measures which we passed which contain authority specific or blanket to the Executive to issue that sort of an order, but I think that to provide this limitation and specifically provide that the order which he already has issued shall not be altered, amended, or repealed, that we ratify that order and permit it to continue beyond the cessation of war activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, the membership of the committee I feel sure is in sympathy with the purpose here expressed.

I think there is no doubt that there would be specific loss to the Government if this authority is not granted, but if granting this authority which is being exercised under the Executive order, which was by virtue of the war, will extend war power after the war ends, it becomes immediately a question of doubtful wisdom as to what we should do. Now, it is very apparent that powers exercised as war powers might continue after the war closes. I have understood that distinguished lawyers recently before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have held that there are decisions by the Supreme Court which permitted war powers to continue after war ended by virtue of certain involutions that come by stress of war and that could not be relieved by the close of war. And I think, while we are in deep sympathy with this purpose, we ought to know whether we are extending war power in time of peace.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will yield to my friend, who is a distinguished lawyer.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Would not the danger you have in mind be averted by inserting the word "extend," so that it would read "amend, alter, extend, or repeal," and leave the order just as it is?

Mr. FESS. I should hope that if the clause remains in the bill, as I wish it could, if it is to be safeguarded, that that amendment could be offered. I would like to see this power given, yet I would not like to see it extended after the war is over.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman this: If he has any objection to the provision here, well and good. I am willing it should go out or stay in, but I for one do not care to do anything on an appropriation bill that would look as though I was trying to repeal an Executive order. That is why the saving clause was put on it. I do not care to do it on an appropriation bill. That is the reason why that proviso was put on. I do not think it adds or detracts from it in any shape, form, or manner especially; only the committee thought they did not wish to be placed in the position of attempting legislation on an appropriation bill and repeal an Executive order, either before or after war activities.

Now, I want to say just a word as to this section 7, and I am going to state in a few words what, in my opinion, it means. Since the cessation of war activities the various departments of the Government have on hand large quantities of automobiles, office furniture, material, and supplies of other kinds that are needed in other departments, and especially need in the District of Columbia. We make provisions all through this bill for the purchase of supplies just like this in character, but I think the food question was never thought of or suggested until the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] suggested it. We need in the District government here a large number of articles of various kinds which we know the supply commission have on hand at the present time. Therefore this section 7 was put in here for the purpose of a limitation upon the appropriation, and I think if the Chair will observe it, it is very clearly a limitation:

That the commissioners and other responsible officials, in expending appropriations contained in this act—

Underscore those last few words—

In expending the appropriations contained in this act, so far as possible, shall purchase material, supplies, and equipment, when needed and funds are available, from the various services of the Government of the United States possessing material, supplies, and equipment no longer required because of the cessation of war activities.

In other words, there is a glut, so to speak, in the supply department of about $2,000,000 of material the other activities of the Government can not use, and hence we wish and desire by this bill to have the authorities of the District of Columbia use the appropriation contained herein and purchase those supplies from this supply division, as we believe, and know, in fact, that they will purchase them at a much greater reduced cost than they would if they had to go into the open market. Hence I believe this is clearly a limitation upon the expenditure of money contained in this bill. And I trust the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] will withdraw his point of order as to that portion of the section.

Mr. WALSH. I will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Page 90, line 14, after the word "supplies," insert the words "including food supplies."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Massachusetts is performing a distinct public service in calling attention to this Executive order, because on further inquiry it appears it was not justified by the Overman Act and probably is not justified by any existing law—war act or otherwise. If I am in error about that, some gentleman will correct me. I am informed there is something about the history of that Executive order which will show that it was prepared in an element of doubt, to meet what was, we hope, an existing condition in the District of Columbia, where some good might be affected by an Executive order during the war. But it certainly would be a dangerous thing if the President of the United States had the power, by Executive order, to direct the disposition of property of any kind. Such a thing would be unthinkable in times of peace and might be tolerated only in times of war, but in this instance it certainly is not justified by any existing law, whether passed under pressure of war or not. So much for the point raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts. If my statement is in error, as I indicated, some gentleman will correct it, but if I am correct, then the gentleman from Massachusetts has uncovered an Executive order issued by the President without warrant of law. So much for that.

I have offered an amendment which proposes to include food supplies that may be obtained from the Army or the Navy if the commissioners can obtain them, at reduced cost, for the use of those inmates of institutions over which the commissioners have charge in the District of Columbia. It might be a good thing to follow this proposition up in the States and let the States buy from the War and Navy Departments in order to supply the various institutions which the States have under their control at a reduced price. Thus we could begin to get these foodstuffs back to the people.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Has the gentleman prepared an amendment?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes. I have offered an amendment to include food supplies. I hope the gentleman will accept it.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will accept it, and for two reasons—first, I think it is a good amendment, and, secondly, I think the word "supplies" covers it, anyhow.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I also think so, but the language "food supplies" emphasizes it and will call attention to the fact that the Government has food supplies in storage unused while the consumers are paying extravagantly high prices for everything they get to eat.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if a new Member may be permitted to make a short nonpartisan talk, I should like to have your attention, because I believe I have something here that will be of interest to all of you.

Some time ago it was my good fortune to be in a city where they employed 23,000 men in their factories. They had a Victory loan quota there of about $4,000,000. At that time they thought they would have to let 3,000 men go. The merchants and business men of that city, numbering over 500, got together and agreed that they would cut their prices down to a point where they would run without profit, or sell without profit, for a period of 90 days, while they were passing from the war program to the peace program. In view of that concession made by the merchants and business men of the town, the industries agreed to keep 3,000 men on their pay roll whom they did not need for a period of 90 days, which they did; and the men in those factories subscribed to the loan 100 per cent. The landlords of the town reduced rents 15 per cent. The various dry goods stores cut their prices anywhere from 15 to 50 per cent. That town did that for a period of 90 days. Why? Because the prices of foodstuffs had risen to such a point that the men could not support their families and at the same time buy these bonds. And yet in that city the people in two days oversubscribed their quota $1,000,000.

Now, then, we find that we have in this country, held by the Government, vast quantities of preserved meats, which I have listed, and I ask the privilege of putting the statement into the RECORD as a part of my remarks in order to save your time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to insert in his remarks the statement he has referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Here are the figures:

Surplus meat products.

Furnished by packing houses, products since May 5, average price April, 1917, to date.]

	Pounds.	Per can.	Per pound.
Roast beef:			
In 6-pound cans	12,000,000	$2.70283	$0.45
In 2-pound cans	17,330,000	.825	.41½
In 1-pound cans	9,000,000	.5138	.51
In 12-ounce cans	378,000	.3569	.40
Corned beef:			
In 6-pound cans	5,600,000	2.0937	.33
In 24-ounce cans	18,000,000	.7675	.45
In 1-pound cans	8,500,000	.45174	.45
In 12-ounce cans	4,250,000	.386166	.38
Corned beef hash:			
In 2-pound cans	15,700,000	.4899	.25
In 1-pound cans	5,160,000	.2847	.28
Bacon:			
In tins	38,533,000	.462992	.46
In crates	8,686,000	.40181	.40

The War Department authorizes the publication of the following statement from the Office of the Director of Sales, showing estimated surplus meat products on hand in the United States:

Meat.	Container.	Pounds on hand.
Bacon (series 8)	In crates	8,686,118
Bacon (series 10)	12-pound cans	38,536,620
Roast beef	6-pound cans	11,847,912
Do	2-pound cans	17,333,464
Do	1-pound cans	8,925,594
Do	12-ounce cans	378,124
Corned beef	6-pound cans	5,620,176
Do	24-ounce cans	18,079,005
Do	1-pound cans	8,489,525
Do	12-ounce cans	4,238,550
Corned beef hash	2-pound cans	15,660,636
Do	1-pound cans	5,160,732

PRESS INTERVIEW WITH THE SECRETARY OF WAR, MAY 14.

The following informal verbal statements were made by the Secretary of War in conversation with the newspaper correspondents May 14:

There has been a misapprehension with regard to the policy of the War Department in disposing of meat supplies. The meats in question are specially prepared meats, in special containers, and of a kind never sold commercially in the United States—roast beef, specially salted pork—which are not articles of ordinary commercial trade in the United States. The cans are not even labeled. The question of disposing of these supplies is not a question of maintaining a price level—the War Department has no interest in that—but of some way to dispose of them. We can not, for instance, set up retail stores all over the United States to sell Army supplies, and therefore have to dispose of them in bulk. So much of the supplies as are of the ordinary commercial kind in the United States and which people recognize we are selling in the United States—selling them in any way in which we can prevent speculation. But specially prepared Army supplies—7-pound cans of roast beef, and things of that sort—are not known to the commercial public of the United States, and the buying public knows nothing about them, and they would not be available for ordinary commerce here. I have talked the whole question over with the sales director, and there are a number of questions that have to be solved. Some products, for instance, by repacking in new tins and being labeled, could be resold in the United States. There is a possibility that we may be able to dispose of substantial quantities of food supplies in institutions where bulk purchases are made. All avenues are to be sought out, and, so far as possible, food and clothes will be sold in the United States.

—

The market regulates the price; we have no power to set an arbitrary price. If we had a million pair of shoes to sell we would have no means of going to John Jones and letting him buy a pair of Army shoes, but by putting them on the market it would probably affect the market price.

—

There has been no agreement with the meat packers with regard to the distribution of meat supplies, but they have suggested that the most practical thing to do would be to sell these supplies in Europe instead of disposing of them in this country, because of the fact that they are packed for transportation across the ocean. In this way it would not be necessary for the packers to prepare other food for transportation while the present supply is being distributed in this country.

Here is something more that will interest the farmers to know. There is also held by the Government the following:

75,000 sets of harness—cost $85 with collars; $75 without.
1,000,000 yards No. 8 duck.
3,000,000 pair cotton socks.
2,000,000 pair woolen socks.
12,000,000 cotton undershirts.
8,000,000 cotton drawers.
627,000 woolen undershirts.
2,500,000 woolen drawers.
1,500,000 pair Jersey knit gloves.
1,500,000 pair cotton flannel gloves, leather palm.
20,000 black raincoats.
100,000 overalls.
7,000 moleskin breeches and coats.

Now, with reference to these foodstuffs and other supplies, I will state that they are located not in Washington but in Chicago, Columbia, Schenectady, New Cumberland, Newport News, Baltimore, Omaha, New Orleans, Boston, San Antonio, New York, St. Louis, El Paso, Atlanta, and San Francisco. I incorporate this detailed statement in my remarks:

Surplus meats.

[The figures below are approximate amounts only and subject to change. True surplus will be shown by this office about May 20.]

	Pounds bacon, issue series 8 (crates).	Pounds bacon, issue series 10 (12-pound cans).	Beef, roast.				Beef, corned.				Hash, corned beef.	
			6-pound cans.	2-pound cans.	1-pound cans.	12-ounce cans.	6-pound cans.	24-ounce cans.	1-pound cans.	12-ounce cans.	2-pound cans.	1-pound cans.
Chicago	4,337,174	19,071,548	857,700	4,823,700	4,734,000	191,008	55,632	5,324,908	3,325,874	1,064,136	3,898,998	2,039,368
Columbus	1,398,944	1,502,856	193,476	3,026,328	1,312,170	289,152	.....	4,680,534	1,784,723	2,420,784	2,530,704	2,921,376
Schenectady	.....	1,192,464	.....	.....	1,404,000	.....	.....	79,848	.....	48,000	1,000,008	.....
New Cumberland	.....	8,549,752	173,460	376,680	1,475,424	.....	.....	746,868	46,416	2,118,480	85,560	.....
Newport News	40,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	25,008	.....	20,000	.....
Baltimore	2,430,000	5,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	10,000	15,000	.....	.....	10,000	.....
Omaha	200,000	790,000	.....	170,000	.....	.....	32,000	195,480	727,488	.....	40,008	.....

Surplus meats.—Continued.

	Pounds bacon, issue series 8 (crates).	Pounds bacon, issue series 10 (12-pound cans).	Beef, Roast.				Beef, Corned				Hash, corned beef.	
			6-pound cans.	2-pound cans.	1-pound cans.	12-ounce cans.	6-pound cans.	24-ounce cans.	1-pound cans.	12-ounce cans.	2-pound cans.	1-pound cans.
New Orleans							40,008	10,008				
Boston		1,200,000	50,008				9,008				100,008	
San Antonio	90,000						70,008	10,008			10,008	
New York		40,000	700,008	40,008		60,008	550,008	600,008	2,500,008			200,008
St. Louis	40,000	1,190,000		220,008			40,008	390,008	80,008		100,008	
El Paso							20,008					
Atlanta				10,008			80,008				30,008	
San Francisco	150,000						30,008				5,008	
Total by unit	8,686,118	38,536,620	1,974,652	8,666,732	8,925,594	504,168	936,696	12,052,670	8,489,525	5,651,400	7,830,318	5,160,752
Total in pounds	8,686,118	38,536,620	11,847,912	17,333,464	8,925,594	378,124	5,620,176	18,907,005	8,489,525	4,238,550	15,660,636	5,160,752

Now, then, I just offer this suggestion: You may think it is a foolish one, but we have used the post offices of this country during this war for various purposes, for recruiting and for distributing various kinds of propaganda, and we have used the parcel post for almost everything. Would it not be possible to utilize the 55,000 post offices to transport these goods to the consumers through the medium of the parcel post? The consumers by buying Liberty bonds have paid for these goods, and now they are paying top prices for everything they need. The high price of food supplies has created a critical situation to-day with the laboring man. With his rent and the prices of clothes and foodstuffs increasing from day to day, I maintain that the time has come when he should have a square deal and an opportunity through governmental agencies to get the benefit of the goods for which he has sacrificed and paid. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. That the sum of $50,865 shall be transferred to the credit of the United States from the amount in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia to pay the indebtedness of the District of Columbia to the United States on account of advances to defray the expenses of constructing and equipping a school building in Georgetown, D. C., as provided in the act approved March 3, 1875; and said sum shall be transferred to the credit of the United States from the amount in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia immediately upon the approval of this act.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 92, line 18, insert as a new section the following:

"SEC. 11. That an act entitled 'An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States,' approved March 19, 1918, be, and the same is hereby, repealed."

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman reserve it?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I really am in a little bit of a hurry to get this matter through. We have been delayed three days now.

Mr. BLANTON. I admit it may be subject to a point of order, but will the gentleman reserve it?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will reserve it for three minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. That is all I want.

Mr. Chairman, there was a tacit understanding at the time each emergency war measure was passed that as soon as the emergency was over the war measure would be repealed. War board after war board has been done away with within the last few months, even in the closing hours of the Sixty-fifth Congress. We are getting ready right now to turn back just as quickly as possible the railroads to their owners, and I for one wish that we had never taken them over in the first place. We are also preparing now to turn back all of the wires to their owners just as quickly as possible, and I for one wish that we had never taken them over in the first place. Our good friends from the East and from the North have seen fit to force upon the South and upon the West what is commonly called and designated a seven-hour day's work. The South and the West just now are suffering from what has been designated as the "daylight-saving act," which was clearly an emergency war measure only, and may have been necessary at the time for Congress to place upon the statute books of the country, but that emergency certainly has passed. In the South and West in certain portions until this year for three years they have suffered an unprecedented drought, taxing to the limit the resources and endurance of the people and country. Now it has had God's smile shine upon it this year, and we have one of the biggest grain crops ever seen in the history of the country. Many of the boys are away from home yet. Thousands of them are yet in the camps of this country, where they have been for 13 or 14 long months. With a seven-hour day's work there is no chance to harvest the wheat and the oats which are needing harvesting right now. Even though this amendment is subject to a point of order, and even though it will be stricken out on the point of order, I hope that this Congress will keep good its tacit understanding at the time we passed this daylight act and will help our committee to promptly report and pass one of the scores of bills now pending before the committee to repeal the daylight-saving act and to make the repeal immediately effective.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Minnesota to reserve it.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I reserved the point of order, and I now make it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes the point of order that the amendment is new legislation. The Chair, of course, sustains the point of order.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I desire to return now to page 2 of the bill, lines 8 and 10, "Salaries of the commissioners, $6,000." I understood the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WHEELER] to reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. WALSH. He reserved it on the entire paragraph.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, the office of Commissioner of the District of Columbia is a very important one. I reserved the point of order solely for the purpose of bringing up the question of the salaries of the District Commissioners. Upon investigation I am firmly of the opinion that the salaries of the commissioners should be increased. Therefore I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. WALSH. I renew the point of order on the $6,000 items in lines 8 and 10, page 2, the increase in the commissioners' salaries.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JUUL. What is the amount of the increase?

Mr. WALSH. One thousand dollars. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I move to amend by inserting in lieu of the item stricken out the figures "$5,000," which are the figures contained in the current law; in line 8, $5,000, and in line 10, $5,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Page 2, line 8, strike out "$6,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000"; in line 10 strike out "$6,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry

amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question upon the bill and amendments to the final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put the amendments in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. KAHN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported a bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri reserves all points of order on the bill.

Mr. KAHN. I desire to say to the House that I hope to bring the bill up and have general debate on it Monday.

LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

Mr. HUDDLESTON, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the following cases, no adverse reports having been made thereon:

A bill (H. R. 12200, 65th Cong.) granting an increase of pension to John Coss;

A bill (H. R. 12014, 65th Cong.) for the relief of Nancy A. Parsons;

A bill (H. R. 2720, 65th Cong.) granting a pension to James E. Norman; and

A bill (H. R. 2462, 65th Cong.) to reimburse Hugh T. Caffey, Leeds, Ala., for money and stamps stolen, etc.

COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will reappoint as directors on the governing board of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf Mr. PORTER, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RAKER, of California, who are now serving as members of that board.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, June 9, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Acting Secretary of State submitting supplemental estimate of appropriations required by the Department of State for additional employees, for scientific attachés at the embassies in London and Paris, and for representation in international scientific bodies, for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 81); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required for buildings and grounds at St. Elizabeths Hospital, fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 82); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Appropriations was discharged from the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 104) providing for the appointment by each Member of the House of Representatives of one secretary and one clerk, whose names shall be placed on the rolls and paid in monthly installments, and the same was referred to the Committee on Accounts.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 5209) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one captured German cannon or fieldpiece to the town of Oak Ridge, La.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 5210) for the erection of a Federal building for the United States post office at Warren, R. I.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 5211) to repeal chapter 154 of the acts of the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, being the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 5212) to amend section 4 of the act of June 29, 1906, as amended by the act of May 9, 1918, relative to the naturalization of aliens serving in the force of the Allies during the present war; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WELLING: A bill (H. R. 5213) for the relief of occupants and claimants of unsurveyed public land in township 8, north of range 2 west of Salt Lake meridian, Utah; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 5214) to establish a fish hatchery and biological station in the third congressional district of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 5215) to obtain revenue and to promote and encourage the production of iron sulphate, pyrite, and sulphur, and manufactures thereof in the United States and its possessions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5216) to obtain revenue and to promote and encourage the production of manganese and manganiferous ores and manufactures thereof in the United States and its possessions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 5217) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to secure the title to certain lots of land in Chattanooga, Tenn., and building thereon by purchase or condemnation for post office and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 5218) to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the production of magnesite ores and manufactures thereof in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 5219) to allow credits and provide reliefs for certain persons not now provided for by law; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GANBY: A bill (H. R. 5220) to increase the cost of the public building at Bellefourche, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 5221) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Port Orchard, Wash., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5222) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Seattle, Wash., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5223) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Charleston, Wash., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5224) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bremerton, Wash., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 5225) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: A bill (H. R. 5226) further extending the time for the commencement and completion of the bridge or bridges authorized by an act entitled "An act to amend an act to authorize the Dauphin Island Railway & Harbor Co., its successors or assigns, to construct and maintain a bridge or bridges or viaducts across the water between the mainland, at or near Cedar Point and Dauphin Island, both Little and Big; also to dredge a channel from the deep waters of Mobile Bay into Dauphin Bay; also to construct and maintain docks and wharves along both Little and Big Dauphin Islands," approved June 18, 1912, as extended by an act approved June 30, 1916; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 5228) granting the consent of the Congress to the city of Minneapolis, a muncipal corporation, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Resolution (H. Res. 98) providing for certain employees and the payment of the expenses of the Select Committee on Expenditures in the War Department; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BABKA: Memorial from the Legislature of Ohio, requesting the Secretary of War to make provision that all trophies of war captured by Ohio troops be collected and sent to Ohio to be kept as perpetual memorials; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS: Memorial from the Legislature of Massachusetts, urging relief for the Jews in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Memorial from the Legislature of Massachusetts, urging relief for the Jews in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 5229) granting a pension to Catharine Rodgers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5230) granting a pension to Cora Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BABKA: A bill (H. R. 5231) granting an increase of pension to Frank Vicha; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 5232) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Gonder; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5233) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Benjamin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5234) for the relief of John M. Stewart; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 5235) for the relief of James Orange; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5236) granting a pension to Eliza Frederick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 5237) granting an increase of pension to James T. Thrasher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 5238) for the relief of Cleveland Trinidad Paving Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EVANS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 5239) granting an increase of pension to Gus H. Weber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 5240) for the relief of the heirs at law of James I. A. Trotter, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HERSEY: A bill (H. R. 5241) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand W. Merrill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUSTED: A bill (H. R. 5242) for the relief of Louise L. Coleman, surviving administratrix of the estate of Walter H. Coleman, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 5243) granting an increase of pension to John Leishman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 5244) granting a pension to Marion C. Pearsall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5245) granting a pension to Jacob Pusey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 5246) for the relief of the estate of Pleasant M. Craigmiles; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 5247) for the relief of Robert Abernethy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 5248) granting a pension to Agnes Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Resolutions adopted at a mass meeting in Metropolitan Opera House, Philadelphia, Jacob Snier, chairman, relative to pogroms in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BEGG: Petition of joint session of the Congregationalist, Baptist, and Methodist churches of New London, Ohio, protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition of citizens of Illinois, against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of numerous residents of the city of Amsterdam, N. Y., praying for the repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition signed by certain members of the congregation of the Methodist Church of Fonda, N. Y., protesting against removing the ban upon the manufacture and sale of wine and beers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of numerous residents of Delanson, N. Y., protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of numerous residents of the city of Schenectady, N. Y., praying for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Mohawk Valley Grange, No. 1289, of Canajoharie, N. Y., and of the executive committee of the Montgomery County (N. Y.) Farm Bureau Association, praying for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of numerous residents of the city of Amsterdam, N. Y., praying for the repeal of the luxury-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of the clerks in first and second class post offices of Cleveland, Ohio, for an increase in salaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution recommending uniformity of Federal and State rules and regulations for eradicating tuberculosis, adopted by the National Live Stock Exchange, of Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the National Live Stock Exchange, of Chicago, Ill., urging increased appropriation for the animal disease eradication work of the Bureau of Animal Industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of the National Live Stock Exchange, urging release of telegraphic lines of Chicago, Ill., and return of railroads to the owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Slovanian Society, of Cleveland, Ohio, in favor of Jugo-Slavs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of sundry citizens of Illinois, for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of 18 citizens of La Salle County, Ill., for the repeal of the stamp tax on medicines, etc.; W. D. Anger, of Rockford, Ill., for the repeal of section 900 to 911, inclusive, of the war-revenue act; and Gunther Hardware Co., Quincy, Ill., for the repeal of the tax on sporting goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARNER: Petition of Texas Bankers' Association, Dallas, Tex., indorsing efforts made by Texas ports to obtain a fair share of ships controlled and operated by the Emergency Fleet Corporation; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: Petition of citizens of McNeill, Ark., favoring the repeal of the so-called stamp tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: Petitions of residents of Binghamton, Otego, and Cooperstown, all in the State of New York, for the repeal of the tax on soda water, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of residents of Delhi, farmers in vicinity of Binghamton, and farm bureau and home bureau associations representing 2,000 homes, in Delaware County, all of New York State, favoring repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Petition of S. F. Vance and many other patrons of Jack's drug store, Birmingham, Ala., for repeal of tax on soda water, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: Petition of Diehl's drug store, Grove & Singer, Charles A. Drefs, Sentinel Motor Corporation, Oakland Distributing Co., G. H. Pappenberg's (Inc.), Economic Drug Store, W. A. Rogers, George Hass, and sundry citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., opposing revenue taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Asbury (Del.) Methodist Episcopal Church, Buffalo, N. Y., and William D. Young, secretary Cling-Surface Co., urging against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Theo Raithel, Frank E. Harvey, and August Baetzhold's Sons, all of Buffalo, N. Y., against war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of William Breckenridge and Joseph Z. Schneller, of Buffalo, N. Y., in reference to passage of oil-land leasing bill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Cameron J. Davis, rector Trinity Church, Buffalo, N. Y., opposing repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of E. C. Gillett, secretary of New York State Horticultural Society, opposing daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAJOR: Telegrams from prominent citizens of seventh district of Missouri, urging retention of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of First Baptist Church of Lexington, Mo., advocating war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: Petition of sundry citizens of Nebraska, for the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOON: Papers to accompany H. R. 5217; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MOONEY: Petition of Balkan, No. 133, S. N. P. J., of Cleveland, Ohio, relating to Jugo-Slav affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: Petitions of citizens of Mexico, N. Y., protesting against tax on ice cream and soft drinks; and of citizens of Oneida, protesting against luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NOLAN: Petition favoring the Mondell bill, appropriating $500,000,000 for public-land settlement for returning soldiers; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Labor Council favoring the repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Santa Cruz Portland Cement Co., of San Francisco, Calif., asking for protection to the potash industry of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Cloak, Suit, and Skirt Manufacturers' Protective Association, New York, and Kenier-Williams Stamping Co., Richmond Hill, New York State, against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Columbia Graphophone Co., New York, protesting against Department of Labor Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of New York State Horticultural Society, protesting against daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Petition of Hon. Leon F. Moss, of Los Angeles, Calif., on Federal paved highways; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: Resolutions adopted by the Iowa State Federation of Labor assembled May 20-23, 1919, favoring repeal of an amendment to the war-time prohibition act as affecting beers and wine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSE: Petitions of cities of Carrolltown, Barnesboro, Spangler, St. Benedict, and Patton, Cambria County, Pa., protesting against tax on sodas, etc., and asking that same be repealed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of First Presbyterian Church of Tyrone, Pa., protesting against the modification of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of the cloak, suit, and skirt manufactuers of New York, numbering not less than 300, protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of several hundred citizens of New York City against tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Live Stock Exchange, Chicago, Ill., recommending uniformity of Federal and State rules and regulations for eradicating tuberculosis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National Live Stock Exchange, Chicago, Ill., urging that the railroads be turned back to their owners and the release of telegraphic lines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the National Live Stock Exchange, Chicago, Ill., deprecating unfair publicity of regulative bodies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National Live Stock Exchange, Chicago, Ill., favoring approved constructive legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of Bethany Grange, No. 748, New York State, urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 138 residents of Medina, N. Y., and vicinity, urging the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Genesee County (N. Y.) Pomona Grange, representing 3,300 grange members, unanimously urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of citizens of Port Henry, N. Y., for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Keeseville, N. Y., for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Providence (R. I.) Housewives' League, urging action to reduce food prices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Division No. 4, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Providence, R. I., opposing any league of nations that does not recognize the freedom of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of residents of Mayport and vicinity, in Clarion County, Pa., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: Petition of W. M. Caldwell, of Lafollette, Tenn., for repeal of the railroad and mine war laws; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio: Petition of Leipsic (Ohio) Grange, No. 1664, for the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the law committee, International Association of Machinists, Van Wert (Ohio) Lodge No. 667, indorsing Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of H. G. Fry, Delphos, and Turnbull Motor Truck & Wagon Co., Defiance, both of Ohio, asking for repeal of the tax on commercial motor vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Robert Mead Latty, in behalf of the Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, of Broughton, Ohio; Methodist Episcopal Church, Bryan; E. J. Marsh, Edward Rhoades, Jesse Rupp, all of West Unity; Oakwood Methodist Episcopal Sunday School; Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, Antwerp; Fred Grandy; Salem congregation, Van Wert Methodist Episcopal circuit; North Union Methodist Episcopal Church, Van Wert; Beech Grove congregation; Sunday school, Grove Hill; Whitfield Methodist Episcopal congregation; C. P. Godfrey, Ottawa, all of Ohio, opposing repeal of war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Western Ohio Bottling Works, Van Wert; H. G. Mauk & Son, Van Wert; Western Ohio Bottling Works, Paulding; Ely & Co., Pioneer; Weiss Clothing Co., Frick Clothing Store, Rampe Store Co., Ottawa; Veneier & Nofzinger, Montpelier; Balyeat & Wassanberg, and Charles Balyeat, all of Ohio, for the repeal of the luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: Petition of farmers of Porter County, Ind., asking that they be placed back on the Lord's time; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *June 9, 1919.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we begin our day with meditation upon the greatness and glory of Thy name. We come before Thee not only that we may receive that fullness of character and perfectness of life that will make us in accord with the divine will in our personal feelings and aspirations, but we seek also from Thee that vigor and strength of intellectual power that we may hold the balance of justice, and know the path of right, and think after Thee Thy thoughts concerning the government of men. We pray that Thou will endue us this day with Thine own Spirit that we may follow Thy word and work out Thy plan in the work that Thou hast committed to our hands. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the proceedings of Friday last, when, on request of Mr. WARREN and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

INVITATION TO AMERICAN REPUBLICS (H. DOC. NO. 86).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of State, recommending legislation authorizing the President of the United States to invite each of the American Republics to send, after June 1, 1920, not more than two of its citizens at one time to receive instruction in the United States Naval Academy and the United States Military Academy, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

GILLESPIE PLANT EXPLOSION (S. DOC. NO. 31).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of $1,319,033.59 required by the War Department for payment of claims for damages to private property by the explosion at the T. A. Gillespie Loading Co.'s plant in October, 1918, etc., which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2480) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SNYDER, Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, and Mr. CARTER managers at the conference on the part of the House.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. STERLING presented a petition of sundry citizens of Watertown, S. Dak., praying for the repeal of the so-called "luxury" tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Calif., praying for the repeal of war-time prohibition so as to permit the manufacture of wine and beer, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McLEAN presented memorials of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of South Manchester; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New Haven; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Shelton; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Seymour; of the congregations of the Baptist Church of Preston City, the Congregational Church of Stafford, and the Methodist Episcopal Church of West Cranby; of the Christian Endeavor Society of Chaplin; and of sundry citizens of Torrington and West Stafford, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of New Haven, Conn., praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CURTIS presented a resolution adopted at a convention of sundry grain dealers, merchants, and shippers at Hutchinson, Kans., praying for a congressional investigation of the Bureau of Markets of the Department of Agriculture, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona presented petitions of Local Lodge No. 92, H. S. S., of Lowell; of Local Lodge No. 547, National Croatian Society, of Bisbee; and of Local Lodge No. 132, S. S. P. Z., of Lowell, all in the State of Arizona, praying for the independence of the Jugo-Slavs and for justice and fair dealing in connection with peace deliberations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NEWBERRY presented a petition of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Ypsilanti, Mich., and a petition of the Diocese of the Protestant Episcopal Church, of Marquette, Mich., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations' treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Battle Creek, Mich., and a memorial of the Common Council of Petoskey, Mich., remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented memorials of sundry citizens of Muskegon, Owosso, Corunna, Coats Grove, Howard, Coral, and Belding, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of sundry citizens of Jackson, Mich., praying for the repeal of the so-called "luxury" tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of St. John the Baptist Lodge, No. 8, Slav Croatian Union, of Calumet, Mich., praying for the independence of the Jugo-Slavs and for justice and fair dealing in connection with peace deliberations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Holland, Mich., remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HALE presented a memorial of sundry Italian citizens of Portland, Me., remonstrating against the treatment accorded Italy in the matter of Fiume, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Auburn, Me., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Portland, Me., remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented petitions of sundry citizens of Easton, Cordova, Royal Oak, Bozman, and Longwoods, all in the State of Maryland, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented memorials of the Board of the Grace Methodist Episcopal Church Sunday School of Cumberland, and of sundry citizens of Cumberland and Buckeystown, all in the State of Maryland, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KING presented a petition of the Affiliated Patriotic Societies, of Ottawa, Ill., praying for the proposed modification of war-time prohibition so as to permit the manufacture of beer and wine, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Utah Coal Producers' Association, of Salt Lake City, Utah, praying for the imposition of a tax on imported coal, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WARREN. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably with sundry amendments the bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 11) thereon. Copies of the bill will be placed on the desks of all Senators, and I hope I may be able to call it up for consideration some time to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 72, submitted by Mr. LODGE on the 6th instant, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized, during the Sixty-sixth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 1521) authorizing the Cowlitz Tribe of Indians, residing in the State of Washington, to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 1522) granting a pension to Marius Thomsen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 1523) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph F. Mitchell (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 1524) donating captured cannon and unloaded projectiles to the city of Cawker City, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 1525) to donate one captured cannon to Mount Union College, Alliance, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1526) granting a pension to Edward Piero (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 1527) granting an increase of pension to John A. Boutte (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 1528) granting an increase of pension to Frederick R. Radebaugh; and

A bill (S. 1529) granting a pension to Rice M. Hughes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 1530) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the municipality of Martin, Tenn., captured German cannon and cannon balls or shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1531) granting a pension to Mary E. Martin (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 1532) directing delivery of State war-service records to the States requesting same; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1533) for the relief of Anna M. Tobin, independent executrix of the estate of Frank R. Tobin, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1534) to amend an act entitled "An act to pension the survivors of certain Indian wars from January 1, 1859, to January, 1891, inclusive, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1917; and

A bill (S. 1535) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to pension the survivors of certain Indian wars from January 1, 1859, to January, 1891, inclusive, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1917; to the Committee on Pensions.

INDIAN CLAIMS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. On May 23 I introduced Senate bill 628, authorizing the Indian tribes and individual Indians, or any of them, residing in the State of Washington to submit certain claims to the Court of Claims. It was referred to the Committee on Claims. It is a matter relating entirely to the Indians. It is a claim of Indians and has heretofore been considered entirely by the Committee on Indian Affairs. The Indian Affairs Committee has held hearings upon it, and a similar bill has passed the Senate, I think, twice—once, at any rate. I think the bill should go to the Committee on Indian Affairs. I ask that the Committee on Claims be discharged from its further consideration and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS TO AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WATSON submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for investigating farm domestic water supply and drainage disposal, the construction of farm buildings, etc., from $25,000 to $75,000, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. RANSDELL submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $83,200 for the investigation and improvement of fruits and the methods of fruit growing, harvesting, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS AGAINST MEXICO.

Mr. KING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 74), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas claims aggregating millions of dollars in compensation for damages to property and for personal outrages and destruction of life suffered by citizens of the United States in the Republic of Mexico have been filed with the Department of State for presentation to the Government of Mexico; and

Whereas some years have already intervened between the commission of such damages and outrages and no progress is apparently being made toward the liquidation, settlement, and payment of such claims: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate whether or not said claims have been presented to the Government of Mexico, and what steps and measures are being taken to prosecute such claims and to liquidate and settle the same, and if said claims have not been presented, then to report to the Senate what steps and measures are contemplated to be taken with respect thereto and when the department will proceed with the same; also to report to the Senate the number of citizens of the United States who have been killed in Mexico since Porfirio Diaz retired from the Presidency of Mexico, together with the number of nationals of other countries who have been killed in Mexico as far as the Secretary of State is advised; also to report to the Senate the amount of claims filed with the Secretary for damages suffered by citizens of the United States in Mexico, and any information which the Secretary has as to the confiscation of property of citizens of the United States and as to the damage suffered by the citizens of the United States in Mexico; also to report to the Senate the number of citizens of the United States who have been compelled to leave Mexico on account of the disorders prevailing in that country, the amount of property abandoned by such persons, and the number of citizens of the United States presently residing in Mexico and the amount of their property.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT PUBLICATIONS.

Mr. KING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 75), which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior report to the Senate the number of publications or periodicals issued by the Department of the Interior, together with the name of each publication, the bureau or other division of the Department of the Interior issuing the same, the time it is issued, the name of the editor and the number of persons employed in preparing the same for publication, the number of copies issued, the cost of the same, the usual number of pages, the persons to whom they are sent, whether said publication is distributed gratuitously or upon subscription, the purpose and object of such publication, and whether or not the same is employed to advocate and carry on a propaganda to promote measures pending in Congress, and whether or not the department publishes such periodicals for the purpose of advocating legislation which it desires to be enacted by Congress; whether conferences or conventions have been held at the instance and invitation of the Department of the Interior to promote legislation pending in Congress, and whether funds of the Government have been used to arrange for or pay the expenses of such conferences or conventions and the amount of funds used for such purposes.

POWER OF THE SENATE OVER TREATIES.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask unanimous consent to introduce into the RECORD a very short article from the pen of former Gov. Simeon E. Baldwin relating to the power of the Senate in the making of treaties.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MOSES. What is the request?

Mr. THOMAS. The request is for the publication of a very short article by former Gov. Baldwin, of Connecticut, relating to the treaty-making power of the Senate.

Mr. MOSES. To be published as a document?

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, no; in the RECORD.

Mr. MOSES. In view of the announcement that I have several times made before, I ask that it go to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. THOMAS. I did not understand the Senator's remark. Does the Senator object?

Mr. MOSES. I have stated several times that utterances by Senators or the President of the United States would not be met by any objection from me, but utterances of other persons which are presented here for printing in the RECORD or as a public document I should venture to ask might be sent to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. THOMAS. Very good. Of course, I am aware I am not able to have the order made at this time in the presence of the objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The article will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 4226. An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

TREATY OF PEACE.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask to have the following cablegram from President Wilson read.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	France	Kenyon	New
Borah	Frelinghuysen	Keyes	Newberry
Brandegee	Gay	King	Norris
Capper	Gronna	Knox	Nugent
Chamberlain	Hale	La Follette	Overman
Culberson	Harding	Lenroot	Page
Cummins	Harris	Lodge	Phipps
Curtis	Harrison	McCumber	Pittman
Dial	Hitchcock	McKellar	Poindexter
Dillingham	Johnson, Calif.	McLean	Pomerene
Elkins	Jones, N. Mex.	McNary	Reed
Fall	Jones, Wash.	Moses	Sheppard
Fernald	Kellogg	Myers	Sherman
Fletcher	Kendrick	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.

Smith, Md.	Sutherland	Underwood	Warren
Smoot	Swanson	Wadsworth	Watson
Spencer	Thomas	Walsh, Mass.	
Sterling	Trammell	Walsh, Mont.	

Mr. DIAL. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SMITH of South Carolina] is detained on account of illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

PARIS, *June 7, 1919.*

TUMULTY,
White House, Washington.

Please convey the following to Senator HITCHCOCK:

"I am heartily glad that you have demanded an investigation with regard to the possession of texts of the treaty by unauthorized persons. I have felt that it was highly undesirable officially to communicate the text of a document which is still in negotiation and subject to change. Anyone who has possession of the official English text has what he is clearly not entitled to have or to communicate. I have felt in honor bound to act in the same spirit and in the same way as the representatives of the other great powers in this matter, and am confident that my fellow countrymen will not expect me to break faith with them. I hope the investigation will be most thoroughly prosecuted."

WOODROW WILSON.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it seems to be beyond controversy at this time that this treaty is now being published in practically all of the countries abroad. Certainly copies are being circulated throughout Germany, Norway, Sweden, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, France, and probably England. I entertain no doubt myself that there are a number of copies in this country, which I think the investigation which the President properly indorses and asks to be made thorough will undoubtedly establish.

My desire, Mr. President, has been from the beginning to have a copy of this treaty. As I said the other day, had the treaty been confined to making peace with Germany I should not be as deeply interested in that part of it; but I am deeply interested in the league of nations, which is interwoven with the treaty, and therefore I have made every effort within my power to secure a copy of this treaty.

I have in my possession this morning a copy of the treaty, which I am going to ask permission of the Senate to print as a Senate document. I am permitted to make this treaty public by the consent of those who gave it to me. The particular copy which I am offering this morning was brought to this country by Mr. Frazier Hunt, the staff correspondent of the Chicago Tribune. It was taken to the Chicago Tribune office last week and retained there for some time, just how long I do not know, but the Tribune felt, for patriotic reasons, that it ought not to print it on its own initiative and without first having presented the treaty to the officials in Washington, and so withheld the printing of the treaty.

The treaty was brought to Washington last afternoon and delivered to me as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I entertain no doubt that it is a true and correct copy, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be printed as a Senate document.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, a few moments ago I asked permission to introduce into the RECORD a very short statement by a very eminent citizen of this country, to which objection was made. In view of that fact, I object to the unanimous consent at this time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Regular order!

Mr. BORAH. I move that the document which I have, which purports to be, and I entertain no doubt is, a true copy of the treaty of peace, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Idaho. [Putting the question.] The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. PITTMAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. NORRIS. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. KELLOGG (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. I do not see him present and therefore withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]. Under those circumstances I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT], which I transfer to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT]. He is absent and I am unable to obtain a transfer. I therefore withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. Transferring that pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FLETCHER. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "nay."

Mr. LODGE. I am able to transfer my pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. KING. I wish to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], and the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] are detained on official business.

Mr. HARRIS. My colleague the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] is detained from the Senate by death in his family.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] and the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] are detained on public business.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON]; and

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—47.

Ashurst	Fernald	La Follette	Phipps
Beckham	France	Lenroot	Poindexter
Borah	Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Pomerene
Brandegee	Gronna	McLean	Reed
Capper	Hale	McNary	Sherman
Chamberlain	Harding	Moses	Smoot
Culberson	Johnson, Calif.	Myers	Spencer
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Sutherland
Curtis	Kendrick	New	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Kenyon	Newberry	Walsh, Mass.
Elkins	Keyes	Norris	Warren
Fall	Knox	Page	

NAYS—24.

Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Swanson
Fletcher	King	Ransdell	Thomas
Gay	McCumber	Sheppard	Trammel
Harris	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	Underwood
Harrison	Nugent	Smith, Md.	Walsh, Mont.
Hitchcock	Overman	Stanley	Williams

NOT VOTING—25.

Ball	Henderson	Penrose	Sterling
Bankhead	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Townsend
Calder	Kellogg	Robinson	Watson
Colt	Kirby	Shields	Wolcott
Edge	McCormick	Simmons	
Gerry	Martin	Smith, Ga.	
Gore	Owen	Smith, S. C.	

So Mr. BORAH's motion was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I wish to say only a word in reference to the vote which has just been taken which I did not have the opportunity to do during the roll call.

Like all the other Members of the Senate, I am intensely interested in what is in this treaty, and should be glad to see the official copy at the earliest possible moment. I voted against publishing in the RECORD the document as presented by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] for this reason: I have great confidence in the Senator from Idaho and I know that he would not offer a document to the Senate that he did not believe was the official copy, but there is no evidence which has been given to the Senate in either the remarks of the Senator from Idaho or by investigation of one of the committees of the Senate, that this is a true and official copy of the treaty that has been made up in Paris. If it is, there will be no harm done; but if it is not and it goes out to the country with the sanction of the United States Senate as a part of the arm that approves this treaty, that the document that is published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is the official copy that has been agreed on in Paris, and there should turn out to be clauses in it that are not accurate or which are misleading, it may cause great harm in the country. For that reason I thought it the wiser part to withhold the publication of the treaty as an official document

until we knew absolutely and beyond peradventure that we had an official copy.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in addition to what the Senator from Alabama has said, I desire to say that there is another reason why this document should not now be published. In the negotiation of treaties, prior to their final making, the party who represents the United States officially under the Constitution is the President of the United States, the executive department, and as the Senator from Idaho knows from a communication addressed to the White House from the President, which was this morning given to the Committee on Foreign Relations and which I suppose will be published this afternoon, the President states that by agreement with France and Great Britain the treaty was to be withheld until it had been finally negotiated. That means, of course, until Germany has had her say about it and we have had our say about modifying the treaty in accordance with the wishes of Germany or for reasons of our own. So, in addition to the reasons given by the Senator from Alabama, there is the grave reason of this being a piece of bad faith upon the part of a part of the United States Government when that part of the United States Government that is authorized to make agreements of a preliminary or negotiatory character with foreign governments had made an agreement, and had communicated that agreement to a committee of this body, or rather had communicated it, and it had come to a committee of this body.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I simply desire to say that I omitted to state that this document is printed both in French and English text. Of course, I only desire the English text printed. I should have stated that.

Mr. McCUMBER rose.

Mr. BORAH. If the Senator from North Dakota wishes to make some remarks, though I have another motion to make, I shall make it after he shall have concluded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I only desire to say that for 20 years I have consistently voted against making public any treaty that was under negotiation until it came to us as a completed contract between the nations. I have done so on the ground, first, that until it came before the Senate it belonged peculiarly to the Executive branch and not to the Senate, and, secondly, because I have considered that the better relations between nations demanded that a treaty be disposed of by the delegation or other authority that had to deal with it before it was given publicity. This being my view in all of the time past, I can not change it with a change of administration.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, as explanations seem to be the order of the moment, I desire to say a word. I have had no sympathy whatever with the movement afoot to get prematurely a copy of this treaty. I believe in the orderly course of events we should await the time when the treaty comes to us through the regular channels. At the same time I am just as anxious to have first-hand knowledge of this treaty as any other Senator can be, and at the earliest moment practicable.

My reason for the vote I have just cast is this: It has been said that this treaty has been published in other countries. Just before the Senate was convened this morning I was advised that the treaty has been, or is to be, printed by one of the leading journals in New York City. That being so, I could see no reason why everybody outside of this Chamber should have access to a copy of this treaty and Senators not have it before them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I think it is unfortunate that the treaty has been made public at this particular time, but at the same time, as it has been, or is about to be, made public, I can not understand why it should not be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, before the Senator from Ohio sits down, I desire to ask him a question. I understood him to say that he thought it unfortunate the treaty had been made public. I want to ask him if he does not think he has made a mistake of language there? I suppose he means the negotiations up to date, for the treaty has not been completed, and will not be completed until it has been signed not only by one side to it but by the other side. Everybody knows that constant changes are being made every day or two in it.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I think that my words were fairly intelligible. Of course this document is not a treaty in the legal, technical sense; it is perhaps negotiatory in character; but such as it is, I think we all understand it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Because a newspaper guesses from what has gone before what shall follow, guesses from the negotiations as to what shall be a treaty, I do not see why the Senate of the United States, a calm, deliberative body, partially national and partially international in its functions, should take the newspaper view of the matter.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Idaho will permit me, I desire to say that I feel there is probably an exaggeration of the importance of whether this document is made public or not; but it seems to me beneath the dignity of the Senate of the United States to cooperate with the German Government in endeavoring to make this public for the purpose of throwing a monkey wrench into the negotiations.

We all know that this treaty was first made public in Germany; that the German Government did it for a purpose; that the purpose of the German Government was to interfere with the negotiations and the settlement; that the German Government did it for the purpose of getting better terms; and the majority of the Senate of the United States is deliberately cooperating with the German Government in that direction.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, to emphasize further what has been said, it appears that but a few days ago the Senate passed a resolution asking the President, if not incompatible to the public interest, to send the treaty here. Now, before a response is made to that resolution, before it could be answered, the Senate undertakes to publish what purports to be a copy of the treaty. It seems to me common respect for the resolution which has been sent to the President would certainly have induced this body to have waited until a reasonable time until they had obtained his answer.

I wish to emphasize the fact that, without waiting for a response from the President to the request addressed to him, this course is taken by a vote of the Senate. The President said that he was committed and in honor bound not to give the treaty out without the consent certainly of those with whom he had made the agreement. He had the authority to make such an agreement, because the treaty is at his disposal until transmitted here. It seems to me a remarkable piece of disrespect to the President, in order to nag and worry him, to take this unprecedented course before he could even answer the resolution sent to him by the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, instead of throwing a monkey wrench into the machinery, this action of the Senate is simply carrying out the newer doctrine of "open covenants, openly arrived at." There are two propositions contained in that statement; one is that the covenants should be open when they are reached, and the other is that in reaching them all proceedings should be public. Most of the objections which have been made must base their merit, whatever merit they may have, upon the old doctrine that everything should be done behind closed doors; that all such business should be secret. But we had a great statesman not long ago who overthrew that idea and who gave to the world the new doctrine that secret treaties were an abomination. I agreed with him; I approved of that position, and the people of the civilized world approved of it. While the treaty may be changed before it is finally signed, the existing draft of the treaty with Germany is one of the steps in arriving at a covenant, and the Senate's action makes it an open step.

To my mind it is no objection that Germany is now practicing the doctrine of openly arriving at covenants, and that therefore we should arrive at them secretly. If the doctrine is good, if it is right—and I believe it is—then every step in these negotiations leading up to a treaty in which the people of all the civilized world are interested ought to be openly arrived at. It seems to me therefore that in the present highly civilized state of society the reasons for secrecy have no bearing whatever.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, it seems to me that the question as to whether or not we believe in openly arrived at covenants can have nothing to do with the question on which the Senate has just acted. It is apparent from the message which we received from the President this morning that, in his opinion, this treaty should not be given any publicity at this time; at any rate, this document, alleged to be a copy of the treaty, should not be given publicity. All the reasons for that we can not know; but we do know that the President is upon the ground; we do know that he is advised as to the reasons as to why this should not be done. There is no evidence here that this purported copy comes through Germany. We are advised by the Senator from Idaho that this purported copy is printed in both English and French. How it was obtained we have no evidence; but we do know, from the statement given us this morning by the President, that it has been obtained in some way contrary to the wishes of the representatives of the United States, France, and England. We can only surmise that it has been obtained in a surreptitious manner, a manner not commendable, a manner decidedly improper and worthy of the condemnation of the Senate. We are officially advised by the President that if any such copy is here it came over in an improper manner, and it has possibly been obtained through theft. Will the Senate of the United States put its approval upon a petty larceny, a larceny which has for its purpose interference in the

most important foreign affairs in which this country has ever been engaged? I submit, Senators, that this thing should not be done; that it is unworthy of the Senate and unworthy of our country.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I do not wish to repeat, if I can help it, any particle of the very strong statements made against the propriety of the Senate's action this morning. We know that somebody came into the possession of this treaty illegitimately. So well does the Senate know it that it is pressing an investigation to see who has been guilty of this crime against humanity—and I am not overstating the case. I am not surprised to see the humor of the antileaguephobists.

Mr. President, it is a violation of the agreement of our commissioners in the formation of this treaty. We are a part of the treaty-making power. We are violating a confidence just as much as if we ourselves had been a party to the treaty; and now we insist on doing this, and for what purpose? We do not know whether it is the treaty or not. We know that the one negotiating it on the part of the United States is opposed to its publication. In fact, so far as we know it is not the treaty. We have a right to infer that it is not the treaty, for there is no use in withholding it after it is completed; and yet the Senate, which is investigating the crime, has immediately vindicated the criminal by publishing the product of his thievery, and then holding an investigation, examining this very morning by what strange processes this treaty, or alleged treaty, ever came into the United States at all.

We know that it did come to the United States. We know that it did come through Germany, if the newspapers are correct, and that is all the information we have as to it. We know that they first published it; and no matter who published it, no matter how he got it, no matter how correct or incorrect it is, it is a piece of bad faith on the part of the United States as one of the negotiators of this treaty to come now and, as has been well said, probably throw a monkey wrench into the proceedings at this hour, thus carrying out the very purpose of those who do not wish this treaty to be ratified.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I merely wish to add to this post-mortem symposium the statement that I voted against the motion simply because I did not think it was fair to play favorites in the introduction of documents offered for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I wish to say that had I been present—and I was down at the War Department when the Senate voted, trying to find out the date of arrival this week of the *Amphion*, that is bringing home from France an Arkansas regiment, now the One hundred and forty-second Field Artillery—I should have voted against the motion to publish the alleged treaty in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD now.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I myself have a "single-track mind," and I like to know what I am talking about if my intellect will allow me to grasp the subject.

I read with pleasure before it was introduced, and then heard read with pleasure, the President's cablegram which will be a part of the printed RECORD to-morrow, sent, not through the usual channels of communication with this body, the Department of State, or directly to one of the Senators who read it into the RECORD, but through the President's secretary in the White House to one of the Senators, addressed personally in this body, and not through the State Department at all. If there was the slightest degree of impropriety in the Senator's offering this document for printing in the RECORD, he is responsible for such impropriety. I was glad to have read it before it was read openly, and glad to hear it being read and made a part of the RECORD. It justified my vote upon the question of printing in the RECORD the copy of the treaty offered by the Senator from Idaho.

I hold in my hand the copy of the cablegram from the President, addressed:

TUMULTY,
White House, Washington:

Please convey the following to Senator HITCHCOCK:

"I am heartily glad that you have demanded an investigation with regard to the possession of the text of the treaty by unauthorized persons. I have felt that it was highly undesirable officially to communicate the text of a document which is still in negotiation and subject to change. Anyone who has possession of the official English text has what he is clearly not entitled to have or to communicate. I have felt in honor bound to act in the same spirit and in the same way as the representatives of the other great powers"—

And so forth.

Mr. President, the investigation as to who has copies of this treaty is proceeding openly before the Foreign Relations Committee. This cablegram was presented to the different members of that committee this morning, and it is now in the record of the committee itself. I considered it an indorsement of the action of the Senate in ordering the investigation. As a lawyer I can see no method by which we can ascertain whether there is first an official copy of the treaty in existence here in the United States or whether there is a copy of the treaty which is correct, although not authorized or not official, unless we have a copy of the treaty itself, either of the one class or the other.

The President first is very careful to speak of the English copy of the text. He says that anyone who has or claims to have in his possession the official English text of this treaty has it in his possession without authority, and he wants it investigated. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has presented what he says he is confident is a copy of the treaty in both French and English. The English translation could easily have been made from the French text; and it need not cast any reflection upon the President or anyone in the White House whomsoever that the text is translated into English as presented here, and, under the request of the Senator from Idaho, will be printed in the RECORD to-morrow in English. The Secretary of State has various copies of the treaty in his possession; and he has the opportunity and doubtless will immediately cause an investigation to be made, when this copy which the Senator has offered is printed, to ascertain whether it is a correct copy by comparison with the official text which he has.

These are the conditions that exist here. The President has indorsed this investigation. How are we to carry the investigation on? The Senate is endeavoring to get copies of this treaty. That is a part of the resolution itself of the Senator from Nebraska, endeavoring to get copies of the treaty which are in New York. One of them is presented here, and we are informed that it is a crime against humanity to have it printed!

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FALL. Just a moment. If there is a crime against humanity, I would be rather inclined to think that, in my judgment, it was entering upon the treaty. However, that is merely the judgment of one Senator. The treaty itself might be a crime against humanity, but the publicity of it could not be.

I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think it is fair to state that the investigation was for the purpose of getting the treaty or copies of the treaty? Was not the investigation for the purpose of ascertaining how the stolen copy came to this country?

Mr. FALL. Oh, certainly, certainly. That is one of the purposes of the investigation. The proceedings of the Foreign Relations Committee were open; a stenographer and newspaper men were in attendance; and therefore I am betraying no confidence at all in the statement which I have made. The Senator will have an opportunity to read the proceedings of the Foreign Relations Committee, which will be printed from time to time.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. FALL. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. Is it not to be conceded that if this alleged copy came into the hands of the representative of the newspaper as stated, it must have come to him with knowledge of the understanding that it was not to be made public until completed, and therefore is it not a breach of faith on his part to make it public or to communicate it to anyone else who might make it public, and is not the Senate in the position of being particeps criminis to that sort of breach of faith?

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I did not catch the last part of the Senator's question.

Mr. FLETCHER. Conceding that the alleged copy was not stolen, but was delivered to a newspaper correspondent, it must have been delivered with the knowledge that it was not to be made public or communicated to anyone else until it was finally completed.

Mr. FALL. Oh, no, Mr. President; I do not so understand at all. This is not an official copy of the treaty until it is transmitted to this body, as has been said by those who have been opposing its publication until it has been transmitted to this body by the President. Now, anyone who has an official copy of that treaty in his possession in the English text, the President says, did not obtain it by his authority or is not authorized to give publicity to it. We are simply publishing this treaty that the Senator has offered here for what it may be worth. The State Department is here to correct it, if in any respect it is incorrect and does not compare word for word with the official text which it has in its possession. I claim that the President has indorsed the action of those who have voted for the publication of this treaty, and necessarily so.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I would have moved to refer this matter to the Committee on Foreign Relations if I had had the slightest doubt that the motion would be defeated.

There was a public meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee this morning for the purpose of conducting hearings to determine whether or not there is an authentic copy of the

treaty as far as it has progressed. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] was before that committee for the purpose of giving the committee information upon which to base that inquiry. In my opinion, it was the duty of the Senator from Idaho to present this alleged copy of the treaty to that committee if he intended to present it to this body, so that that committee might determine its authenticity. If he believes that this is an authentic copy of the treaty as it now exists, it should at least be submitted to the committee that now has under hearing the very question; and I want to say further, without any violation of the confidence of the committee, because it was all public from the very beginning, that the question came up as to whether or not the committee would do anything at this time that might lead to the publication of a copy of the treaty, and the committee decided not to do it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator will be reminded of the fact that the Senator from Idaho stated that the committee could not bind him by any such action.

Mr. PITTMAN. Then the Senator from Idaho is the only member of that committee who is justified in an affirmative vote, because the acting chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER], asked whether or not the subpœna duces tecum was intended to bring before the committee the copy of treaty alleged to be in existence in this country, and it was then decided that it was not wise to make public the treaty at the present time, if one did exist, by bringing it publicly before that committee, but that the committee would determine later, after ascertaining whether there was an authentic copy of the treaty in existence in this country, whether or not they would make it public. It was then that the Senator from Idaho stated that as an individual member of that committee he would not be bound by any such understanding; but he was the only Senator there who relieved himself from the consensus of opinion of the committee.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a moment?

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. FALL. Did not the Senator hear the statment made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] that there was a copy here, and that it would be presented at 12 o'clock?

Mr. PITTMAN. I heard no such statement at all, and I think the record will bear me out that the Senator from Connecticut stated that on the meeting of the Senate he would state who did have a copy.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me——

Mr. PITTMAN. The reason why I would not think the Senator from Connecticut would come upon this floor and present a purported copy of the treaty, after that meeting which he attended, was because he stood silent when the chairman asked if it was the consensus of opinion that the subpœna duces tecum should not include the treaty, and continued to remain silent after the chairman declared such would be the order.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

Mr. PITTMAN. And the chairman asked with regard to the understanding because it was suggested that the committee should decide whether or not any copy of the treaty should be made public before it was made public officially, and the Senator from Connecticut did not except himself from that understanding as did the Senator from Idaho. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not want the Senator to yield and I do not desire to interrupt him. I simply want to say that I will answer when he concludes his remarks.

Mr. PITTMAN. Very well. However, I think the record will bear me out in the statement that the question was deliberately suggested by the chairman, or rather the chairman asked of the committee, whether they intended to include in the subpœna duces tecum, which was intended to bring in all papers bearing on the possession of the copy of the purported treaty, the copy of the treaty itself, and if it was the intention of the committee to permit the alleged treaty to become public through such hearings. It was contended then by Senators present that to take that means of violating the agreement of the President of the United States would be improper.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, I think the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] was present and stated that he would not favor making the treaty public unless it was officially received from the President, if I recollect correctly the discussion in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PITTMAN. But the record will bear me out, and it is a public record, that it was distinctly understood that we would subsequently determine as a committee whether or not publicity should be given to any copy of the treaty that the committee might uncover. In fact it was suggested at that very meeting that the first thing to determine was whether or not there was an authentic copy, then the committee would determine the advisability of making it public.

Now, in violation of that understanding several members of that committee who were parties to that understanding have come upon the floor here and have voted to make public what is claimed to be the very treaty that they said should not be made public until after the committee had an opportunity to pass upon it.

If the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has what he believes to be a copy of the treaty as it now exists in his possession, he should have presented it to the committee which was in session this morning for the very purpose of investigating the charges made by the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Massachusetts. Did he fail to present it to the committee because he was afraid the committee would not find it to be authentic? Did he fail to present it to the committee because he had an idea that it might divert attention from charges made by the Senator to some other instrument, or did he refuse to present it to the committee because, in his opinion, the committee had already declared that they would not make the instrument public at this time? If the latter was his excuse, then I will admit he excused himself under his statement, but if the latter was his excuse then the vote of every member of the Committee on Foreign Relations who was present on that occasion in favor of the publication of the treaty was a violation of the understanding we had less than two hours ago.

I hope there are Democrats on this side of the Chamber if there are not Republicans on the other side who, in view of the history of this transaction, will move to reconsider this matter. Having voted in the negative, I may not now under the rules.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, if it had been an original proposition to submit a treaty which was in course of negotiation for publication, I would have voted against it; but coming as it did after discussions that had been taking place from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, with charges and countercharges, crimination and recrimination, by Democrats and Republicans and other citizens as well, it seems to me the people of America are entitled to know what it is all about and what is being put forth in New York and elsewhere as the treaty that is being negotiated by our representatives in Paris and those associated with them.

It is conceded on the floor of the Senate, Mr. President, that this is not an official paper; that it is not a completed treaty. It has been stated by the President in the cablegram that the official document has not been given out, so with the American people fully understanding that the document which has been ordered published is not an official document, I can not see how the proceedings at Paris can be interrupted or interfered with by the printing of what purports to be a copy of the treaty, and which is concededly not.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. Would not the Senator prefer, now that the committee is in session for the very purpose of ascertaining the authenticity of this paper, to have it referred to the committee to determine that fact?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It is practically referred to the committee now. The whole subject matter has been referred to the committee and the committee has it within its power and it is a part of its duty, and I am sure with its membership it will do its duty, to ascertain the source from which this alleged document came. If it is a spurious document, or if it is a stolen one, or if some one on the inside has for a consideration in money or otherwise put it in improper hands, the committee will ascertain and report the facts.

I am unwilling to rest under the imputation, Mr. President, that the Senate by voting to print this document becomes a particeps criminis to a fraud or to a theft. It is, I think, pretty generally conceded that this treaty, as far as it has been agreed upon, has been made public in some parts of Europe, and particularly in Germany; and if it is being discussed by the people there intelligently with a record that purports to be partially official at least, why should not the American people be let into the same confidence of the powers that be as are the peoples over there?

I make no apology for my vote and I shall not make any for it in the Senate of the United States or elsewhere upon this or any other proposition involving the welfare of my country. I vote as my conscience dictates rather than as somebody would have me vote upon these great questions which involve the very life of this Republic. To my way of thinking, there has been no question before the American people since the adoption of

the Constitution so important to America as is this proposed league of nations. I have been studying it as best I could, Mr. President, and have been undertaking to arrive at what it is right to do and as to what my conscience dictates should be done in the premises, and not what somebody wants me to do and not what it is best for my party or any party for me to do. I care not for party in this emergency. It is a national, rather, an international, question that is involved. When the time comes to vote upon it I hope I may be able to support the league of nations; but when it is construed in connection with the treaty between all the signatories, which is to be a part of it, and which nobody as yet knows much about, I may not be able to support it; and if I am not, I shall make no apology to anybody. I shall do at the proper time what seems to me to be right under all the circumstances and under my oath of office as a Senator of the United States.

As I understand it, the league of nations and the peace treaty are to be one instrument and are to be construed together. We know what the league or nations is standing alone, but only the Almighty himself knows what the league of nations is going to be when the peace treaty has been finally agreed upon and has become a part of the league. I have heretofore not said anything about it because the proceedings in Paris are kaleidoscopic. They may mean one thing to-day and are entirely changed to-morrow. So until the league of nations and the treaty have been duly prepared and submitted to the Senate no Senator can tell conscientiously and truly what his duty ought to be to the American people under his oath of office. So I shall reserve my judgment, Mr. President, until I can intelligently conclude from the paper itself and all the evidence available what that judgment should be.

Desiring, as I do, to support a league of nations which will assist in bringing about peace, I do not propose to commit myself absolutely and unqualifiedly until the representatives at the peace congress have themselves agreed and until I see what the terms of the treaty of peace are to be.

Mr. President, I had hoped when this war ended and the armistice was signed we would hear no more charges of disloyalty by any Member of the Senate or by anyone else against the Members of this body who were undertaking conscientiously to discharge their duty. But a distinguished Senator has suggested that the printing of this paper is aiding in German propaganda. What nonsense! Some of the Senators here who have voted to have the alleged treaty printed took quite an active part in seeking to destroy militarism in the German Empire, and it comes in very poor grace, it seems to me, to have anybody say that because some of us who were active in participation in that matter are voting now to have this document, which is recognized as not official, printed, we are undertaking to put forth German propaganda.

The American people are an intelligent people, and I honestly believe that if our representatives to the peace conference had taken all of America into their confidence from the start they would have been aided rather than injured in their efforts to negotiate a league of nations and a peace treaty.

Personally I think it is very unfortunate that the discussion of this matter has fallen into and along political lines, but it has. There is no use to close our eyes to the fact that pretty generally the Republicans are in opposition to the treaty while Democrats, without knowing what is in it, are supporting it, probably as an administration measure. I am sorry, Mr. President, that I can not accept everything that comes to us as an administration measure, simply because it is an administration measure. I hope I may be able to support the league of nations and the treaty of peace, but I shall determine my duty for myself when the whole and completed document is submitted here. I think the American people ought not to consider it as a political or party measure. I do not so consider it. I believe there are many—and a majority of our people—who will not so consider it. I hope it will be considered in a broad, statesmanlike way, and that when we come to vote we will not be influenced by passion or prejudice, or by the thought of party or partisan advantage. That whether it emanated from Democratic or Republican sources will have no part with us in reaching a wise conclusion. Let it be said when the league and the treaty come to us and have been ratified or repudiated, as the case may be, the American people will feel and know that the Senate considered only the welfare of their country in reaching their verdict.

I felt it incumbent upon me to say this much, because I repudiate wholly the suggestion that those Senators who have voted to print this unofficial document are undertaking to aid in any German propaganda, or that they are parties in any way to any wrong, if there has been any wrong, that has been perpetrated in procuring the document now under consideration. The welfare of our country, the fate of nations and of civilization itself, may be involved in what we are now doing, and everything ought to be done with deliberation and with the deepest sense of responsibility.

Mr. BRANDEGEE obtained the floor.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I would like to suggest to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] that my observation is that the Senators who are most forward in making imputations that other Senators are instigated by German propaganda are the same Senators who when the United States was actually at war with Germany were the last ones to support active war measures. One of them in particular, I remember, introduced a resolution here placing an embargo upon shipments of ammunition to those great nations that were fighting Germany and that afterwards became our allies in this war. Those who attempted to favor Germany in this way are the ones who now are so forward in charging other Senators with being influenced by Germany.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must come in at this point. This is going beyond the rule.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. When I yielded, I supposed the Senator was going to ask a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I know; but the Chair is getting alarmed, whether anybody else is or not. I want to call attention to the rule.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I did not intend to yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will permit the Chair to read the rule, which is as follows:

> No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

Let us not go beyond the rule.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, may I make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from Washington, if I am not by yielding to lose the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is not criticizing anything that has gone, but you are just getting to a point where you are going to break the rule.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am not going to proceed any further along that line or go beyond that point. But I was just going to make a parliamentary inquiry, since the Chair's ruling evidently has reference to my remarks. I ask whether it is a violation of a rule of the Senate to call attention to the fact that a Senator had introduced a resolution to place an embargo upon the shipment of ammunition to those nations which afterwards became our allies?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is not criticizing anything that has gone so far this morning, but it has just got to the point where we are going to have a row, and I am going to stop it before it starts.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am very glad to stop at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut will proceed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I am glad the Chair called the attention of the Senate to the rule, although I do not think the Senate of the United States ought to require such a rule, because, being a body of gentlemen, Senators ought not to be reflecting upon each other's motives, and generally when they do they do not believe the charges themselves. I disagree with the Chair, however, when it suggests that nothing has happened this morning that the Chair could criticize, because I think when the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] stood up here and accused Members of the Senate of being pro-German and cooperating with our enemies, that is a violation of the rule. But I care nothing about it, because I know he does not mean it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I meant exactly what I said. I do not need the Senator to vindicate me.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator is crazier, then, than I thought he was.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I did not charge anybody with being pro-German. I did not use that term.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Whatever term the Senator used.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator permit me to ask a question?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I will.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Is it not a fact that Germany has used every effort to make the treaty public?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am not in the confidence of Germany and know nothing about it. The Senator from Nebraska can state. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The occupants of the galleries are not yet a part of the Senate and must be in order.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does not the Senator know that in Great Britain, in France, and in Italy there is a scrupulous observance of the promise that has been made not to give the treaty publicity, and that on the other hand Germany has not only given it the widest publicity possible in Germany, but has sent copies into neutral countries, and according to the press reports has even sent copies to Senators of the United States? When the Senate by a vote also declares that the treaty shall be made public, is it not doing exactly what the German Government is doing, and is it not doing exactly the opposite of what the nations associated with the United States are doing?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If the Senator had made those remarks in the form of a motion, I should move that it be subdivided into four parts.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. He did not make a motion; he asked a question.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. He asked four questions in one, and I shall endeavor to answer them seriatim, one at a time, in my own way.

First, I do not know anything about what the German Government has done with the treaty or why they have done it or whether they have had it published or not. I know nothing about what has been done in France or England with the treaty, or whether it was published there. I know nothing about the treaty except what I have seen in the newspapers. I am not in touch with the administration in reference to this matter. I have been trying to get some information, groping in the dark about it. The minute anyone comes forward with something we are confronted with a determined effort to suppress it, even though it purports to be information, although we have just directed the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to find out what we can about it. Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Not at all.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Ask it again.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does the Senator question the universal statement in the past that Germany has used every effort to make this treaty public, not only in Germany but in other parts of the world?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not question it, I do not deny it, and I do not admit it, for I know nothing about it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then if the Senate of the United States takes that same course, is not the majority of the United States Senate cooperating with Germany in trying to throw a monkey wrench into the machinery for the benefit of Germany?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am not familiar with monkey wrenches or with Germany. I do not know what the result of the action of the Senate of the United States may be. All I know is that the President of the United States has sent a cablegram to Mr. Tumulty, who appears to be the conduit through which the executive department now deals with the legislative branch, congratulating the Senator from Nebraska on his efforts to ascertain how these alleged copies of the treaty have escaped from the rules which the President laid down for their control. He wants to go to the bottom of it, and he says if there is any official English text that has escaped his eagle eye it has been obtained by improper methods. I do not know anything about that. I do not know whether this is an official English text or not. The Senator from Nebraska the other day stated what I read from page 694 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> Mr. HITCHCOCK. I can see no great moral boast in that—
>
> Speaking of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]—
>
> If he held the treaty in his hands he held stolen goods—goods probably secured by bribery.

I never have had the highest opinion of this administration, but never in my wildest fancies have I intimated that they could be bribed to give out a treaty. If there is any evidence of that, I hope the Senator from Nebraska will produce it before the committee which is investigating it.

Mr. President, what does this committee propose to do. I read from the resolution which the Senate passed:

> Particularly to ascertain and report to the Senate the names of the persons, corporations, or interests which have secured copies of said treaty, and from whom they were secured and by what method, and also to ascertain and report to the Senate in what manner and to what extent said interests are particularly interested in said treaty.

How can we perform that duty unless we have the treaty? We are instructed to find first who has it; second, what the interests of the parties are in the treaty. The Senator from Idaho promptly produced the treaty. It is the only one I know about. The Senators who clamored to investigate about the treaty promptly wanted it suppressed, when their own instructions are carried out without any effort on their part. The Senator from Nevada——

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. No; I do not yield. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] comes in here and berates the committee and berates the Senate because of this purported treaty which, if incorrect, can be denied in five minutes by the Secretary of State. He, the Secretary of State, says he has 35 originals down there; it would not take him very long to compare this with one of the 35 originals, and if this is not one of the originals he can say so, and nobody will be deceived.

The Senator from Nevada says this treaty should have been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations so that they could state whether or not it was authentic before it was printed. How can we tell whether or not it is authentic? How can you establish the authenticity of a paper which purports to be a copy of another paper unless you see that other paper and compare it? We are not allowed to see the other paper!

The Senator from Nevada says that the Committee on Foreign Relations this morning, as will be disclosed by the record when these hearings are published—the newspaper correspondents were there, and a stenographer was there—voted not to make the treaty public.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator is in error. I did not say "voted."

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator said it was the consensus of opinion, did he not?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes; I spoke of the manner in which it was obtained.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The record will show what the committee did. I am not so confident of my mental superiority over that of the Senator from Nevada as to set up my judgment against his or my recollection against his. The record will show it. My recollection of what was said and done was that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER], who was temporarily presiding over the committee, while we are indicting the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], our regular chairman, said, after we had passed the motion ordering the subpœnaing of certain persons and the production of certain papers, "the understanding of the Chair is that that includes the production by them of a copy of the treaty, if they have it." There was some informal discussion about that, and I said it did not seem to me to be necessary for them to produce their alleged copies of the treaty unless they wanted to do so, but if it became necessary at any time all we would have to do would be to issue an additional subpœna to them to bring the copies, if we wanted them. The question of making the treaty public was never mentioned in the committee.

Mr. PITTMAN. It was decided, was it not, not to include the treaty among the papers required to be produced under a subpœna duces tecum?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator rebuked me a minute ago by saying that it was decided. Nothing was decided.

Mr. PITTMAN. I say the chairman——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The consensus of opinion was that we should not include in the subpœna duces tecum any request for a copy of the treaty, as I understood it.

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes; that was the understanding.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. We are agreed about that; so there is no rebuke about that, and there is no variation between the conduct of the Senate this morning in ordering some other alleged copy of the treaty to be published in the RECORD and in the action of the committee in deciding not to summon some other copy of the treaty from some other source.

Mr. President, the committee having sent to us in what appears to be a bona fide and legitimate way the purported copy of the treaty, it is manifestly just as impossible for the Committee on Foreign Relations to pronounce upon its authenticity as it would be for any Senator on this floor to do so, unless we have the authentic copy to compare it with. The State Department is full of them, as I have stated.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understood the Senator from Connecticut to say "in what appeared to be an authentic and correct way." Would he mind explaining to the Senate how it appears that it is either authentic or correct?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. What I mean by that is, that from the statement of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] it appeared to me to be a bona fide and correct copy.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I heard nothing in the statement of the Senator from Idaho that even tended to show that it was

either authentic or correct. He merely stated that he had gotten it from a newspaper, I believe, or some other source.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator from Mississippi does not always hear what is said.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I do not.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am not attempting to quote the statement of the Senator from Idaho verbatim. It is in the RECORD; though not yet printed, the stenographers have it; but I understood him to say that this copy of the treaty was one procured by represenatives of the Chicago Tribune in Paris or elsewhere in Europe—whether it was in Paris or not I do not remember—and that it was brought to this country directly to the Tribune.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I heard that.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. And I understood the Senator from Massachusetts to say, either on the floor or in conversation, that he had no doubt about its authenticity, because it looked just like the one he had seen over in New York. They may be all forgeries for aught I know. If they are, Mr. Polk will know it at once, and he can denounce them as such.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They may be copies made by some person from some instrument which he thought was the treaty and which may have been the treaty; I do not know.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It may have been so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But to assert that this appears to be authentic and correct when there is no phenomenon and there are no phenomena to show its authenticity and correctness—it is the mental conclusion of the Senator from Idaho and the personal opinion of the Senator from Massachusetts—is drawing it pretty strong.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not ask the Senator from Mississippi to accept their opinions. All I say is that these copies turn up from time to time; that they look alike; that one page of them is printed in French and the other in English, and they appear to be off the same press. Of course, I have no doubt, Mr. President, that they were given out by the peace commission in Paris generally; I have no doubt many of them were brought to this country, and, I think, for perfectly legitimate purposes. I do not think there is any scandal about their being brought to this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If my friend will excuse me a moment—I very much dislike to interrupt the Senator when he is talking—the Senator knows that from old experience——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I know how miserable it makes the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But when the Senator says he has no doubt these documents were given out by the peace commission he undoubtedly does not mean that——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do mean it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Because the peace commission has said that it would not give them out. The President has entered into an agreement with France and England, through the committee of the peace commission, that they should not be given out. I suppose that the Senator means this: That perhaps some member of the peace commission or some official of the peace commission or some subordinate of the peace comission has given them out.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Now, the Senator has said what he supposes I mean and I will state what I do mean. I think I am the best judge of what I mean.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is the best judge of what he means; but I do not know whether or not he is the best judge of what the circumstances mean.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not pretend to be. I will let the Senator be the judge of that. What I mean is this: I know nothing about it whatever and have no information from headquarters, so I am compelled to grope in the dark——

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is simply what the Senator is doing.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Very likely. I am trying to get some light by having this alleged treaty printed, and I am using the best brains I have got to put myself in the other fellow's place over there and see what I should probably do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No man can use better brains than the Senator from Connecticut, even when he is groping in the dark.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. What I suppose happened was this: That in concocting this tremendous treaty, involving the financing of Europe by America, the peace commissioners had to consult with the fellows who controlled finances and financial interests in order to get the money to finance the people they wanted to help.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We know that, because they had a regular finance committee.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Now, then, I suppose that in order for these financial interests to say whether they would undertake this great burden and put up the money and take the bonds of these countries, they wanted to know what the treaty provision was by which they should do it; whether they would be provided for if they put up the money. I suppose so, though I do not know anything about it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That supposition is exactly just.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I think it was quite proper. I do not believe the President was going off in the dark to make a treaty out of his own head, without knowing whether the financial provisions of it could be carried out. I think probably copies of this treaty were given out—not published—but were handed by the peace commissioners or their agents to certain people for their perusal, and that they were not intended to be made public. That is my opinion; but it is a mere guess. The copies have, however, been given out very generally; and evidently the gentleman to whom they were given, being chosen by the President or his advisers with their usual judgment about the kind of men they would trust, being good judges of human nature, the copies got into the wrong hands; the recipients did not regard the confidence reposed in them, and copies of the treaty passed all around, I think, all over Europe, and in New York, too, and one of them turned up here in the hands of a newspaper man from Chicago. I do not know how he procured it over there. He may have bought it for 15 or 20 cents somewhere, or he may have found it there. Mr. Polk knows whether or not it is genuine, and will not have it in his hands five minutes before he will be able to give his expert opinion as Acting Secretary of State, having examined 35 more of them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If that be true, why did you not wait until Mr. Polk could tell you?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Because I did not have anything to do with it. The Senator from Idaho did, and I am not responsible for him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I see. I did not know that the Senator from Connecticut did not have anything to do with it. I thought that he had a heart-to-heart conference with the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. He told me he had it, and that is what I meant when the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] asked me in the committee this morning if I would name just one copy in this country, and I told him I would at 12 o'clock, because I knew that the Senator from Idaho was going to fish it right out here and hand it over.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And you were going to name at 12 o'clock what the Senator from Idaho stated he had?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. No; I was going to name the man whom I thought had one copy, and that was the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, I see——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am glad that the Senator does.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That the Senator from Idaho would have it at 12 o'clock?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. He would.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Connecticut did not refer, then, to the man who gave a copy to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I did not, because I did not know his name.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand the Senator now; and I really owe the Senator an apology, because I thought he was in the absolute confidence of the leader of the majority on the Republican side and also the leader of the minority party on the Republican side——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. And on the Democratic side.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And that he would know beforehand just what they were going to do. I knew that the Senator from Connecticut was the most reliable partisan in the United States in his party and perhaps in the United States of any party, except myself.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Well, the Senator and I never have had any serious differences.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought that they could rely upon the Senator from Connecticut and that perhaps he was consulted beforehand and knew something about it. I beg the Senator's pardon for thinking so.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator need not do so. I did know about it; I plead guilty to the impeachment.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. Possibly there is a difference of opinion between the Senator and myself on a certain subject. I think we are agreed on the method by which we determined that we should not bring this treaty before the committee. Do I understand the Senator to say that at that time there was no discussion as to the propriety of making the treaty public by bringing it before the committee?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I say I do not remember it; there may have been. My attention may have been diverted.

Mr. PITTMAN. I have a very distinct recollection that the propriety of it was discussed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not care whether it was or not, myself; but, if it pleases the Senator to have my opinion about it, I have given it to him.

Mr. President, I apologize to the Senate for having made any remarks at all on this question, because it is a post-mortem; the thing is done by a vote of the Senate of 2 to 1; it is in the RECORD; and all of this talking about whether or not it ought to have been done or whether two-thirds of the Senate ought to yield their notions of propriety to one-third is pure leather and prunella and amounts to nothing. So I apologize to the Senate and take my seat.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I seem to be one of those who offended the wisdom of the Foreign Relations Committee. I really believe that if I had known that the Foreign Relations Committee was opposed to printing this treaty it would have been a long time before I would have voted to print it; but there was no debate, and when questions come up suddenly all a Senator can do is to do that which seems to him to be right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The name of the Senator from Arizona is first on the roll call.

Mr. ASHURST. Yes; and it is just natural for me to do right, and I somehow do it without reflection. It seemed this way to me: The financial interests have, as they always do, obtained control of a few copies of the treaty and, thus knowing what bonds would be stabilized and what bonds would be not stabilized, began a system of flotation and speculation and gambling to the tune of millions of dollars, and, by the nine gods, what Wall Street is entitled to have the American people are entitled to have. That is my reason for having voted to make the treaty public. I have no excuse to offer here or elsewhere for that vote, and I would slap the face of a man outside of the Senate who challenged me for that vote.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, as a new Senator I should like the privilege of explaining my vote. I voted aye on the motion of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] on the assumption that the practice in this body was that no Senator would offer to have printed in the public RECORD a document which he did not think was of assistance to his associates in forming sound judgments on public questions or helpful in forming public opinion outside. Therefore I thought it was the courteous thing to do to vote in the affirmative and to assume that the motive of the mover was proper and in the public interest. If there is behind this motion any motive to humiliate or embarrass the representatives of the United States Government in Paris at the present time, I am not in sympathy with it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, originally I offered the resolution asking the Secretary of State to furnish the Senate a copy of this treaty, and, because I originally presented the resolution and have had little opportunity heretofore to state my reasons for it, just for an instant I beg you to bear with me.

The resolution was offered not upon any theory of interfering with any negotiations in Paris, not for the purpose of embarrassing any of the representatives of the United States, not from any partisan viewpoint at all; but it was offered upon the theory of government that ever I have had, and the theory of government that I ever shall have while I am in public office. It was offered because when a part of the people—a very small part of the people of the United States—had this treaty in their possession, all the people of the United States were entitled to have this treaty in their possession as well.

I was shocked, I was astounded, I was astonished when I found any opposition to that very simple resolution. The infamy in this matter is not in asking that all our people should have what Wall Street has, but the infamy in it is in endeavoring to keep secret from all the people of the United States what Wall Street has.

Mr. President, I am sick and tired, for one, of hearing statements about the German propaganda, "throwing monkey wrenches into the machinery," and the like. I have always known that the most recent convert is always the most vociferous, but when it is stated on the floor of the Senate that there was any design on the part of any man, so far as I am aware, on my part, least of all, "to throw monkey wrenches into the machinery" at Paris, or to interfere in any aspect with what was transpiring in the peace congress, such a statement is utterly without foundation, known by the man who made it to be utterly without foundation, and made in pretense and hypocrisy only, and in no other fashion, and for no other reason at all.

Mr. President, let us look for an instant at the facts in this case. Here is a treaty completed across the water, a treaty that has been handed to the enemy. That treaty has been given to the enemy, and that treaty having been given to the enemy, a synopsis has been given by our own agents unto our people. After that, the synopsis presumably being a synopsis that was accurate, the Secretary of State of the United States printed that synopsis and delivered it officially to various people who inquired for it. Then all neutral countries, we are informed, have complete copies of this particular treaty; and then it developed in the course of debate that there were copies of the treaty in this country and among certain individuals or gentlemen or financial interests, however you wish to term it, and being utilized by them.

All these are admitted facts; and from them what flows? If they are facts—and I take it that nobody here will deny that they are facts to-day—if you believe in democracy, if you think the American people yet are free, if you believe that the people of the United States yet want their liberty of expression and their freedom of action, when every country on earth has this treaty and when it is in the hands of financial men in New York City, if you believe in democracy and not in autocracy, upon what theory do you keep it from the rest of the people of the United States?

It is not a question of constitutional authority to act upon a treaty. It is not a question of diplomacy or of interfering with diplomatic action. It is not a question of fiduciary or confidential relation at all. It is not a question, indeed, of in any way or in any fashion interfering with those who are acting for us at Paris to-day. It is simply in the higher obligation and duty we owe—our obligation and duty in its last analysis—to the people of the United States of America. Shall we give to all of the people of the United States of America what a few of them have obtained in one manner or another, I care not what, but what the very few have obtained and what is in their possession to-day?

I regret that the President felt that he could not give out the treaty; but that ends the discussion so far as he is concerned. I question not him or his motives at all. That is not the point; but in a free Government like ours, when we know that the treaty is in the hands of men in Wall Street, upon what theory do you justify yourselves to your people of America in saying that they shall not have the same privilege? And, Mr. President, as to the question of the right to have this document, the right exists exactly as if any other document were at stake, any other matter that had been given out in part, and all of which we desired.

When this administration gave out to the people of the United States a synopsis, the administration committed all the heinous sins that have been described by the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber. If this treaty were to be kept secret, if it were not to be delivered unto our people at all, if it were a matter of such transcendent importance that no man on earth should know of it except "the big four" who sit over in Paris marking out the boundaries of the world—if it were of that character, then, of course, it could have been retained in secrecy by them, and the confidential and fiduciary relation might have attached, and there might have been some sort of foundation for the argument that is made here.

But when this administration gave out to the people of America what purported to be an honest synopsis of the treaty this administration itself relieved us and itself of any confidential or any fiduciary relation, and gave at that very time the right to the American people to the entire and to the whole document. They gave us a synopsis, presumably to give us accurate and honest information. If they gave us an honest synopsis, then, Mr. President, there can be no harm in seeing the document itself. If they gave us a dishonest synopsis, then we, as men representing here the American people, ought to get the document itself and learn exactly what it is. But when they gave out the information, at that very moment they gave us the right of inquiry and the right to the particular matter from which it emanated, of which they said it was a correct part.

I admire the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] for his declaration to-day. To-day the reason this treaty ought to be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in a nutshell he has stated. The reason is because finally, in the minds of some men here, the paramount obligation that we owe is to the people of the United States; and when a few of the people of the United States have the treaty, all the people of the United States are entitled to it and to every part of it.

Mr. BECKHAM and Mr. HITCHCOCK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of Montana in the chair). The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BECKHAM. Mr. President, I was not in the Senate Chamber until at the close of the roll call on the motion in reference to the publication of this treaty, or purported treaty, in the RECORD. When I came in there had been, as I understand, no discussion of it, and I voted under a misapprehension. I was

under the impression, from some information, that possibly the treaty had been published in this country and that there was no objection to its being published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But I have listened very attentively to the discussion of this matter since the vote was taken, and I believe that in the light of what has taken place in the Foreign Relations Committee and the investigation which it is about to make we make a mistake, we lower the dignity of the Senate, in undertaking to publish without delay what is alleged to be the treaty framed there in Paris. I think it is a reflection not only upon our delegates to that conference, but upon all of the conferees. I think, too, that we should at least wait a reasonable time, until we can hear from the President in response to the resolution which recently passed the Senate, calling upon him for a copy of the treaty. We might publish this, and in the course of a short while we might find out that a different document is the real treaty. If it is going to be published in the newspapers so soon, the people will see it. But I do not believe, after what I have listened to this morning, that it is wise or proper that the Senate should by this motion insist upon the publication of this so-called treaty; and I shall, therefore, enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which that motion was adopted.

Mr. POINDEXTER. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LODGE. I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I made a motion to lay on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. LODGE. The Chair will not allow me to make the motion?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the only virtue in the argument of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and in the remarks by him, lies in the suggestion that what Wall Street has secured the rest of the country should have. I agree to that general proposition; but the newspapers of the country are attending to that. One great paper in New York, the Times, and another one in Chicago, the Tribune, have already begun, and will undoubtedly at once complete, the publication of this treaty. It is going to the public. It has already, indeed, become public. There remains nothing that the Senate can do to add materially to its publicity. The publication in the RECORD is an insignificant affair; but the very gravamen of the charge against the Senate of the United States is that it is officially proposing to do exactly what the German Government has done, and that is the charge I make. The Senate of the United States is in the attitude of deserting the Governments with which this Government has been associated in this war and in this negotiation. The Senate of the United States is in the attitude of officially perpetrating a breach of the agreement made by the President of the United States with the other Nations with which we have been associated in this war. The Senate of the United States is putting itself in the attitude of a Bolshevik organization, running amuck here in the treaty negotiations. That is what the Senate of the United States is doing by authorizing an official publication of what purports to be the treaty.

As a matter of fact, we know that it is not the treaty. We know that it was the copy originally agreed upon by the victorious nations as a demand presented to Germany. We know that for several weeks the German representatives have been resisting that demand, and that already they have secured some modifications of that demand—modifications which have been agreed to. We know that other modifications are under consideration; and yet the Senate of the United States proposes, by an official publication, to give out to the world what Germany has given out, and what Germany wants to give out.

Mr. President, this treaty, when it is read by all the people in the United States, is not going to change their view. It is largely a matter in which the American Republic has no interest. The dispute over there between our Government—the United States—Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan on one side and Germany on the other relates very largely to the relations between Germany and France. We are not directly concerned in them; and the reason for suppression, the reason for keeping the tentative treaty secret at the time, until Germany had acted, was for the purpose of promoting the signing of the treaty. The reason that Germany sought to give publicity to it was for the purpose of making trouble in France, and trouble in Great Britain, and trouble in the near-by countries when the negotiators made concessions to the German demands. Germany had every interest in doing what the representatives of Great Britain, France, the United States, Italy, and Japan agreed not to do. Germany was interested in publicity. Our representatives and those of the other friendly countries were interested in keeping their agreement to themselves until Germany had acted.

The Senate of the United States can go on record in conflict with the President; but when it goes on record in conflict with the President it goes on record in conflict with the other nations associated with the United States. It goes on record as being in concurrence with Germany. It goes on record as practically running amuck in the peace negotiations over there. It goes on record as aiding Germany in the contention she is making. Now, the Senate can do that. It virtually has done it. I do not myself think it is going to be a matter of such tremendous importance, because sufficient time has already elapsed until it may almost be said that the treaty is ready for final signing. I think an exaggerated importance has been given to the objection to publicity. The suggestion was made by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] that what Wall Street knew the rest of the people of the United States have a right to know. They have, and they are going to get it through the newspapers, where they generally get their information; but the Senate of the United States is going to put itself on record before the world as doing the very thing that Germany wants done. The Senate of the United States, as a part of the Government of the United States, is going on record as being in disagreement with its friends in the late war and in concurrence with its enemy in the late war.

Now, the Senate can do that. Maybe the Senators will feel entirely happy over doing that; but what motive is there for doing it? There will be no publicity gained by doing it. Publicity is already secured—secured by newspapers that are in the business of making things public, regardless of consequences.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] never seems to be capable of understanding the facts connected with the synopsis of the treaty that was published. He seems to be utterly incapable, after all that has been laid before him, of appreciating the fact that the synopsis was given out by all of the nations associated with the United States in this war; that it was given out in Great Britain, it was given out in France, it was given out in Italy, as well as in the United States. He has assumed that it was only given out for the purpose of fooling the American people, but it was given out because the nations associated with us agreed with us that some statement should be made to the world—not to the United States alone, but to the world—of the things proper to be published as the general outline of the treaty.

That synopsis did not include everything. It did not include some of these delicate questions between France and Germany. What do we care whether they are in there or not? To put them in there and to make them public, to make them a subject of public agitation in the condition of Europe now, which borders on lawlessness, which threatens revolution, would have endangered the treaty; and yet the Senator seems to be possessed of the idea that it was an attempt to suppress information from the American people while it was given to the rest of the world.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. What was it intended for?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It was intended to give to the people of the world an outline of the general terms of the treaty.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Thereby giving them an honest outline?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. An honest outline so far as it went.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Then your secrecy was ended when you gave them the synopsis of the treaty.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There was a great deal more publicity given this treaty than ever occurred in the whole history of the world before.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am not questioning that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is the first instance in history in which an attempt has been made to give to the world information about a treaty not yet finished.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. But when you gave the information, then you gave the treaty, and then all of the stuff that you talked about this treaty and its secrecy was at an end. Otherwise you should not have given out the synopsis.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, Mr. President, I do not suppose the Senator from California ever will understand the thing. He seems to be determined not to understand it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. He probably has a "pygmy mind."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, of course I do not understand it as the Senator from Nebraska understands it; and thank God I do not understand it as the Senator from Nebraska understands it!

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from California has repeatedly asserted, here in the Senate and down in the committee, and, I believe, also in interviews, that this was given out for the purpose of deceiving the American public.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Oh, no; now, Mr. President——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. He has never seemed to appreciate the fact——

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will yield in a moment—that this was a document given out——

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want to correct a misstatement.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, the Senator can correct it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No such statement was made by the Senator from California, and I trust that the Senator from Nebraska, with that peculiar acumen and mental analysis which he possesses, will refrain from making a misstatement of that sort.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The stenographic report of the proceedings of the committee this morning will show that in his language before the committee the Senator from California repeated what I have heard him say elsewhere, which clearly implied that the synopsis given out was for the American people. He did not seem to know that it was given to Great Britain. He did not seem to know that it was given to France. He did not seem to know that it was given to all of the associated nations for the purpose of giving to the world all about this treaty that those who were negotiating thought it proper to announce to the world at that time. He has always made a point, here and elsewhere, of assuming that it was some imposition upon the American people and that they were being treated differently from the people elsewhere in the world.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. When the people of America——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from California desist for a moment until the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business? It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 120) to repeal chapter 154 of the act of the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, being the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I rise just long enough to ask whether it is the desire of those who are engaged in this debate to continue the discussion? The unfinished business I would be very glad to take up, but I realize that if once taken up the debate can continue upon this subject that has been before us in the earlier hours of the day.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think it will not be necessary to lay aside the unfinished business. The Senator from Kentucky has entered his motion for a reconsideration, and that will go over until another day.

Mr. LODGE. No; Mr. President, I shall be forced to move to lay aside the unfinished business, because I propose to have a vote on the motion to reconsider. I do not propose to have the voice of the Senate and the American people smothered here to-day if I can help it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That discussion I will leave to the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Massachusetts. I only express my——

Mr. CUMMINS. I have no——

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska will state it.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to inquire whether there is not a motion pending to lay the motion of the Senator from Kentucky on the table?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator from Nebraska that there was such a motion pending at the hour of 2 o'clock, but it was displaced by the unfinished business.

Mr. NORRIS. The motion is not debatable. Why does not the Chair put the question on the motion?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There has been no motion to lay on the table.

Mr. LODGE. I made the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will be very glad to be advised, but the Chair is of the opinion that there is no motion pending to lay on the table.

Mr. LODGE. No; it was not received.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending motion was the motion of the Senator from Kentucky to reconsider the vote by which the treaty was ordered to be printed.

Mr. NORRIS. Then the Chair wants to change his answer to the parliamentary inquiry I made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Nebraska to inquire whether a motion to reconsider was not made.

Mr. NORRIS. No; my inquiry was whether there was not a motion pending to lay the motion of the Senator from Kentucky on the table, and whether that motion is debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair answers that there was not.

Mr. SWANSON. I understand that the unfinished business comes up, and the only way that can be displaced is by a motion to take up something else, and that motion is debatable. If the Senator from Massachusetts wants to move to displace the unfinished business and take up something else he is privileged to do so.

Mr. LODGE. I am going to do so.

Mr. SWANSON. Then if the Senator moves to take up something else that motion is debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor at the present time. He yielded to the Senator from Iowa. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire to say that if it is the pleasure of the Members on both sides of the Chamber to continue at the present time the consideration of the subject which has been up this morning I intend to ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. I do not want that measure to lose its place as the unfinished business.

Mr. SWANSON. I object to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There has been no request made yet, the Chair will advise the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. CUMMINS. In order to bring the matter to a point, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. SWANSON. I object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate now proceed to consider——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] has the floor.

Mr. CUMMINS. He is now discussing the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor and will proceed.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, we seem to have a good deal of unfinished business before the Senate, rather more than usual at this time.

I do not know how the leaders on the other side of this Chamber are going to justify before an intelligent American public the attitude which they are now taking. I understand that they are moved partly by political considerations and partly by personal considerations to start a warfare on the President of the United States; that they propose to do whatever they can do to discredit him in the work in which he is engaged in Paris. I shall be interested in seeing what the outcome will be and what verdict the American people will render on the motley leadership to be seen on the other side of the Chamber, all designed, however, for the same purpose. One Republican leadership declares, as their associates have heretofore declared, that they believe in a league of nations, but they propose to have their own amendments adopted to this treaty, even though it results in destroying the chance of any league of nations at all. Those Senators know very well that there is only one league of nations before the world to-day. They know very well that all preconceived notions, all special hobbies, all particular theories are now at last, after months of labor, merged into this particular league. They know, or they ought to know, because the people of the United States know, that if this league is defeated there will be no league at all. They ought to know that if they carry out their purpose to amend this treaty they will prolong the condition of war, they will delay the settlement of peace, they will keep capital on the anxious seat, and they will keep labor in unemployment. And yet those Senators, whose real purpose it is to defeat the league, stand before the country

at the head of the leading faction of the Republican Party in the Senate and declare that they propose to amend the treaty, no matter even though those results follow.

The other leadership of the Republican Party—that represented by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]—has at least the virtue of candor and courage. It holds forth no pretense to the country that it favors a league. It stands boldly by the proposition that the United States should hold aloof from any association of nations with the design of preserving the peace of the world. Under the leadership of the Senator from Idaho those Republicans go before the country, or propose to go before the country, and, if necessary, they propose to organize a party on the theory that the United States may remain a hermit among the nations; that the United States may be sufficient unto itself; and that the United States has no interest in what happens throughout the rest of the world. They propose to say to the American people the old order of things must be renewed; this peace is only a truce; the old order of war in the world is to remain; every nation must prepare for war in the future as in the past; the idea of international peace and international justice is an iridescent dream. They propose to say to the American people, "You must prepare for enormous appropriations for war; you must prepare for a great Navy and a great Army, because future wars will come." At least they are candid, at least they are sincere, at least they are courageous. With that brand of Republican leadership I can have no sympathy, but for it I can at least have respect. That position means something; and that leadership of the Senator from Idaho is a leadership which can be understood; it is a leadership that can be defended; it is a leadership that can be vindicated, although it is going to be rejected promptly by the American people.

But that other leadership—the leadership which is seeking in covert ways to cripple the negotiations in Paris, which is seeking in covert ways to introduce amendments to this league which will destroy it—is something which can not be defended before the American people. Men can not long in insincerity and in pretense make any case before the American people.

Mr. President, I am not going to discuss the league of nations here to-day, but I shall watch with a good deal of interest to see which leadership in the Republican Party is going to be accepted by the rank and file of the party. There are, fortunately, Republicans who take a still different position. There are Republicans who, while they do not entirely approve every article in this league of nations, yet propose to support it. They think they could draw a better league constitution, but at the same time they recognize that the issue is this league or none. They know that the issue before the American people is whether we shall have war on the future program or whether we shall assist in organizing the world for peace. Those Republicans may stand here in the Senate without recognized leadership, but I believe there are enough of them to defeat any effort to kill this league by amendment. They will stand as the representatives of the great rank and file of Republicans generally who welcome this united effort of 14 nations of the world to organize the world for future peace.

I shall watch the dubious struggle with interest, but I tell you, Senators, the Republican Party has reached the parting of the ways. You can not stand before the American people as the pretended advocates of a league of nations at the same time that you slaughter the only possible league of nations to be had. Neither can you induce the American people to follow you if you take the position that there shall be no league of nations whatever. The American people want to join the movement of the world for the purpose of organizing for international peace. They may criticize the President for the methods that he has adopted, they may criticize the President for some things that he has done, but the American people, when he brings back that league as a part of this peace treaty, are going to be in favor of adopting it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If they will be in favor of adopting it, why does the Senator object to printing it so that they can read it?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The league of nations has been printed, as the Senator from Washington very well knows. It has been officially printed and is before the country, and it is really almost the only part of the treaty in which the United States is interested.

Mr. POINDEXTER. But, Mr. President, it has not been printed in connection with the document of which it constitutes a part.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; it has not been printed in connection with something else.

Mr. POINDEXTER. There is no possibility of understanding its full import——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am talking now about the league of nations, and I am not objecting to the publicity that is given to this treaty.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not agree with the Senator, if he will permit me, in the statement that we have no concern in the adjustment of the terms of peace in Europe. I think we have some concern, but I think that Europe has more concern in it than we have. If the Senator thinks we have no concern in it, he ought to advise the President of the United States not to spend his entire time dictating the terms of peace.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. May I ask the Senator from Nebraska a question?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I shall be glad to answer it.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator has upon very many occasions recently talked about leaders and leadership in his rather futile attempt to classify the Senators upon this side of the Chamber. Does he recognize or does he not recognize that the Senators upon this side of the Chamber will do exactly what each of them thinks he ought to do and vote as he thinks he ought to vote? Does he assume that they will be sincere or does he assume that they are insincere? I would like to know, in view of the remarks of the Senator, whether he grants to Members on this side of the Chamber any honesty whatever either of purpose or in conduct?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am very willing to grant it to the Senator from Iowa to the fullest degree. I have not a doubt that he will continue the uniform record which he has made as a public servant in many years of valuable public service and do exactly what he believes to be right. I am not referring to him individually, I will say, but I will also say that it is evident there is a settled purpose in the leadership upon the opposite side of the Chamber to embarrass the President of the United States. There is evidently a settled purpose here to attempt to make a political issue out of the league of nations. If it fails it will only be because the Senators find that the American people are not going to follow their leadership. It will only be because they realize that they are going to split their own party by doing it. When I say "they" I do not mean every Senator. I mean the controlling interests over on the Republican side which filled the Committee on Foreign Relations with Senators practically pledged to oppose the league of nations and practically pledged to bring an amendment out of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Do Senators think I have not talked with Republicans? I know Republicans on the other side of this Chamber who feel just as I feel, indignant that agreement with the leaders on the treaty should have been made a test to decide whether a Senator should go on the Foreign Relations Committee or not. I am not the only indignant one. There are Republican Senators on the other side of this Chamber, and a number of them, indignant that their personal views on the league of nations should have been inquired into, and it should have been made necessary for them to pledge themselves on an issue which should be decided upon its merits and not on political considerations.

Mr. FALL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FALL. In filling the vacancies on the Democratic side it was not necessary to make inquiries or ascertain how any Democrat would vote, I presume?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There were no vacancies on the Democratic side.

Mr. FALL. In cutting off those who were left off and in seeking to put others on, may I ask the Senator what policy was suggested?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There was no policy. Simply those lacking in seniority were dropped off. There was no such condition that I know of; no question of that sort raised.

Mr. FALL. The Senator did seek to have another member on the committee, did he not?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from New Mexico knows the reason. It was because one Senator had been dropped off of both the big committees that he had been on.

Mr. CUMMINS. May I ask the Senator from Nebraska another question? The Senator evidently believes there is great discord upon the Republican side with regard to this subject and unanimity upon the Democratic side.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Not entire unanimity.

Mr. CUMMINS. But great unanimity?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There is great unanimity among the American people.

Mr. CUMMINS. There is more unanimity among the Senators upon the Democratic side than among those on this side of the Chamber?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have made no such statement.

Mr. CUMMINS. Why is there great unanimity upon the Democratic side and great discord upon the Republican side? Does that indicate greater independence or less independence upon the Democratic side?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not know that I am prepared to answer that question. The Republican Party has been split in prior times into several parts on great issues. It was split upon the tariff issue. The Senator from Iowa was the distinguished leader of what was then called the minority of the Republican Party. But, as a matter of fact, at the present time the purpose of the recognized dominant Republican leadership on that side of the Chamber is to kill the league of nations, if possible, and to kill it by indirection. I say that I have much more admiration for the courage and real leadership of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], who stands out and admits he is against the league of nations; that he wants the world organized for war; that he wants to make war; that he wants the United States to refuse to join any international movement for the preservation of peace. That is real leadership. That makes an issue. That is not the leadership I am complaining of here, which seeks to avoid what is the real question in the public mind. The question in the public mind to-day and the question that is agitating the people is whether we are going to organize the world for peace. We can only organize it for peace by accepting this treaty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, unlike the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and unlike the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], I do not view this as a party question. The Senator from Massachusetts has already indicated that he did view it as a party question by issuing a pronunciamento to his followers upon two different occasions to wait until they could hear further from some indefinite source, supposed to be a Republican caucus. The Senator from Idaho has indicated his view that this ought to be a party question by contending that the Republican Party ought to throw itself as a party into the breach against the covenant of peace. If I am wrong about either one of these statements, I should like to be corrected right now while I am on my feet. [A pause.]

Mr. President, there was a time in the history of the United States prior to this when a great President of the United States, who had been also a great southerner and leader of the armies of the Colonies in their revolt against Great Britain, had a history written of him by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. The Senator from Massachusetts is uniformly accorded the praise of being a very learned and very scholarly man, and what he says and what he quotes is to be received with due accord by lesser men. I am sorry to see the Senator from Massachusetts, after a conversation with the Senator from Idaho—apparently an intense conversation—has disappeared from the Chamber.

At this previous period Gen. George Washington, of the Revolution, and President George Washington, of Virginia and of the American Union, has this said about him by the Senator from Massachusetts. I am quoting from volume 2 of the Life of George Washington, by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]:

> In fact, his general view of the opposition was marked by that perfect clearness which was characteristic of all his opinions when he had fully formed them. In July, 1793, he wrote to Henry Lee,

These are the words of Washington which I am about to quote:

> That there are in this as well as in all other countries discontented characters, I well know.

Of course, George had no regard for the Bolsheviki or the Irish-American vote or the German-American vote, but with his usual foresight he foresaw things of their ilk.

> That there are in this as well as in all other countries discontented characters, I well know; as also that these characters are actuated by very different views; some good, from an opinion that the general measures of the Government are impure; some bad, and, if I might be allowed to use so harsh an expression, *diabolical*—

Think of that adjective coming from the serene Father of his County; diabolic! It sounds like the Wilsonphobia of to-day—

> inasmuch as they are not only meant to impede the measures of the Government generally, but more especially as a great means toward the accomplishment of it, *to destroy the confidence which it is necessary for the people to place*, until they have unequivocal proof of demerit, in their public servants.

Mr. President, if Gen. George Washington, afterwards President, had had in immediate contemplation the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Idaho, he could not better have expressed himself when describing their conduct toward and their words about the present Chief Magistrate, to wit:

> Not only meant to impede the measures of the Government generally, but more especially as a great means toward the accomplishment of it, to destroy the confidence which it is necessary for the people to place, until they have unequivocal proof of demerit, in their public servants.

What are these men, united only on this issue, trying to do? "Not only to impede the measures of the Government generally," because the Government in matters of negotiation of treaties is constituted of the Executive, but more especially, to quote the language of George Washington:

> As a great means toward the accomplishment of it, to destroy the confidence which it is necessary for the people to place, until they have unequivocal proof of demerit, in their public servants.

The present Chief Magistrate of the United States is Woodrow Wilson, elected by the people, in whom sovereignty dwells. These men have been engaged for days and weeks and months in trying to destroy the confidence the American people ought to have in him as their representative. Without waiting until they have "unequivocal proof of demerit," to quote the language of George Washington, they and their foolish followers have been nagging, have been bedeviling, have been on the outside taking advantage of every little uncrossed "t" or undotted "i," or a "q" not followed by a "u," in order to arouse distrust of our representative in Europe—our representative, whether we are Republicans or not; my representative, our representative; the representative of all of us, elected by us to bear our standard abroad. Where did you get your authority to represent the American people in matters of negotiation—from the State of Idaho? Not a bit. She never had any. If you had been from the old State of Virginia, I could have told you that even she never had any. No State in this Union ever had any control of any foreign relations. No Senator or ambassador from a State ever had any. You have full power to make or to amend or to modify a treaty, but you have no power to negotiate one at all.

I will not enter again into the wearisome business of quoting the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], former Senator Spooner, President Taft, and George Washington upon that question. That is too clearly settled for dispute by any man with the intelligence of a Bronx Hill goat, who recognizes no higher ambition in life than eating a tin can.

What is your right to interfere with the negotiation of a treaty? Whence proceeds it? From your State and from the Nation or from the Constitution? It proceeds from no whence. Of course, you have the general right of an American citizen to express your views; that is a different proposition; but you force upon the Senate now, with a partisan majority and with a few men on this side of the Chamber who are seeking reelection and think it is popular, an official utterance of the Senate of the United States as a body interfering with the negotiation powers of the President. But I believe I will go on and quote the balance of what George Washington had to say. George Washington continued:

> In this right I consider myself whilst I am an occupant of office, and if they were to go further and call me their slave during this period, I would not dispute the point.

Friends, do you appreciate the full pathos of that? That comes from George Washington.

> If they were to go further and call me their slave during this period, I would not dispute the point.

It is the habit of Senators and Presidents to call themselves public "servants," but George Washington is the only one of us who ever consented to be called a public slave, and he did it out of intellectual humility and the great magnanimity and modesty that made up the greatness of the man. I do not do it; you do not do it. I am not the slave of Mississippi; I am not the slave of the American people; I am not the slave of American public opinion. I am its servant—its hired servant, if you will—with the right to quit the job whenever I get ready. But such was the pathos of the situation presented to George Washington under circumstances like those which now face Mr. Wilson that he confesses himself a public slave.

> If they were to go further and call me their slave during this period, I would not dispute the point.

He further says:

> But in what will this abuse terminate?

What is the abuse to which he refers? It is the abuse of the interference of other people with the constitutional right of the Executive to negotiate with foreign countries. He further says:

> For I have a consolation within me that no earthly effort can deprive me of, and that is that neither ambition nor interested motives have influenced my conduct.

Will the Senator from Idaho say, will the Senator from Massachusetts, who has retired from the Chamber, say that either "ambition or interested motives" have influenced Woodrow Wilson's conduct? Will they dare face the American people with that assertion? Will the two wings of the Republican Party coalesce with that assertion? They dare not; and

neither one of them dares by itself to make it. George Washington goes on further:

The arrows of malevolence, therefore, however barbed and well pointed—

Are there any two men in the Senate that are more capable of better "barbing and well pointing an arrow" than the leader of the majority of the Republican side and the leader of the minority upon that side—both probably candidates for the Presidency?

The arrows of malevolence, therefore, however barbed and well pointed, never can reach the most vulnerable part of me, though whilst I am up as a mark they will be continually aimed.

So much for George Washington.

Now I come to the lesser light—the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. Perhaps I ought to apologize for saying "the lesser light," because when he undertook to write a biography of George Washington, in a great number of particulars he made himself the greater light. He was descended from the Cabots and Lodges and the old Federalists in Massachusetts; and their chief aim in life was to keep the Irish from getting control in Massachusetts when they began to come in there very early, which heredity was very much at variance, by the way, with the vote he cast here the other day. But the Senator—the lesser light—says of George Washington:

He was not much given, however, to talking about his assailants.

That is Woodrow Wilson again, is it not? He did become human once when he defied that infernal Irish-American in New York and told him that "he knew more about disloyal votes in America than he himself did." He became human again when he refused to receive a leader of the Irish-Americans who called on him to give him instruction and advice, and who previously had by language insulted him. I wish he would become human oftener. I like for a man to become human every now and then and lose his temper.

Thomas Jefferson said of George Washington that he was very human after all; that now and then he got into a towering passion, and somebody said about him that upon the field of Germantown he "swore like an angel of the Lord." A man ought now and then to swear like an angel of the Lord. My only quarrel with Woodrow Wilson is that he does not do it oftener, better, and more strongly and more virulently, especially when he represents the American people and his opponents represent all of the hyphenates in America—all of the enemy hyphenates in America.

You have not yet introduced any resolution against Japan providing for the independence of Korea, lately conquered and very much oppressed. Why? Because you know Great Britain will be good humored with you and Japan will not be, and because there are a lot of Irish-American votes in America, and there are no Korean votes in America. That is the honest God's truth about you. But to go on with "the lesser light." LODGE says of George Washington:

He was not much given, however, to talking about his assailants. If he said anything, it was usually in the way of contemptuous sarcasm, as when he wrote to Morris: "The affairs of this country can not go amiss. There are so many watchful guardians of them and such infallible guides that one is at no loss for a director at every turn."

Oh, they come from Massachusetts—these infallible guides—they come from Idaho; they come from Missouri; they come from all around the country, as you know. They are such "infallible guides" that "one is at no loss for a director at every turn." One may be at a bit of a loss about following the directions if he is a good American, an unhyphenated patriot, and devoted to his own country, without any regard to a "fatherland" in Europe—if he is just an American and nothing more, and spews out hyphens.

Washington continues:

But of these matters I shall say little.

That is the end of the quotation from Washington. Then says "the lesser light"—and I apologize for the phrase:

If these attacks had any effect on him, it was only to make him more determined in carrying out his purposes.

I guess that is what you mean when you say Wilson has got a "stiff, long lower jaw," that he is "stubborn" and does not listen to what you are saying. Who else is listening to it? Do you imagine France is listening to it? Do you imagine Great Britain is listening to it? Do you imagine Italy is listening to it? Germany is listening to it, and Germany is making the most out of it that she can, with the hope of getting better terms—poor, foolish Germany, catching at straws.

Mr. President, there is not a great deal of much importance connected with what I have just read, except the fact that it comes from the Senator from Massachusetts. If the Senator from Idaho had been a great scholar and had written a great many books of one sort or another, I expect perhaps I would have found something from him to quote. I have served with the Senator from Idaho for a long time, and have very high regard for him; in fact, personally, I am very fond of him.

I do not want to put myself in the attitude of a preacher and of reading him a lecture. God knows I have got no right to take that attitude toward any human being on the face of the earth; but I would in a friendly way counsel him to consider more the atmosphere of the world and the atmosphere of the United States and a little bit less the atmosphere of the Washington Post and Washington Republican bosses and of the Senate Chamber.

Sometime ago the Senator from Idaho said that ex-President of the United States Taft was a sort of walking corpse. Taft came back in his inimitable, good-natured way and said "yes"; he recognized that, but he was trying to keep from having more walking corpses on the surface of the earth. I would advise the Senator from Idaho that, if his real ambition is to be President of the United States, he had better study the opinion of the people of the United States and not the opinion merely of the partisan majority of the Senate of the United States at this time. Even that will change before the vote is cast, because the people will by then be heard from, and even Senators are just politicians.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Mississippi would not want me to take the advice of ex-President Taft as to how to become President, would he?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, the advice of the ex-President as to how to become President would be very bad advice; but the advice or the example of the Senator from Idaho as to how to be the next President would be infinitely worse advice.

Now, Mr. President, I ask to have inserted as a part of my remarks an editorial from the St. Louis Daily Globe-Democrat of Sunday morning, May 18, entitled "America and article 10."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

AMERICA AND ARTICLE 10.

The one provision on which such American opposition to the covenant of the league of nations as now remains is based is that of article 10. This article reads as follows:

"The members of the league undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression the council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled."

It is claimed by some that this provision will increase rather than diminish the probability of war, that it will draw us into war against our will and judgment, and that it will prevent the extension of national boundaries.

If this or any other provision of the covenant would increase war, it is safe to say that no nation and few individuals would favor it—not now, at any rate, after the experience of the last four years. But the sole purpose of the league of nations is to prevent war, or, at least, to diminish it as far as is humanly possible, and this section is considered necessary to the achievement of that purpose. Many amendments were made to the covenant as a result of American opposition, but article 10, although special stress was laid upon it by the opposition, was not touched. No concession was made to the demands of American critics as to this section, because it was considered vital to the existence of the league and therefore vital to the attainment of its design, the prevention of war. Why is it considered vital? Because any association of nations to promote peace and who intend, as a means to that end, to reduce their armament, their war power, must have some assurance of mutual protection. If they voluntarily weaken their defenses there must be some understanding among them to prevent such weakening from imperiling any of their number. The situation of the United States and Great Britain is such that they could probably take care of themselves under any circumstances, but this is true of no others. If, on the other hand, they have such pledges of support, then they can feel that their safety is relatively insured and their stability established, and they can enter upon an era of peace unfearing any outward aggression. No nation having any reason to fear an enemy, actual or possible, and there are now few that do not, will pledge itself to disarmament and avoidance of war unless some substitute is provided of a protective nature. The continental nations of Europe have always had that fear constantly before them, and no league of peace involving disarmament is possible that does not remove that fear, at least to a large extent, for these nations simply will not enter one without some such security as is offered by article 10. We, 3,000 miles from any enemy that might endanger us, can say we do not need it, and perhaps we do not, but it is essential to them and to the organization of any effective league of peace. That is why article 10 has not been changed. France in particular must look upon it as her chief safeguard if her desire for a special treaty is not attained.

But is this section likely to draw us into war? Consider first the purpose of this covenant—the promotion of peace by the prevention of war. Is war to be prevented by increasing the risk of it? The nations of Europe are more deeply concerned in the prevention of war than we are. They know more about it, have had a longer experience with its horrors. They know, too well, also, that a small spark is likely to kindle a great conflagration. They do not want war to start. Is it at all reasonable to assume then, that these nations are willing to approve an agreement that will promote war? If this section would draw us into war it would draw them in much more quickly and involve them much more seriously if it were in Europe. If this were probable is it imaginable that the high representatives of these nations would not only approve of this article but insist upon its retention? These men we may presume represent the highest qualities of intelligence, patriotism, and statesmanship in their respective countries. To charge them with favoring an agreement that would increase the risk of war is to charge them with an imbecility worse than treason to their people.

No; the purpose of this article, as of the whole covenant, is to prevent war. If there had been such an agreement in existence in 1914 there would have been no war. Germany would not have dared to begin a war with the knowledge that all the other nations, and particularly the United States and Great Britain, were leagued against her in such a purpose. There was much of madness in the conduct of Germany, but Germany was not that mad. If Germany, with all her power, the greatest war power ever developed by any people, would not have dared this, what nation would dare? Where is the country within the league or out of it that would engage in war against a member of the league with such an overwhelming force potentially against it? The mere moral power of this agreement is quite sufficient to deter any nation from war without first complying with the procedure of arbitration or conciliation required in this covenant.

Article 10 is the basic section of the association of nations, the preliminary assurance of mutual support against external aggression threatening territorial integrity or loss of sovereignty, and of mutual respect for such integrity and sovereignty. That is to say, the members will not only themselves respect the sovereign rights of one another but will protect them from aggression by others. There is no probability of aggression or interference without some basis or excuse for action in a dispute. The action of the league and its members in regard to all disputes is set forth in subsequent articles of the covenant, which provide for the course of action in case of violation of the rules of procedure by members of the league in their relations with one another. These articles do not apply, with the exception of 17, to countries not members. Every conceivable contingency within the league is provided for in these articles. Article 10 is a general, comprehensive section, and is designed to provide for possible emergencies not covered in the detailed provisions of the subsequent articles, such a great emergency, perhaps, as that which arose in 1914, although even that began with a dispute.

External aggression must come either from within or from without the league. If a member of the league is attacked by another member of the league in disregard of its covenants, the course of action by the league itself is set forth in article 16. If a nation outside the league refuses, upon invitation, to accept the obligations of membership for the purpose of the dispute which it has with such member and resorts to war, it is directed in article 17 that the provisions of article 16 shall likewise be applied against it. That article provides, first, for the severance of trade and financial relations with the offending nation, the prohibition of all intercourse between the nationals of the members of the league and those of the offending State, and the prevention of all financial, commercial, or personal intercourse between the nationals of the offending State and the nationals of any other State whatsoever. That, in brief, is an economic and social boycott, followed by a general blockade. The pressure of such an economic isolation is something no nation would like to contemplate, and no nation would lightly risk the loss it would involve. But if military action still were needed, the council would recommend to the Governments the forces to be contributed. The Governments would decide for themselves as to the merits of the council's recommendation.

Now, it is clearly to be seen that any aggression, actual or threatened, from within the league or without, is covered in articles 11 to 17 and full provision made therein for the course of action to be taken by the respective members of the league. Therefore, any action of war based specifically and exclusively upon article 10 must spring from acts or circumstances not contemplated or foreseen in the formulation of these other articles, acts that are entirely outside their provisions. A sudden and unexpected attack by one nation upon another, a member of the league, so sudden that no opportunity could be given to interpose the arbitration or conciliation measures, would come under this article. Such an attack is less likely to occur, with the nations combined to crush it, than any other. But if this or any other emergency should arise, not specifically covered in the agreement and which threatened or perpetrated external aggression upon any member of the league, then the members would stand together under article 10. In this aspect it is simply a provision for the exceptional, unexpected, and unforeseen hostility.

Article 10, it is apparent, has several purposes and functions. It is, first of all, the fundamental agreement of mutual support in case of attack from without. It is the foundation upon which the other articles relating to international disputes is laid. There would be no league without it, for many of the nations concerned would not enter into an association that called for disarmament unless some such pledge were made, just as a man whose life is threatened is unwilling to give up his arms unless assured that he will be protected in other ways. If the plans of disarmament are carried out to the satisfaction of the countries and made universal, the time will come when such an agreement as this will be superfluous, for the fear which demands it now will be removed. But under present conditions, and the terror of Germany's sudden and prodigious attack still in the minds of the world, such an understanding is an essential basis for a peace that can be felt to be secure. This is particularly true because of the new countries that are being created as a result of the war and whose integrity and sovereignty are in special need of exterior support. The respect of sovereignty is another important feature. All nations are jealous of their sovereign rights as nations, particularly their right to conduct their own affairs, and this is a proper agreement to respect those rights.

But more than all this, article 10 is the preliminary assertion of solidarity upon which articles 11 to 17 are based and which in a way encompasses them. It establishes a principle; they define its application. It is a mistake to consider article 10 as something that stands alone. Nor is it less a part of the two articles which precede it, those relating to disarmament. In itself it calls for no action by the league or the members of the league unless some extraordinary emergency arises for which no other provision is made in the covenant. In that remote exigency the council is directed to advise upon the means by which the obligations under it may be fulfilled. The council can only advise. It rests upon the respective Governments themselves to decide how they will fulfill their obligations under it. The advice of the council must be by unanimous agreement of its members, and the United States will be a member. No advice as to the course of action will therefore be given that would be considered unjust to the United States by the representative of our Government. Probably no advice will be given by the council until after consultation with the respective Governments represented in the council. This consultation would seem to be essential in important matters, for this is a league of nations, not a superstate, and the members of the council are primarily but representatives of the nations that are given the predominating influence. Inasmuch as these nations have the greatest power, both in themselves and in the league, their responsibilities will be the greater, and they will endeavor to reach an agreement among themselves as to what action should be taken in case of such an extraordinary emergency as would fall upon article 10 alone. Each Government must be its own judge as to the manner in which it will fulfill its obligation, and the character and extent of its support will depend upon the circumstances of the case, the greatness of the emergency, and the degree of its own danger. That danger would be measured to a large extent by proximity, and it is reasonable to assume that the countries nearest the seat of trouble would be first to go to the aid of the one attacked. But somehow all would help, if the help of all were seen to be necessary, and it is this assurance that is required to give cohesion and stability to the association, and which alone can provide the moral influence, which may become compulsory, that must be provided for in the absence of a permanent international police force.

To summarize: Article 10 is the necessary binding of the nations into a unified and potential force for mutual respect and protection. The fulfillment of all ordinary obligations in the pledge it involves is provided for in other articles. It is only in exceptional circumstances, not otherwise provided for, that action under it specifically would be appealed for. The occurrence of such circumstances is highly improbable, but if they should develop each nation would be the judge of its obligations under the article. Good faith would require the support it pledges, but whether that support would be economic alone, or both economic and military, would depend upon the nature of the case and the understanding reached by the respective Governments.

Mr. Taft, Mr. Root, and Mr. Hughes, the three leading Republicans of the country, discussed this article at length before the covenant was revised. Mr. Hughes, the least friendly of the three, opposed it, but said that "certainly each power will be the judge of what in good faith it should do. In the case of the United States the guaranty will not be made good except by the action of Congress, and it will be for Congress to decide whether we are bound and what we shall undertake." Mr. Root believes the article necessary to the solution of the reconstruction problems and the maintenance of the stability of the reconstruction. "The allied nations in their council," he said, "must determine the lines of reconstruction. Their determination must be enforced. They may make mistakes. Doubtless they will, but there must be decision, and decision must be enforced. Under these circumstances the United States can not quit. It must go on to the performance of its duty, and the immediate aspect of article 10 is an agreement to do that."

He thought, however, that it should not be made permanent and suggested an amendment permitting any party, after five years, to terminate its obligation under it upon one year's notice. If within five years this provision would seem to be unnecessary, because conditions had become stable and the fear that now makes it necessary had passed away, the revision of the covenant has made amendment to that effect possible. And, besides, the revised covenant permits any nation to withdraw upon two years' notice if it is found to be onerous or unsatisfactory. Mr. Taft finds no objection to article 10, although he had suggested that it might be better to show distinctly the distribution of obligation under it. He assumes, however, that distribution will be arranged by the council and the respective Governments. "The fact that the council is to advise what means shall be taken to fulfill the obligation shows," he says, "that they are to be such as each nation shall deem proper and fair under the circumstances considering its remoteness from the country and the fact that nearer presence of other nations should induce them to furnish the required military force."

Now, as to the claim that it will prevent the territorial development of nations or the assistance of a nation desiring to help the people of another struggling for freedom. The United States is living evidence that war is not essential to territorial expansion and development. We added Florida and Louisiana Purchase and Alaska to our domain by peaceable means. There is nothing in article 10 to prevent such territorial changes. Nor is there anything to prevent changes in form or character of any government. It proposes no interference with peoples in their internal affairs. If a part of a nation should desire to separate from the rest and set up an independent government, there is nothing in this article or elsewhere in the covenant calling for hostile action by the league or any of its members. The possibility that we, for example, might be prevented from going to the rescue of a people seeking their independence is not a persuasive objection. We have had many opportunities in the past, but only once in all history have we taken up arms in such a cause, and there is not the slightest probability of another case similar to Cuba arising in this hemisphere. All the people in the western world are now free. Although we have had profound sympathy for the struggles for freedom occurring from time to time in the Eastern Hemisphere, we have never once even thought of going to war for them. As to the claim set up by one or two objectors that this would constitute an impious limitation of the Almighty, we are disposed to believe that no association of men can in any way limit His power.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I now ask to have inserted as a part of my remarks an editorial from the same paper of May 25 entitled "Reason or passion," an editorial paying some attention to the attempted effort of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to arouse the feeling of the South against the colored majority, as he alleges, in the league of nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

REASON OR PASSION.

Senator REED'S speech on the treaty is not an appeal to reason but an appeal to prejudice. His experience as a politician has taught him that there is nothing so responsive to the influence of rhetoric as prejudice. But if this great matter is to be settled rightly, it must be settled rationally. Passion is a power for good if it is founded upon truth and restrained by reason, but it is an unmitigated evil if it is without either truth or reason. The question before the United States Senate is the most important one that has ever been presented to that body for its approval. There has been nothing comparable with it since the adoption of the Constitution. It should be considered, therefore, with the analytical perception, calm judgment, and the honesty and patriotism of true statesmanship. It is essential that it be discussed honestly if the people are to form opinion that is based upon truth, and opinion that is not based upon truth is not the opinion that should govern conduct and action in the United States of America.

Senator REED'S speech is for the deliberate purpose of arousing the racial prejudice that is instinctive in nearly all of us. He pictures a world governed by black, yellow, and brown races. "This is a colored league of nations," he says. "That is to say, the majority of the na-

tions composing the league do not belong to the white race of men. On the contrary, they are a conglomerate of the black, yellow, brown, and red races, frequently so intermixed and commingled as to constitute an unclassified mongrel breed." What is the truth as to this? Of the 32 nations that are set down as original members of the league of nations only 7 are not white—India, China, Haiti, Hedjaz, Japan, Liberia, and Siam, and the Arabians of Hedjaz, we think, would strenuously object to the classification of a Semitic race as not white. Of the 13 nations invited to accede to the covenant only 1, Persia, could be placed in Senator REED'S category of color, and that is a debatable classification for Persia. So, in fact, out of 45 nations altogether that are recognized by the covenant only 8—only 7, if we eliminate Hedjaz—are colored nations. The nations that are white, by any standard of ethnology, are the United States, Belgium, Great Britain, Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Serbia, Uruguay, Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Salvador, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and Venezuela. Where are the colored nations in this list, which, with the 8 previously mentioned, is the complete roll of the nations entering or invited to enter the league?

Starting with such a basis of untruth Senator REED proceeds to elaborate by misrepresentation of the principle, long fixed in international law, of the equality of States. This does not mean that States are equal in dignity, importance, or power, but that each possesses the same number of sovereign rights and powers. That is to say, the essential rights of one nation, however small, are the same as the rights of any other nation, however great. That is a principle the United States has always asserted and defended. It is the principle upon which the Monroe doctrine is founded, and any association of States would be impossible without its recognition. In every conference of States for the promotion of international understandings that has ever been held the rule of equality of States has been operative. In all such conferences decisions are reached by unanimous agreement, and only by unanimous agreement, just as the treaty now before us has been formulated by the unanimous agreement of the representatives of the 32 nations at the peace conference. So it will be in the league of nations. It is expressly stated in the covenant that all decisions shall be by unanimous agreement of the council or the assembly, except in a few specified cases of procedure. A majority of votes, therefore, has no significance whatever. No combination of States for voting purposes can have any power when a single vote is supreme. For example, the United States, under the provisions of this covenant, can stand alone, with its single vote, against all the other nations of the world. It could have no more power with 40 votes than it has with one when any number of votes short of the entire number means no more than one. But Senator REED endeavors to convey the impression that the league is to be controlled by the number of votes, like a legislative assembly. This is as absurd as it is untrue. America nor England nor France nor even Liberia would think for a moment of entering into an association where it could be dominated by the votes of others. No such domination is possible over any nation under the covenant of the league. When this is understood Senator REED'S racial comparisons are seen to be wholly irrelevant.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, nothing was ever more stupid than that appeal of the Senator from Missouri. There is not a man in the United States that will respond more quickly than I to an appeal to race supremacy, race integrity, race purity, and to making this country a white man's country all over; but when the Senator went on to treat the Senator from North Carolina, the Senator from South Carolina, the Senator from Louisiana, and me as if we were veritable asses he went just a little bit too far. He comes from a State that does not disfranchise Negroes by any pretext of constitutional disqualification for the suffrage; he comes from a State which does not disfranchise illiterates by any disqualification for the suffrage; and yet he went on here for half an hour trying to arouse the prejudice of the southern people on the race issue and upon the illiteracy question, when he knew as well as I know and as well as you know that the difference was this: In the internal and domestic administration of affairs the qualification of the suffrage is a privilege extended in the interests of society within the country. He knew as well as I know that in international affairs the white man is entitled to govern the white man's country, the brown man the brown man's country, and the black man the black man's country, and that question does not come into it except in so far as the white man and the brown man and the black man may want to secure each his own supremacy in his own country and to secure national world justice for all.

Mr. President, I do not know how the Senator from Missouri voted the other day upon the proposition of my colleague [Mr. HARRISON] to limit woman suffrage to white women. I suppose he voted with us; I suppose his political interest in Missouri was to vote with us; but he comes from a State that never made that distinction; he comes from a State that never had a literacy provision. What right did he have to stand here and make that appeal to us upon the ground of illiteracy and the balance of it?

And that is not all. His statement that a majority of the nations represented in the league of nations were colored was not even correct. He had to fudge like all the world to make it appear correct. For example, he represented Cuba as being a colored country. Cuba has 66 per cent white population; Mississippi has less than 50 per cent. I suppose he would deny Mississippi a right——

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; for a question.

Mr. REED. For a correction.

Mr. WILLIAMS. For a question or a correction; yes.

Mr. REED. If the Senator had read what I said, he would know that I frankly stated in my speech the percentage of both races in Cuba.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator quoted a lot of things from the Encyclopedia Brittanica—came very near republishing it—and I presume he quoted that; it appears in the Encyclopedia Brittanica at any rate; but when he was making his general remarks I do not remember his mentioning it. However, he may have done so.

Mr. REED. It is there clearly and explicitly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; it amounts to a quotation from the Encyclopedia Brittanica.

Mr. REED. Not as a quotation, but as my own comment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That may be so.

Mr. REED. That is all I want to say to the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And did the Senator notice the fact that Mississippi, South Carolina, and Louisiana have a less percentage of white population than Cuba? I do not think he did.

Mr. REED. No; I do not know that I did.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The truth is that Mississippi, Louisiana, and South Carolina are parts of a white man's country, and whether they accidentally or incidentally have a numerical majority of Negroes makes no difference. The truth is that California is a white man's country, and however much the Chinese and Japanese may give her trouble she proposes to remain a white man's country, as a part of a white man's country. The Senator knew all that.

The Senator knew another thing. He knew that not a single move could be taken that would affect the interests of the United States of America in the league of peace, or in the council of the league, except upon a few unimportant matters of parliamentary and administrative procedure, without a unanimous vote. He knew that. He knew that we had an eternal veto upon the entire proceedings.

He knew another thing. He knew that, even if the league of nations had not given us a veto, our vote—great, popular, strong, and military as we are—would have constituted a veto.

He knew another thing. He knew that while Great Britain, Canada, Australia, and South Africa were represented they were not represented as parts of the British Kingdom, but as parts of the self-governing British Empire; and he knew, as well as I know and as well as you know, that in a very great number of questions affecting the United States of America Canada and Australia would vote against Great Britain, and have voted against her hitherto.

He knew, as I know and you know, that when it comes to the question of admission of Hindoos and Japanese and Chinese, Canada and Australia have blocked the wheels of parliamentary legislation in Great Britain, and that Great Britain has recognized the substantial nationality of all of the self-governing English-speaking provinces of Great Britain. He knew, as I know, that Canada and Australia and South Africa have asserted the right in connection with the foreign relations of the British Empire not to go into a war in which Great Britain was involved unless their own parliaments so decided. If he did not know that, he is lamentably ignorant.

Then he dwelt—I do not know how long—upon admitting Cuba and admitting Nicaragua and admitting a couple of other South American States. He seems to be ignorant of the fact that, for fear lest Great Britain had too much advantage in connection with the separate and independent votes of Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and South Africa—frequently differing with her—it was thought well to put in a lot of our American dependencies that we could control.

Now, Mr. President, I ask to insert as a part of my remarks an editorial from some paper—I have forgotten which, but I believe the New York World, although I do not remember exactly—headed "Politics and the covenant."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

POLITICS AND THE COVENANT.

In discussing the ratification of the peace treaty Tuesday we said that "it is unthinkable that it should be considered in any other than the broadest and most unbiased spirit of patriotism and humanity. No personal or partisan feeling should be permitted to affect the judgment in any way whatsoever." We were speaking of the whole treaty, but we think it no less important that the provisions for a league of nations be considered with the same largeness. This paper has long maintained that this is not a partisan question, and any attempt to make it a partisan question would be disastrous as well as essentially wrong. It would be wrong because it is a great forward movement for America and for all mankind. It would be wrong because it is the goal toward which American principle, American diplomacy, and American influence upon international relations have been trending ever since the Jay treaty was signed by George Washington in 1794. America, more than

all other nations put together, has been developing the principle and extending the practice of international arbitration through more than a century, and the league of nations is but the consequence, the some time inevitable consequence, of American history; it is but the organization of the world for the general and complete application of the principle and policy that America individually has continuously and persistently advocated and applied. The league of nations is essentially an American ideal realized through the pressure of a universal calamity that has convinced all peoples of the necessity of international cooperation for the preservation of peace.

To attempt to block such a movement for partisan reasons is profoundly wrong, we repeat. And it would be disastrous to the party, for it has back of it a public opinion so vast and so earnest, so determined that the experience of the last four years shall not be repeated if it is humanly possible to prevent it, that any such attempt would be utterly futile. The civilized world supports it, demands it; the people of the United States demand it. It is entirely too great a matter to be an issue in party politics. The personalities of the moment, without exception, are but incidental to it. The prejudices of the moment will soon be forgotten. We stand before the door of a new era. What would America say, what would the world say, what would the future say, if with this great opportunity we refused to enter because of personal dislike or of partisan prejudice? It is not a question of supporting or opposing Wilson; it is a question of fulfilling the manifest destiny of America as the leader of mankind in its struggle for freedom and progress.

But aside from all this, it is not a party question because it is peculiarly a nonpartisan development of American principles. It is the result, as we have said, of a century of growing experience to which successive administrations have contributed without regard to party. And it has been given concrete form in the forge of war through the influence of men, Republicans and Democrats, who were united for this end, not as partisans but as Americans who realized the necessity and the opportunity. Of the 120 men who formed the provisional committee that called the national conference for the creation of a League to Enforce Peace in 1915, men who represented the entire country, men of great eminence as statesmen, educators, clergymen, lawyers, editors, and business men, the majority were Republicans. Out of that memorable conference in Independence Hall at Philadelphia, on June 17, 1915, grew the present covenant of the league of nations. There was organized and inaugurated the great movement which aroused the earnest thought and purpose first of America and then of England. They were not politicians who met at Independence Hall, although many of them had held, or were then holding, high office in their respective parties. They were broad-minded, patriotic citizens who sought to extend established American principles to the whole world and thereby to prevent, if possible, the repetition of such a calamity as that which was appalling civilization. Republicans and Democrats, though a majority were Republicans, worked together to advance this cause. The movement had been advancing a year before President Wilson began to give expression to his interest. He did not originate the idea, nor has he ever claimed to have done so. But he saw in it, as others had seen, the remedy for the great affliction, and he began to use the powers of his high office to press it upon the attention of the Governments. And no one objected. Through the three and a half years that intervened between June, 1915, and the armistice in November, 1918, while this movement was constantly growing in power, while the President was urging it on every occasion, not a voice was raised against it. Upon what basis of right can there be any partisan movement against it at this late hour? It should be considered wholly and absolutely on its merits, both by Republicans and by Democrats, not as a Wilson document but as an American document, and, through America, a world document, upon which the nations hope to found a higher and better civilization. It is not perfect. No one claims that it is. But it is a great beginning, and it should be altered only in the light of a world experience still to come.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the leader of the majority faction of the Republican majority, "ariz in his place," to quote the language of Private John Allen, here two or three weeks or months ago during the closing days of the last session to make, as John Allen said, "a few onnecessary remarks" about the fact that there was no mention of the Monroe doctrine in the covenant for the preservation of peace amongst the nations of the earth. He grew eloquent—I take that back; the Senator from Massachusetts never was eloquent for a minute in his life—but he grew rabid; he grew metaphysical; he grew strident; he grew very earnest, and denounced the treaty because there was no mention in it of the Monroe doctrine. I am violating no confidence when I say that he was present, as I was, at a meeting at the White House, because the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] brought it nearly all out some time ago. When the President was asked why there was no mention of the Monroe doctrine in the covenant of the league of peace, he responded in substance—although I am not even pretending to quote his exact language—that he supposed that there could be mention of it were it thought desirable, but that he had not thought it necessary; that the league did not refer to any mere "policies," just as it did not refer to any mere "domestic" questions. That was about what he said, was it not, I will ask the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It was.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But at any rate the Senator from Massachusetts came in a few days and literally made the air blue with apprehension as to what was going to happen to us when Europe got hold of the Monroe doctrine, on the ground that it was not mentioned in the treaty.

Some time after that I went home to Mississippi. I went out on the plantation, culled my flowers, attended to my vegetables, played with my grandchildren, and made but one speech. Meanwhile, between those events, the President of the United States secured a recognition of the Monroe doctrine in haec verba in the treaty of peace. In making that speech I said: The Senator from Massachusetts made all of this trouble about that, and in his discussion with the president of Harvard, Mr. Lowell, one of his chief objections was that there was no exclusion of the Monroe doctrine from the operations of the league of nations. Then I offered to bet $5 to two doughnuts that the fact that the President had brought it within the provisions of the league of nations and expressly excluded it would make no difference with the Senator from Massachusetts. That was not gambling; that was betting on a certainty, because I knew the Senator from Massachusetts, and I knew that he woke up every morning, as some newspaper said, with the idea of reading the morning news, and when he found out which side of a new phase Wilson was on he took the other side, to make the most political capital out of it that he could.

Do you know, that is one of the queer effects of Republican leadership. The Senator from Massachusetts was not always that way. He used to say that "politics stopped at the coast," and "never went any further"; but the minute he was made political leader over there his objection to the exclusion of the mention of the Monroe doctrine increased to virulence when he was faced with the inclusion of it.

So he made not an eloquent speech, because the Senator from Massachusetts has no imagination; he has only a reasoning capacity, and a very highly respectable reasoning capacity, and a very highly respectable historical information, which enables him to make a very clear statement of something, but he can not put any heart and soul into it, because he has no Celtic imagination. He has pure Anglo-Saxon, Teutonic, exhaustive, and exhausting methods. But he comes back to the Senate later on and he gives the President Cain because he *has* put the Monroe doctrine into the league of nations.

The President came back to us the other time at the White House, and said to us: "In recognizing the principles of the league of nations I have secured the application of the Monroe doctrine to the entire world." That was not sufficient for the Senator from Massachusetts, so he quarreled with him. Now he comes back with the Monroe doctrine expressly excluded, and the Senator almost swells himself up—if he had been a poser and an actor he would have swelled himself up, but to do him justice he is never either; just a plain, ordinary man of good scholarly and historical ability, with plain, good common sense, and a very wary, cool-headed, and adroit politician—but he came in here, "swelling himself up" as nearly as he could, and he said: "The Monroe doctrine is not a regional question. It is a question that no country in the world is entitled to decide or pass on, or interpret, or perhaps even mention, except ourselves." Well, if that be true, why did he quarrel about not putting it in the first draft of the league of nations? That was my view. That is my view yet. It ought never to have been mentioned. The very nature of it and the nature of the proposed league and our past utterances all excluded it.

He makes fun of the phrase "a regional question." Well, it is "regional," and not less regional because it is ours and Great Britain's utterance, nor any the less "regional" because it includes and applies to a whole continent. This continent after all is not all of the earth, but only a part or a "region" of it, nor have we ever contended that the Monroe doctrine applies outside of this continent—this hemisphere.

Why did he quarrel about the nonmention of it at first? Simply because Wilson was President and a Democrat. Why does he quarrel now when it is mentioned? Simply because Wilson is President and is a Democrat.

"Politics stops at the seacoast." Does it? Is the Senator from Massachusetts illustrating that principle right now? Can you find a single thing that the President of the United States can do that he will approve of? I defy you. Of course, while the war was going on he was like all others, simply an American. We wanted to be. Those few people in the United States who did not want to be had to be; but he wanted to be. It was like his vote upon the Irish resolution the other day. Do any of you believe that that ingenious explanation of his was anything but disingenuous? Can you imagine that all the Cabots and all the Lodges in years past have not hated the Irish, and that the Irish have not hated them, principally because the Irish were Democrats? Do you imagine that the Senator from Massachusetts has any less sympathy for the people of Ulster—Protestants and English and Scotch—than I have? Do you imagine that he loves the Celtic Irish any better than I? Half my friends are Irish.

Now I come to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. He is of a different type. He does not pretend to be a Brahmin. He would acknowledge himself not quite a paragon but an ordinary, common citizen. He would not base his right to express public opinion either upon his scholarship or upon his pedigree.

Take him all around, I love him; I think he is one of the most lovable fellows I have ever met. Take him all around, he is sincere and honest, too; and he is sincere in the position he has taken in this matter, and honest about it, only he is wrong. The only trouble is that he is a Prussian "junker" at heart and does not know it—let us say, rather, an American "junker."

I do not mean by that that he sympathized with the Germans in the war. I do not mean by that that the Germans could have gotten any more help from him than from me—not a particle; but his idea of State sovereignty is exactly the same as that of Bismarck and as that of Kaiser Wilhelm and as that of the Prussian junkers. His position is that there must be no limitation upon the sovereignty of a country, its independent sovereignty. He nods his head in approval. I knew he was honest, and I knew I was honest, and I knew that I could not misrepresent him.

Now, what was the whole Prussian State sovereignty idea? It was that a State had a right to do whatever a State chose to do, and that there could be no limitation and ought not to be any limitation upon the sovereignty and the power and the might of the State except its inability to physically execute its decrees. Is not that right? I ask the Senator from Idaho, is not that a correct statement of the Prussian position so far as he understands it?

Mr. BORAH. I rather think that is correct. It is also George Washington's view.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Ah! Now the Senator is trying to bring in poor old George as an ally of the Prussian junker. [Laughter.] George is dead, and he can not deny it; but if George were alive he would deny it every minute of his life, because George was so diffident as to the sovereign rights of a country that he executed the Jay treaty, and the people in that day contended that that was a surrender of the rights of Congress and of the sovereignty of the United States. But let that pass.

The Senator confesses that the position which I have attributed to him and which I have attributed to the Prussian junkers is not only his position but he contends that it was George Washington's position. Mr. President, no country ever entered into a treaty with the smallest other country in the world without surrendering or limiting the exercise of a part of its sovereignty.

What is sovereignty as defined in international law? It is the unlimited power of a State to direct its own destiny in its own pathway, according to its own will. When we entered into an agreement with Mexico that we might pursue bandits and marauders across the Rio Grande into Mexico and capture them, Mexico surrendered or limited a part of her sovereignty; and when we agreed that Mexican troops might pursue bandits into our territory we surrendered or limited a part of our sovereignty, and in each case an essential of sovereignty. Under the international definition of sovereignty, when I make an agreement with myself or with a friend not to smoke a cigar for a week I surrender a part of my individual sovereignty; but in a real sense whenever a man or a nation agrees not to do a thing it is as high an assertion of national or of independent sovereignty as leaving itself or himself free to do the thing. The agreement has its initiative in self-limitation, the highest form of self-assertion or sovereignty or free will. To agree to keep the peace of the world under the dictates of Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace, to agree to recognize as best you can the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, and try to settle differences by arbitration and by peaceful solution rather than by mitrailleuses and chassepots and Springfield rifles is to that extent, of course, a surrender of the sovereignty or a limitation upon the sovereignty of each country that agrees to the arrangement—an agreement to agree without resort to throat cutting or poison gas. If I had a dispute with the Senator from Utah to-day about a land title and we agreed to leave it to a court of justice instead of fighting it out upon the public highway, it would be a surrender of his original right and my original right to do as each one of us saw fit.

Ah, but gentlemen tell me that in the course of time it may appear that under the covenant of peace the United States might be forced to do something that it did not want to do.

Under the judgment of the justice of the peace or of the court, I or the Senator from Utah might be forced to do something that he or I did not want to do; but the world has agreed that in the settlement of individual controversies it is better to run the risk of the court's making a mistake than it is to leave men to cut one another's throats, and the settlement of individual controversies is of less importance than the solution of national and international questions by arbitration; because if the Senator from Utah and I agree to cut one another's throats it does not affect anybody but the Senator from Utah and me and our wives and our children; but when two nations go in to cut one another's throats it cuts the throats of all, everybody—the people that did not want it as well as the people that did want it—the women and the children and the nuns and the priests and the preachers and the lawyers and the beggars upon the streets, and everybody in the world.

I can not understand the lack of imagination in a man. I can not understand the lack of vision of a man, who wants to go back to 1913. Victor Berger, or whatever his name is, who was elected as a Socialist from the Milwaukee district, told the public that it was a lie that we went to war "to make the world safe for democracy." Maybe he is right. Some things that have been going on in Paris here lately rather make me think that maybe he is. Instead of meeting there with common accord to secure the peace of the world, instead of thinking about the men and the women and the children and the churches and the schools and the highways and the public buildings and all of the accumulations of civilization that peace has built up, men came there quarrelling about Fiume and came there quarrelling about a few islands upon the Adriatic coast, and about some coal fields in the Saar district, and about what should be the proper boundaries between Poland and Czechoslovakia, when every one of them has gotten more out of the war than they ever hoped to get since the day they were born.

Do you know, fellow Senators, I sometimes think that if I had been Wilson, at Paris, the time would have been reached several times when I would have said: "I came here in the name of the American people, in the name of their traditions, and in the name of their ideals and of a common humanity, to help make a better world. You are narrow and provincial and selfish, and you are seeking money and you are seeking territory. You are going back to the Borah-Prussian-junker doctrine of unlimited sovereignty, and the right upon the part of Italy to stand out against the world for a little thing like Fiume, upon the part of France to stand out against the world for a little thing like the amount of reparation, the attempted assertion for a little while of the right of Poland to take not only access to the sea but government and control of it. I am tired. I am going back to America, and Europe can settle her infernal selfish difficulties as she blank pleases. If there is any country in the world that can stand by itself in its wealth, in its size, in its resources, in its capacity to put armed men in the Army and the Navy, it is my country. We are pretty far off from you. Go to the dickens with your European affairs. I am going to join BORAH and the Prussian junkers and contend for unlimited American sovereignty and preparation for universal war—universal preparation for war during peace times."

Do you want to go back to 1913? You can not go back to it the way you were at that time. If you do not secure a covenant for peace amongst the civilized nations of the world, if you do not secure a measure of disarmanent, if you do not secure some means whereby you can settle by arbitration international differences of every sort, then still, notwithstanding it all, the old time of American isolation has passed, and you and I must prepare the best army and the best navy on this globe. Are you willing to do it?

I have heard a lot of talk about preparation for war and all that, and a lot of criticism of the fact that the English and we were unready. We were the great unready nation, but we were unready of a set purpose. We thought it was better to strain every muscle and every nerve and every thought and every soul sentiment of the people to meet a great emergency when the emergency came than it was to keep prepared, by countless and incalculable burdens upon the people, during all the time when the emergency was not present. We were wise. The war has proven that we were wise. The English-speaking race to-day dominates—not by its navy, not by its military force, but by its common sense and its statesmanship and its commercialism and its literature this entire world; and to what does it owe it? It owes it to the fact that Great Britain was an island and we were an island continent, and that during peace times, at any rate, we could leave the industries of the people unburdened and untrammeled. Schoolhouses went up, cathedrals and churches, highways, philanthropic associations, everything in the world that sums up civilization.

What is civilization? It is the massing together at a given time of the accumulations of the past. How does a man differ from the brutes of the field? Simply by the fact that from one generation to another he can accumulate. The cat and the dog and the tiger and the lion start where their forefathers started. We start upon the shoulders of our forefathers; and all that accumulation, from generation to generation, spells civilization. Man is the only monument-building creature, because he is the only one that considers the past. He is the only creature that dreams of the future and "has visions," because he is the only

one that thinks of the future to any great extent. And here step in the Prussian and American junkers, including my good, dear friend from Idaho, and they tell us, "Do not, above all things in the world, let there be even a suspicion of the limitation of your sovereignty," as if a voluntary limitation were any less an act of sovereignty than the failure to make a limitation.

What is the difference between a savage and a civilized man? One puts limitations upon his individual sovereignty, and the other does not. What is the difference between a civilized nation and a savage or barbarous nation like Turkey? One puts limitations—whether by unwritten law, as in Great Britain, or by written law, as here—upon its free action and the other does not; and of all the men who have stood in this Chamber, in eloquent words and in eloquent thought approving and applauding the idea of putting a self-limit upon the operation of National Government, the Senator from Idaho stands at the front. The Constitution of the United States is nothing but the people's self-limitation upon their dual agencies of Government.

I listened to him the other day when he was defending the Constitution, and went over to him after it was over and said: "BORAH, old fellow, you have made mighty near a good old-fashioned Democratic speech." He has stood all the time for a self-limited Government, constitutionally limited by the people, who are the ultimate sovereigns, in the interest of the people whose future is at stake; and yet, when it comes to international affairs, he wants the United States left free to do whatever in the dickens it pleases; and he now nods his head at me in approval of that. That is all the German junker wanted. He wanted Germany left free to do whatever in the dickens it pleased. That is all that Turkey wanted, and that is all that Alexander the Great wanted, and that is all that Nero wanted, and that is all that any savage ever wanted since the world began—just to be left free to do whatever in the dickens he pleased. So the Senator is advocating the cause of a savage and a barbarous and a Nero-like Government, a Turkish and a Prussian Government transferred to the United States. He wants a people who, of their own free will, limit their power of operation within their own territory, expressing that voice in the Constitution as a limitation upon executive, judiciary, and legislative, to be still left free, outside of its borders, to do whatever it pleases, without any limitation.

Now, my friends, there are limitations which civilized men can not ignore, outside of treaties. The Senator from Idaho, if he had been a German, I suppose, even with his ideas of unlimited sovereignty, never would have agreed that Germany should invade Belgium and march over her prostrate body in order to be able to take France in the flank; but in order that he may measure up to his full ideals and his full notions he ought to have thought that, because it was a part of the rights of Germany as a full, unlimited sovereignty, and a full, unlimited sovereignty is bound by nothing except its own measure of its own will and power. Yet the Senator from Idaho must confess that even a full, unlimited sovereignty is bound by some ideas of ethics and right.

He will agree to that, I know; so he will agree to at least that self-limitation upon government that a nation should never do wrong just because it has might. The Senator agrees to that, does he not? I thought so; he bows in acquiescence. I knew it. The minute he bows in acquiescence to that he bows in acquiescence to the idea that a nation ought to limit its sovereignty in the cause of right as against its power or might. Then his whole argument sinks to the ground, and the whole Prussian junker argument sinks to the ground. If we be bound as a nation by certain laws of ethics which are recognized, then we can be more sacredly bound by putting those laws of ethics, voluntarily and beforehand, in writing in the shape of a treaty, or world treaty or league.

Mr. President, I have not talked much about this business, because I wanted to wait until we had it before us in the proper way, and I am not talking about the details of the treaty yet, because I want to wait.

There are two classes of people in the world, and however unworthy I may be—and I know my own unworthiness better than anybody else except God—I belong to one of them. I do not belong to the class of legalists who can see nothing in the present and hope for nothing in the future except as based upon a precedent in the past. I belong to that class of men who dream, and who are not ashamed of dreaming; who dream of a better world and want it, and, in so far as they are worthy to pray to God at all, pray to Him for it, a world where not only individual men shall govern themselves, though in my own case I may have failed, but where communities shall govern themselves, and where nations shall govern themselves, and where, above all things in the world, humanity all over the world shall govern itself by common concert of action and common accord between nations in behalf of the right and justice and peace.

As some of you know, I have quoted frequently the words of Thomas Jefferson, "My passion is peace." But, my friends, it never was peace against might; it never was peace against the assertion upon the part of any man or any nation, not even the United States, to control its own destiny as it pleased, regardless of the destiny and the welfare and the peace and the happiness of the world. If right acknowledge might and lie down before, then there is nothing left but might, not even God's might, but brute's might.

Oh, you tell me, now, then, if this peace goes into effect the United States might be forced to do something it does not want to do. It has, in the first place, a veto power, and if the public opinion of the world became so powerful that that veto power did not count, then the United States ought to be made to do what common humanity and common sense and the interests of the world demand. That time will never come. There is no fear of it. I have no fear at all of the world running up against the United States.

Oh, you tell me the United States has only one vote. Yes; Mississippi has only two votes in this body. Somebody might say for that reason Mississippi would be forever barred; but if Mississippi has any sense at all she will find some representatives from other States who agree with her every now and then, and whenever she is right she will find a majority in most cases.

We first have in the council the veto power, and, in the next place, if we did not have it we have the decently expressed opinion of decent people of the world on our side when right. What does the Senator want? Is he going back to old-time days when we talked about "a manifest destiny"? I think he is. A manifest destiny to spread ourselves all over Central and South America? I do not know. But I never found any destiny in the world which was manifest except this:

Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he reap.

If you sow the seeds of might and power and empire and unlimited sovereignty, the chances are that you will reap a harvest of that sort raised on some other people's field, not on your own; and if you sow seeds of accord, harmony, peace, self-limitation, then of those seeds some day you will reap the harvest, not only on other people's fields but upon your own. It is an awfully nice thing to reap the harvest that you planted, and it is the only destiny that I know of that is both good and manifest.

How long are you going to take to subject Central and South America to North American destinies? A great deal depends upon the answer to that question. Within 200 years from now the majority of the Western Hemisphere will be Spanish and Portugese speaking people. What do you want to do with them? Do you want to be left free to do whatever you please with them? I do not know that that is in the Senator's thought at all, I hope it is not; but I do know it has been in the thought of a great many people.

Mr. President, I wish that I had the gift of tongues; I wish that I had the persuasive voice of Thomas Jefferson; I wish that I had the calm, cool impressive voice of the President of the United States. I have not either. All I can say is that I spew out, as far as I am concerned, the idea that this Government representing these United States desires to reserve to itself any power whatsoever to execute the cause of might against the cause of right. It may be replied that the American people never would want to do it. I do not think they would myself, but if the reply be right, then the counter reply comes in: "Then if they never want to do it why reserve the so-called right?"—in other words, why not voluntarily limit our might?

There are men opposed to this league who pretend they are opposed to it because of special provisions in it which they want amended. The Senator from Massachusetts is one of those. Most of the provisions he wanted amended were amended according to his ideas, but he is opposing it yet. Then there are men honest and steadfast in their ways, like the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], who are opposed to all covenants, to all leagues of peace.

Their honesty I can fully recognize, their intellectual integrity I rather admire, but their wisdom I can not perceive, because if they be right with regard to nations in international affairs the same principle would be right as regards individual affairs and as regards affairs between States in the American Union. How can a man stand opposed to all possible covenants of peace except upon one ground, and that is that he believes a covenant would more nearly lead to war than it would to peace itself? The Senator has expressed that view, I think.

But how can a thing constructed for the purpose of keeping peace have a tendency to produce discord? If he and I entered into an agreement to leave all future disputes to arbitrators, would he contend with me that that would be a cause of dispute between him and me greater than we could have had without the agreement? It might not always keep the peace between us if either of us lost our temper extremely, but it at least would have the tendency of keeping the peace.

Mr. President, when you think of the men who have died upon the battle fields with their eyes unclosed, glaring and fleering at the sunlight and the moonlight, arms torn and gone, legs twisted and torn, gassed and yet living; when you think of the women at home mourning for them, when you think of the children left fatherless and without much of a mother's care, because the mother is disheartened and can not give them the old care, is there anything in the world even promising some relief from that sort of thing that you and I are not prepared to embrace if we can?

I thank God that my boys came back without a scratch, I thank God that they did their duty, and I thank God that we are not amongst the number of those who are mourning. But all the same I know those who are mourning.

There is nothing in the world more pathetic, there is nothing more tragic, there is nothing more insane and idiotic—and I use the words advisedly—than war. There never was a just war on both sides since the world began. Somebody was wrong somewhere. All we ask is that there shall be some impartial tribunal to determine who is wrong and to enforce the decent opinion of the world upon the wrongdoer. The Senator steps in the arena and talks about "the sovereignty of this Nation." Who gave this Government sovereignty? The people. Who decided to divide the sovereignty between our dual sets of government? The people. How did they do it? Through the voice of the Constitution. What was the voice of the Constitution? Self-limitation upon the sovereignty of the States and the sovereignty of individuals. Self-limitation, not outside limitation. That is all a treaty, or a world treaty, or league is. And yet when the State of Mississippi has a suit with the State of Idaho it becomes outside limitation in a certain sense by the decision of the Supreme Court. But was it the surrender of any essential right of sovereignty upon the part of either? No. Why not? Because each consented to it, each agreed to it. In other words, because the so-called limitation of sovereignty was an assertion in the highest degree of sovereignty.

Mr. President, I reckon I have talked enough.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I move to lay upon the table the motion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] to reconsider the motion by which the Senate voted to print the treaty.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The unfinished business is before the Senate, I believe.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I understood there was a motion made to reconsider the vote.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; that motion is not pending at the present time.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If it is not pending, I still have the floor, and I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I move that we take up for consideration the motion of the Senator from Idaho to print the treaty. That is the matter which was before the Senate, I understand, when the unfinished business came up.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Beckham	Harris	Moses	Simmons
Borah	Harrison	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.
Brandegee	Hitchcock	New	Smith, Md.
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Newberry	Smoot
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Spencer
Cummins	Kellogg	Nugent	Stanley
Dial	Kendrick	Overman	Sterling
Dillingham	Kenyon	Page	Sutherland
Edge	Keyes	Phelan	Swanson
Elkins	King	Phipps	Thomas
Fall	Kirby	Pittman	Trammell
Fernald	Knox	Poindexter	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Lodge	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
France	McCumber	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Frelinghuysen	McKellar	Reed	Warren
Hale	McLean	Robinson	Watson
Harding	McNary	Sheppard	Williams

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-eight Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BORAH. I have the floor. I was in possession of the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The last business was the calling of the roll. No one had the floor.

Mr. BORAH. I do not understand that a roll call takes a Senator from the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Idaho did not even yield to the Senator from Nebraska. The Senator from Nebraska rose upon the floor of the Senate and suggested the absence of a quorum. He did not even address the Chair. I make the point of order that the Senator from Idaho has the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not want to have any controversy about it. If the Senator from Idaho desires the floor, I am very glad to yield to him.

Mr. BORAH. I feel that in all fairness and as I understand the rules I had the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Perhaps that is so. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] stated that his principal objection to the publication of this document is its lack of authenticity, that no one can know definitely whether it is the treaty or not. I feel that an examination of this copy of the treaty will convince the Senate that it is authentic, and I know of no way by which to bring its terms and its conditions and its authenticity before the Senate except to read the document. No Senator will doubt its authenticity if he will follow me.

After reading for several minutes Mr. BORAH was interrupted by

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I desire to raise a point of order against the reading of this document.

Mr. BORAH. Will the Senator permit me to complete the sentence I was reading?

Mr. SWANSON. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of Montana in the chair). The Senator from Virginia will state his point of order.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator said he would wait until I finish reading the sentence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order having been raised, the Senator from Virginia will state his point of order.

Mr. SWANSON. Under Rule XXXVI, section 3, which reads:

All confidential communications made by the President of the United States to the Senate shall be by the Senators and the officers of the Senate kept secret; and all treaties which may be laid before the Senate, and all remarks, votes, and proceedings thereon, shall also be kept secret until the Senate shall by their resolution take off the injunction of secrecy, or unless the same shall be considered in open executive session.

The Senator states that this is a treaty. So it is required by the rule that it shall be laid before the Senate——

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator accept the fact that it is a treaty?

Mr. SWANSON. I can not accept it; but the Senator states on his authority, whatever it is, that he is about to lay it before the Senate as a treaty, and under the rule to which I have referred it can only be considered in open session by a vote of the Senate. I think the Senator is evidently violating clearly a rule of the Senate. I submit for the consideration of the Chair Rule XXXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, page 41 of the Senate Manual.

Mr. BORAH. This is not a confidential communication—far from it.

Mr. SWANSON. This rule says: "And all treaties which may be laid before the Senate."

The Senator says he lays before the Senate a treaty.

Mr. BORAH. I do not contend that I am laying before the Senate a treaty. I contend I am laying before the Senate a treaty which has been proposed to the German Government. It is not a treaty; neither has it been communicated to the Senate under that rule by the President.

Mr. SWANSON. The rule refers to any treaty laid before the Senate by anyone. It does not say "by the President" or any remarks thereon. I know the Senator does not want to violate a rule of the Senate unless the Senate gives him authority to do so.

Mr. BORAH. I will merely say that this treaty is going to the public. There is no mistake about that. It will be there to-morrow morning. I await the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair before ruling would like to have from the Senator from Idaho an expression of his view concerning the language of the rule.

Mr. BORAH. I understand the objection is based upon paragraph 3 of Rule XXXVI, which reads as follows:

3. All confidential communications made by the President of the United States to the Senate shall be by the Senators and the officers of the Senate kept secret—

I do not understand, I do not believe that this comes under that provision. This is not a communication made by the President.

Mr. SWANSON. It is not claimed that it comes under that provision.

Mr. BORAH. It continues:

and all treaties which may be laid before the Senate, and all remarks, votes, and proceedings thereon shall also be kept secret, until the Senate shall, by their resolution, take off the injunction of secrecy, or unless the same shall be considered in open executive session.

Mr. President, I do not contend that this instrument which I am presenting to the Senate is a signed treaty which has been transmitted to the Senate by anyone. I claim that it is a copy of the proposed treaty which has been submitted to the German Government, but which has not yet been signed either by the German Government or by anyone else so as to constitute in any sense a treaty as referred to in the rule. I am willing to take the Chair's ruling.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the Chair, in addition to what the Senator from Idaho has said, that this identical document which the Senator is reading was by vote of the Senate this very day ordered to be printed in the RECORD; so there can not be any such thing as an injunction of secrecy now imposed on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the vote heretofore taken would not be persuasive upon this question, and, moreover, that vote has been rendered nugatory; at least its effect has been suspended by the pendency of the motion to reconsider. Will the Senator from Idaho give a little more enlightenment on the subject of subdivision 3 of the rule, which reads:

All confidential communications made by the President of the United States to the Senate shall be by the Senators and the officers of the Senate kept secret.

That obviously refers to communications submitted by the President. This is not such a communication. Now, however, the rule begins to relate to something else which comes before the Senate in some other way than by being submitted by the President. Obviously the President might submit a treaty in accordance with the first paragraph of the subdivision; but he has not done so. It is quite apparently contemplated, therefore, that a treaty may come before the Senate in some way other than by being submitted by the President.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, this is not a treaty; it has not been executed. It has been said upon the floor this morning by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], who I presume is as familiar as anyone with the situation, that there have been changes made in the treaty; so that this particular document never will be the treaty which will be before the Senate. I am not contending that it is the treaty which will ultimately come before the Senate for ratification by the Senate. What I am contending is that it is the document which was proposed by the Versailles conference to the German Government. Whether or not it will ever be a treaty is a wholly different proposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. So the Chair understands the Senator from Idaho to contend that the document in question does not fall under the provision of this rule, because it is not a treaty as the word "treaty" is used in the rule?

Mr. BORAH. That is my contention.

Mr. FALL. Will the Senator from Idaho yield to me a moment?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. FALL. Would it come under the rule as a treaty otherwise laid before the Senate? The rule, of course, contemplates the submission first of the treaty to the Senate, and provides for secrecy. Then it speaks of the laying of the treaty before the Senate and provides for secrecy. That means, of course, that when a committee has reported back the treaty and it goes on the calendar, it shall not be laid before the Senate in the open public session of the Senate unless the Senate so orders. It does not apply to a state of affairs such as this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair inquire further of the Senator from Idaho if that is the case, is it not equally so that no document is really a treaty until after it receives the approval of the Senate? Is it not only then that it becomes a treaty?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, this it not a treaty, as I contend, at all; for it has not been approved by the German people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is what the Chair desires to know from the Senator. When, in the opinion of the Senator, does a document really become a treaty?

Mr. BORAH. Under this rule, I should say it becomes a treaty whenever the President—the executive department—has completed his or their portion of the negotiation of the treaty and sends it here. Then it is a treaty under the rule of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BORAH. Yes. When the document has been signed by the Executive and sent here, it is a treaty under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, if the contention of the Senator is correct, why the necessity of the second subdivision of the paragraph of the rule? Such a treaty would come within the first part of the paragraph, which reads:

All confidential communications made by the President of the United States to the Senate shall be by the Senators and the officers of the Senate kept secret.

Such a treaty as the Senator suggests comes directly within that paragraph, and all the rest of it would be surplusage.

Mr. BORAH. No. There may be many confidential communications which are not treaties, and the first clause of the rule refers to any confidential communication which may be sent by the President, it may be about something else.

Mr. SWANSON. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. BORAH. In just a moment. Then the rule provides:

And all treaties which may be laid before the Senate—

That contemplates, in the first place, a treaty, and, in the second place, after it has been laid before the Senate, presumably by authorities authorized to lay it before the Senate——

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, it seems to me exactly the reverse. If the Senator reads the first clause of Rule XXXVII, he will find it provides:

When a treaty shall be laid before the Senate for ratification, it shall be read a first time.

And so forth. Consequently the rule seems to contemplate two kinds of treaties, one made by the President for ratification and the other which comes here as this one comes here. You can not publish the treaty until you have the secrecy removed.

Mr. BORAH. But this is not a treaty at all, in the sense in which the rule speaks of a treaty. It is simply a document which was proposed to the German people, and which will now never become a treaty until it has been signed or accepted by the German people. It may be changed in the most radical particulars prior to that time; indeed, we know that there have been some changes if the press dispatches be correct. So it is not a treaty as the word is used in the rules of the Senate.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, I only want to suggest that it is the well-understood rule of diplomatic procedure, and it is adopted and accepted by all of the countries of the world, that a document becomes a treaty the moment it is signed by the parties. It is only evidence of negotiations until that period. When it is signed it becomes a treaty—an existing treaty—between the two countries.

The next step is the exchange of ratifications, which is merely an office that is performed for the purpose of putting the treaty into force. The treaty exists; it is the agreement between the two countries, but it does not go into effect; it lies dormant until the ratifications are exchanged. It is for the purpose of obtaining our advice and consent to the ratification of the treaty that the Constitution requires that it be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the rule never contemplated the presentation in this form of such a document as is now tendered for the RECORD, and he overrules the point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, before the Senator from Idaho proceeds, I desire to ask him if the document from which he is reading purports to be signed?

Mr. BORAH. No; it does not.

Mr. BORAH resumed the reading, and was interrupted by

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I call the attention of the Chair to Rule XI, which reads as follows:

When the reading of a paper is called for, and objected to, it shall be determined by a vote of the Senate without debate.

I object to the reading of this document, and I insist that Rule XI is applicable. It would be utterly futile to adopt a rule of that character if it only——

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the point is to be determined without debate, I think.

Mr. BORAH. Permit me to say, however, that I understand that rule applies to matters which it is asked to have read by the Secretary.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I insist, Mr. President, that it does not apply to that alone, because, if it did, the rule would be an utterly futile one. A Senator asks that a paper be read from the desk; objection is made, and he reads it himself. The rule was intended——

Mr. LODGE. I make the point of order that the question must be determined without debate.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The rule was contemplated to apply to just such a case.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will settle it. The question is, Shall the reading proceed?

Mr. WALSH of Montana, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. SMOOT called for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer as heretofore, I vote "nay."

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. ROBINSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I should like to inquire if the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. STERLING. I have a pair with the Senator from South Carolina, and therefore withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. Not knowing how he would vote on this question, I withhold my vote.

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WILLIAMS (after having voted in the negative). I failed to note that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], with whom I have a pair, is not present. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], and vote "nay."

Mr. LODGE. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], which I have previously announced, to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], and vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], and vote "yea."

Mr. KING. I wish to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] are detained from the Senate on public business.

Mr. HARRIS. My colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], is absent on account of a death in his family.

Mr. LODGE. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY]; and

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK] with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON].

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—42.

Borah	Frelinghuysen	McNary	Pomerene
Brandegee	Hale	Moses	Reed
Capper	Harding	Myers	Sherman
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	Nelson	Smoot
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	New	Spencer
Dillingham	Kellogg	Newberry	Sutherland
Edge	Kenyon	Norris	Wadsworth
Elkins	Keyes	Overman	Warren
Fall	Knox	Page	Watson
Fernald	Lodge	Phipps	
France	McLean	Poindexter	

NAYS—24.

Beckham	Harrison	McKellar	Stanley
Culberson	Hitchcock	Nugent	Swanson
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Underwood
Fletcher	Kendrick	Robinson	Walsh, Mass.
Gay	Kirby	Sheppard	Walsh, Mont.
Harris	McCumber	Simmons	Williams

NOT VOTING—30.

Ashurst	Gronna	Owen	Smith, S. C.
Ball	Henderson	Penrose	Sterling
Bankhead	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Thomas
Calder	King	Ransdell	Townsend
Colt	La Follette	Shields	Trammell
Curtis	Lenroot	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Gerry	McCormick	Smith, Ga.	
Gore	Martin	Smith, Md.	

So the question was determined in the affirmative.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho will proceed.

Mr. BORAH resumed the reading of the treaty and was interrupted by

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. Under Rule XIX, section 1, it is provided:

> No Senator shall speak more than twice upon any one question in debate on the same day without the leave of the Senate, which shall be determined without debate.

I make the point of order that the Senator is now speaking for the second time.

Mr. SMOOT. He has a right to speak the second time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. PHELAN. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BORAH resumed the reading, and was interrupted by

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, without taking the Senator from the floor, I should like to make a request for unanimous consent, which I think will be agreeable to the Senator, if I may make that request without taking the Senator from the floor.

Mr. BORAH. Would that take me from the floor, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If anybody raises the question, it will.

Mr. NELSON. I suppose I can state what my request will be without that being done.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

Mr. NELSON. My request is that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that a direct vote be had upon the motion to reconsider the motion of the Senator from Idaho to print this document in the RECORD.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I should like to have that done, but I do not want to lose the floor, and if that unanimous-consent request is submitted and objected to, that will take me off the floor.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I think that can be accomplished by adding "and that the consideration of the application for unanimous consent shall not operate to deprive the Senator from Idaho of the floor."

Mr. BORAH. Very well.

Mr. NORRIS. Is that going to be done without debate?

Mr. NELSON. My request is that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that a vote be had without debate upon the motion to reconsider the motion of the Senator from Idaho to print this document in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, as far as I can speak for those here, I think that will be entirely satisfactory. We objected very seriously when the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] made a bona fide motion to reconsider, and a disposition was shown to lay that motion on the table. If we can have a direct vote on that question, we are willing to have it without any debate.

Mr. LODGE. Without debate?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Without debate.

Mr. BORAH. That is, that the vote shall be taken upon the motion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] to reconsider?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; that is it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As the Chair understands, the proposition is that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside; that by unanimous consent, and without debate the vote be taken upon the motion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM.] to reconsider; and that such action will not lose the floor to the Senator from Idaho. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none. The question is on the motion to reconsider.

Mr. NORRIS. I suggest the absence of a quorum, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that is in direct violation of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. NORRIS. It is only done for the purpose of getting Senators here.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator calls for the yeas and nays, they will come in.

Mr. NORRIS. It will take just twice as long. However, I call for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll. The question is on the motion to reconsider.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The vote is being taken on the motion to reconsider?

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the motion to reconsider.

Mr. LODGE. Those against reconsideration will vote "nay," then.

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). Because of my general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], who is not in his seat, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer as before and vote "yea."

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] and vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] and vote "yea."

Mr. ROBINSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Georgia was called). The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] is detained from the Senate by death in his family.

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I announce that I am paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). In the absence of my pair, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER], I withhold my vote.

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT]. In his absence, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Transferring my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. HARDING (after having voted in the negative). I have already cast my vote in the negative before I was aware of the absence of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Alabama to the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] and vote "nay."

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] to the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] and vote "nay."

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that the Senator from Vermont has transferred his pair to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE].

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then I am at liberty to vote, and I vote "yea."

Mr. KING. I desire to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] are detained on public business.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK] with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON].

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—26.

Beckham	Hitchcock	Overman	Stanley
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Phelan	Swanson
Dial	Kendrick	Pittman	Trammell
Fletcher	King	Robinson	Walsh, Mont.
Gay	Kirby	Sheppard	Williams
Harris	McKellar	Simmons	
Harrison	Nugent	Smith, Ariz.	

NAYS—41.

Borah	Gronna	Lodge	Reed
Capper	Hale	McLean	Sherman
Chamberlain	Harding	McNary	Smoot
Cummins	Johnson, Calif.	Nelson	Spencer
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	New	Sutherland
Dillingham	Kellogg	Newberry	Wadsworth
Edge	Kenyon	Norris	Walsh, Mass.
Elkins	Keyes	Page	Warren
Fall	Knox	Phipps	
France	La Follette	Poindexter	
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Pomerene	

NOT VOTING—29.

Ashurst	Gore	Owen	Thomas
Ball	Henderson	Penrose	Townsend
Bankhead	Johnson, S. Dak.	Ransdell	Underwood
Brandegee	McCormick	Shields	Watson
Calder	McCumber	Smith, Ga.	Wolcott
Colt	Martin	Smith, Md.	
Fernald	Moses	Smith, S. C.	
Gerry	Myers	Sterling	

So the motion to reconsider was rejected.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, there are a number of maps in this proposed treaty, which I presume can not go in the RECORD. At least, I understand that the rule is that they can not, so I will not ask that the maps be printed in the RECORD. Later, I will see if we can have the proposed treaty printed as a Senate document with the maps.

The proposed treaty is as follows:

CONDITIONS OF PEACE

The United States of America, the British Empire, France, Italy and Japan,

These Powers being described in the present Treaty as the Principal Allied and Associated Powers,

Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, the Hedjaz, Honduras, Liberia, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, the Serb-Croat and Slovene State, Siam, Tchecko-Slovakia and Uruguay,

These Powers constituting with the Principal Powers mentioned above, the Allied and Associated Powers,

of the one part;

And Germany.

of the other part;

Bearing in mind that on the request of the Imperial German Government an armistice was granted on November 11, 1918 to Germany by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers in order that a Treaty of Peace might be concluded with her, and

The Allied and Associated Powers being equally desirous that the war in which they were successively involved directly or indirectly and which originated in the declaration of war by Austria-Hungary on July 28, 1914 against Serbia, the declaration of war by Germany against Russia on August 1, 1914 and against France on August 3, 1914, and in the invasion of Belgium, should be replaced by a firm, just and durable peace.

For this purpose the High Contracting Parties represented as follows:

The President of the United States of America, by:

The Honourable Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, acting in his own name and by his own proper authority;

The Honourable Robert Lansing, Secretary of State;

The Honourable Henry White, formerly Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States at Rome and Paris;

The Honourable Edward M. House;

General Tasker H. Bliss, Military Representative of the United States on the Supreme War Council;

His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions Beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, by:

The Right Honourable David Lloyd George, M. P., First Lord of His Treasury and Prime Minister;

The Right Honourable Andrew Bonar Law, M. P., His Lord Privy Seal;

The Right Honourable Viscount Milner, G. C. B., G. C. M. G., His Secretary of State for the Colonies;

The Right Honourable Arthur James Balfour, O. M., M. P., His Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs;

The Right Honourable George Nicoll Barnes, M. P., Minister without portfolio;

And

for the Dominion of Canada, by:

The Right Honourable Sir Robert Laird Borden, G. C. M. G., Prime Minister;

The Right Honourable Sir George Eulas Foster, G. C. M. G., Minister of Trade and Commerce;

for the Commonwealth of Australia, by:

The Right Honourable William Morris Hughes, Attorney General and Prime Minister;

The Right Honourable Sir Joseph Cook, G. C. M. G., Minister for the Navy;

for the Union of South Africa, by:

General the Right Honourable Louis Botha, Prime Minister;

Lieutenant General the Right Honourable Jan Christiaan Smuts, K. C., Minister of Defence;

for the Dominion of New Zealand, by:
The Right Honourable W. F. Massey, Minister of Labour and Prime Minister;
for India, by:
The Right Honourable Edwin Samuel Montagu, M. P., His Secretary of State for India;
Major General His Highness Maharaja Sir Ganga Singh Bahadur, Maharaja of Bikaner, G. C. S. I., G. C. I. E., G. C. V. O., K. C. B., A. D. C.;
The President of the French Republic, by:
Mr. Georges Clemenceau, President of the Council, Minister of War;
Mr. Pichon, Minister of Foreign Affairs;
Mr. L.-L. Klotz, Minister of Finance;
Mr. André Tardieu, Commissary General for Franco-American Military Affairs;
Mr. Jules Cambon, Ambassador of France.
His Majesty the King of Italy, by:
Mr. V. E. Orlando, President of the Council of Ministers;
Baron S. Sonnino, Minister of Foreign Affairs;
Marquis G. F. Salvago Raggi, Senator of the Kingdom, formerly Ambassador of His Majesty the King of Italy at Paris;
Mr. A. Salandra, Deputy, formerly President of the Council of Ministers;
Mr. S. Barzilai, Deputy, formerly Minister;
His Majesty the Emperor of Japan, by:
Marquis Saïonzi, formerly President of the Council of Ministers;
Baron Makino, formerly Minister of Foreign Affairs, Member of the Diplomatic Council;
Viscount Chinda, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of H. M. the Emperor of Japan at London;
Mr. K. Matsui, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of H. M. the Emperor of Japan at Paris;
Mr. H. Ijuin, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of H. M. the Emperor of Japan at Rome;
His Majesty the King of the Belgians, by:
Mr. Hymans, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Minister of State;
Mr. van den Heuvel, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of H. M. the King of the Belgians, Minister of State;
Mr. Vandervelde, Minister of Justice, Minister of State;
The President of the Republic of Bolivia, by:
Mr. Ismael Montes, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Bolivia at Paris;
The President of the Republic of Brazil, by:
Mr. Epitacio Pessoa, formerly Minister of State, formerly Member of the Supreme Court of Justice, Federal Senator;
Mr. Pandiá Calogeras, Deputy, formerly Minister of Finance;
Mr. Raul Fernandes;
The President of the Chinese Republic, by:
Mr. Lou Tseng-Tsiang, Minister of Foreign Affairs;
Mr. Chengting Thomas Wang, formerly Minister of Agriculture and Commerce;
The President of the Cuban Republic, by:
Mr. Antonio Sanchez de Bustamante, Dean of the Faculty of Law in the University of Havana, President of the Cuban Society of International Law;
The President of the Republic of Ecuador, by:
Mr. Enrique Dorn y de Alsua, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Ecuador in Paris;
His Majesty the King of the Hellenes, by:
Mr. Eleftherios Veniselos, President of the Council of Ministers;
Mr. Nicolas Politis, Minister of Foreign Affairs;
The President of the Republic of Guatemala, by:
Mr. Joaquin Mendez, formerly Minister of State for Public Works and Public Instruction; Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Guatemala at Washington, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary on special mission at Paris;
The President of the Republic of Haiti, by:
Mr. Tertullien Guilbaud, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Haiti at Paris;
His Majesty the King of the Hedjaz, by:
Mr. Rustem Haidar;
Mr. Abdul Hadi Aouni;
The President of the Republic of Honduras, by:
Dr. Policarpe Bonilla, on special mission to Washington, formerly President of the Republic of Honduras, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary;
The President of the Republic of Liberia, by:
The Honourable C. D. B. King, Secretary of State;
The President of the Republic of Nicaragua, by:
Mr. Salvador Chamorro, President of the Chamber of Deputies;
The President of the Republic of Panama, by:
Mr. Antonio Burgos, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Panama at Madrid;
The President of the Republic of Peru, by:
Mr. Carlos G. Candamo, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Peru at Paris;
The President of the Polish Republic, by:
Mr. Roman Dmowski, President of the Polish National Committee;
Mr. Ignace Paderewski, President of the Council of Ministers, Minister of Foreign Affairs;
The President of the Portuguese Republic, by:
Dr. Affonso Costa, formerly President of the Council of Ministers;
Mr. Augusto Soares, formerly Minister of Foreign Affairs;
His Majesty the King of Roumania, by:
Mr. Jean J. C. Bratiano, President of the Council of Ministers, Minister of Foreign Affairs;
General Constantin Coanda, Corps Commander, A. D. C. to the King, formerly President of the Council of Ministers;
His Majesty the King of the Serbs, the Croats, and the Slovenes, by:
Mr. N. P. Pachitch, formerly President of the Council of Ministers;
Mr. Ante Trumbic, Minister of Foreign Affairs;
Mr. Milenko R. Vesnitch, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of H. M. the King of Serbia at Paris;
His Majesty the King of Siam, by:
Prince Charoon, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of H. M. the King of Siam at Paris;
Prince Traidos Prabandhu, Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs;
The President of the Tchecko-Slovakian Republic, by:
Mr. Charles Kramar, President of the Council of Ministers;
Mr. Edouard Benes, Minister of Foreign Affairs;
The President of the Republic of Uruguay, by:
Mr. Juan Antonio Buero, Minister of Industry, formerly Minister of Foreign Affairs;
Germany, by:
Count Brockdorff-Rantzau, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Empire;
Dr. Landsberg, Minister of Justice of the Empire;
Mr. Giesberts, Minister of Posts of the Empire;
Oberbürgermeister Leinert, President of the Prussian National Assembly;
Dr. Schücking;
Dr. Karl Melchior;
Acting in the name of the German Empire and of each and every component State,

Who having communicated their full powers found in good and due form have agreed as follows:

From the coming into force of the present Treaty the state of war will terminate. From that moment and subject to the provisions of this Treaty official relations with Germany, and with any of the German States, will be resumed by the Allied and Associated Powers.

PART I.

THE COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

The High Contracting Parties,

In order to promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace and security

by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war,

by the prescription of open, just and honourable relations between nations,

by the firm establishment of the understandings of international law as the actual rule of conduct among Governments, and

by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organised peoples with one another,

Agree to this Covenant of the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 1.

The original Members of the League of Nations shall be those of the Signatories which are named in the Annex to this Covenant and also such of those other States named in the Annex as shall accede without reservation to this Covenant. Such accession shall be effected by a Declaration deposited with the Secretariat within two months of the coming into force of the Covenant. Notice thereof shall be sent to all other Members of the League.

Any fully self-governing State, Dominion or Colony not named in the Annex may become a Member of the League if its admission is agreed to by two-thirds of the Assembly, provided that it shall give effective guarantees of its sincere intention to observe its international obligations, and shall accept such regulations as may be prescribed by the League in regard to its military and naval forces and armaments.

Any Member of the League may, after two years' notice of its intention so to do, withdraw from the League, provided that all its international obligations and all its obligations under this Covenant shall have been fulfilled at the time of its withdrawal.

ARTICLE 2.

The action of the League under this covenant shall be effected through the instrumentality of an Assembly and of a Council, with a permanent Secretariat.

ARTICLE 3.

The Assembly shall consist of Representatives of the Members of the League.

The Assembly shall meet at stated intervals and from time to time as occasion may require at the Seat of the League or at such other place as may be decided upon.

The Assembly may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the League or affecting the peace of the world.

At meetings of the Assembly each Member of the League shall have one vote, and may have not more than three Representatives.

ARTICLE 4.

The Council shall consist of Representatives of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, together with Representatives of four other Members of the League. These four Members of the League shall be selected by the Assembly from time to time in its discretion. Until the appointment of the Representatives of the four Members of the League first selected by the Assembly, Representatives of Belgium, Brazil, Spain and Greece shall be members of the Council.

With the approval of the majority of the Assembly, the Council may name additional Members of the League whose Representatives shall always be members of the Council; the Council with like approval may increase the number of Members of the League to be selected by the Assembly for representation on the Council.

The Council shall meet from time to time as occasion may require, and at least once a year, at the Seat of the League, or at such other place as may be decided upon.

The Council may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the League or affecting the peace of the world.

Any Member of the League not represented on the Council shall be invited to send a Representative to sit as a member at any meeting of the Council during the consideration of matters specially affecting the interests of that Member of the League.

At meetings of the Council, each Member of the League represented on the Council shall have one vote, and may have not more than one Representative.

ARTICLE 5.

Except where otherwise expressly provided in this Covenant or by the terms of the present Treaty, decisions at any meeting of the Assembly or of the Council shall require the agreement of all the Members of the League represented at the meeting.

All matters of procedure at meetings of the Assembly or of the Council, including the appointment of Committees to investigate particular matters, shall be regulated by the Assembly or by the Council and may be decided by a majority of the Members of the League represented at the meeting.

The first meeting of the Assembly and the first meeting of the Council shall be summoned by the President of the United States of America.

ARTICLE 6.

The permanent Secretariat shall be established at the Seat of the League. The Secretariat shall comprise a Secretary General and such secretaries and staff as may be required.

The first Secretary General shall be the person named in the Annex; thereafter the Secretary General shall be appointed by the Council with the approval of the majority of the Assembly.

The secretaries and staff of the Secretariat shall be appointed by the Secretary General with the approval of the Council.

The Secretary General shall act in that capacity at all meetings of the Assembly and of the Council.

The expenses of the Secretariat shall be borne by the Members of the League in accordance with the apportionment of the expenses of the International Bureau of the Universal Postal Union.

ARTICLE 7.

The Seat of the League is established at Geneva.

The Council may at any time decide that the Seat of the League shall be established elsewhere.

All positions under or in connection with the League, including the Secretariat, shall be open equally to men and women.

Representatives of the Members of the League and officials of the League when engaged on the business of the League shall enjoy diplomatic privileges and immunities.

The buildings and other property occupied by the League or its officials or by Representatives attending its meetings shall be inviolable.

ARTICLE 8.

The Members of the League recognise that the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations.

The Council, taking account of the geographical situation and circumstances of each State, shall formulate plans for such reduction for the consideration and action of the several Governments.

Such plans shall be subject to reconsideration and revision at least every ten years.

After these plans shall have been adopted by the several Governments, the limits of armaments therein fixed shall not be exceeded without the concurrence of the council.

The Members of the League agree that the manufacture by private enterprise of munitions and implements of war is open to grave objections. The Council shall advise how the evil effects attendant upon such manufacture can be prevented, due regard being had to the necessities of those Members of the League which are not able to manufacture the munitions and implements of war necessary for their safety.

The Members of the League undertake to interchange full and frank information as to the scale of their armaments, their military and naval programmes and the condition of such of their industries as are adaptable to war-like purposes.

ARTICLE 9.

A permanent Commission shall be constituted to advise the Council on the execution of the provisions of Articles 1 and 8 and on military and naval questions generally.

ARTICLE 10.

The Members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

ARTICLE 11.

Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the Members of the League or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole League, and the League shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations. In case any such emergency should arise the Secretary General shall on the request of any Member of the League forthwith summon a meeting of the Council.

It is also declared to be the friendly right of each Member of the League to bring to the attention of the Assembly or of the Council any circumstance whatever affecting international relations which threatens to disturb international peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends.

ARTICLE 12.

The Members of the League agree that if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, they will submit the matter either to arbitration or to inquiry by the Council, and they agree in no case to resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the report by the Council.

In any case under this Article the award of the arbitrators shall be made within a reasonable time, and the report of the Council shall be made within six months after the submission of the dispute.

ARTICLE 13.

The Members of the League agree that whenever any dispute shall arise between them which they recognise to be suitable for submission to arbitration and which cannot be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy, they will submit the whole subject-matter to arbitration.

Disputes as to the interpretation of a treaty, as to any question of international law, as to the existence of any fact which if established would constitute a breach of any international obligation, or as to the extent and nature of the reparation to be made for any such breach, are declared to be among those which are generally suitable for submission to arbitration.

For the consideration of any such dispute the court of Arbitration to which the case is referred shall be the court agreed on by the parties to the dispute or stipulated in any convention existing between them.

The Members of the League agree that they will carry out in full good faith any award that may be rendered, and that they will not resort to war against a Member of the League which complies therewith. In the event of any failure to carry out such an award, the Council shall propose what steps should be taken to give effect thereto.

ARTICLE 14.

The Council shall formulate and submit to the Members of the League for adoption plans for the establishment of a Permanent Court of International Justice. The Court shall be competent to hear and determine any dispute of an international character which the parties thereto submit to it. The Court may also give an advisory opinion upon any dispute or question referred to it by the Council or by the Assembly.

ARTICLE 15.

If there should arise between Members of the League any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, which is not submitted to arbitration in accordance with Article 13, the Members of the League agree that they will submit the matter to the Council. Any party to the dispute may effect such submission by giving notice of the existence of the dispute to the Secretary General, who will make all necessary arrangements for a full investigation and consideration thereof.

For this purpose the parties to the dispute will communicate to the Secretary General, as promptly as possible, statements of their case with all the relevant facts and papers, and the Council may forthwith direct the publication thereof.

The Council shall endeavour to effect a settlement of the dispute, and if such efforts are successful, a statement shall be made public giving such facts and explanations regarding the dispute and the terms of settlement thereof as the Council may deem appropriate.

If the dispute is not thus settled, the Council either unanimously or by a majority vote shall make and publish a report containing a statement of the facts of the dispute and the recommendations which are deemed just and proper in regard thereto.

Any Member of the League represented on the Council may make public a statement of the facts of the dispute and of its conclusions regarding the same.

If a report by the Council is unanimously agreed to by the Members thereof other than the Representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the Members of the League agree that they will not go to war with any party to the dispute which complies with the recommendations of the report.

If the Council fails to reach a report which is unanimously agreed to by the Members thereof, other than the Representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the Members of the League reserve to themselves the right to take such action as they shall consider necessary for the maintenance of right and justice.

If the dispute between the parties is claimed by one of them, and is found by the Council, to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the Council shall so report, and shall make no recommendation as to its settlement.

The Council may in any case under this Article refer the dispute to the Assembly. The dispute shall be so referred at the request of either party to the dispute, provided that such request be made within fourteen days after the submission of the dispute to the Council.

In any case referred to the Assembly all the provisions of this Article and of Article 12 relating to the action and powers of the Council shall apply to the action and powers of the Assembly, provided that a report made by the Assembly, if concurred in by the Representatives of those Members of the League represented on the Council and of a majority of the other Members of the League, exclusive in each case of the Representatives of the parties to the dispute, shall have the same force as a report by the Council concurred in by all the members thereof other than the Representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute.

ARTICLE 16.

Should any Member of the League resort to war in disregard of its covenants under Articles 12, 13 or 15, it shall *ipso facto* be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other Members of the League, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant-breaking State, and the prevention of all financial, commercial or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking State and the nationals of any other State, whether a Member of the League or not.

It shall be the duty of the Council in such case to recommend to the several Governments concerned what effective military or naval force the Members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the covenants of the League.

The Members of the League agree, further, that they will mutually support one another in the financial and economic measures which are taken under this Article, in order to minimise the loss and inconvenience resulting from the above measures, and that they will mutually support one another in resisting any special measures aimed at one of their number by the covenant-breaking State, and that they will take the necessary steps to afford passage through their territory to the forces of any of the Members of the League which are co-operating to protect the covenants of the League.

Any Member of the League which has violated any covenant of the League may be declared to be no longer a Member of the League by a vote of the Council concurred in by the Representatives of all the other Members of the League represented thereon.

ARTICLE 17.

In the event of a dispute between a Member of the League and a State which is not a Member of the League, or between States not Members of the League, the State or States not Members of the League shall be invited to accept the obligations of membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, upon such conditions as the Council may deem just. If such invitation is accepted, the provisions of Articles 12 to 16 inclusive shall be applied with such modifications as may be deemed necessary by the Council.

Upon such invitation being given the Council shall immediately institute an inquiry into the circumstances of the dispute and recommend such action as may seem best and most effectual in the circumstances.

If a State so invited shall refuse to accept the obligations of membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, and shall resort to war against a Member of the League, the provisions of Article 16 shall be applicable as against the State taking such action.

If both parties of the dispute when so invited refuse to accept the obligations of membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, the Council may take such measures and make such recommendations as will prevent hostilities and will result in the settlement of the dispute.

ARTICLE 18.

Every treaty or international engagement entered into hereafter by any Member of the League shall be forthwith registered with the Secretariat and shall as soon as possible be published by it. No such treaty or international engagement shall be binding until so registered.

ARTICLE 19.

The Assembly may from time to time advise the reconsideration by Members of the League of treaties which have become inapplicable and the consideration of international conditions whose continuance might endanger the peace of the world.

ARTICLE 20.

The Members of the League severally agree that this Covenant is accepted as abrogating all obligations or understandings *inter se* which are inconsistent with the terms thereof, and solemnly undertake that they will not hereafter enter into any engagements inconsistent with the terms thereof.

In case any Member of the League shall, before becoming a Member of the League, have undertaken any obligations inconsistent with the terms of this Covenant, it shall be the duty of such Member to take immediate steps to procure its release from such obligations.

ARTICLE 21.

Nothing in this Covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements, such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe doctrine, for securing the maintenance of peace.

ARTICLE 22.

To those colonies and territories which as a consequence of the late war have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the States which formerly governed them and which are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuout conditions of the modern world, there should be applied the principle that the well-being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilisation and that securities for the performance of this trust should be embodied in this Covenant.

The best method of giving practical effect to this principle is that the tutelage of such peoples should be entrusted to advanced nations who by reason of their resources, their experience or the geographical position can best undertake this responsibility, and who are willing to accept it, and that this tutelage should be exercised by them as Mandatories on behalf of the League.

The character of the mandate must differ according to the stage of the development of the people, the geographical situation of the territory, its economic conditions and other similar circumstances.

Certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire have reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognised subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a Mandatory until such time as they are able to stand alone. The wishes of these communities must be a principal consideration in the selection of the Mandatory.

Other peoples, especially those of Central Africa, are at such a stage that the Mandatory must be responsible for the administration of the territory under conditions which will guarantee freedom of conscience and religion, subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals, the prohibition of abuses such as the slave trade, the arms traffic and the liquor traffic, and the prevention of the establishment of fortifications or military and naval bases and of military training of the natives for other than police purposes and the defence of territory, and will also secure equal opportunities for the trade and commerce of other Members of the League.

There are territories, such as South-West Africa and certain of the South Pacific Islands, which, owing to the sparseness of their population, or their small size, or their remoteness from the centres of civilisation, or their geographical contiguity to the territory of the Mandatory, and other circumstances, can be best administered under the laws of the Mandatory as integral portions of its territory, subject to the safeguards above mentioned in the interests of the indigenous population.

In every case of mandate, the Mandatory shall render to the Council an annual report in reference to the territory committed to its charge.

The degree of authority, control, or administration to be exercised by the Mandatory shall, if not previously agreed upon by the Members of the League, be explicitly defined in each case by the Council.

A permanent Commission shall be constituted to receive and examine the annual reports of the Mandatories and to advise the Council on all matters relating to the observance of the mandates.

ARTICLE 23.

Subject to and in accordance with the provisions of international conventions existing or hereafter to be agreed upon, the Members of the League:

(*a*) will endeavour to secure and maintain fair and humane conditions of labour for men, women, and children, both in their own countries and in all countries to which their commercial and industrial relations extend, and for that purpose will establish and maintain the necessary international organisations;

(*b*) undertake to secure just treatment of the native inhabitants of territories under their control;

(*c*) will entrust the League with the general supervision over the execution of agreements with regard to the traffic in women and children, and the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs;

(*d*) will entrust the League with the general supervision of the trade in arms and ammunition with the countries in which the control of this traffic is necessary in the common interest;

(*e*) will make provision to secure and maintain freedom of communications and of transit and equitable treatment for the commerce of all Members of the League. In this connection, the special necessities of the regions devastated during the war of 1914–1918 shall be borne in mind;

(*f*) will endeavour to take steps in matters of international concern for the prevention and control of disease.

ARTICLE 24.

There shall be placed under the direction of the League all international bureaux already established by general treaties if the parties to such treaties consent. All such international bureaux and all commissions for the regulation of matters of international interest hereafter constituted shall be placed under the direction of the League.

In all matters of international interest which are regulated by general conventions but which are not placed under the control of international bureaux or commissions, the Secretariat of the League shall, subject to the consent of the Council and if desired by the parties, collect and distribute all relevant information and shall render any other assistance which may be necessary or desirable.

The Council may include as part of the expenses of the Secretariat the expenses of any bureau or commission which is placed under the direction of the League.

ARTICLE 25.

The Members of the League agree to encourage and promote the establisment and co-operation of duly authorised voluntary national Red Cross organisations having as purposes the improvement of health, the prevention of disease and the mitigation of suffering throughout the world.

ARTICLE 26.

Amendments to this Covenant will take effect when ratified by the Members of the League whose Representatives compose the Council and by a majority of the Members of the League whose Representatives compose the Assembly.

No such amendment shall bind any Member of the League which signifies its dissent therefrom, but in that case it shall cease to be a Member of the League.

ANNEX.

I. Original members of the League of Nations signatories of the treaty of peace.

United States of America.
Belgium.
Bolivia.
Brazil.
British Empire.
Canada.
Australia.
South Africa.
New Zealand.
India.
China.
Cuba.
Ecuador.
France.
Greece.
Guatemala.
Haiti.
Hedjaz.
Honduras.
Italy.
Japan.
Liberia.
Nicaragua.
Panama.
Peru.
Poland.
Portugal.
Roumania.
Serb-Croat and Slovene State.
Siam.
Tchecko-Slovakia.
Uruguay.

States invited to accede to the covenant.

Argentine Republic.
Chili.
Colombia.
Denmark.
Netherlands.
Norway.
Paraguay.
Persia.
Salvador.
Spain.
Sweden.
Switzerland.
Venezuela.

II. First Secretary General of the League of Nations.

The honourable Sir James Eric Drummond, G. C. M. G., C. B.

PART II.

BOUNDARIES OF GERMANY.

ARTICLE 27.

The boundaries of Germany will be determined as follows:

1. *With Belgium:*

From the point common to the three frontiers of Belgium, Holland and Germany and in a southerly direction:

the north-eastern boundary of the former territory of *neutral Moresnet*, then the eastern boundary of the *Kreis* of Eupen, then the frontier between Belgium and the *Kreis* of Montjoie, then the north-eastern and eastern boundary of the *Kreis* of Malmédy to its junction with the frontier of Luxemburg.

2. *With Luxemburg:*

The frontier of the 3rd August, 1914, to its junction with the frontier of France of the 18th July, 1870.

3. *With France:*

The frontier of the 18th July, 1870, from Luxemburg to Switzerland with the reservations made in Article 48 of Section IV (Saar Basin) of Part III.

4. *With Switzerland:*
The present frontier.
5. *With Austria:*
The frontier of the 3rd August, 1914, from Switzerland to Tchecko-Slovakia is hereinafter defined.
6. *With Tchecko-Slovakia:*
The frontier of the 3rd August, 1914, between Germany and Austria from its junction with the old administrative boundary separating Bohemia and the province of Upper Austria to the point north of the salient of the old province of Austrian Silesia situated at about 8 kilometres east of Neustadt.
7. *With Poland:*
From the point defined above in a northerly direction to the point of the salient of the eastern boundary of the *Kreis* of Falkenberg, which is about 3 kilometres east of Puschine:
a line to be fixed on the ground passing east of ZÜLZ:
thence the eastern boundary of the *Kreis* of Falkenberg, then the boundary between Upper and Middle Silesia, then the western boundary of Posnania to the Bartsch, then the course of this river downstream, then the boundary between the *Kreise* of Guhrau and of Glogau in a northerly direction, then the boundary of Posnania in a north-easterly direction to its junction with the boundary between the *Kreise* of Lissa and Fraustadt;
thence in a north-westerly direction to a point to be chosen on the road between the villages of Unruhstadt and Kopnitz:
a line to be fixed on the ground passing west of Geyrsdorf, Brenno, Fehlen, Altkloster, Klebel, and east of Ulbersdor, Buchwaldf, Ilgen, Weine, Lupitze, Schwenten;
thence in a northerly direction to the northernmost point of Lake Chlop:
a line to be fixed on the ground following the median line of the lakes; the town and the station of Bentschen however (including the junction of the lines Schwiebus-Bentschen and Züllichau-Bentschen) remaining in Polish territory;
thence in an north-north-easterly direction to the point of junction of the boundaries of the *Kreise* of Schwerin, Birnbaum and Meseritz:
a line to be fixed on the ground passing east of Betsche;
thence in a northerly direction the boundary separating the *Kreise* of Schwerin and Birnbaum, then in an easterly direction the northern boundary of the *Regierungsbezirk* of Posen, then in a north-easterly direction the boundary between the *Kreise* of Filehne and Czarnikau, then the course of the Netze up-stream, then in a northerly direction the eastern boundary of the *Kreis* of Czarnikau to its junction with the northern boundary of Posnania;
thence in a north-easterly direction to a point on the frontier of Posnania situated at the extremity of the salient at about 5 kilometres west-north-west of Schneidemühl:
a line to be fixed on the ground;
thence the frontier of Posnania to its junction with the boundary between the *Kreise* of Flatow and of Deutschkrone;
thence in a north-easterly direction to point 205 (about 5 kilometres west-north-west of Konitz):
a line to be fixed on the ground approximately parallel to the railway Schneidemühl-Konitz and about 8 kilometres west of it and passing to the west of Annafeld, Gresonse, Friedland, Steinborn, Jenznik, Niesewanz and east of Sakollno, Wengerz, Gursen, Radawnitz, Lanken, Damnitz, Schlochau (leaving in German territory the Hammerstein-Schlochau-Prechlau railway), Lichtenhagen, Richnau;
thence in a northerly direction the boundary between the *Kreise* of Konitz and Schlochau, then the boundary of West Prussia to the northern extremity of the salient about 8 kilometres south-east of Lauenburg;
thence in a northerly direction to the Baltic Sea:
a line to be fixed on the ground, passing east of the villages of Hohenfelde, Saulin, Chottschow, following the median line of the lakes situated east of those places, and through point 32 about 5 kilometres north-north-west of Ossecken.
8. *With Denmark:*
The frontier as it will be fixed in accordance with Articles 109 and 110 of Part III, Section XII (Schleswig).

ARTICLE 28.

The boundaries of East Prussia, with the reservations made in Articles 94 and 96 of Section IX (East Prussia) of Part III will be determined as follows:
from a point on the coast of the Baltic Sea about 1½ kilometres north of Pröbbernau Church in a direction of about 159° East from true North:
a line to be fixed on the ground for about 2 kilometres;
thence in a straight line to the light at the bend of the Elbinger Channel in approximately latitude 54° 19½′ North, longitude 19° 26′ East of Greenwich;
thence to the easternmost mouth of the Nogat River at a bearing of approximately 209° East from true North;
thence up the course of the Nogat River to the point where the latter leaves the Vistula (Weichsel);
thence up the principal channel of navigation of the Vistula, then the southern boundary of the *Kreis* of Marienwerder, then that of the *Kreis* of Rosenberg eastwards to the point where it meets the old boundary of East Prussia;
thence the old boundary between East and West Prussia, then the boundary between the *Kreise* of Osterode and Neidenburg, then the course of the river Skottau down-stream, then the course of the Neide up-stream to a point situated about 5 kilometres west of Bialutten being the nearest point to the old frontier of Russia;
thence in an easterly direction to a point immediately south of the intersection of the road Neidenburg-Mlava with the old frontier of Russia:
a line to be fixed on the ground passing north of Bialutten;
thence the old frontier of Russia to a point east of Schmallenigken, then the principal channel of navigation of the Niemen (Memel) downstream, then the Skierwieth arm of the delta to the Kurisches Haff;
thence a straight line to the point where the eastern shore of the Kurische Nehrung meets the administrative boundary about 4 kilometres south-west of Nidden;
thence this administrative boundary to the western shore of the Kurische Nehrung.

ARTICLE 29.

The boundaries as described above are drawn in red on a one-in-a-million map which is annexed to the present Treaty (Map No. 1.)
In the case of any discrepancies between the text of the Treaty and this map or any other map which may be annexed, the text will be final.

ARTICLE 30.

In the case of boundaries which are defined by a waterway, the terms "course" and "channel" used in the present Treaty signify: in the case of non-navigable rivers, the median line of the waterway or of its principal arm, and, in the case of navigable rivers, the median line of the principal channel of navigation. It will rest with the Boundary Commissions provided by the present Treaty to specify in each case whether the frontier line shall follow any changes of the course or channel which may take place or whether it shall be definitely fixed by the position of the course or channel at the time when the present Treaty comes into force.

PART III.

POLITICAL CLAUSES FOR EUROPE.

Section I. Belgium.

ARTICLE 31.

Germany, recognizing that the Treaties of April 19, 1839, which established the status of Belgium before the war, no longer conform to the requirements of the situation, consents to the abrogation of the said treaties and undertakes immediately to recognize and to observe whatever conventions may be entered into by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, or by any of them, in concert with the Governments of Belgium and of the Netherlands, to replace the said Treaties of 1839. If her formal adhesion should be required to such conventions or to any of their stipulations, Germany undertakes immediately to give it.

ARTICLE 32.

Germany recognizes the full sovereignty of Belgium over the whole of the contested territory of Moresnet (called *Moresnet neutre*).

ARTICLE 33.

Germany renounces in favour of Belgium all rights and title over the territory of Prussian Moresnet situated on the west of the road from Liège to Aix-la-Chapelle; the road will belong to Belgium where it bounds this territory.

ARTICLE 34.

Germany renounces in favour of Belgium all rights and title over the territory comprising the whole of the *Kreise* of Eupen and of Malmédy.
During the six months after the coming into force of this Treaty, registers will be opened by the Belgium Authorities

at Eupen and Malmédy in which the inhabitants of the above territory will be entitled to record in writing a desire to see the whole or part of it remain under German sovereignty.

The results of this public expression of opinion will be communicated by the Belgian Government to the League of Nations, and Belgium undertakes to accept the decision of the League.

ARTICLE 35.

A Commission of seven persons, five of whom will be appointed by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, one by Germany and one by Belgium, will be set up fifteen days after the coming into force of the present Treaty to settle on the spot the new frontier line between Belgium and Germany, taking into account the economic factors and the means of communication.

Decisions will be taken by a majority and will be binding on the parties concerned.

ARTICLE 36.

When the transfer of the sovereignty over the territories referred to above has become definitive, German nationals habitually resident in the territories will definitively acquire Belgian nationality *ipso facto*, and will lose their German nationality.

Nevertheless German nationals who become resident in the territories after the 1st August, 1914, shall not obtain Belgian nationality without a permit from the Belgian Government.

ARTICLE 37.

Within the two years following the definitive transfer of the sovereignty over the territories assigned to Belgium under the present Treaty, German nationals over 18 years of age habitually resident in those territories will be entitled to opt for German nationality.

Option by a husband will cover his wife, and option by parents will cover their children under 18 years of age.

Persons who have exercised the above right to opt must within the ensuing twelve months transfer their place of residence to Germany.

They will be entitled to retain their immovable property in the territories acquired by Belgium. They may carry with them their movable property of every description. No export or import duties may be imposed upon them in connection with the removal of such property.

ARTICLE 38.

The German Government will hand over without delay to the Belgian Government the archives, registers, plans, title deeds and documents of every kind concerning the civil, military, financial, judicial or other administrations in the territory transferred to Belgian sovereignty.

The German Government will likewise restore to the Belgian Government the archives and documents of every kind carried off during the war by the German authorities from the Belgian public administrations, in particular from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs at Brussels.

ARTICLE 39.

The proportion and nature of the financial liabilities of Germany and of Prussia which Belgium will have to bear on account of the territories ceded to her shall be fixed in conformity with Article, 254 and 256 of Part IX (Financial Clauses) of the present Treaty.

Section II. Luxemburg.

ARTICLE 40.

With regard to the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, Germany renounces the benefit of all the provisions inserted in her favour in the treaties of February 8, 1842, April 2, 1847, October 20–25, 1865, August 18, 1866, February 21 and May 11, 1867, May 10, 1871, June 11, 1872, and November 11, 1902, and in all conventions consequent upon such treaties.

Germany recognizes that the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg ceased to form part of the German Zollverein as from January 1, 1919, renounces all rights to the exploitation of the railways, adheres to the termination of the *régime* of neutrality of the Grand Duchy, and accepts in advance all international arrangements which may be concluded by the Allied and Associated Powers relating to the Grand Duchy.

ARTICLE 41.

Germany undertakes to grant to the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, when a demand to that effect is made to her by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, the rights and advantages stipulated in favour of such Powers or their nationals in the present Treaty with regard to economic questions, to questions relative to transport and to aerial navigation.

Section III. Left bank of the Rhine.

ARTICLE 42.

Germany is forbidden to maintain or construct any fortifications either on the left bank of the Rhine or on the right bank to the west of a line drawn 50 kilometres to the East of the Rhine.

ARTICLE 43.

In the area defined above the maintenance and the assembly of armed forces, either permanently or temporarily, and military manœuvres of any kind, as well as the upkeep of all permanent works for mobilization are in the same way forbidden.

ARTICLE 44.

In case Germany violates in any manner whatever the provisions of Articles 42 and 43, she shall be regarded as committing a hostile act against the Powers signatory of the present Treaty and as calculated to disturb the peace of the world.

Section IV. Saar Basin.

ARTICLE 45.

As compensation for the destruction of the coal-mines in the north of France and as part payment towards the total reparation due from Germany for the damage resulting from the war, Germany cedes to France in full and absolute possession, with exclusive rights of exploitation, unencumbered and free from all debts and charges of any kind, the coal-mines situated in the Saar Basin as defined in Article 48.

ARTICLE 46.

In order to assure the rights and welfare of the population and to guarantee to France complete freedom in working the mines, Germany agrees to the provisions of Chapters I and II of the Annex hereto.

ARTICLE 47.

In order to make in due time permanent provision for the government of the Saar Basin in accordance with the wishes of the population, France and Germany agree to the provisions of Chapter III of the Annex hereto.

ARTICLE 48.

The boundaries of the territory of the Saar Basin, as dealt with in the present stipulations, will be fixed as follows:—

On the south and south-west: by the frontier of France as fixed by the present Treaty.

On the north-west and north: by a line following the northern administrative boundary of the *Kreis* of Merzig from the point where it leaves the French frontier to the point where it meets the administrative boundary separating the commune of Saarhölzbach from the commune of Britten; following this communal boundary southwards and reaching the administrative boundary of the canton of Merzig so as to include in the territory of the Saar Basin the canton of Mettlach, with the exception of the commune of Britten; following successively the northern administrative limits of the cantons of Merzig and Haustadt, which are incorporated in the aforesaid Saar Basin, then successively the administrative boundaries separating the *Kreise* of Sarrelouis, Ottweiler, and Saint-Wendel from the *Kreise* of Merzig, Trèves (Trier), and the Principality of Birkenfeld as far as a point situated about 500 metres north of the village of Furschweiler (viz., the highest point of the Metzelberg).

On the north-east and east: from the last point defined above to a point about 3½ kilometres east-north-east of Saint-Wendel:

a line to be fixed on the ground passing east of Furschweiler, west of Roschberg, east of points 418, 329 (south of Roschberg), west of Leitersweiler, north-east of point 464, and following the line of the crest southwards to its junction with the administrative boundary of the *Kreis* of Kusel;

thence in a southerly direction the boundary of the *Kreis* of Kusel, then the boundary of the *Kreis* of Homburg towards the south-south-east to a point situated about 1,000 metres west of Dunzweiler;

thence to a point about 1 kilometre south of Hornbach:

a line to be fixed on the ground passing through point 424 (about 1,000 metres south-east of Dunzweiler), point 363 (Fuchs Berg), point 322 (south-west of Waldmohr), then east of Jägersburg and Erbach, then encircling Homburg, passes through the points 361 (about 2½ kilometres north-east by east of that town), 342 (about 2 kilometres south-east of that town), 347 (Schreiners Berg), 356, 350 (about 1½ kilometres south-east of Schwarzenbach), then passing east of Einöd, south-east of points 322 and 333, about 2 kilometres east of Webenheim, about 2 kilometres east of Mimbach, passing east of the plateau which is traversed by the road from Mimbach to Böckweiler (so as to include this road in the territory of the Saar Basin), passing immediately north of the junction of the roads from

Böckweiler and Altheim situated about 2 kilometres north of Altheim, then passing south of Ringweilderhof and north of point 322, rejoining the frontier of France at the angle which it makes about 1 kilometre south of Hornbach (see Map No. 2 scale 1/100,000 annexed to the present Treaty).

A Commission composed of five members, one appointed by France, one by Germany, and three by the Council of the League of Nations, which will select nationals of other Powers, will be constituted within fifteen days from the coming into force of the present Treaty, to trace on the spot the frontier line described above.

In those parts of the preceding line which do not coincide with administration boundaries, the Commission will endeavour to keep to the line indicated, while taking into consideration, so far as is possible, local economic interests and existing communal boundaries.

The decisions of this Commission will be taken by a majority, and will be binding on the parties concerned.

ARTICLE 49.

Germany renounces in favour of the League of Nations, in the capacity of trustee, the government of the territory defined above.

At the end of fifteen years from the coming into force of the present Treaty the inhabitants of the said territory shall be called upon to indicate the sovereignty under which they desire to be placed.

ARTICLE 50.

The stipulations under which the cession of the mines in the Saar Basin shall be carried out, together with the measures intended to guarantee the rights and the well-being of the inhabitants and the government of the territory, as well as the conditions in accordance with which the plebiscite hereinbefore provided for is to be made, are laid down in the Annex hereto. This Annex shall be considered as an integral part of the present Treaty, and Germany declares her adherence to it.

ANNEX.

In accordance with the provisions of Articles 45 to 50 of the present Treaty, the stipulations under which the cession by Germany to France of the mines of the Saar Basin will be effected, as well as the measures intended to ensure respect for the rights and well-being of the population and the government of the territory, and the conditions in which the inhabitants will be called upon to indicate the sovereignty under which they may wish to be placed, have been laid down as follows:—

Chapter I. Cession and exploitation of mining property.

1.

From the date of the coming into force of the present Treaty, all the deposits of coal situated within the Saar Basin as defined in Article 48 of the said Treaty, become the complete and absolute property of the French State.

The French State will have the right of working or not working the said mines, or of transferring to a third party the right of working them, without having to obtain any previous authorisation or to fulfil any formalities.

The French State may always require that the German mining laws and regulations referred to below shall be applied in order to ensure the determination of its rights.

2.

The right of ownership of the French State will apply not only to the deposits which are free and for which concessions have not yet been granted, but also to the deposits for which concessions have already been granted, whoever may be the present proprietors, irrespective of whether they belong to the Prussian State, to the Bavarian State, to other States or bodies, to companies or to individuals, whether they have been worked or not, or whether a right of exploitation distinct from the right of the owners of the surface of the soil has or has not been recognized.

3.

As far as concerns the mines which are being worked, the transfer of the ownership to the French State will apply to all the accessories and subsidiaries of the said mines, in particular to their plant and equipment both on and below the surface, to their extracting machinery, their plants for transforming coal into electric power, coke and by-products, their workshops, means of communication, electric lines, plant for catching and distributing water, land, buildings such as offices, managers', employees' and workmen's dwellings, schools, hospitals, and dispensaries, their stocks and supplies of every description, their archives and plans, and in general everything which those who own or exploit the mines possess or enjoy for the purpose of exploiting the mines and their accessories and subsidiaries.

The transfer will apply also to the debts owing for products delivered before the entry into possession by the French State, and after the signature of the present Treaty, and to deposits of money made by customers, whose rights will be guaranteed by the French State.

4.

The French State will acquire the property free and clear of all debts and charges. Nevertheless, the rights acquired, or in course of being acquired, by the employees of the mines and their accessories and subsidiaries at the date of the coming into force of the present Treaty, in connection with pensions for old age or disability, will not be affected. In return, Germany must pay over to the French State a sum representing the actuarial amounts to which the said employes are entitled.

5.

The value of the property thus ceded to the French State will be determined by the Reparation Commission referred to in Article 233 of Part VIII (Reparations) of the present Treaty.

This value shall be credited to Germany in part payment of the amount due for reparation.

It will be for Germany to indemnify the proprietors or parties concerned, whoever they may be.

6.

No tariff shall be established on the German railways and canals which may directly or indirectly discriminate to the prejudice of the transport of the personnel or products of the mines and their accessories or subsidiaries, or of the material necessary to their exploitation. Such transport shall enjoy all the rights and privileges which any international railway conventions may guarantee to similar products of French origin.

7.

The equipment and personnel necessary to ensure the despatch and transport of the products of the mines and their accessories and subsidiaries, as well as the carriage of workmen and employees, will be provided by the local railway administration of the Basin.

8.

No obstacle shall be placed in the way of such improvements of railways or waterways as the French State may judge necessary to assure the despatch and the transport of the products of the mines and their accessories and subsidiaries, such as double trackage, enlargement of stations, and construction of yards and appurtenances. The distribution of expenses will, in the event of disagreement, be submitted to arbitration.

The French State may also establish any new means of communication, such as roads, electric lines and telephone connections which it may consider necessary for the exploitation of the mines.

It may exploit freely and without any restrictions the means of communication of which it may become the owner, particularly those connecting the mines and their accessories and subsidiaries with the means of communication situated in French territory.

9.

The French State shall always be entitled to demand the application of the German mining laws and regulations in force on the 11th November, 1918, excepting provisions adopted exclusively in view of the state of war, with a view to the acquisition of such land as it may judge necessary for the exploitation of the mines and their accessories and subsidiaries.

The payment for damage caused to immovable property by the working of the said mines and their accessories and subsidiaries shall be made in accordance with the German mining laws and regulations above referred to.

10.

Every person whom the French State may substitute for itself as regards the whole or part of its rights to the exploitation of the mines and their accessories and subsidiaries shall enjoy the benefit of the privileges provided in this Annex.

11.

The mines and other immovable property which become the property of the French State may never be made the subject of measures of forfeiture, forced sale, expropriation or requisition, nor of any other measure affecting the right of property.

The personnel and the plant connected with the exploitation of these mines or their accessories and subsidiaries, as well as the product extracted from the mines or manufactured in their accessories and subsidiaries, may not at any time be made the subject of any measures of requisition.

12.

The exploitation of the mines and their accessories and subsidiaries, which become the property of the French State, will continue, subject to the provisions of paragraph 23 below, to be subject to the régime established by the German laws and regulations in force on the 11th November, 1918, excepting provisions adopted exclusively in view of the state of war.

The rights of the workmen shall be similarly maintained, subject to the provisions of the said paragraph 23, as established on the 11th November, 1918, by the German laws and regulations above referred to.

No impediment shall be placed in the way of the introduction or employment in the mines and their accessories and subsidiaries of workmen from without the Basin.

The employees and workmen of French nationality shall have the right to belong to French labour unions.

13.

The amount contributed by the mines and their accessories and subsidiaries, either to the local budget of the territory of the Saar Basin or to the communal funds, shall be fixed with due regard to the ratio of the value of the mines to the total taxable wealth of the Basin.

14.

The French State shall always have the right of establishing and maintaining, as incidental to the mines, primary or technical schools for its employees and their children, and of causing instruction therein to be given in the French language, in accordance with such curriculum and by such teachers as it may select.

It shall also have the right to establish and maintain hospitals, dipensaries, workmen's houses and gardens and other charitable and social institutions.

15.

The French State shall enjoy complete liberty with respect to the distribution, despatch and sale prices of the products of the mines and their accessories and subsidiaries.

Nevertheless, whatever may be the total product of the mines, the French Government undertakes that the requirements of local consumption for industrial and domestic purposes shall always be satisfied in the proportion existing in 1913 between the amount consumed locally and the total output of the Saar Basin.

Chapter II. Government of the territory of the Saar Basin.

16.

The Government of the territory of the Saar Basin will be entrusted to a Commission representing the League of Nations.

17.

The Governing Commission provided for by paragraph 16 shall consist of five members chosen by the Council of the League of Nations, and will include one citizen of France, one native inhabitant of the Saar Basin, not a citizen of France, and three members belonging to three countries other than France or Germany.

The members of the Governing Commission shall be appointed for one year and may be re-appointed. They can be removed by the Council of the League of Nations, which will provide for their replacement.

The members of the Governing Commission will be entitled to a salary which will be fixed by the Council of the League of Nations, and charged on the local revenues.

18.

The Chairman of the Governing Commission shall be appointed for one year from among the members of the Commission by the Council of the League of Nations and may be re-appointed.

The Chairman will act as the executive of the Commission.

19.

Within the territory of the Saar Basin the Governing Commission shall have all the powers of government hitherto belonging to the German Empire, Prussia, or Bavaria, including the appointment and dismissal of officials, and the creation of such administrative and representative bodies as it may deem necessary.

It shall have full powers to administer and operate the railways, canals, and the different public services.

Its decisions shall be taken by a majority.

20.

Germany will place at the disposal of the Governing Commission all official documents and archives under the control of Germany, of any German State, or of any local authority, which relate to the territory of the Saar Basin or to the rights of the inhabitants thereof.

21.

It will be the duty of the Governing Commission to ensure, by such means and under such conditions as it may deem suitable, the protection abroad of the interests of the inhabitants of the territory of the Saar Basin.

22.

The Governing Commission shall have the full right of user of all property, other than mines, belonging, both in public and in private domain, to the Imperial German Government, or the Government of any German State, in the territory of the Saar Basin.

As regards the railways an equitable apportionment of rolling stock shall be made by a mixed Commission on which the Government of the territory of the Saar Basin and the German railways are represented.

Persons, goods, vessels, carriages, wagons and mails coming from or going to the Saar Basin shall enjoy all the rights and privileges relating to transit and transport which are specified in the provisions of Part XII (Ports, Waterways, Railways) of the present Treaty.

23.

The laws and regulations in force on November 11th, 1918, in the territory of the Saar Basin (except those enacted in consequence of the state of war) shall continue to apply.

If, for general reasons or to bring these laws and regulations into accord with the provisions of the present Treaty, it is necessary to introduce modifications, these shall be decided on, and put into effect by the Governing Commission, after consultation with the elected representatives of the inhabitants in such a manner as the Commission may determine.

No modification may be made in the legal régime for the exploitation of the mines, provided for in paragraph 12, without the French State being previously consulted, unless such modification results from a general regulation respecting labour adopted by the League of Nations.

In fixing the conditions and hours of labour for men, women and children, the Governing Commission is to take into consideration the wishes expressed by the local labour organisations, as well as the principles adopted by the League of Nations.

24.

Subject to the provisions of §4 no rights of the inhabitants of the Saar Basin acquired or in process of acquisition at the date of the coming into force of this Treaty, in respect of any insurance system of Germany or in respect of any pension of any kind, are affected by any of the provisions of the present Treaty.

Germany and the Government of the territory of the Saar Basin will preserve and continue all of the aforesaid rights.

25.

The civil and criminal courts existing in the territory of the Saar Basin shall continue.

A civil and criminal court will be established by the Governing Commission to hear appeals from the decisions of the said courts and to decide matters for which these courts are not competent.

The Governing Commission will be responsible for settling the organisation and jurisdiction of the said court.

Justice will be rendered in the name of the Governing Commission.

26.

The Governing Commission will alone have the power of levying taxes and dues in the territory of the Saar Basin.

These taxes and dues will be exclusively applied to the needs of the territory.

The fiscal system existing on November 11th, 1918, will be maintained as far as possible and no new tax except customs duties may be imposed without previously consulting the elected representatives of the inhabitants.

27.

The present stipulations will not affect the existing nationality of the inhabitants of the territory of the Saar Basin.

No hindrance shall be placed in the way of those who wish to acquire a different nationality, but in such case the acquisition of the new nationality will involve the loss of any other.

28.

Under the control of the Governing Commission the inhabitants will retain their local assemblies, their religious liberties, their schools and their language.

The right of voting will not be exercised for any assemblies other than the local assemblies, and will belong to every inhabitant over the age of twenty years, without distinction of sex.

29.

Any of the inhabitants of the Saar Basin who may desire to leave the territory will have full liberty to retain in it their immovable property or to sell it at fair prices, and to remove their movable property free of any charges.

30.

There will be no military service, whether compulsory or voluntary, in the territory of the Saar Basin, and the construction of fortifications therein is forbidden.

Only a local gendarmerie for the maintenance of order may be established.

It will be the duty of the Governing Commission to provide in all cases for the protection of persons and property in the Saar Basin.

31.

The territory of the Saar Basin as defined by Article 48 of the present Treaty shall be subjected to the French customs régime. The receipts from the customs duties on goods intended for local consumption shall be included in the budget of the said territory after deduction of all costs of collection.

No export tax shall be imposed upon metallurgical products or coal exported from the said territory to Germany, nor upon German exports for the use of the industries of the territory of the Saar Basin.

Natural or manufactured products originating in the Basin in transit over German territory and similarly German products in transit over the territory of the Basin shall be free of all customs duties.

Products which both originate in and pass from the Basin into Germany shall be free of import duties for a period of five years from the date of the coming into force of the present Treaty, and during the same period articles imported from Germany into the territory of the Basin for local consumption shall likewise be free of import duties.

During these five years the French Government reserves to itself the right of limiting to the annual average of the quantities imported into Alsace-Lorraine and France in the years 1911 to 1913 the quantites which may be sent into France of all articles coming from the Basin, which include raw materials and semi-manufactured goods imported duty free from Germany. Such average shall be determined after reference to all available official information and statistics.

32.

No prohibition or restriction shall be imposed upon the circulation of French money in the territory of the Saar Basin.

The French State shall have the right to use French money in all purchases, payments and contracts connected with the exploitation of the mines or their accessories and subsidiaries.

33.

The Governing Commission shall have power to decide all questions arising from the interpretation of the preceding provisions.

France and Germany agree that any dispute involving a difference of opinion as to the interpretation of the said provisions shall in the same way be submitted to the Governing Commission, and the decision of a majority of the Commission shall be binding on both countries.

Chapter III. Plebiscite.

34.

At the termination of a period of fifteen years from the coming into force of the present Treaty, the population of the territory of the Saar Basin will be called upon to indicate their desires in the following manner:—

A vote will take place by communes or districts, on the three following alternatives:—(*a*) maintenance of the régime established by the present Treaty and by this Annex; (*b*) union with France; (*c*) union with Germany.

All persons without distinction of sex, more than twenty years old at the date of the voting, resident in the territory at the date of the signature of the present Treaty, will have the right to vote.

The other conditions, methods and the date of the voting shall be fixed by the Council of the League of Nations in such a way as to secure the liberty, secrecy and trustworthiness of the voting.

35.

The League of Nations shall decide on the sovereignty under which the territory is to be placed, taking into account the wishes of the inhabitants as expressed by the voting.

(*a*) If, for the whole or part of the territory, the League of Nations decides in favour of the maintenance of the régime established by the present Treaty and this Annex, Germany hereby agrees to make such renunciation of her sovereignty in favour of the League of Nations as the latter shall deem necessary. It will be the duty of the League of Nations to take appropriate steps to adapt the régime definitely adopted to the permanent welfare of the territory and the general interests.

(*b*) If for the whole or part of the territory, the League of Nations decides in favour of union with France, Germany hereby agrees to cede to France in accordance with the decision of the League of Nations all rights and title over the territory specified by the League.

(*c*) If, for the whole or part of the territory, the League of Nations decides in favour of union with Germany, if will be the duty of the League of Nations to cause the German Government to be re-established in the government of the territory specified by the League.

36.

If, the League of Nations decides in favour of the union of the whole or part of the territory of the Saar Basin with Germany, France's rights of ownership in the mines situated in such part of the territory will be repurchased by Germany in their entirety at a price payable in gold. The price to be paid will be fixed by three experts, one nominated by Germany, one by France, and one, who shall be neither a Frenchman nor a German, by the Council of the League of Nations; the decision of the experts will be given by a majority.

If, within the six months following the decision of the experts, the price above referred to has not been paid by Germany, the said territory will be finally acquired by France.

37.

If, in consequence of the repurchase provided for in paragraph 36, the ownership of the mines or any part of them is transferred to Germany, the French State and French nationals shall have the right to purchase such amount of coal of the Saar Basin as their industrial and domestic needs are found at that time to require. An equitable arrangement regarding amounts of coal, duration of contract, and prices will be fixed in due time by the Council of the League of Nations.

38.

It is understood that France and Germany may by special agreements concluded before the time fixed for the payment of the price for the repurchase of the mines, modify the provisions of paragraphs 36 and 37.

39.

The Council of the League of Nations shall make such provisions as may be necessary for the establishment of the régime which is to take effect after the decisions of the League of Nations mentioned in paragraph 35 have become operative, including an equitable apportionment of any obligations of the Government of the territory of the Saar Basin arising from loans raised by the Commission or from other causes.

From the coming into force of the new régime, the powers of the Governing Commission will terminate, except in the case provided for in paragraph 35 (*a*).

40.

In all matters dealt with in the present Annex, the decisions of the Council of the League of Nations will be taken by a majority.

Section V. Alsace-Lorraine.

The High Contracting Powers, recognising the moral obligation to redress the wrong done by Germany in 1871 both to the rights of France and to the wishes of the population of Alsace and Lorraine, which were separated from their country in spite of the solemn protest of their representatives at the Assembly of Bordeaux,

Agree upon the following articles:

ARTICLE 51.

The territories which were ceded to Germany in accordance with the Preliminaries of Peace signed at Versailles on the 26th February, 1871 and the Treaty of Frankfort of the 10th May, 1871, are restored to French sovereignty as from the date of the Armistice of the 11th November, 1918.

The provisions of the Treaties establishing the delimitation of the frontiers before 1871 shall be restored.

ARTICLE 52.

The German Government shall hand over without delay to the French Government all archives, registers, plans, titles and documents of every kind concerning the civil, military, financial, judicial or other administrations of the territories restored to French sovereignty. If any of these documents, archives, registers, titles or plans have been misplaced, they will be restored by the German Government on the demand of the French Government.

ARTICLE 53.

Separate agreements shall be made between France and Germany dealing with the interests of the inhabitants of the territories referred to in Article 51, particularly as regards their civil rights, their business and the exercise of their professions, it being understood that Germany undertakes as from the present date to recognise and accept the regulations laid down in the Annex hereto regarding the nationality of the inhabitants or natives of the said territories, not to claim at any time or in any place whatsoever as German nationals those who shall have been declared on any ground to be French, to receive all others in her territory, and to conform, as regards the property of German nationals in the territories indicated in article 51, with the provisions of Article 297 and the Annex to Section IV of Part X (Economic Clauses) of the present Treaty.

Those German nationals who without acquiring French nationality shall receive permission from the French Government to reside in the said territories shall not be subjected to the provisions of the said Article.

ARTICLE 54.

Those persons who have regained French nationality in virtue of paragraph 1 of the Annex hereto, will be held to be Alsace-Lorrainers for the purposes of the present Section.

The persons referred to in Paragraph 2 of the said Annex will from the day on which they have claimed French nationality be held to be Alsace-Lorrainers with retroactive effect as from the 11th November, 1918. For those whose application is rejected, the privilege will terminate at the date of the refusal.

Such juridical persons will also have the status of Alsace-Lorrainers as have been recognised as possessing this quality, whether by the French administrative authorities or by a judicial decision.

ARTICLE 55.

The territories referred to in Article 51 shall return to France, free and quit of all public debts, under the conditions laid down in Article 255 of Part IX (Financial Clauses) of the present Treaty.

ARTICLE 56.

In conformity with the provisions of article 256 of Part IX (Financial Clauses) of the present Treaty France shall enter into possession of all property and estate within the territories referred to in Article 51, which belong to the German Empire or German States, without any payment or credit on this account to any of the States ceding the territories.

This provision applies to all movable or immovable property of public or private domain together with all rights whatsoever belonging to the German Empire or German States or to their administrative areas.

Crown property and the property of the former Emperor or other German sovereigns shall be assimilated to property of the public domain.

ARTICLE 57.

Germany shall not take any action, either by means of stamping or by any other legal or administrative measures not applying equally to the rest of her territory, which may be to the detriment of the legal value or redeemability of German monetary instruments or monies which, at the date of the signature of the present Treaty, are legally current, and at that date are in the possession of the French Government.

ARTICLE 58.

A special Convention will determine the conditions for repayment in marks of the exceptional war expenditure advanced during the course of the war by Alsace-Lorraine or by public bodies in Alsace-Lorraine on account of the Empire in accordance with German law, such as payment to the families of persons mobilised, requisitions, billeting of troops, and assistance to persons who have been expelled.

In fixing the amount of these sums Germany shall be credited with that portion which Alsace-Lorraine would have contributed to the Empire to meet the expenses resulting from these payments, this contribution being calculated according to the proportion of the Imperial revenues derived from Alsace-Lorraine in 1913.

ARTICLE 59.

The French Government will collect for its own account the Imperial taxes, duties and dues of every kind leviable in the territories referred to in Article 51 and not collected at the time of the Armistice of the 11th November, 1918.

ARTICLE 60.

The German Government shall without delay restore to Alsace-Lorrainers (individuals, juridical persons and public institutions) all property, rights and interests belonging to them on the 11th November, 1918, in so far as these are situated in German territory.

ARTICLE 61.

The German Government undertakes to continue and complete without delay the execution of the financial clauses regarding Alsace-Lorraine contained in the Armistice Conventions.

ARTICLE 62.

The German Government undertakes to bear the expense of all civil and military pensions which had been earned in Alsace-Lorraine on the date of the 11th November, 1918, and the maintenance of which was a charge on the budget of the German Empire.

The German Government shall furnish each year the funds necessary for the payment in francs, at the average rate of exchange for that year, of the sums in marks to which persons resident in Alsace-Lorraine would have been entitled if Alsace-Lorraine had remained under German jurisdiction.

ARTICLE 63.

For the purposes of the obligation assumed by Germany in Part VIII (Reparations) of the present Treaty to give compensation for damages caused to the civil populations of the Allied and Associated countries in the form of fines, the inhabitants of the territories referred to in Article 51 shall be assimilated to the above-mentioned populations.

ARTICLE 64.

The regulations concerning the control of the Rhine and of the Moselle are laid down in Part XII (Ports, Waterways and Railways) of the present Treaty.

ARTICLE 65.

Within a period of three weeks after the coming into force of the present Treaty, the port of Strasburg and the port of Kehl shall be constituted, for a period of seven years, a single unit, from the point of view of exploitation.

The administration of this single unit will be carried on by a manager named by the Central Rhine Commission, which shall also have power to remove him. He shall be of French nationality. He will reside in Strasburg and will be subject to the supervision of the Central Rhine Commission.

There will be established in the two ports Free Zones in conformity with Part XII (Ports, Waterways and Railways) of the present Treaty.

A special Convention between France and Germany, which shall be submitted to the approval of the Central Rhine Commission, will fix the details of this organisation, particularly as regards finance.

It is understood that for the purpose of the present Article the port of Kehl includes the whole of the area necessary for the movements of the port and the trains which serve it, including the harbour, quays and railroads, platforms, cranes, sheds and warehouses, silos, elevators and hydro-electric plants, which make up the equipment of the port.

The Germn Government undertakes to carry out all measures which shall be required of it in order to assure that all the making-up and switching of trains arriving at or departing from Kehl, whether for the right bank or the left bank of the Rhine, shall be carried on in the best conditions possible.

All property rights shall be safeguarded. In particular the administration of the Ports shall not prejudice any property rights of the French or Baden railroads.

Equality of treatment as respects traffic shall be assured in both ports to the nationals, vessels and goods of every country.

In case at the end of the sixth year France shall consider that the progress made in the improvement of the port of Strasburg still requires a prolongation of this temporary régime, she may ask for such prolongation from the Central Rhine Commission, which may grant an extension for a period not exceeding three years.

Throughout the whole period of any such extension the free zones above provided for shall be maintained.

Pending appointment of the first manager by the Central Rhine Commission a provisional manager who shall be of French nationality may be appointed by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers subject to the foregoing provisions.

For all purposes of the present Article the Central Rhine Commission will decide by a majority of votes.

ARTICLE 66.

The railway and other bridges across the Rhine now existing within the limits of Alsace-Lorraine shall, as to all their parts and their whole length, be the property of the French State, which shall ensure their upkeep.

ARTICLE 67.

The French Government is substituted in all the rights of the German Empire over all the railways which were administered by the Imperial railway administration and which are actually working or under construction.

The same shall apply to the rights of the Empire with regard to railway and tramway concessions within the territories referred to in Article 51.

This substitution shall not entail any payment on the part of the French State.

The frontier railway stations shall be established by a subsequent agreement, it being stipulated in advance that on the Rhine frontier they shall be situated on the right bank.

ARTICLE 68.

In accordance with the provisions of Article 268 of Chapter I of Section I of Part X (Economic Clauses) of the present Treaty, for a period of five years from the coming into force of the present Treaty, natural or manufactured products originating in and coming from the territories referred to in Article 51 shall, on importation into German customs territory, be exempt from all customs duty.

The French Government shall fix each year, by decree communicated to the German Government, the nature and amount of the products which shall enjoy this exemption.

The amount of each product which may be thus sent annually into Germany shall not exceed the average of the amounts sent annually in the years 1911–1913.

Further, during the period of five years above mentioned, the German Government shall allow the free export from Germany and the free re-importation into Germany, exempt from all customs duties and other charges (including internal charges), of yarns, tissues, and other textile materials or textile products of any kind and in any condition, sent from Germany into the territories referred to in Article 51, to be subjected there to any finishing process, such as bleaching, dyeing, printing, mercerisation, gassing, twisting or dressing.

ARTICLE 69.

During a period of ten years from the coming into force of the present Treaty, central electric supply works situated in German territory and formerly furnishing electric power to the territories referred to in Article 51 or to any establishment the working of which passes permanently or temporarily from Germany to France, shall be required to continue such supply up to the amount of consumption corresponding to the undertakings and contracts current on the 11th November, 1918.

Such supply shall be furnished according to the contracts in force and at a rate which shall not be higher than that paid to the said works by German nationals.

ARTICLE 70.

It is understood that the French Government preserves its right to prohibit in the future in the territories referred to in Article 51 all new German participation:

1. In the management or exploitation of the public domain and of public services, such as railways, navigable waterways, water works, gas works, electric power, etc.

2. In the ownership of mines and quarries of every kind and in enterprises connected therewith;

3. In metallurgical establishments, even though their working may not be connected with that of any mine.

ARTICLE 71.

As regards the territories referred to in Article 51, Germany renounces on behalf of herself and her nationals as from the 11th November, 1918, all rights under the law of the 25th May, 1910, regarding the trade in potash salts, and generally under any stipulations for the intervention of German organisations in the working of the potash mines. Similarly, she renounces on behalf of herself and her nationals all rights under any agreements, stipulations or laws, which may exist to her benefit with regard to other products of the aforesaid territories.

ARTICLE 72.

The settlement of the questions relating to debts contracted before the 11th November, 1918, between the German Empire and the German States or their nationals residing in Germany on the one part and Alsace-Lorrainers residing in Alsace-Lorraine on the other part shall be effected in accordance with the provisions of Section III of Part X (Economic Clauses) of the present Treaty, the expression "before the war," therein being replaced by the expression "before the 11th November, 1918." The rate of exchange applicable in the case of such settlement shall be the average rate quoted on the Geneva Exchange during the month preceding the 11th November, 1918.

There shall be established in the territories referred to in Article 51, for the settlement of the aforesaid debts under the conditions laid down in Section III of Part X (Economic Clauses) of the present Treaty, a special clearing office, it being understood that this office shall be regarded as a "central office" under the provisions of paragraph 1 of the Annex to the said Section.

ARTICLE 73.

The private property, rights and interests of Alsace-Lorrainers in Germany will be regulated by the stipulations of Section IV of Part X (Economic Clauses) of the present Treaty.

ARTICLE 74.

The French Government reserves the right to retain and liquidate all the property, rights and interests which German nationals or societies controlled by Germany possessed in the territories referred to in Article 51 on November 11, 1918, subject to the conditions laid down in the last paragraph of Article 53 above.

Germany will directly compensate its nationals who may have been dispossessed by the aforesaid liquidations.

The product of these liquidations shall be applied in accordance with the stipulations of Sections III and IV of Part X (Economic Clauses) of the present Treaty.

ARTICLE 75.

Notwithstanding the stipulations of Section V of Part X (Economic Clauses) of the present Treaty, all contracts made before the date of the promulgation in Alsace-Lorraine of the French decree of 30th November, 1918, between Alsace-Lorrainers (whether individuals or juridical persons) or others resident in Alsace-Lorraine on the one part and the German Empire or German States and their nationals resident in Germany on the other part, the execution of which has been suspended by the armistice or by subsequent French legislation, shall be maintained.

Nevertheless, any contract of which the French Government shall notify the cancellation to Germany in the general interest within a period of six months from the date of the coming into force of the present Treaty, shall be annulled except in respect of any debt or other pecuniary obligation arising out of any act done or money paid thereunder before the 11th November, 1918.

With regard to prescriptions, limitations, and forfeitures in Alsace-Lorraine, the provisions of Articles 300 and 301 of Section V, Part X (Economic Clauses) shall be applied with the substitution for the expression "outbreak of war" of the expression "11th November, 1918," and for the expression "duration of the war" of the expression "period from the 11th November, 1918, to date of the coming into force of the present Treaty."

ARTICLE 76.

Questions concerning rights in industrial, literary or artistic property of Alsace-Lorrainers shall be regulated in accordance with the general stipulations of Section VII of Part X (Economic Clauses) of the present Treaty, it being understood that Alsace-Lorrainers holding rights of this nature under German legislation will preserve full and entire enjoyment of those rights on German territory.

ARTICLE 77.

The German Government undertakes to pay over to the French Government such proportion of all reserves accumulated by the Empire or by public or private bodies dependent upon it, for the purposes of disability and old age insurance as would fall to the disability and old age insurance fund at Strasburg.

The same shall apply in respect of the capital and reserves accumulated in Germany falling legitimately to other social insurance funds, to miners' superannuation funds, to the fund of the railways of Alsace-Lorraine, to other superannuation organisation established for the benefit of the personnel of public administrations and institutions operating in Alsace-Lorraine, and also in respect of the capital and reserves due by the insurance fund of private employees at Berlin, by reason of engagements entered into for the benefit of insured persons of that category resident in Alsace-Lorraine.

A special Convention shall determine the conditions and procedure of these transfers.

ARTICLE 78.

With regard to the execution of judgments, orders and prosecutions, the following rules shall be applied:

1. All civil and commercial judgments which shall have been given since the 3rd August, 1914, by the Courts of Alsace-Lorraine between Alsace-Lorrainers, or between Alsace-Lorrainers and foreigners, or between foreigners, and which shall not have been appealed from before the 11th November, 1918, shall be regarded as final and capable of being fully executed.

When the judgment has been given between Alsace-Lorrainers and Germans or between Alsace-Lorrainers and subjects of the allies of Germany, it shall only be capable of execution after the issue of an *exequatur* by the corresponding new tribunal in the restored territory referred to in Article 51.

2. All judgments given by German Courts since the 3rd August, 1914, against Alsace-Lorrainers for political crimes or misdemeanors shall be regarded as null and void.

3. All sentences passed since the 11th November, 1918, by the Imperial Court of Leipzig on appeals against the decisions of the Courts of Alsace-Lorraine shall be regarded as null and void and shall be so pronounced. The papers in regard to the cases in which such sentences have been given shall be returned to the Courts of Alsace-Lorraine concerned.

All appeals to the Imperial Court against decisions of the Courts of Alsace-Lorraine shall be suspended. In the cases referred to above the papers shall be returned under the aforesaid conditions for transfer without delay to the French *Cour de Cassation* which shall be competent to decide them.

4. All prosecutions in Alsace-Lorraine for offences committed during the period between the 11th November, 1918, and the coming into force of the present Treaty will be conducted under German law except in so far as this has been modified by decrees duly published on the spot by the French authorities.

5. All other questions as to competence, procedure or administration of justice, shall be determined by a special Convention between France and Germany.

ARTICLE 79.

The stipulations as to nationality contained in the Annex hereto shall be considered as of equal force with the provisions of the present Section.

All other questions concerning Alsace-Lorraine which are not regulated by the present Section and the Annex thereto or by the general provisions of the present Treaty, will form the subject of further conventions between France and Germany.

ANNEX.

1.

As from the 11th November, 1918, the following persons are *ipso facto* reinstated in French nationality:

1. Persons who lost French nationality by the application of the Franco-German Treaty of the 10th May, 1871, and who have not since that date acquired any nationality other than German;

2. The legitimate or natural descendants of the persons referred to in the immediately preceding paragraph, with the exceptions of those whose ascendants in the paternal line include a German who migrated into Alsace-Lorraine after the 15th July, 1870;

3. All persons born in Alsace-Lorraine of unknown parents, or whose nationality is unknown.

2.

Within the period of one year from the coming into force of the present Treaty, persons included in any of the following categories may claim French nationality:

1. All persons not restored to French nationality under paragraph 1 above, whose ascendants include a Frenchman or Frenchwoman who lost French nationality under the conditions referred to in the said paragraph;

2. All foreigners, not nationals of a German State, who acquired the status of a citizen of Alsace-Lorraine before the 3rd August, 1914;

3. All Germans domiciled in Alsace-Lorraine, if they have been so domiciled since a date previous to the 15th July, 1870, or if one of their ascendants was at that date domiciled in Alsace-Lorraine;

4. All Germans born or domiciled in Alsace-Lorraine, who have served in the Allied or Associated armies during the present war, and their descendants;

5. All persons born in Alsace-Lorraine before the 10th May, 1871, of foreign parents, and the descendants of such persons;

6. The husband or wife of any person whose French nationality may have been restored under paragraph 1, or who may have claimed and obtained French nationality in accordance with the preceding provisions.

The legal representative of a minor may exercise, on behalf of that minor, the right to claim French nationality; and if that right has not been exercised, the minor may claim French nationality within the year following his majority.

Except in the case provided for in No. 6 of the present paragraph, the French authorities reserve to themselves the right, in individual cases, to reject the claim to French nationality.

3.

Subject to the provisions of paragraph 2, Germans born or domiciled in Alsace-Lorraine shall not acquire French nationality by reason of the restoration of Alsace-Lorraine to France, even though they may have the status of citizens of Alsace-Lorraine.

They may acquire French nationality only by naturalisation, on condition of having been domiciled in Alsace-Lorraine from a date previous to the 3rd August, 1914, and of submitting proof of unbroken residence within the restored territory for a period of three years from the 11th November, 1918.

France will be solely responsible for their diplomatic and consular protection from the date of their application for French naturalisation.

4.

The French Government shall determine the procedure by which reinstatement in French nationality as of right shall be effected, and the conditions under which decisions shall be given upon claims to such nationality and applications for naturalisation, as provided by the present Annex.

Section VI. Austria.

ARTICLE 80.

Germany acknowledges and will respect strictly the independence of Austria, within the frontiers which may be fixed in a Treaty between that State and the Principal allied and associated Powers; she agrees that this independence shall be inalienable, except with the consent of the Council of the League of Nations.

Section VII. Tchecko-Slovak State.

ARTICLE 81.

Germany, in conformity with the action already taken by the Allied and Associated Powers, recognizes the complete independence of the Tchecko-Slovak State which will include the autonomous territory of the Ruthenians to the south of the Carpathians. Germany hereby recognizes the frontiers of this State as determined by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and the other interested States.

ARTICLE 82.

The old frontier as it existed on August 3, 1914, between Austria-Hungary and the German Empire will constitute the frontier between Germany and the Tchecko-Slovak State.

ARTICLE 83.

Germany renounces in favour of the Tchecko-Slovak State all rights and title over the portion of the territory of Silesia lying between the old Austro-German frontier and a line to be fixed on the ground, starting from a point in the course of the Oder, immediately south of the Ratibor-Oderberg railway, and running in a northwesterly direction, passing west of Kranowitz and east of Katscher so as to rejoin the old Austrian frontier at the south-eastern point of its salient about 5 kilometres west of Leobschütz.

A Commission composed of seven members, five nominated by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, one by Poland and one by the Tchecko-Slovak State, will be appointed fifteen days after the coming into force of the present Treaty to trace on the spot the frontier line between Poland and the Tchecko-Slovak State.

The decisions of this Commission will be taken by a majority and shall be binding on the parties concerned.

ARTICLE 84.

German nationals habitually resident in any of the territories recognized as forming part of the Tchecko-Slovak State will obtain Tchecko-Slovak nationality *ispo facto* and lose their German nationality.

ARTICLE 85.

Within a period of two years from the coming into force of the present Treaty, German nationals over eighteen years of age habitually resident in any of the territories recognized as forming part of the Tchecko-Slovak State will be entitled to opt for German nationality. Tchecko-Slovaks who are German nationals and are habitually resident in Germany will have a similar right to opt for Tchecko-Slovak nationality.

Option by a husband will cover his wife and option by parents will cover their children under eighteen years of age.

Persons who have exercised the above right to opt must within the succeeding twelve months transfer their place of residence to the State for which they have opted.

They will be entitled to retain their landed property in the territory of the other State where they had their place of residence before exercising the right to opt. They may carry with them their moveable property of every description. No export or import duties may be imposed upon them in connection with the removal of such property.

Within the same period Tchecko-Slovaks who are German nationals and are in a foreign country will be entitled, in the absence of any provisions to the contrary in the foreign law, and if they have not acquired the foreign nationality, to obtain Tchecko-Slovak nationality and lose their German nationality by complying with the requirements laid down by the Tchecko-Slovak State.

ARTICLE 86.

The Tchecko-Slovak State accepts and agrees to embody in a Treaty with the Principal Allied and Associated Powers such provisions as may be deemed necessary by the said Powers to protect the interests of inhabitants of that State who differ from the majority of the population in race, language or religion.

The Tchecko-Slovak State further accepts and agrees to embody in a Treaty with the said Powers such provisions as they may deem necessary to protect freedom of transit and equitable treatment of the commerce of other nations.

The proportion and nature of the financial obligations of Germany and Prussia which the Tchecko-Slovak State will have to assume on account of the Silesian territory placed under its sovereignty will be determined in accordance with Article 254 of Part IX (Financial Clauses) of the present Treaty.

Subsequent agreements will decide all questions not decided by the present Treaty which may arise in consequence of the cession of the said territory.

Section VIII. Poland.

ARTICLE 87.

Germany, in conformity with the action already taken by the Allied and Associated Powers, recognizes the complete independence of Poland, and renounces in her favour all rights and title over the territory bounded by the Baltic Sea; the eastern frontier of Germany as laid down in Article 27 of Part II (Boundaries of Germany) of the present Treaty; the frontier of the Tchecko-Slovak State from a point situated 8 kilometers to the East of Neustadt to its meeting point with the former frontier between Germany and Austria-Hungary; this last frontier to the meeting point of the former frontiers of Germany, Austria-Hungary and Russia; the former frontier between Germany and Russia to the point where it crosses the course of the Niemen, and then the northern frontier of East Prussia as laid down in Article 28 of Part II aforesaid.

The provisions of this article do not, however, apply to the territories of East Prussia and the Free City of Danzig, as defined in Article 28 of Part II (Boundaries of Germany) and in Article 100 of Section XI (Danzig) of this Part.

The boundaries of Poland not laid down in the present Treaty will be subsequently determined by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers.

ARTICLE 88.

A Commission consisting of seven members, five of whom shall be nominated by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, one by Germany, and one by Poland, shall be constituted fifteen days after the coming into force of the present Treaty to delimit on the spot the frontier-line between Poland and Germany.

The decision of the Commission will be taken by a majority of votes and shall be binding upon the parties concerned.

ARTICLE 89.

Poland undertakes to grant to persons and to means of transport of whatever nationality, coming from or destined for East Prussia, the same rights of transit over Polish territory situated between East Prussia and Germany as she gives to her own nationals.

ARTICLE 90.

German nationals habitually resident in territories recognised as forming part of Poland will acquire Polish nationality *ipso facto* and will lose their German nationality.

German nationals, however, or their descendants who became resident in these territories after January 1, 1908, will not acquire Polish nationality without a special authorisation from the Polish State.

ARTICLE 91.

Within a period of two years after the coming into force of the present Treaty, German nationals over 18 years of age habitually resident in any of the territories recognised as forming part of Poland will be entitled to opt for German nationality.

Poles who are German nationals over 18 years of age and habitually resident in Germany will have a similar right to opt for Polish nationality.

Option by a husband will cover his wife and option by parents will cover their children under 18 years of age.

Persons who have exercised the above right to opt must within the succeeding twelve months transfer their place of residence to the State for which they have opted.

They will be entitled to retain their immovable property in the territory of the other State where they had their place of residence before exercising the right to opt.

They may carry with them their movable property of every description. No export or import duties or charges may be imposed upon them in connection with the removal of such property.

Within the same period Poles who are German nationals and are in a foreign country wil be entitled, in the absence of any provisions to the contrary in the foreign law, and if they have not acquired foreign nationality, to obtain Polish nationality and to lose their German nationality by complying with the requirements laid down by the Polish State.

ARTICLE 92.

The proportion and the nature of the financial liabilities of Germany and Prussia to be borne by Poland will be determined in accordance with Article 254 of Part IX (Financial Clauses) of the present Treaty.

There shall be excluded from the share of such financial liabilities assumed by Poland that portion of the debt which according to the finding of the Reparation Commission referred to in the above-mentioned Article, arises from measures adopted by the German and Prussian Governments with a view to German colonisation in Poland.

In fixing under Article 256 of the present Treaty the value of the property and possessions belonging to the German Empire and to the German States which pass to Poland with the territory transferred above, the Reparation Commission shall exclude from the valuation buildings, forests and other State property which belonged to the former kingdom of Poland; Poland shall acquire these properties free of all costs and charges.

Further agreements will regulate all questions arising out of the cession of the above territory which are not regulated by the present Treaty.

ARTICLE 93.

Poland accepts and agrees to embody in a Treaty with the Principal Allied and Associated Powers such provisions as may be deemed necessary by the said Powers to protect the interests of inhabitants of Poland who differ from the majority of the population in race, language, or religion.

Poland further accepts and agrees to embody in a Treaty with the said Powers such provisions as they may deem necessary to protect freedom of transit and equitable treatment of the commerce of other nations.

Section IX. East Prussia.

ARTICLE 94.

In the area between the southern frontier of East Prussia, as described in Article 28 of Part II (Frontiers of Germany) of the present Treaty, and the line described below, the inhabitants will be called upon to indicate by a vote the State to which they wish to belong:

The western and northern boundary of *Regierungsbezirk* Allenstein to its junction with the boundary between the *Kreise* of Oletsko and Angerburg; thence, the northern boundary of the *Kreise* of Oletsko to its junction with the old frontier of East Prussia.

ARTICLE 95.

The German troops and authorities will be withdrawn from the area defined above within a period not exceeding fifteen days after the coming into force of the present Treaty. Until the evacuation is completed they will abstain from all requisitions in money or in kind and from all measures injurious to the economic interests of the country.

On the expiration of the above-mentioned period the said area will be placed under the authority of an International Commission of five members appointed by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers. This Commission will have general powers of administration and, in particular, will be charged with the duty of arranging for the vote and of taking such measures as it may deem necessary to ensure its freedom, fairness and secrecy. The Commission will have all necessary authority to decide any questions to which the execution of these provisions may give rise. The Commission will make such arrangements as may be necessary for assistance in the exercise of its functions by officials chosen by itself from the local population; its decisions will be taken by a majority.

Every person, irrespective of sex, will be entitled to vote who:

(a) Is 20 years of age at the date of the coming into force of the present Treaty, and

(b) Was born within the area where the vote will take place or has been habitually resident there from a date to be fixed by the Commission.

Every person will vote in the commune where he is habitually resident or, if not habitually resident in the area, in the commune where he was born.

The result of the vote will be determined by commune (*Gemeinde*) according to the majority of the votes in each commune.

On the conclusion of the voting the number of votes cast in each commune will be communicated by the Commission to the Principal Allied and Associated Powers with a full report as to the taking of the vote and a recommendation as to the line which ought to be adopted as the boundary of East Prussia in this region. In this recommendation regard will be paid to the wishes of the inhabitants as shown by the vote and to the geographical and economic conditions of the locality. The Principal Allied and Associated Powers will then fix the frontier between East Prussia and Poland in this region.

If the line fixed by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers is such as to exclude from East Prussia any part of the territory defined in Article 94, the renunciation of its rights by Germany in favour of Poland, as provided in Article 87 above, will extend to the territories so excluded.

As soon as the line has been fixed by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, the authorities administering East Prussia will be notified by the International Commission that they are free to take over the administration of the territory to the north of the line so fixed, which they shall proceed to do within one month of such notification and in the manner prescribed by the Commission. Within the same period and as prescribed by the Commission, the Polish Government must proceed to take over the administration of the territory to the south of the line. When the administration of the territory by the East Prussian and Polish authorities respectively has been provided for, the powers of the Commission will terminate.

Expenditure by the Commission, whether in the discharge of its own functions or in the administration of the territory, will be borne by the local revenues. East Prussia will be required to bear such proportion of any deficit as may be fixed by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers.

ARTICLE 96.

In the area comprising the *Kreise* of Stuhm and Rosenberg and the portion of the *Kreis* of Marienburg which is situated east of the Nogat and that of Marienwerder east of the Vistula, the inhabitants will be called upon to indicate by a vote, to be taken in each commune (*Gemeinde*), whether they desire the various communes situated in this territory to belong to Poland or to East Prussia.

ARTICLE 97.

The German troops and authorities will be withdrawn from the area defined in Article 96 within a period not exceeding fifteen days after the coming into force of the present Treaty. Until the evacuation is completed they will abstain from all requisitions in money or in kind and from all measures injurious to the economic interests of the country.

On the expiration of the above-mentioned period, the said area will be placed under the authority of an International Commission of five members appointed by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers. This Commission, supported if occasion arises by the necessary forces, will have general powers of administration and in particular will be charged with the duty of arranging for the vote and of taking such measures as it may deem necessary to ensure its freedom, fairness and secrecy. The Commission will conform as far as possible to the provisions of the present Treaty relating to the plebiscite in the Allenstein area; its decision will be taken by a majority.

Expenditure by the Commission, whether in the discharge of its own functions or in the administration of the territory, will be borne by the local revenues.

On the conclusion of the voting the number of votes cast in each commune will be communicated by the Commission to the Principal Allied and Associated Powers with a full report as to the taking of the vote and a recommendation as to the line which ought to be adopted as the boundary of East Prussia in this region. In this recommendation regard will be paid to the wishes of the inhabitants as shown by the vote and to the geographical and economic conditions of the locality. The Principal Allied and Associated Powers will then fix the frontier between East Prussia and Poland in this region, leaving in any case to Poland for the whole of the section bordering on the Vistula full and complete control of the river including the east bank as far east of the river as may be necessary for its regulation and improvement. Germany agrees that in any portion of the said territory which remains German, no fortifications shall at any time be erected.

The Principal Allied and Associated Powers will at the same time draw up regulations for assuring to the population of East Prussia to the fullest extent and under equitable conditions access to the Vistula and the use of it for themselves, their commerce and their boats.

The determination of the frontier and the foregoing regulations shall be binding upon all the parties concerned.

When the administration of the territory has been taken over by the East Prussian and Polish authorities respectively, the powers of the Commission will terminate.

ARTICLE 98.

Germany and Poland undertake, within one year of the conclusion of this Treaty, to enter into a Convention of which the terms, in case of difference, shall be settled by the Council of the League of Nations, with the object of securing, on the one hand to Germany full and adequate railroad facilities for communication between the rest of Germany and East Prussia over the intervening Polish territory, and on the other hand to Poland full and adequate railroad facilities for communication between Poland and the Free City of Danzig over any German territory that may, on the right bank of the Vistula, intervene between Poland and the Free City of Danzig.

Section X. Memel.

ARTICLE 99.

Germany renounces in favour of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers all rights and title over the territories included between the Baltic, the north eastern frontier of East Prussia as defined in Article 28 of Part II (Frontiers of Germany) of the present Treaty and the former frontier between Germany and Russia.

Germany undertakes to accept the settlement made by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers in regard to these territories, particularly in so far as concerns the nationality of the inhabitants.

Section XI. Free city of Danzig.

ARTICLE 100.

Germany renounces in favour of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers all rights and title over the territory comprised within the following limits:

from the Baltic Sea southwards to the point where the principal channels of navigation of the Nogat and the Vistula (Weichsel) meet:

the boundary of East Prussia as described in Article 28 of Part II. (Boundaries of Germany) of the present Treaty;

thence the principal channel of navigation of the Vistula downstream to a point about 6 1/2 kilometres north of the bridge of Dirschau;

thence north-west to point 5, 1 1/2 kilometres south-east of the church of Güttland:

a line to be fixed on the ground;

thence in a general westerly direction to the salient of the *Kreis* of Berent 8 1/2 kilometres north-east of Schöneck:

a line to be fixed on the ground passing between Mühlbanz on the south and Rambeltsch on the north;

thence the boundary of the *Kreis* of Berent westwards to the re-entrant which it forms 6 kilometres north-north-west of Schöneck;

thence to a point on the median line of Lonkener See:

a line to be fixed on the ground passing north of Neu Fietz and Schatarpi and south of Barenhütte and Lonken;

thence the median line of the Lonkener See to its northernmost point;

thence to the southern end of Pollenziner See:

a line to be fixed on the ground;

thence the median line of Pollenziner See to its northernmost point;

thence in a north-easterly direction to a point about 1 kilometre south of Koliebken Church, where the Danzig-Neustadt railway crosses a stream:

a line to be fixed on the ground passing south-east of Kamehlen, Krissau, Fidlin, Sulmin (Richthof), Mattern, Schäferei, and to the north-west of Neuendorf, Marschau, Czapielken, Hoch- and Klein-Kelpin, Pulvermühl, Renneberg and the towns of Olivia and Zoppot;

thence the course of this stream to the Baltic Sea.

The boundaries described above are drawn on a German map scale 1/100,000, attached to the present Treaty (Map No. 4).

ARTICLE 101.

A Commission composed of three members appointed by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, including a High Commissioner as President, one member appointed by Germany and one member appointed by Poland, shall be constituted within fifteen days of the coming into force of the present Treaty for the

purpose of delimiting on the spot the frontier of the territory as described above, taking into account as far as possible the existing communal boundaries.

ARTICLE 102.

The city of Danzig together with the rest of the territory described in Article 100 is established as a Free City, and placed under the protection of the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 103.

A constitution for the Free City of Danzig shall be drawn up by the duly appointed representatives of the Free City in agreement with a High Commissioner to be appointed by the League of Nations. This constitution shall be placed under the guarantee of the League of Nations.

The High Commissioner will also be entrusted with the duty of dealing in the first instance with all differences arising between Poland and the Free City of Danzig in regard to this treaty or any arrangements or agreements made thereunder.

The High Commissioner shall reside at Danzig.

ARTICLE 104.

A Convention, the terms of which shall be fixed by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, shall be concluded between the Polish Government and the Free City of Danzig with the following objects:

(1) To effect the inclusion of the Free City of Danzig within the Polish Customs frontiers, and to establish a free area in the port.

(2) To ensure to Poland without any restriction the free use and service of all waterways, docks, basins, wharves and other works within the territory of the Free City necessary for Polish imports and exports.

(3) To ensure to Poland the control and administration of the Vistula and of the whole railway system within the Free City, except such street and other railways as serve primarily the needs of the Free City, and of postal, telegraphic and telephonic communication between Poland and the port of Danzig.

(4) To ensure to Poland the right to develop and improve the waterways, docks, basins, wharves, railways and other works and means of communication mentioned in this article, as well as to lease or purchase through appropriate processes such land and other property as may be necessary for these purposes.

(5) To provide against any discrimination within the Free City of Danzig to the detriment of citizens of Poland and other persons of Polish origin or speech.

(6) To provide that the Polish Government shall undertake the conduct of the foreign relations of the Free City of Danzig as well as the diplomatic protection of citizens of that city when abroad.

ARTICLE 105.

On the coming into force of the present Treaty German nationals ordinarily resident in the territory of the Free City of Danzig will *ipso facto* become citizens of that city and will lose their German nationality.

ARTICLE 106.

Within a period of two years from the coming into force of the present Treaty, German nationals over 18 years of age ordinarily resident in the territory described in Article 100 will have the right to opt for German nationality.

Option by a husband will cover his wife and option by parents will cover their children less than 18 years of age.

All persons who exercise the right of option referred to above must during the ensuing twelve months transfer their place of residence to Germany.

These persons will be entitled to preserve the immovable property possessed by them in the territory of the Free City of Danzig. They may carry with them their movable property of every description. No export or import duties shall be imposed upon them in this connection.

ARTICLE 107.

All property situated within the territory of the Free City of Danzig belonging to the German Empire or to any German State shall pass to the Principal Allied and Associated Powers for transfer to the Free City of Danzig or to the Polish State as they may consider equitable.

ARTICLE 108.

The proportion and nature of the financial liabilities of Germany and of Prussia to be borne by the Free City of Danzig shall be fixed in accordance with Article 254 of Part IX (Financial Clauses) of the present Treaty.

All other questions which may arise from the cession of the territory referred to in Article 100 shall be settled by further agreements.

Section XII. Schleswig.

ARTICLE 109.

The frontier between Germany and Denmark shall be fixed in conformity with the wishes of the population.

For this purpose, the population inhabiting the territories of the former German Empire situated to the north of a line, from East to West, (shown by a blue line on the map No. 3, annexed to the present Treaty):

starting in the Schleimünde south of Lootsen Island and following the course of the Schlei upstream,

then leaving the Schlei and turning south-west so as to pass south-east of Schleswig, Haddeby and Busdorf and north-west of Fahrdorf, and to meet the Reider Au north-west of Jagel.

following the course of the Reider Au and then the course of the river Treene to a point north-east of Friedrichstadt.

turning south to meet the river Eider passing east of Friedrichstadt,

thence the course of the Eider to the North Sea,

shall be called upon to pronounce by a vote which will be taken under the following conditions:

1. Within a period not exceeding ten days from the coming into force of the present Treaty, the German troops and authorities (including the *Oberpräsidentea, Regierungs-präsidenten, Landräthe, Amtsvorsteher, Oberbürgermeister* shall evacuate the zone lying to the north of the line above fixed.

Within the same period the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils which have been constituted in this zone shall be dissolved; members of such Councils who are natives of another region and are exercising their functions at the date of the coming into force of the present Treaty, or who have gone out of office since the 1st March, 1919, shall also be evacuated.

The said zone shall immediately be placed under the authority of an International Commission, composed of five members, of whom three will be designated by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers; the Norwegian and Swedish Governments will each be requested to designate a member; in the event of their failing to do so, these two members will be chosen by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers.

The Commission, assisted in case of need by the necessary forces, shall have general powers of administration. In particular, it shall at once provide for filling the places of the evacuated German authorities, and if necessary shall itself give orders for their evacuation, and proceed to fill the places of such local authorities as may be required. It shall take all steps which it thinks proper to ensure the freedom, fairness, and secrecy of the vote. It shall be assisted by German and Danish technical advisers chosen by it from among the local population. Its decisions will be taken by a majority.

One half of the expenses of the International Commission and of the expenditure occasioned by the plebiscite shall be paid by Germany.

2. The right to vote shall be given to all persons, without distinction of sex, who:

(*a*) Have completed their twentieth year at the date of the coming into force of the present Treaty; and

(*b*) Were born in the zone in which the plebiscite is taken, or have been domiciled there since a date before the 1st January, 1900, or had been expelled by the German authorities without having retained their domicile there.

Every person will vote in the commune (*Gemeinde*) where he is domiciled or of which he is a native.

Military persons, officers, non-commissioned officers and soldiers of the German army, who are natives of the zone of Schleswig in which the plebiscite is taken, shall be given the opportunity to return to their native place in order to take part in the voting there.

3. In the section of the evacuated zone lying to the north of a line, from East to West (shown by a red line on map No. 3 which is annexed to the present Treaty):

passing south of the island of Alsen and following the median line of Flensburg Fjord,

thence leaving the fjord about 6 kilometres north of Flensburg and following the course of the stream flowing past Kupfermühle upstream to a point north of Niehuus,

thence, passing north of Pattburg and Ellund and south of Fröslee to meet the eastern boundary of the *Kreis* of Tondern at its junction with the boundary between the old jurisdictions of Slogs and Kjær (*Slogs Herred* and *Kjær Herred*),

thence, the latter boundary to where it meets the Scheidebek,
thence the course of the Scheidebek (Alte Au), Süder Au and Wied Au downstream successively to the point where the latter bends northwards about 1,500 metres west of Ruttebüll,
thence, in a west-north-westerly direction to meet the North Sea north of Sieltoft,
thence, passing north of the island of Sylt,
the vote above provided for shall be taken within a period not exceeding three weeks after the evacuation of the country by the German troops and authorities.

The result will be determined by the majority of votes cast in the whole of this section. This result will be immediately communicated by the Commission to the Principal Allied and Associated Governments and proclaimed.

If the vote results in favour of the reincorporation of this territory in the Kingdom of Denmark, the Danish Government in agreement with the Commission will be entitled to effect its occupation with their military and administrative authorities immediately after the proclamation.

4. In the section of the evacuated zone situated to the south of the preceding section and lying to the north of a line from East to West (shown by a brown line on map No. 3, annexed to the present Treaty):

leaving the Baltic coast about 13 kilometres east-north-east of Flensburg,
running
south-west so as to pass south-east of: Sygum, Ringsberg, Munkbrarup, Adelby, Tastrup, Jarplund, Oversee, and north-west of: Langballigholz, Langballig, Bönstrup, Rüllschau, Weseby, Kleinwolstrup, Gross-Solt,
thence westwards passing south of Frörup and north of Wanderup,
thence in a south-westerly direction passing south-east of Oxlund, Stieglund and Ostenau and north-west of the villages on the Wanderup-Kollund road;
thence in a north-westerly direction passing south-west of Löwenstedt, Joldelund, Goldelund and north-east of Kolkerheide and Högel to the bend of the Soholmer Au, about 1 kilometre east of Soholm where it meets the southern boundary of the *Kreis* of Tondern,
thence, following this boundary to the North Sea,
thence, passing south of the islands of Fohr and Amrum and north of the islands of Oland and Langeness,
the vote will be taken within a period not exceeding five weeks after the plebiscite has been held in the preceding section.

The result will be determined by communes (*Gemeinden*), according to the majority of the votes cast in each commune (*Gemeinde*).

5. In the section of the evacuated zone situated to the south of the preceding section and to the north of the line which starts from the mouth of the Schlei (Sli) and ends at the mouth of the Eider, the vote will be taken within a period not exceeding two weeks after the plebiscite shall have been held in the second section.

The result will likewise be determined by communes (*Gemeinden*), in accordance with the majority of the votes cast in each commune (*Gemeinde*).

ARTICLE 110.

A Commission composed of seven members, five of whom shall be nominated by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, one by Denmark, and one by Germany shall be constituted within fifteen days from the date when the final result of the vote is known, to trace the frontier line on the spot.

The decisions of the Commission will be taken by a majority of votes and shall be binding on the parties concerned.

ARTICLE 111.

Pending a delimitation on the spot, a frontier line will be fixed by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers according to a line based on the result of the voting, and proposed by the International Commission, and taking into account the particular geographical and economic conditions of the localities in question.

From that time the Danish Government may effect the occupation of these territories with the Danish civil and military authorities, and the German Government may reinstate up to the said frontier line the German civil and military authorities whom it has evacuated.

Germany hereby renounces definitively in favour of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers all rights of sovereignty over the territories situated to the north of the frontier line fixed in accordance with the above provisions. The Principal Allied and Associated Powers will hand over the said territories to Denmark.

ARTICLE 112.

All the inhabitants of the territory which is returned to Denmark will acquire Danish nationality *ipso facto*, and will lose their German nationality.

Persons, however, who had become habitually resident in this territory after the 1st October, 1918, will not be able to acquire Danish nationality without permission from the Danish Government.

ARTICLE 113.

Within two years from the date on which the sovereignty over the whole or part of the territory or Schleswig subjected to the plebiscite is restored to Denmark:

Any person over 18 years of age, born in the territory restored to Denmark, not habitually resident in this region, and possessing German nationality, will be entitled to opt for Denmark;

Any person over 18 years of age habitually resident in the territory restored to Denmark will be entitled to opt for Germany.

Option by a husband will cover his wife and option by parents will cover their children less than 18 years of age.

Persons who have exercised the above right to opt must within the ensuing twelve months transfer their place of residence to the State in favour of which they have opted.

They will be entitled to retain the immovable property which they own in the territory of the other State in which they were habitually resident before opting. They may carry with them their movable property of every description. No export or import duties may be imposed upon them in connection with the removal of such property.

ARTICLE 114.

The proportion and nature of the financial or other obligations of Germany and Prussia which are to be assumed by Denmark will be fixed in accordance with Article 254 of Part IX (Financial Clauses) of the present Treaty.

Further stipulations will determine any other questions arising out of the transfer to Denmark of the whole or part of the territory of which she was deprived by the Treaty of October 30, 1864.

Section XIII. Heligoland.

ARTICLE 115.

The fortifications, military establishments, and harbours of the Islands of Heligoland and Dune shall be destroyed under the supervision of the Principal Allied Governments by German labour and at the expense of Germany within a period to be determined by the said Governments.

The term "harbours" shall include the north-east mole, the west wall, the outer and inner breakwaters and reclaimed land within them, and all naval and military works, fortifications and buildings, constructed or under construction, between lines connecting the following positions taken from the British Admiralty chart No. 126 of 19 April, 1918:

a). lat. 54° 10′ 49″ N.; long. 7° 53′ 39″ E.;
b). — 54° 10′ 35″ N.; — 7° 54′ 18″ E.;
c). — 54° 10′ 14″ N.; — 7° 54′ 00″ E.;
d). — 54° 10′ 17″ N.; — 7° 53′ 37″ E.;
e). — 54° 10′ 44″ N.; — 7° 53′ 26″ E.

These fortifications, military establishments and harbours shall not be reconstructed; nor shall any similar works be constructed in future.

Section XIV. Russia and Russian States.

ARTICLE 116.

Germany acknowledges and agrees to respect as permanent and inalienable the independence of all the territories which were part of the former Russian Empire on August 1st, 1914.

In accordance with the provisions of Article 259 of Part IX (Financial Clauses) and Article 292 of Part X (Economic Clauses), Germany accepts definitely the abrogation of the Brest-Litovsk treaties and of all treaties, conventions and agreements entered into by her with the Maximalist Government in Russia.

The Allied and Associated Powers formally reserve the rights of Russia to obtain from Germany restitution and reparation based on the principles of the present Treaty.

ARTICLE 117.

Germany undertakes to recognize the full force of all treaties or agreements which may be entered into by the Allied and Associated Powers with States now existing or coming into existence in future in the whole or part of the former Empire of Russia as it existed on August 1, 1914, and to recognize the frontiers of any such States as determined therein.

PART IV.

GERMAN RIGHTS AND INTERESTS OUTSIDE GERMANY.

ARTICLE 118.

In territory outside her European frontiers as fixed by the present Treaty, Germany renounces all rights, titles and privileges whatever in or over territory which belonged to her or to her allies, and all rights, titles and privileges whatever their origin which she held as against the Allied and Associated Powers.

Germany undertakes immediately to recognise and to conform to the measures which may be taken now or in the future by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, in agreement where necessary with third Powers, in order to carry the above stipulation into effect.

In particular Germany declares her acceptance of the following Articles relating to certain special subjects.

Section I. German Colonies.

ARTICLE 119.

Germany renounces in favour of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers all her rights and titles over her oversea possessions.

ARTICLE 120.

All movable and immovable property in such territories belonging to the German Empire or to any German State shall pass to the Government exercising authority over such territories, on the terms laid down in Article 257 of Part IX (Financial Clauses) of the present Treaty. The decision of the local courts in any dispute as to the nature of such property shall be final.

ARTICLE 121.

The provisions of Section I (Commercial Relations) and Section IV (Property, Rights and Interests) of Part X (Economic Clauses) of the present Treaty shall apply in the case of these territories whatever be the form of Government adopted for them.

ARTICLE 122.

The Government exercising authority over such territories may make such provisions as it thinks fit with reference to the repatriation from them of German nationals and to the conditions upon which German subjects of European origin shall, or shall not, be allowed to reside, hold property, trade or exercise a profession in them.

ARTICLE 123.

The provisions of Article 260 of Part IX (Financial Clauses) of the present Treaty shall apply in the case of all agreements concluded with German nationals for the construction or exploitation of public works in the German oversea possessions, as well as any sub-concessions or contracts resulting therefrom which may have been made to or with such nationals.

ARTICLE 124.

Germany hereby undertakes to pay, in accordance with the estimate to be presented by the French Government and approved by the Reparation Commission, reparation for damage suffered by French nationals in the Cameroons or the frontier zone by reason of the acts of the German civil and military authorities and of German private individuals during the period from the 1st January, 1900, to the 1st August, 1914.

ARTICLE 125.

Germany renounces all rights under the Conventions and Agreements with France of the 4th November, 1911, and the 28th September, 1912, relating to Equatorial Africa. She undertakes to pay to the French Government, in accordance with the estimate to be presented by that Government and approved by the Reparation Commission, all the deposits, credits, advances, etc., effected by virtue of these instruments in favour of Germany.

ARTICLE 126.

Germany undertakes to accept and observe the agreements made or to be made by the Allied and Associated Powers or some of them with any other Power with regard to the trade in arms and spirits, and to the matters dealt with in the General Act of Berlin of the 26th February, 1885, and the General Act of Brussels of the 2nd July, 1890.

ARTICLE 127.

The native inhabitants of the former German oversea possessions shall be entitled to the diplomatic protection of the Governments exercising authority over those territories.

Section II. China.

ARTICLE 128.

Germany renounces in favour of China all benefits and privileges resulting from the provisions of the final Protocol signed at Peking on the 7th September, 1901, and from all annexes, notes and documents supplementary thereto. She likewise renounces in favour of China any claim to indemnities accruing thereunder subsequent to the 14th March, 1917.

ARTICLE 129.

From the coming into force of the present Treaty the High Contracting Parties shall apply, in so far as concerns them respectively:

1. The Arrangement of the 29th August, 1902, regarding the new Chinese customs tariff.

2. The Arrangement of the 27th September, 1905, regarding Whang-Poo, and the provisional supplementary Arrangement of the 4th April, 1912.

China, however, will no longer be bound to grant to Germany the advantages or privileges which she allowed Germany under these arrangements.

ARTICLE 130.

Subject to the provisions of Section VIII of this Part, Germany cedes to China all the buildings, wharves and pontoons, barracks, forts, arms and munitions of war, vessels of all kinds, wireless telegraphy installations and other public property belonging to the German Government, which are situated or may be in the German Concessions at Tientsin and Hankow or elsewhere in Chinese territory.

It is understood, however, that premises used as diplomatic or consular residences or offices are not included in the above cession, and, furthermore, that no steps shall be taken by the Chinese Government to dispose of the German public and private property situated within the so-called Legation Quarter at Peking without the consent of the Diplomatic Representatives of the Powers which, on the coming into force of the present Treaty, remain Parties to the Final Protocol of the 7th September, 1901.

ARTICLE 131.

Germany undertakes to restore to China within twelve months from the coming into force of the present Treaty all the astronomical instruments which her troops in 1900–1901 carried away from China, and to defray all expenses which may be incurred in effecting such restoration, including the expenses of dismounting, packing, transporting, insurance and installation in Peking.

ARTICLE 132.

Germany agrees to the abrogation of the leases from the Chinese Government under which the German Concessions at Hankow and Tientsin are now held.

China, restored to the full exercise of her sovereign rights in the above areas, declares her intention of opening them to international residence and trade. She further declares that the abrogation of the leases under which these concessions are now held shall not affect the property rights of nationals of Allied and Associated Powers who are holders of lots in these concessions.

ARTICLE 133.

Germany waives all claims against the Chinese Government or against any Allied or Associated Government arising out of the internment of German nationals in China and their repatriation. She equally renounces all claims arising out of the capture and condemnation of German ships in China, or the liquidation, sequestration or control of German properties, rights and interests in that country since August 14th, 1917. This provision, however, shall not affect the rights of the parties interested in the proceeds of any such liquidation, which shall be governed by the provisions of Part X (Economic Clauses) of the present Treaty.

ARTICLE 134.

Germany renounces in favour of the Government of His Britannic Majesty the German State property in the British Concession at Shameen at Canton. She renounces in favour of the French and Chinese Governments conjointly the property of the German school situated in the French Concession at Shanghai.

Section III. Siam.

ARTICLE 135.

Germany recognises that all treaties, conventions and agreements between her and Siam, and all rights, title and privileges derived therefrom, including all rights of extraterritorial jurisdiction, terminated as from July 22, 1917.

ARTICLE 136.

All goods and property in Siam belonging to the German Empire or to any German State, with the exception of premises used as diplomatic or consular residences or offices, pass *ipso facto* and without compensation to the Siamese Government.

The goods, property, and private rights of German nationals in Siam shall be dealt with in accordance with the provisions of Part X (Economic Clauses) of the present Treaty.

ARTICLE 137.

Germany waives all claims against the Siamese Government on behalf of herself or her nationals arising out of the seizure or condemnation of German ships, the liquidation of German property, or the internment of German nationals in Siam. This provision shall not affect the rights of the parties interested in the proceeds of any such liquidation, which shall be governed by the provisions of Part X (Economic Clauses) of the present Treaty.

Section IV. Liberia.

ARTICLE 138.

Germany renounces all rights and privileges arising from the arrangements of 1911 and 1912 regarding Liberia, and particularly the right to nominate a German Receiver in Liberia.

She further renounces all claim to participate in any measures whatsoever which may be adopted for the rehabilitation of Liberia.

ARTICLE 139.

Germany recognizes that all treaties and arrangements between her and Liberia terminated as from August 8, 1917.

ARTICLE 140.

The property, rights and interests of Germans in Liberia shall be dealt with in accordance with Part X (Economic Clauses) of the present treaty.

Section V. Morocco.

ARTICLE 141.

Germany renounces all rights, titles and privileges conferred on her by the General Act of Algeciras of April 7, 1906, and by the Franco-German Agreements of February 9, 1909 and November 4, 1911. All treaties, agreements, arrangements and contracts concluded by her with the Sherifian Empire are regarded as abrogated as from August 3, 1914.

In no case can Germany take advantage of these instruments and she undertakes not to intervene in any way in negotiations relating to Morocco which may take place between France and the other Powers.

ARTICLE 142.

Germany having recognized the French Protectorate in Morocco, hereby accepts all the consequences of its establishment, and she renounces the régime of the capitulations therein.

This renunciation shall take effect as from August 3, 1914.

ARTICLE 143.

The Sherifian Government shall have complete liberty of action in regulating the status of German nationals in Morocco and the conditions in which they may establish themselves there.

German protected persons, semsars and "associés agricoles" shall be considered as having ceased, as from August 3, 1914, to enjoy the privileges attached to their status and shall be subject to the ordinary law.

ARTICLE 144.

All property and possessions in the Sherifian Empire of the German Empire and the German States pass to the Maghzen without payment.

For the purposes of this clause, the property and possessions of the German Empire and States shall be deemed to include all the property of the Crown, the Empire or States, and the private property of the former German Emperor and other Royal personages.

All movable and immovable property in the Sherifian Empire belonging to German nationals shall be dealt with in accordance with Sections III and IV of Part X (Economic Clauses) of the present Treaty.

Mining rights which may be recognised as belonging to German nationals by the Court of Arbitration set up under the Moroccan Mining Regulations shall form the subject of a valuation, which the arbitrators shall be requested to make, and these rights shall then be treated in the same way as property in Morocco belonging to German nationals.

ARTICLE 145.

The German Government shall ensure the transfer to a person nominated by the French Government of the shares representing Germany's portion of the capital of the State Bank of Morocco. The value of these shares, as assessed by the Reparation Commission, shall be paid to the Reparation Commission for the credit of Germany on account of the sums due for reparation. The German Government shall be responsible for indemnifying its nationals so dispossessed.

This transfer will take place without prejudice to the repayment of debts which German nationals may have contracted towards the State Bank of Morocco,

ARTICLE 146.

Moroccan goods entering Germany shall enjoy the treatment accorded to French goods.

Section VI. Egypt.

ARTICLE 147.

Germany declares that she recognises the Protectorate proclaimed over Egypt by Great Britain on December 18, 1914, and that she renounces the régime of the Capitulations in Egypt.

This renunciation shall take effect as from August 4, 1914.

ARTICLE 148.

All treaties, agreements, arrangements, and contracts concluded by Germany with Egypt are regarded as abrogated as from August 4, 1914.

In no case can Germany avail herself of these instruments and she undertakes not to intervene in any way in negotiations relating to Egypt which may take place between Great Britain and the other Powers.

ARTICLE 149.

Until an Egyptian law of judicial organization establishing courts with universal jurisdiction comes into force, provision shall be made, by means of decrees issued by His Highness the Sultan, for the exercise of jurisdiction over German nationals and property by the British Consular Tribunals.

ARTICLE 150.

The Egyptian Government shall have complete liberty of action in regulating the status of German nationals and the conditions under which they may establish themselves in Egypt.

ARTICLE 151.

Germany consents to the abrogation of the decree issued by His Highness the Khedive on November 28, 1904, relating to the Commission of the Egyptian Public Debt, or to such changes as the Egyptian Government may think it desirable to make therein.

ARTICLE 152.

Germany consents, in so far as she is concerned, to the transfer to His Britannic Majesty's Government of the powers conferred on His Imperial Majesty the Sultan by the Convention signed at Constantinople on October 29, 1888, relating to the free navigation of the Suez Canal.

She renounces all participation in the Sanitary, Maritime, and Quarantine Board of Egypt and consents, in so far as she is concerned, to the transfer to the Egyptian Authorities of the powers of that Board.

ARTICLE 153

All property and possessions in Egypt of the German Empire and the German States pass to the Egyptian Government without payment.

For this purpose, the property and possessions of the German Empire and States shall be deemed to include all the property of the Crown, the Empire or the States, and the private property of the former German Emperor and other Royal personages.

All movable and immovable property in Eygpt belonging to German nationals shall be dealt with in accordance with Sections III and IV of Part X (Economic Clauses) of the present Treaty.

ARTICLE 154.

Egyptian goods entering Germany shall enjoy the treatment accorded to British goods.

Section VII. Turkey and Bulgaria.

ARTICLE 155.

Germany undertakes to recognise and accept all arrangements which the Allied and Associated Powers may make with Turkey and Bulgaria with reference to any rights, interests and privileges whatever which might be claimed by Germany or her nationals in Turkey and Bulgaria and which are not dealt with in the provisions of the present Treaty.

Section VIII. Shantung.

ARTICLE 156.

Germany renounces, in favour of Japan, all her rights, title, and privileges—particularly those concerning the territory of Kiaochow, railways, mines and submarine cables—which she acquired in virtue of the Treaty concluded by her with Chiua

on March 6, 1898, and of all other arrangements relative to the Province of Shantung.

All German rights in the Tsingtao-Tsinanfu Railway, including its branch lines, together with its subsidiary property of all kinds, stations, shops, fixed and rolling stock, mines, plant and material for the exploitation of the mines, are and remain acquired by Japan, together with all rights and privileges attaching thereto.

The German State submarine cables from Tsingtao to Shanghai and from Tsingtao to Chefoo, with all the rights, privileges and properties attaching thereto, are similarly acquired by Japan, free and clear of all charges and encumbrances.

ARTICLE 157.

The movable and immovable property owned by the German State in the territory of Kiaochow, as well as all the rights which Germany might claim in consequence of the works or improvements made or of the expenses incurred by her, directly or indirectly, in connection with this territory, are and remain acquired by Japan, free and clear of all charges and encumbrances.

ARTICLE 158.

Germany shall hand over to Japan within three months from the coming into force of the present Treaty, the archives, registers, plans, title-deeds and documents of every kind, wherever they may be, relating to the administration, whether civil, military, financial, judicial or other, of the territory of Kiaochow.

Within the same period Germany shall give particulars to Japan of all treaties, arrangements or agreements relating to the rights, title or privileges referred to in the two preceding articles.

PART V.

MILITARY, NAVAL AND AERIAL CLAUSES.

In order to render possible the initiation of a general limitation of the armaments of all nations, Germany undertakes strictly to observe the military, naval and air clauses which follow.

Section I. Military clauses.

Chapter I. Effectives and cadres of the German Army.

ARTICLE 159.

Within two months of the coming into force of the present Treaty the German military forces shall be demobilized as prescribed hereinafter.

ARTICLE 160.

The German Army must not comprise more than seven divisions of infantry and three divisions of cavalry.

In no case must the total number of effectives in the Army of the States constituting Germany ever exceed one hundred thousand men, including officers and establishments of depots. The Army shall be devoted exclusively to the maintenance of order within the territory and to the control of the frontiers.

The total effective strength of officers, including the personnel of staffs, whatever their composition, must not exceed four thousand.

ARTICLE 161.

Divisions and Army Corps headquarters staffs shall be organised in accordance with Table No. I annexed to this Section.

The number and strengths of the units of infantry, artillery, engineers, technical services and troops laid down in the aforesaid Table consitute maxima which much not be exceeded.

The following units may each have their own depot:

An Infantry regiment;
A Cavalry regiment;
A regiment of Field Artillery;
A battalion of Pioneers.

ARTICLE 162.

The divisions must not be grouped under more than two army corps headquarters staffs.

The maintenance or formation of forces differently grouped or of other organisations for the command of troops or for preparation for war is forbidden.

The Great German General Staff and all similar organisations shall be dissolved and may not be reconstituted in any form.

The officers, or persons in the position of officers, in the Ministries of War in the different States in Germany and in the Administrations attached to them, must not exceed three hundred in number and are included in the maximum strength of four thousand laid down in the 3rd paragraph of Article 160.

ARTICLE 163.

Army administrative services consisting of civilian personnel not included in the number of effectives prescribed by the present Treaty will have such personnel reduced in each class to one-tenth of that laid down in the Budget of 1913.

ARTICLE 164.

The number of employés or officials of the German States, such as customs officers, forest guards and coastguards, shall not exceed that of the employés or officials functioning in these capacities in 1913.

The number of gendarmes and employees or officials of the local or municipal police may only be increased to an extent corresponding to the increase of population since 1913 in the districts or municipalities in which they are employed.

These employees and officials may not be assembled for military training.

Chapter II. Armament, munitions and material.

ARTICLE 165.

At the expiration of two months from the coming into force of the present Treaty the German Army must not possess an armament greater than the amounts fixed in Table No. II, annexed to this Section, with the exception of an optional increase not exceeding one-twentyfifth part for small arms and one-fiftieth part for guns, which shall be exclusively used to provide for such eventual replacements as may be necessary.

ARTICLE 166.

At the expiration of two months from the coming into force of the present Treaty, the stock of munitions which the German Army may have at its disposal shall not exceed the amounts fixed in Table No. III annexed to this Section.

Within the same period the German Government will store these stocks at points to be notified to the Governments of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers. The German Government is forbidden to establish any other stocks, depots, or reserves of munitions.

ARTICLE 167.

The number and calibre of the guns constituting at the date of the coming into force of the present Treaty the armament of the fortified works, fortresses, any land or coast forts which Germany is allowed to retain must be notified immediately by the German Government to the Governments of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, and will constitute maximum amounts which may not be exceeded.

Within two months from the coming into force of the present Treaty, the maximum stock of ammunition for these guns will be reduced to, and maintained at, the following uniform rates:—fifteen hundred rounds per piece for those the calibre of which is 10.5 cm. and under: five hundred rounds per piece for those of higher calibre.

ARTICLE 168.

The manufacture of arms, munitions, or any war material, shall only be carried out in factories or works the location of which shall be communicated to and approved by the Governments of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, and the number of which they retain the right to restrict.

Within three months from the coming into force of the present Treaty, all other establishments for the manufacture, preparation, storage or design of arms, munitions, or any war material whatever shall be closed down. The same applies to all arsenals except those used as depots for the authorized stocks of munitions. Within the same period the personnel of these arsenals will be dismissed.

ARTICLE 169.

Within two months from the coming into force of the present Treaty German arms, munitions and war material, including anti-aircraft material, existing in Germany in excess of the quantities allowed, must be surrendered to the Governments of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers to be destroyed or rendered useless. This will also apply to any special plant intended for the manufacture of military material, except such as may be recognised as necessary for equipping the authorised strength of the German army.

The surrender in question will be effected at such points in German territory as may be selected by the said Governments.

Within the same period arms, munitions and war material, including anti-aircraft material, of origin other than German, in whatever state they may be, will be delivered to the said Governments, who will decide as to their disposal.

ARTICLE 170.

Importation into Germany of arms, munitions and war material of every kind shall be strictly prohibited.

The same applies to the manufacture for, and export to, foreign countries of arms, munitions and war material of every kind.

ARTICLE 171.

The use of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases and all analogous liquids, materials or devices being prohibited, their manufacture and importation are strictly forbidden in Germany.

The same applies to materials specially intended for the manufacture, storage and use of the said products or devices.

The manufacture and the importation into Germany of armoured cars, tanks and all similar constructions suitable for use in war are also prohibited.

ARTICLE 172.

Within a period of three months from the coming into force of the present Treaty, the German Government will disclose to the Governments of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers the nature and mode of manufacture of all explosives, toxic substances or other like chemical preparations used by them in the war or prepared by them for the purpose of being so used.

Chapter III. Recruiting and Military Training.

ARTICLE 173.

Universal compulsory military service shall be abolished in Germany.

The German Army may only be constituted and recruited by means of voluntary enlistment.

ARTICLE 174.

The period of enlistment for non-commissioned officers and privates must be twelve consecutive years.

The number of men discharged for any reason before the expiration of their term of enlistment must not exceed in any year five per cent. of the total effectives fixed by the second paragraph of Article 160 of the present Treaty.

ARTICLE 175.

The officers who are retained in the Army must undertake the obligation to serve in it up to the age of forty-five years at least.

Officers newly appointed must undertake to serve on the active list for twenty-five consecutive years at least.

Officers who have previously belonged to any formations whatever of the Army, and who are not retained in the units allowed to be maintained, must not take part in any military exercise whether theoretical or practical, and will not be under any military obligations whatever.

The number of officers discharged for any reason before the expiration of their term of service must not exceed in any year five per cent. of the total effectives of officers provided for in the third paragraph of Article 160 of the present Treaty.

ARTICLE 176.

On the expiration of two months from the coming into force of the present Treaty there must only exist in Germany the number of military schools which is absolutely indispensable for the recruitment of the officers of the units allowed. These schools will be exclusively intended for the recruitment of officers of each arm, in the proportion of one school per arm.

The number of students admitted to attend the courses of the said schools will be strictly in proportion to the vacancies to be filled in the cadres of officers. The students and the cadres will be reckoned in the effectives fixed by the second and third paragraphs of Article 160 of the present Treaty.

Consequently, and during the period fixed above, all military academies or similar institutions in Germany, as well as the different military schools for officers, student officers (*Aspiranten*), cadets, non-commissioned officers or student non-commissioned officers (*Aspiranten*), other than the schools above provided for, will be abolished.

ARTICLE 177.

Educational establishments, the universities, societies of discharged soldiers, shooting or touring clubs and, generally speaking, associations of every description, whatever be the age of their members, must not occupy themselves with any military matters.

In particular they will be forbidden to instruct or exercise their members, or to allow them to be instructed or exercised, in the profession or use of arms.

These societies, associations, educational establishments and universities must have no connection with the Ministries of War or any other military authority.

ARTICLE 178.

All meaures of mobilization or appertaining to mobilization are forbidden.

In no case must formations, administrative services or General Staffs include supplementary cadres.

ARTICLE 179.

Germany agrees, from the coming into force of the present Treaty, not to accredit nor to send to any foreign country, any military, naval or air mission, nor to allow any such mission to leave her territory, and Germany further agrees to take appropriate measures to prevent German nationals from leaving her territory to become enrolled in the Army, Navy, or Air service of any foreign Power, or to be attached to such Army, Navy or Air service for the purpose of assisting in the military, naval or air training thereof, or otherwise for the purpose of giving military, naval or air instruction in any foreign country.

The Allied and Associated Powers agree, so far as they are concerned, from the coming into force of the present Treaty, not to enrol in nor to attach to their armies or naval or air forces any German national for the purpose of assisting in the military training of such armies, or naval or air forces, or otherwise to employ any such German national as military, naval or aeronautic instructor.

The present provision does not, however, affect the right of France to recruit for the Foreign Legion in accordance with French military laws and regulations.

Chapter IV. Fortifications.

ARTICLE 180.

Within three months of the coming into force of the present Treaty, all fortified works, fortresses and field works situated on German territory to the west of a line drawn fifty kilometres to the east of the Rhine shall be disarmed and dismantled, as provided in Article 42 of Part III (Political Clauses for Europe) of the present Treaty.

The construction of any new fortification, whatever its nature and importance, is forbidden in this zone.

The system of fortified works of the southern and eastern frontiers of Germany shall be maintained in its existing state.

Table No. 1.

STATE AND ESTABLISHMENT OF ARMY CORPS HEADQUARTERS STAFFS AND OF INFANTRY AND CAVALRY DIVISIONS.

These tabular statements do not form a fixed establishment to be imposed on Germany, but the figures contained in them (number of units and strengths) represent maximum figures, which should not in any case be exceeded.

I. Army corps headquarters staffs.

Unit	Maximum No. authorised.	Maximum strengths of each unit.	
		Officers.	N.C.O.'s and men.
Army corps headquarters staffs	2	30	150
Total for headquarters staffs	.....	60	300

II. *Establishment of an infantry division.*

Unit.	Maximum No. of such units in a single division.	Maximum strengths of each unit.	
		Officers.	N.C.O.'s and men.
Headquarters of an infantry division	1	25	70
Headquarters of divisional infantry	1	4	30
Headquarters of divisional artillery	1	4	30
Regiment of infantry	3	70	2,300
(Each regiment comprises 3 battalions of infantry. Each battalion comprises 3 companies of infantry and 1 machine-gun company.)			
Trench mortar company	3	6	150
Divisional squadron	1	6	150
Field artillery regiment	1	85	1,300
(Each regiment comprises 3 groups of artillery. Each group comprises 3 batteries.)			
Pioneer battalion	1	12	400
(This battalion comprises 2 companies of pioneers, 1 pontoon detachment, 1 searchlight section.)			
Signal detachment	1	12	300
(This detachment comprises 1 telephone detachment, 1 listening section, 1 carrier pigeon section.)			
Divisional medical service	1	20	400
Parks and convoys	.....	14	800
Total for infantry division	.....	410	10,830

III. Establishment of a cavalry division.

Unit.	Maximum number of such units in a single division.	Maximum strengths of each unit.	
		Officers.	N.C.O.'s and men.
Headquarters of a cavalry division	1	15	50
Cavalry regiment	6	40	800
(Each regiment comprises 4 squadrons.)			
Horse artillery group (3 batteries)	1	20	400
Total for cavalry division		275	5,250

Table No. II.

TABULAR STATEMENT OF ARMAMENT ESTABLISHMENT FOR A MAXIMUM OF 7 INFANTRY DIVISIONS, 3 CAVALRY DIVISIONS, AND 2 ARMY CORPS HEADQUARTERS STAFFS.

Material.	Infantry division. (1)	For 7 infantry divisions. (2)	Cavalry division. (3)	For 3 cavalry divisions. (4)	2 Army corps headquarters staffs. (5)	Total of columns 2, 4, and 5. (6)
Rifles	12,000	84,000	.....	.....	This establishment must be drawn from the increased armaments of the divisional infantry.	84,000
Carbines	.....	.....	6,000	18,000		18,000
Heavy machine guns	108	756	12	36		792
Light machine guns	162	1,134	.....	.....		1,134
Medium trench mortars	9	63	.....	.....		63
Light trench mortars	27	189	.....	.....		189
7.7 cm. guns	24	168	12	36		204
10.5 cm. howitzers	12	84	.....	.....		84

Table No. III.

MAXIMUM STOCKS AUTHORISED.

Material.	Maximum number of arms authorised.	Establishment per unit.	Maximum, totals.
		Rounds.	*Rounds.*
Rifles	84,000	400	40,800,000
Carbines	18,000		
Heavy machine guns	792	8,000	15,408,000
Light machine guns	1,134		
Medium trench mortars	63	400	25,200
Light trench mortars	189	800	151,200
Field artillery			
7.7 cm. guns	204	1,000	204,000
10.5 cm. howitzers	84	800	67,200

Section II. Naval Clauses.

ARTICLE 181.

After the expiration of a period of two months from the coming into force of the present Treaty the German naval forces in commission must not exceed:

6 battleships of the *Deutschland* or *Lothringen* type,
6 light cruisers,
12 destroyers,
12 torpedo boats,

or an equal number of ships constructed to replace them as provided in Article 190.

No submarines are to be included.

All other warships, except where there is provision to the contrary in the present Treaty, must be placed in reserve or devoted to commercial purposes.

ARTICLE 182.

Until the completion of the minesweeping prescribed by Article 193 Germany will keep in commission such number of minesweeping vessels as may be fixed by the Governments of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers.

ARTICLE 183.

After the expiration of a period of two months from the coming into force of the present Treaty the total personnel of the German Navy, including the manning of the fleet, coast defences, signal stations, administration and other land services, must not exceed fifteen thousand, including officers and men of all grades and corps.

The total strength of officers and warrant officers must not exceed fifteen hundred.

Within two months from the coming into force of the present Treaty the personnel in excess of the above strength shall be demobilized.

No naval or military corps or reserve force in connection with the Navy may be organised in Germany without being included in the above strength.

ARTICLE 184.

From the date of the coming into force of the present Treaty all the German surface warships which are not in German ports cease to belong to Germany, who renounces all rights over them.

Vessels which, in compliance with the Armistice of 11th November 1918, are now interned in the ports of the Allied and Associated Powers are declared to be finally surrendered.

Vessels which are now interned in neutral ports will be there surrendered to the Governments of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers. The German Government must address a notification to that effect to the neutral Powers on the coming into force of the present Treaty.

ARTICLE 185.

Within a period of two months from the coming into force of the present Treaty the German surface warships enumerated below will be surrendered to the Principal Allied and Associated Powers in such Allied ports as the said Powers may direct.

These warships will have been disarmed as provided in Article XXIII of the Armistice dated 11th November, 1918. Nevertheless they must have all their guns on board.

BATTLESHIPS.

Oldenburg.
Thuringen.
Ostfriesland.
Helgoland.
Posen.
Westfalen.
Rheinland.
Nassau.

LIGHT CRUISERS.

Stettin.
Danzig.
München.
Lübeck.
Stralsund.
Augsburg.
Kolberg.
Stuttgart.

and, in addition, forty-two modern destroyers and fifty modern torpedo boats, as chosen by the Governments of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers.

ARTICLE 186.

On the coming into force of the present Treaty the German Government must undertake, under the supervision of the Governments of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, the breaking-up of all the German surface warships now under construction.

ARTICLE 187.

The German auxiliary cruisers and fleet auxiliaries enumerated below will be disarmed and treated as merchant ships.

INTERNED IN NEUTRAL COUNTRIES:

Berlin.
Santa Fé.
Seydlitz.
Yorck.

IN GERMANY:

Ammon.
Ansiwald.
Bosnia.
Cardoba.
Cassel.
Dania.
Rio Negro.
Rio Pardo.
Santa Cruz.
Schwaben.
Solingen.
Steigerwald.
Franken.
Gundomar.
Fürst Bülow.
Gertrud.
Kigoma.
Rugia.
Santa Elena.
Schleswig.
Möwe.
Sierra Ventana.
Chemnitz.
Emil Georg von Strauss.
Habsburg.
Meteor.
Waltraute.
Scharnhorst.

ARTICLE 188.

On the expiration of one month from the coming into force of the present Treaty all German submarines, submarine salvage vessels and docks for submarines, including the tubular dock, must have been handed over to the Governments of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers.

Such of these submarines, vessels and docks as are considered by the said Governments to be fit to proceed under their own power or to be towed shall be taken by the German Government into such Allied ports as have been indicated.

The remainder, and also those in course of construction, shall be broken up entirely by the German Government under the

supervision of the said Governments. The breaking-up must be completed within three months at the most after the coming into force of the present Treaty.

ARTICLE 189.

Articles, machinery, and material arising from the breaking-up of German warships of all kinds, whether surface vessels or submarines, may not be used except for purely industrial or commercial purposes.

They may not be sold or disposed of to foreign countries.

ARTICLE 190.

Germany is forbidden to construct or acquire any warships other than those intended to replace the units in commission provided for in Article 181 of the present Treaty.

The warships intended for replacement purposes as above shall not exceed the following displacement:

Armoured ships	10,000 tons
Light cruisers	6,000 tons
Destroyers	800 tons
Torpedo boats	200 tons

Except where a ship has been lost, units of the different classes shall only be replaced at the end of a period of twenty years in the case of battleships and cruisers, and fifteen years in the case of destroyers and torpedo boats, counting from the launching of the ship.

ARTICLE 191.

The construction and acquisition of any submarine, even for commercial purposes, shall be forbidden in Germany.

ARTICLE 192.

The warships in commission of the German fleet must only have on board or in reserve the allowance of arms, munitions and war material fixed by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers.

Within a month from the fixing of the quantities as above, arms, munitions and war material of all kinds, including mines and torpedoes, now in the hands of the German Government and in excess of the said quantities, shall be surrendered to the Governments of the said Powers at places to be indicated by them. Such arms, munitions and war material will be destroyed or rendered useless.

All other stocks, depôts or reserves of arms, munitions or naval war material of all kinds are forbidden.

The manufacture in German territory and the export of these articles to foreign countries shall be forbidden.

ARTICLE 193.

On the coming into force of the present Treaty Germany will forthwith sweep up the mines in the following areas in the North Sea to the eastward of longitude 4° 00′ E. of Greenwich:

(1) Between parallels of latitude 53° 00′ N. and 59° 00′ N.;

(2) To the northward of latitude 60° 30′ N.

Germany must keep these areas free from mines.

Germany must also sweep and keep free from mines such areas in the Baltic as may ultimately be notified by the Governments of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers.

ARTICLE 194.

The personnel of the German Navy shall be recruited entirely by voluntary engagements entered into for a minimum period of twenty-five consecutive years for officers and warrant officers; twelve consecutive years for petty officers and men.

The number engaged to replace those discharged for any reason before the expiration of their term of service must not exceed five per cent. per annum of the totals laid down in this Section (Article 183).

The personnel discharged from the Navy must not receive any kind of naval or military training or undertake any further service in the Navy or Army.

Officers belonging to the German Navy and not demobilised must engage to serve till the age of forty-five, unless discharged for sufficient reasons.

No officer or man of the German mercantile marine shall receive any training in the Navy.

ARTICLE 195.

In order to ensure free passage into the Baltic to all nations, Germany shall not erect any fortifications in the area comprised between latitudes 55° 27′ N. and 54° 00′ N. and longitudes 9° 00′ E. and 16° 00′ E. of the meridian of Greenwich, nor instal any guns commanding the maritime routes between the North Sea and the Baltic. The fortifications now existing in this area shall be demolished and the guns removed under the supervision of the Allied Governments and in periods to be fixed by them.

The German Government shall place at the disposal of the Governments of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers all hydographical information now in its possession concerning the channels and adjoining waters between the Baltic and the North Sea.

ARTICLE 196.

All fortified works and fortifications, other than those mentioned in Article 195 and in Part III (Political Clauses for Europe) Section XIII (Heligoland), now established within fifty kilometres of the German coast or on German islands off that coast shall be considered as of a defensive nature and may remain in their existing condition.

No new fortifications shall be constructed within these limits. The armament of these defences shall not exceed, as regards the number and calibre of guns, those in position at the date of the coming into force of the present Treaty. The German Government shall communicate forthwith particulars thereof to all the European Governments.

On the expiration of a period of two months from the coming into force of the present Treaty the stocks of ammunition for these guns shall be reduced to and maintained at a maximum figure of fifteen hundred rounds per piece for calibres of 4.1-inch and under, and five hundred rounds per piece for higher calibres.

ARTICLE 197.

During the three months following the coming into force of the present Treaty the German high-power wireless telegraphy stations at Nauen, Hanover and Berlin shall not be used for the transmission of messages concerning naval, military or political questions of interest to Germany or any State which has been allied to Germany in the war, without the assent of the Governments of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers. These stations may be used for commercial purposes, but only under the supervision of the said Governments, who will decide the wave-length to be used.

During the same period Germany shall not build any more high-power wireless telegraphy stations in her own territory or that of Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria or Turkey.

Section III. Air clauses.

ARTICLE 198.

The armed forces of Germany must not include any military or naval air forces.

Germany may, during a period not extending beyond the 1st October, 1919, maintain a maximum number of one hundred seaplanes or flying boats, which shall be exclusively employed in searching for submarine mines, shall be furnished with the necessary equipment for this purpose, and shall in no case carry arms, munitions or bombs of any nature whatever.

In addition to the engines installed in the seaplanes or flying boats above mentioned, one spare engine may be provided for each engine of each of these craft.

No dirigible shall be kept.

ARTICLE 199.

Within two months from the coming into force of the present Treaty the personnel of the air forces on the rolls of the German land and sea forces shall be demobilised. Up to the 1st October, 1919, however, Germany may keep and maintain a total number of one thousand men, including officers, for the whole of the cadres and personnel, flying and non-flying, of all formations and establishments.

ARTICLE 200.

Until the complete evacuation of German territory by the Allied and Associated troops, the aircraft of the Allied and Associated Powers shall enjoy in Germany freedom of passage through the air, freedom of transit and of landing.

ARTICLE 201.

During the six months following the coming into force of the present Treaty, the manufacture and importation of aircraft, parts of aircraft, engines for aircraft, and parts of engines for aircraft, shall be forbidden in all German territory.

ARTICLE 202.

On the coming into force of the present Treaty, all military and naval aeronautical material, except the machines mentioned in the second and third paragraphs of Article 198, must be delivered to the Government of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers.

Delivery must be effected at such places as the said Governments may select, and must be completed within three months.

In particular, this material will include all items under the following heads which are or have been in use or were designed for warlike purposes:

Complete aeroplanes and seaplanes, as well as those being manufactured, repaired or assembled.

Dirigibles able to take the air, being manufactured, repaired or assembled.

Plant for the manufacture of hydrogen.

Dirigible sheds and shelters of every kind for aircraft.

Pending their delivery, dirigibles will, at the expense of Germany, be maintained inflated with hydrogen; the plant for the manufacture of hydrogen, as well as the sheds for dirigibles, may, at the discretion of the said Powers, be left to Germany until the time when the dirigibles are handed over.

Engines for aircraft.

Nacelles and fuselages.

Armament (guns, machine guns, light machine guns, bomb-dropping apparatus, torpedo-dropping apparatus, synchronization apparatus, aiming apparatus).

Munitions (cartridges, shells, bombs loaded or unloaded, stocks of explosives or of material for their manufacture).

Instruments for use on aircraft.

Wireless apparatus and photographic or cinematograph apparatus for use on aircraft.

Component parts of any of the items under the preceding heads.

The material referred to above shall not be removed without special permission from the said Governments.

Section IV. Inter-Allied Commissions of Control.

ARTICLE 203.

All the military, naval, and air clauses contained in the present Treaty, for the execution of which a time-limit is prescribed, shall be executed by Germany under the control of Inter-Allied Commissions specially appointed for this purpose by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers.

ARTICLE 204.

The Inter-Allied Commissions of Control will be specially charged with the duty of seeing to the complete execution of the delivery, destruction, demolition and rendering things useless to be carried out at the expense of the German Government in accordance with the present Treaty.

They will communicate to the German authorities the decisions which the Principal Allied and Associated Powers have reserved the right to take, or which the execution of the military, naval and air clauses may necessitate.

ARTICLE 205.

The Inter-Allied Commissions of Control may establish their organisations at the seat of the central German Government.

They shall be entitled as often as they think desirable to proceed to any point whatever in German territory, or to send sub-commissions, or to authorize one or more of their members to go, to any such point.

ARTICLE 206.

The German Government must give all necessary facilities for the accomplishment of their missions to the Inter-Allied Commissions of Control, and to their members.

It shall attach a qualified representative to each Inter-Allied Commission of Control for the purpose of receiving the communications which the Commission may have to address to the German Government and of supplying or procuring for the Commission all information or documents which may be required.

The German Government must in all cases furnish at its own cost all labour and material required to effect the deliveries and the works of destruction, dismantling, demolition, and of rendering things useless, provided for in the present Treaty.

ARTICLE 207.

The upkeep and cost of the Commissions of Control and the expenses involved by their work shall be borne by Germany.

ARTICLE 208.

The Military Inter-Allied Commission of Control will represent the Governments of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers in dealing with the German Government in all matters concerning the execution of the military clauses.

In particular it will be its duty to receive from the German Government the notifications relating to the location of the stocks and depôts of munitions, the armament of the fortified works, fortresses and forts which Germany is allowed to retain, and the location of the works or factories for the production of arms, munitions and war material and their operations.

It will take delivery of the arms, munitions, and war material, will select the points where such delivery is to be effected, and will supervise the works of destruction, demolition, and of rendering things useless, which are to be carried out in accordance with the present Treaty.

The German Government must furnish to the Military Inter-Allied Commission of Control all such information and documents as the latter may deem necessary to ensure the complete execution of the military clauses, and in particular all legislative and administrative documents and regulations.

ARTICLE 209.

The Naval Inter-Allied Commission of Control will represent the Governments of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers in dealing with the German Government in all matters concerning the execution of the naval clauses.

In particular it will be its duty to proceed to the building yards and to supervise the breaking-up of the ships which are under construction there, to take delivery of all surface ships or submarines, salvage ships, docks and the tubular dock, and to supervise the destruction and breaking-up provided for.

The German Government must furnish to the Naval Inter-Allied Commission of Control all such information and documents as the Commission may deem necessary to ensure the complete execution of the naval clauses, in particular the designs of the warships, the composition of their armaments, the details and models of the guns, munitions, torpedoes, mines, explosives, wireless telegraphic apparatus and, in general, everything relating to naval war material, as well as all legislative or administrative documents or regulations.

ARTICLE 210.

The Aeronautical Inter-Allied Commission of Control will represent the Governments of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers in dealing with the German Government in all matters concerning the execution of the air clauses.

In particular it will be its duty to make an inventory of the aeronautical material existing in German territory, to inspect aeroplane, balloon and motor manufactories, and factories producing arms, munitions and explosives capable of being used by aircraft, to visit all aerodromes, sheds, landing grounds, parks and depôts, to authorise, where necessary, a removal of material and to take delivery of such material.

The German Government must furnish to the Aeronautical Inter-Allied Commission of Control all such information and legislative, administrative or other documents which the Commission may consider necessary to ensure the complete execution of the air clauses, and in particular a list of the personnel belonging to all the German Air Services, and of the existing material, as well as of that in process of manufacture or on order, and a list of all establishments working for aviation, of their positions, and of all sheds and landing grounds.

Section V. General articles.

ARTICLE 211.

After the expiration of a period of three months from the coming into force of the present Treaty, the German laws must have been modified and shall be maintained in conformity with this Part of the present Treaty.

Within the same period all the administrative or other measures relating to the execution of this Part of the Treaty must have been taken.

ARTICLE 212.

The following portions of the Armistice of November 11, 1918: Article VI, the first two and the sixth and seventh paragraphs of Article VII; Article IX; Clauses I, II and V of Annex n° 2, and the Protocol, dated April 4, 1919, supplementing the Armistice of November 11, 1918, remain in force so far as they are not inconsistent with the above stipulations.

ARTICLE 213.

So long as the present Treaty remains in force, Germany undertakes to give every facility for any investigation which the Council of the League of Nations, acting if need be by a majority vote, may consider necessary.

PART VI.

PRISONERS OF WAR AND GRAVES.

Section I. Prisoners of war.

ARTICLE 214.

The repatriation of prisoners of war and interned civilians shall take place as soon as possible after the coming into force of the present Treaty and shall be carried out with the greatest rapidity.

ARTICLE 215.

The repatriation of German prisoners of war and interned civilians shall, in accordance with Article 214, be carried out by a Commission composed of representatives of the Allied and Associated Powers on the one part and of the German Government on the other part.

For each of the Allied and Associated Powers a Sub-Commission, composed exclusively of representatives of the interested Power and of Delegates of the German Government, shall regulate the details of carrying into effect the repatriation of the prisoners of war.

ARTICLE 216.

From the time of their delivery into the hands of the German Authorities the prisoners of war and interned civilians are to be returned without delay to their homes by the said Authorities.

Those amongst them who before the war were habitually resident in territory occupied by the troops of the Allied and Associated Powers are likewise to be sent to their homes, subject to the consent and control of the Military Authorities of the Allied and Associated armies of occupation.

ARTICLE 217.

The whole cost of repatriation from the moment of starting shall be borne by the German Government who shall also provide the land and sea transport and staff considered necessary by the Commission referred to in article 215.

ARTICLE 218.

Prisoners of war and interned civilians awaiting disposal or undergoing sentence for offences against discipline shall be repatriated irrespective of the completion of their sentence or of the proceedings pending against them.

This stipulation shall not apply to prisoners of war and interned civilians punished for offences committed subsequent to May 1st, 1919.

During the period pending their repatriation all prisoners of war and interned civilians shall remain subject to the existing regulations, more especially as regards work and discipline.

ARTICLE 219.

Prisoners of war and interned civilians who are awaiting disposal or undergoing sentence for offences other than those against discipline may be detained.

ARTICLE 220.

The German Government undertakes to admit to its territory without distinction all persons liable to repatriation.

Prisoners of war or other German nationals who do not desire to be repatriated may be excluded from repatriation; but the Allied and Associated Governments reserve to themselves the right either to repatriate them or to take them to a neutral country or to allow them to reside in their own territories.

The German Government undertakes not to institute any exceptional proceedings against these persons or their families nor to take any repressive or vexatious measures of any kind whatsoever against them on this account.

ARTICLE 221.

The Allied and Associated Governments reserve the right to make the repatriation of German prisoners of war or German nationals in their hands conditional upon the immediate notification and release by the German Government of any prisoners of war who are nationals of the Allied and Associated Powers and may still be in Germany.

ARTICLE 222.

Germany undertakes:

1. To give every facility to the Commissions to enquire into the cases of those who cannot be traced; to furnish such Commissions with all necessary means of transport; to allow them access to camps, prisons, hospitals and all other places; and to place at their disposal all documents, whether public or private which would facilitate their enquiries.

2. To impose penalties upon any German officials or private persons who have concealed the presence of any nationals of any of the Allied and Associated Powers or have neglected to reveal the presence of any such after it had come to their knowledge.

ARTICLE 223.

Germany undertakes to restore without delay from the date of the coming into force of the present Treaty all articles, money, securities and documents which have belonged to nationals of the Allied and Associated Powers and which have been retained by the German authorities.

ARTICLE 224.

The High Contracting Parties waive reciprocally all repayment of sums due for the maintenance of prisoners of war in their respective territories.

Section II. Graves.

ARTICLE 225.

The Allied and Associated Governments and the German Government will cause to be respected and maintained the graves of the soldiers and sailors buried in their respective territories.

They agree to recognise any Commission appointed by an Allied or Associated Government for the purpose of identifying, registering, caring for or erecting suitable memorials over the said graves and to facilitate the discharge of its duties.

Furthermore they agree to afford, so far as the provisions of their laws and the requirements of public health allow, every facility for giving effect to requests that the bodies of their soldiers and sailors may be transferred to their own country.

ARTICLE 226.

The graves of prisoners of war and interned civilians who are nationals of the different belligerent States and have died in captivity shall be properly maintained in accordance with Article 225 of the present Treaty.

The Allied and Associated Governments on the one part and the German Government on the other part reciprocally undertake also to furnish to each other:

1. A complete list of those who have died together with all information useful for identification;

2. All information as to the number and position of the graves of all those who have been buried without identification.

PART VII.

PENALTIES.

ARTICLE 227.

The Allied and Associated Powers publicly arraign William II of Hohenzollern, formerly German Emperor, for a supreme offence against international morality and the sanctity of treaties.

A special tribunal will be constituted to try the accused, thereby assuring him the guarantees essential to the right of defence. It will be composed of five judges, one appointed by each of the following Powers: namely, the United States of America, Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan.

In its decision the tribunal will be guided by the highest motives of international policy, with a view to vindicating the solemn obligations of international undertakings and the validity of international morality. It will be its duty to fix the punishment which it considers should be imposed.

The Allied and Associated Powers will address a request to the Government of the Netherlands for the surrender to them of the ex-Emperor in order that he may be put on trial.

ARTICLE 228.

The German Government recognises the right of the Allied and Associated Powers to bring before military tribunals persons accused of having committed acts in violation of the laws and customs of war. Such persons shall, if found guilty, be sentenced to punishments laid down by military law. This provision will apply notwithstanding any proceedings or prosecution before a tribunal in Germany or in the territory of her allies.

The German Government shall hand over to the Allied and Associated Powers, or to such one of them as shall so request, all persons accused of having committed an act in violation of the laws and customs of war, who are specified either by name or by the rank, office or employment which they held under the German authorities.

ARTICLE 229.

Persons guilty of criminal acts against the nationals of one of the Allied and Associated Powers will be brought before the military tribunals of that Power.

Persons guilty of criminal acts against the nationals of more than one of the Allied and Associated Powers will be brought before military tribunals composed of members of the military tribunals of the Powers concerned.

In every case the accused will be entitled to name his own counsel.

ARTICLE 230.

The German Government undertakes to furnish all documents and information of every kind, the production of which may be considered necessary to ensure the full knowledge of the incriminating acts, the discovery of offenders and the just appreciation of responsibility.

PART VIII.

REPARATION.

Section I. General provisions.

ARTICLE 231.

The Allied and Associated Governments affirm and Germany accepts the responsibility of Germany and her Allies for causing all the loss and damage to which the Allied and Associated Governments and their nationals have been subjected as a consequence of the war imposed upon them by the aggression of Germany and her Allies.

ARTICLE 232.

The Allied and Associated Governments recognize that the resources of Germany are not adequate, after taking into account permanent diminutions of such resources which will re-

sult from other provisions of the present Treaty, to make complete reparation for all such loss and damage.

The Allied and Associated Governments, however, require, and Germany undertakes, that she will make compensation for all damage done to the civilian population of the Allied and Associated Powers and to their property during the period of the belligerency of each as an Allied or Associated Power against Germany by such aggression by land, by sea and from the air, and in general all damage as defined in Annex I hereto.

In accordance with Germany's pledges, already given, as to complete restoration for Belgium, Germany undertakes, in addition to the compensation for damage elsewhere in this Chapter provided for, as a consequence of the violation of the Treaty of 1839, to make reimbursement of all sums which Belgium has borrowed from the Allied and Associated Governments up to November 11, 1918, together with interest at the rate of five per cent. (5%) per annum on such sums. This amount shall be determined by the Reparation Commission, and the German Government undertakes thereupon forthwith to make a special issue of bearer bonds to an equivalent amount payable in marks gold, on May 1st, 1926, or, at the option of the German Government, on the 1st of May in any year up to 1926. Subject to the foregoing, the form of such bonds shall be determined by the Reparation Commission. Such bonds shall be handed over to the Reparation Commission, which has authority to take and acknowledge receipt thereof on behalf of Belgium.

ARTICLE 233.

The amount of the above damage for which compensation is to be made by Germany shall be determined by an Inter-Allied Commission, to be called the *Reparation Commission* and constituted in the form and with the powers set forth hereunder and in Annexes II to VII inclusive hereto.

This Commission shall consider the claims and give to the German Government a just opportunity to be heard.

The findings of the Commission as to the amount of damage defined as above shall be concluded and notified to the German Government on or before the 1st May, 1921, as representing the extent of that Government's obligations.

The Commission shall concurrently draw up a schedule of payments prescribing the time and manner for securing and discharging the entire obligation within a period of thirty years from the 1st May, 1921. If, however, within the period mentioned, Germany fails to discharge her obligations, any balance remaining unpaid may, within the discretion of the Commission, be postponed for settlement in subsequent years, or may be handled otherwise in such manner as the Allied and Associated Governments, acting in accordance with the procedure laid down in this Part of the present Treaty, shall determine.

ARTICLE 234.

The Reparation Commission shall after the 1st May, 1921, from time to time, consider the resources and capacity of Germany and, after giving her representatives a just opportunity to be heard, shall have discretion to extend the date, and to modify the form of payments, such as are to be provided for in accordance with Article 233: but not to cancel any part, except with the specific authority of the several Governments represented upon the Commission.

ARTICLE 235.

In order to enable the Allied and Associated Powers to proceed at once to the restoration of their industrial and economic life, pending the full determination of their claims, Germany shall pay in such instalments and in such manner (whether in gold, commodities, ships, securities or otherwise) as the Reparation Commission may fix, during 1919, 1920, and the first four months of 1921, the equivalent of 20,000,000,000 gold marks.

Out of this sum the expenses of the armies of occupation subsequent to the armistice of the 11th November, 1918, shall first be met, and such supplies of food and raw materials as may be judged by the Governments of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers to be essential to enable Germany to meet her obligations for reparation may also, with the approval of the said Governments, be paid for out of the above sum. The balance shall be reckoned towards liquidation of the amounts due for reparation.

Germany shall further deposit bonds as prescribed in Paragraph 12 (*c*) of Annex II hereto.

ARTICLE 236.

Germany further agrees to the direct application of her economic resources to reparation as specified in Annexes III, IV, V, and VI, relating respectively to merchant shipping, to physical restoration and to coal and derivatives of coal, and to dyestuffs and other chemical products; provided always that the value of the property transferred and any services rendered by her under these Annexes, assessed in the manner therein prescribed, shall be credited to her towards liquidation of her obligations under the above articles.

ARTICLE 237.

The successive instalments, including the above sum, paid over by Germany in satisfaction of the above claims will be divided by the Allied and Associated Governments in proportions which have been determined upon by them in advance on a basis of general equity and of the rights of each.

For the purposes of this division the value of property transferred and services rendered under Article 243, and under Annexes III, IV, V, VI, and VII, shall be reckoned in the same manner as cash payments effected in that year.

ARTICLE 238.

In addition to the payments mentioned above Germany shall effect, in accordance with the procedure laid down by the Reparation Commission, restitution in cash of cash taken away, seized or sequestrated, and also restitution of animals, objects of every nature and securities taken away, seized or sequestrated, in the cases in which it proves possible to identify them in territory belonging to Germany or her Allies.

Until this procedure is laid down, restitution will continue in accordance with the provisions of the Armistice of 11th of November 1918 and its Renewals and the Protocols thereto.

ARTICLE 239.

Germany undertakes to make forthwith the restitution contemplated by Article 238 and to make the payments and deliveries contemplated by Articles 233, 234, 235 and 236.

ARTICLE 240.

Germany recognizes the Commission provided for by Article 233 as the same may be constituted by the Allied and Associated Governments in accordance with Annex II, and agrees irrevocably to the possession and exercise by such Commission of the power and authority given to it under the present Treaty.

The German Government will supply to the Commission all the information which the Commission may require relative to the financial situation and operations and to the property, productive capacity, and stocks and current production of raw materials and manufactured articles of Germany and her nationals, and further any information relative to military operations which in the judgment of the Commission may be necessary for the assessment of Germany's liability for reparation as defined in Annex I.

The German Government will accord to the members of the Commission and its authorised agents the same rights and immunities as are enjoyed in Germany by duly accredited diplomatic agents of friendly Powers.

Germany further agrees to provide for the salaries and expenses of the Commission and of such staff as it may employ.

ARTICLE 241.

Germany undertakes to pass, issue, and maintain in force any legislation, orders, and decrees that may be necessary to give complete effect to these provisions.

ARTICLE 242.

The provisions of this Part of the present Treaty do not apply to the property, rights and interests referred to in Sections III and IV of Part X (Economic Clauses of the present Treaty, except so far as concerns any final balance in favour of Germany under Article 243 (*a*).

ARTICLE 243.

The following shall be reckoned as credits to Germany in respect to her reparation obligations:—

(*a*) Any final balance in favour of Germany under Sections III and IV of Part X (Economic Clauses) and Section V (Alsace-Lorraine) of Part III (Political Clauses for Europe).

(*b*) Amounts due to Germany in respect of transfers under Part IX (Financial Clauses), Part XII (Ports, Waterways and Railways) and Section IV (Saar Basin) of Part III (Political Clauses in Europe).

(*c*) Amounts which in the judgment of the Reparation Commission should be credited to Germany on account of any other transfers under the present Treaty of property, rights, concessions or other interests.

In no case however shall credit be given for property restored in accordance with Article 238.

ARTICLE 244.

The transfer of the German submarine cables which do not form the subject of particular provisions of the present Treaty is regulated by Annex VII hereto.

ANNEX I.

Compensation may be claimed from Germany under Article 232 above in respect of the total damage under the following categories.

1. Damage to injured persons and to surviving dependents by personal injury to or death of civilians caused by acts of war, including bombardments or other attacks on land, on sea, or from the air, and all the direct consequences thereof, and of all operations of war by the two groups of belligerents wherever arising.

2. Damage caused by Germany or her allies to civilian victims of acts of cruelty, violence or maltreatment (including injuries to life or health as a consequence of imprisonment, deportation, internment or evacuation, of exposure at sea or of being forced to labour by Germany or her allies), wherever arising and to the surviving dependents of such victims.

3. Damage caused by Germany or her allies in their own territory or in occupied or invaded territory to civilian victims of all acts injurious to health or capacity to work, or to honour, as well as to the surviving dependents of such victims.

4. Damage caused by any kind of maltreatment of prisoners of war.

5. As damage caused to the peoples of the Allied and Associated Powers, all pensions and compensations in the nature of pensions to naval and military victims of war (including members of the air forces), whether mutilated, wounded, sick or invalided, and to the dependents of such victims, the amount due to the Allied and Associated Governments being calculated for each of them as being the capitalised cost of such pensions and compensations at the date of the coming into force of the present Treaty, on the basis of the scales in force in France at such date.

6. The cost of assistance by the Governments of the Allied and Associated Powers to prisoners of war and to their families and dependents.

7. Allowances by the Governments of the Allied and Associated Powers to the families and dependents of mobilised persons or persons serving with the forces, the amount due to them for each calendar year in which hostilities occurred being calculated for each Government on the basis of the average scale for such payments in force in France during that year.

8. Damage caused to civilians by being forced by Germany or her allies to labour without just remuneration.

9. Damage in respect of all property wherever situated belonging to any of the Allied or Associated States or their nationals, with the exception of naval and military works or materials, which has been carried off, seized, injured or destroyed by the acts of Germany or her allies on land, on sea or from the air, or damage directly in consequence of hostilities or of any operations of war.

10. Damage in the form of levies, fines and other similar exactions imposed by Germany or her allies upon the civilian population.

ANNEX II.

1.

The Commission referred to in Article 233 shall be called "The Reparation Commission" and is hereinafter referred to as "the Commission."

2.

Delegates to the Commission shall be nominated by the United States of America, Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, Belgium and Serbia. Each of these Powers will appoint one Delegate and also one Assistant Delegate, who will take his place in case of illness or necessary absence, but at other times will only have the right to be present at proceedings without taking any part therein. On no occasion shall the Delegates of more than five of the above Powers have the right to take part in the proceedings of the Commission and to record their votes. The Delegates of the United States, Great Britain, France and Italy shall have this right on all occasions. The Delegate of Belgium shall have this right on all occasions other than those referred to below. The Delegate of Japan shall have this right on occasions when questions relating to damage at sea, and questions arising under Article 260 of Part IX (Financial Clauses) in which Japanese interests are concerned, are under consideration. The Delegate of the Serb Croat and Slovene State shall have this right when questions relating to Austria, Hungary or Bulgaria are under consideration.

Each Government represented on the Commission shall have the right to withdraw therefrom upon twelve months' notice filed with the Commission and confirmed in the course of the sixth month after the date of the original notice.

3.

Such of the other Allied and Associated Powers as may be interested shall have the right to appoint a Delegate to be present and act as Assessor only while their respective claims and interests are under examination or discussion, but without the right to vote.

4.

In case of the death, resignation or recall of any Delegate, Assistant Delegate or Assessor, a successor to him shall be nominated as soon as possible.

5.

The Commission will have its principal permanent Bureau in Paris and will hold its first meeting in Paris as soon as practicable after the coming into force of the present Treaty, and thereafter will meet in such place or places and at such time as it may deem convenient and as may be necessary for the most expeditious discharge of its duties.

6.

At its first meeting the Commission shall elect from among the Delegates referred to above a Chairman and a Vice-Chairman, who shall hold office for one year and shall be eligible for re-election. If a vacancy in the Chairmanship or Vice-Chairmanship should occur during the annual period, the Commission shall proceed to a new election for the remainder of the said period.

7.

The Commission is authorised to appoint all necessary officers, agents and employees who may be required for the execution of its functions, and to fix their remuneration; to constitute committees, whose members need not necessarily be members of the Commission, and to take all executive steps necessary for the purpose of discharging its duties; and to delegate authority and discretion to officers, agents and committees.

8.

All proceedings of the Commission shall be private, unless, on particular occasions, the Commission shall otherwise determine for special reasons.

9.

The Commission shall be required, if the German Government so desire, to hear, within a period which it will fix from time to time, evidence and arguments on the part of Germany on any question connected with her capacity to pay.

10.

The Commission shall consider the claims and give to the German Government a just opportunity to be heard, but not to take any part whatever in the decisions of the Commission. The Commission shall afford a similar opportunity to the allies of Germany, when it shall consider that their interests are in question.

11.

The Commission shall not be bound by any particular code or rules of law or by any particular rule of evidence or of procedure, but shall be guided by justice, equity and good faith. Its decisions must follow the same principles and rules in all cases where they are applicable. It will establish rules relating to methods of proof of claims. It may act on any trustworthy modes of computation.

12.

The Commission shall have all the powers conferred upon it, and shall exercise all the functions assigned to it by the present Treaty.

The Commission shall in general have wide latitude as to its control and handling of the whole reparation problem as dealt with in this part of the present Treaty and shall have authority to interpret its provisions. Subject to the provisions of the present Treaty, the Commission is constituted by the several Allied and Associated Governments referred to in paragraphs 2 and 3 above as the exclusive agency of the said Governments respectively for receiving, selling, holding, and distributing the reparation payments to be made by Germany under this Part of the present Treaty. The Commission must comply with the following conditions and provisions:—

(*a*) Whatever part of the full amount of the proved claims is not paid in gold, or in ships, securities, and commodities or otherwise, Germany shall be required, under such conditions as the Commission may determine, to cover by way of guarantee by an equivalent issue of bonds, obligations or otherwise, in order to constitute an acknowledgment of the said part of the debt;

(b) In periodically estimating Germany's capacity to pay, the Commission shall examine the German system of taxation, first to the end that the sums for reparation which Germany is required to pay shall become a charge upon all her revenues prior to that for the service or discharge of any domestic loan, and secondly, so as to satisfy itself that, in general, the German scheme of taxation is fully as heavy proportionately as that of any of the Powers represented on the Commission.

(c) In order to facilitate and continue the immediate restoration of the economic life of the Allied and Associated countries, the Commission will as provided in Article 235 take from Germany by way of security for and acknowledgment of her debt a first instalment of gold bearer bonds free of all taxes or charges of every description established or to be established by the Government of the German Empire or of the German States, or by any authority subject to them; these bonds will be delivered on account and in three portions, the marks gold being payable in conformity with Article 262 of Part IX (Financial Clauses) of the present Treaty as follows:

1. To be issued forthwith 20,000,000,000 Marks gold bearer bonds, payable not later than the 1st May, 1921, without interest. There shall be specially applied towards the amortisation of these bonds the payments which Germany is pledged to make in conformity with Article 235, after deduction of the sums used for the reimbursement of expenses of the armies of occupation and for payment of foodstuffs and raw materials. Such bonds as have not been redeemed by the 1st May, 1921, shall then be exchanged for new bonds of the same type as those provided for below (Paragraph 12, c, 2).

2. To be issued forthwith, further 40,000,000,000 Marks gold bearer bonds, bearing interest at 2½ per cent. per annum between 1921 and 1926, and thereafter at 5 per cent. per annum with an additional 1 per cent. for amortisation beginning in 1926 on the whole amount of the issue.

3. To be delivered forthwith a covering undertaking in writing to issue when, but not until, the Commission is satisfied that Germany can meet such interest and sinking fund obligations, a further instalment of 40,000,000,000 Marks gold 5 per cent. bearer bonds, the time and mode of payment of principle and interest to be determined by the Commission.

The dates for payment of interest, the manner of applying the amortisation fund, and all other questions relating to the issue, management, and regulation of the bond issue shall be determined by the Commission from time to time.

Further issues by way of acknowledgment and security may be required as the Commission subsequently determines from time to time.

(d) In the event of bonds, obligations, or other evidence of indebtedness issued by Germany by way of security for or acknowledgment of her reparation debt being disposed of outright, not by way of pledge, to persons other than the several Governments in whose favour Germany's original reparation indebtedness was created, an amount of such reparation indebtedness shall be deemed to be extinguished corresponding to the nominal value of the bonds, etc., so disposed of outright, and the obligation of Germany in respect of such bonds, shall be confined to her liabilities to the holders of the bonds, as expressed upon their face.

(e) The damage for repairing, reconstructing and rebuilding property in the invaded and devastated districts, including reinstallation of furniture, machinery and other equipment, will be calculated according to the cost at the dates when the work is done.

(f) Decisions of the Commission relating to the total or partial cancellation of the capital or interest of any verified debt of Germany must be accompanied by a statement of its reasons.

13.

As to voting, the Commission will observe the following rules:

When a decision of the Commission is taken, the votes of all the Delegates entitled to vote, or in the absence of any of them, of their Assistant Delegates, shall be recorded. Abstention from voting is to be treated as a vote against the proposal under discussion. Assessors have no vote.

On the following questions unanimity is necessary:

(a) Questions involving the sovereignty of any of the Allied and Associated Powers, or the cancellation of the whole or any part of the debt or obligations of Germany.

(b) Questions of determining the amount and conditions of bonds or other obligations to be issued by the German Government and of fixing the time and manner for selling, negotiating or distributing such bonds.

(c) Any postponement, total or partial, beyond the end of 1930, of the payment of instalments falling due between the 1st May, 1921, and the end of 1926 inclusive.

(d) Any postponement, total or partial, of any instalment falling due after 1926 for a period exceeding three years.

(e) Questions of applying in any particular case a method of measuring damages different from that which has been previously applied in a similar case.

(f) Questions of the interpretation of the provisions of this Part of the present Treaty.

All other questions shall be decided by the vote of a majority.

In case of any difference of opinion among the Delegates, which cannot be solved by reference to their Governments, upon the question whether a given case is one which requires a unanimous vote for its decision or not, such difference shall be referred to the immediate arbitration of some impartial person to be agreed upon by the Governments, whose award the Allied and Associated Governments agree to accept.

14.

Decisions of the Commission, in accordance with the powers conferred upon it, shall forthwith become binding and may be put in to immediate execution without further proceedings.

15.

The Commission will issue to each of the interested Powers, in such form as the Commission shall fix:—

1. A certificate stating that it holds for the account of the said Power bonds of the issues mentioned above, the said certificate, on the demand of the Power concerned, being divisible in a number of parts not exceeding five;

2. From time to time certificates stating the goods delivered by Germany on account of her reparation debt which it holds for the account of the said Power.

The said certificates shall be registered, and upon notice to the Commission, may be transferred by endorsement.

When bonds are issued for sale or negotiation, and when goods are delivered by the Commission, certificates to an equivalent value must be withdrawn.

16.

Interest shall be debited to Germany as from 1st May, 1921, in respect hereto as determined by the Commission, after allowing for sums already covered by cash payments or their equivalent, by bonds issued to the Commission, or under Article 243. The rate of interest shall be 5 per cent, unless the Commission shall determine at some future time that circumstances justify a variation of this rate.

The Commission, in fixing on 1st May, 1921, the total amount of the debt of Germany, may take account of interest due on sums arising out of the reparation of material damage as from 11th November, 1918, up to 1st May, 1921.

17.

In case of default by Germany in the performance of any obligation under this Part of the present Treaty, the Commission will forthwith give notice of such default to each of the interested Powers and may make such recommendations as to the action to be taken in consequence of such default as it may think necessary.

18.

The measures which the Allied and Associated Powers shall have the right to take, in case of voluntary default by Germany, and which Germany agrees not to regard as acts of war, may include economic and financial prohibitions and reprisals and in general such other measures as the respective Governments may determine to be necessary in the circumstances.

19.

Payments required to be made in gold or its equivalent on account of the proved claims of the Allied and Associated Powers may at any time be accepted by the Commission in the form of chattels, properties, commodities, businesses, rights, concessions, within or without German territory, ships, bonds, shares, or securities of any kind, or currencies of Germany or other States, the value of such substitutes for gold being fixed at a fair and just amount by the Commission itself.

20.

The Commission, in fixing or accepting payment in specified properties or rights, shall have due regard for any legal or equitable interests of the Allied and Associated Powers or of neutral Powers or of their nationals therein.

21.

No member of the Commission shall be responsible, except to the Government appointing him, for any action or omission as such member. No one of the Allied or Associated Governments assumes any responsibility in respect of any other Government.

22.

Subject to the provisions of the present Treaty this Annex may be amended by the unanimous decision of the Governments represented from time to time upon the Commission.

23.

When all the amounts due from Germany and her allies under the present Treaty or the decisions of the Commission have been discharged and all sums received, or their equivalents, shall have been distributed to the Powers interested, the Commission shall be dissolved.

ANNEX III.

1.

Germany recognises the right of the Allied and Associated Powers to the replacement, ton for ton (gross tonnage) and class for class, of all merchant ships and fishing boats lost or damaged owing to the war.

Nevertheless, and in spite of the fact that the tonnage of German shipping at present in existence is much less than that lost by the Allied and Associated Powers in consequence of the German aggression, the right thus recognised will be enforced on German ships and boats under the following conditions:

The German Government on behalf of themselves and so as to bind all other persons interested, cede to the Allied and Associated Governments the property in all the German merchant ships which are of 1,600 tons gross and upwards; in one-half, reckoned in tonnage, of the ships which are between 1,000 tons and 1,600 tons gross; in one-quarter, reckoned in tonnage, of the steam trawlers; and in one-quarter, reckoned in tonnage, of the other fishing boats.

2.

The German Government will, within two months of the coming into force of the present Treaty, deliver to the Reparation Commission all the ships and boats mentioned in Paragraph I.

3.

The ships and boats mentioned in Paragraph I include all ships and boats which (*a*) fly, or may be entitled to fly, the German merchant flag; or (*b*) are owned by any German national, company or corporation or by any company or corporation belonging to a country other than an Allied or Associated country and under the control or direction of German nationals; or (*c*) which are now under construction (1) in Germany, (2) in other than Allied or Associated countries for the account of any German national, company, or corporation.

4.

For the purpose of providing documents of title for the ships and boats to be handed over as above mentioned, the German Government will:

(*a*) Deliver to the Reparation Commission in respect of each vessel a bill of sale or other document of title evidencing the transfer to the Commission of the entire property in the vessel, free from all encumbrances, charges and liens of all kinds, as the Commission may require;

(*b*) Take all measures that may be indicated by the Reparation Commission for ensuring that the ships themselves shall be placed at its disposal.

5.

As an additional part of reparation, Germany agrees to cause merchant ships to be built in German yards for the account of the Allied and Associated Governments as follows:

(*a*) Within three months of the coming into force of the present Treaty, the Reparation Commission will notify to the German Government the amount of tonnage to be laid down in German shipyards in each of the two years next succeeding the three months mentioned above;

(*b*) Within twenty-four months of the coming into force of the present Treaty, the Reparation Commission will notify to the German Government the amount of tonnage to be laid down in each of the three years following the two years mentioned above;

(*c*) The amount of tonnage to be laid down in each year shall not exceed 200,000 tons, gross tonnage;

(*d*) The specifications of the ships to be built, the conditions under which they are to be built and delivered, the price per ton at which they are to be accounted for by the Reparation Commission, and all other questions relating to the accounting, ordering, building and delivery of the ships, shall be determined by the Commission.

6.

Germany undertakes to restore in kind and in normal condition of upkeep to the Allied and Associated Powers, within two months of the coming into force of the present Treaty, in accordance with procedure to be laid down by the Reparation Commission, any boats and other movable appliances belonging to inland navigation which since the 1st August, 1914, have by any means whatever come into her possession or into the possession of her nationals, and which can be identified.

With a view to make good the loss in inland navigation tonnage, from whatever cause arising, which has been incurred during the war by the Allied and Associated Powers, and which cannot be made good by means of the restitution prescribed above, Germany agrees to cede to the Reparation Commission a portion of the German river fleet up to the amount of the loss mentioned above, provided that such cession shall not exceed 20 per cent. of the river fleet as it existed on the 11th November, 1918.

The conditions of this cession shall be settled by the Arbitrators referred to in Article 339 of Part XII (Ports, Waterways and Railways) of the present Treaty, who are charged with the settlement of difficulties relating to the apportionment of river tonnage resulting from the new international régime applicable to certain river systems or from the territorial changes affecting those systems.

7.

Germany agrees to take any measures that may be indicated to her by the Reparation Commission for obtaining the full title to the property in all ships which have during the war been transferred, or are in process of transfer, to neutral flags, without the consent of the Allied and Associated Governments.

8.

Germany waives all claims of any description against the Allied and Associated Governments and their nationals in respect of the detention, employment, loss or damage of any German ships or boats, exception being made of payments due in respect of the employment of ships in conformity with the Armistice Agreement of the 13th January, 1919, and subsequent Agreements.

The handing over of the ships of the German mercantile marine must be continued without interruption in accordance with the said agreement.

9.

Germany waives all claims to vessels or cargoes sunk by or in consequence of naval action and subsequently salved, in which any of the Allied or Associated Governments or their nationals may have any interest either as owners, charterers, insurers or otherwise, notwithstanding any decree of condemnation which may have been made by a Prize Court of Germany or of her Allies.

ANNEX IV.

1.

The Allied and Associated Powers require, and Germany undertakes, that in part satisfaction of her obligations expressed in this Part of the present Treaty she will, as hereinafter provided, devote her economic resources directly to the physical restoration of the invaded areas of the Allied and Associated Powers, to the extent that these Powers may determine.

2.

The Allied and Associated Governments may file with the Reparation Commission lists showing:

(*a*) Animals, machinery, equipment, tools and like articles of a commercial character, which have been seized, consumed or destroyed by Germany or destroyed in direct consequence of military operations, and which such Governments, for the purpose of meeting immediate and urgent needs, desire to have replaced by animals and articles of the same nature which are in being in German territory at the date of the coming into force of the present Treaty;

(*b*) Reconstruction materials (stones, bricks, refractory bricks, tiles, wood, window-glass, steel, lime, cement, etc.), machinery, heating apparatus, furniture, and like articles of a commercial character which the said Governments desire to have produced and manufactured in Germany and delivered to them to permit of the restoration of the invaded areas.

3.

The lists relating to the Articles mentioned in 2 (*a*) above shall be filed within sixty days after the date of the coming into force of the present Treaty. The lists relating to the articles in 2 (*b*) above shall be filed on or before the 31st December, 1919. The lists shall contain all such details as are customary in commercial contracts dealing with the subject matter, including specifications, dates of delivery (but not extending over more than four years), and places of delivery, but not price or value, which shall be fixed as hereinafter provided by the Commission.

4.

Immediately upon the filing of such lists with the Commission, the Commission shall consider the amount and number of the materials and animals mentioned in the lists provided for above which are to be required of Germany. In reaching a decision on this matter the Commission shall take into account such domestic requirements of Germany as it deems essential for the maintenance of Germany's social and economic life, the prices and dates at which similar articles can be obtained in the Allied and Associated countries as compared with those to be fixed for German articles, and the general interest of the Allied and Associated Governments that the industrial life of Germany be not so disorganised as to affect adversely the ability of Germany to perform the other acts of reparation stipulated for. Machinery, equipment, tools and like articles of a commercial character in actual industrial use are not, however, to be demanded of Germany unless there is no free stock of such articles respectively which is not in use and is available, and then not in excess of thirty per cent, of the quantity of such articles in use in any one establishment or undertaking.

The Commission shall give representatives of the German Government an opportunity and a time to be heard as to their capacity to furnish the said materials, articles and animals. The decision of the Commission shall thereupon and at the earliest possible moment be communicated to the German Government and to the several interested Allied and Associated Governments. The German Government undertakes to deliver the materials, articles and animals as specified in the said communication, and the interested Allied and Associated Governments severally agree to accept the same, provided they conform to the specification given, or are not, in the judgment of the Commission, unfit to be utilized in the work of reparation.

5.

The Commission shall determine the value to be attributed to the materials, articles and animals to be delivered in accordance with the foregoing, and the Allied or Associated Power receiving the same agrees to be charged with such value, and the amount thereof shall be treated as a payment by Germany to be divided in accordance with Article 237 of this Part of the present Treaty.

In cases where the right to require physical restoration as above provided is exercised, the Commission shall ensure that the amount to be credited against the reparation obligation of Germany shall be the fair value of work done or materials supplied by Germany, and that the claim made by the interested Power in respect of the damage so repaired by physical restoration shall be discharged to the extent of the proportion which the damage thus repaired bears to the whole of the damage thus claimed for.

6.

As an immediate advance on account of the animals referred to in paragraph 2 (*a*) above, Germany undertakes to deliver in equal monthly instalments in the three months following the coming into force of the present Treaty, the following quantities of live stock:

1. *To the French Government.*

500 stallions (3 to 7 years).
30,000 fillies and mares (18 months to 7 years) Type: Ardennais, Boulonnais or Belgian.
2,000 bulls (18 months to 3 years).
90,000 milch cows (2 to 6 years).
1,000 rams.
100,000 sheep.
10,000 goats.

2. *To the Belgian Government.*

200 stallions (3 to 7 years), large Belgian type.
5,000 mares (3 to 7 years), large Belgian type.
5,000 fillies (18 months to 3 years), large Belgian type.
2,000 bulls (18 months to 3 years).
50,000 milch cows (2 to 6 years).
40,000 heifers.
200 rams.
20,000 sheep.
15,000 sows.

The animals delivered shall be of average health and condition.

To the extent that animals so delivered cannot be identified as animals taken away or seized, the value of such animals shall be credited against the reparation obligations of Germany in accordance with Paragraph 5 of this Annex.

7.

Without waiting for the decisions of the Commission referred to in paragraph 4 of this Annex to be taken, Germany must continue the delivery to France of the agricultural material referred to in Article III of the Renewal of the Armistice of 16th January 1919.

ANNEX V.

1.

Germany accords the following options for the delivery of coal and derivatives of coal to the undermentioned signatories of the present Treaty.

2.

Germany undertakes to deliver to France seven million tons of coal per year for ten years. In addition, Germany undertakes to deliver to France annually for a period not exceeding ten years an amount of coal equal to the difference between the annual production before the war of the coal mines of the Nord and Pas de Calais, destroyed as a result of the war, and the production of the mines of the same area during the years in question: such delivery not to exceed twenty million tons in any one year of the first five years, and eight million tons in any one year of the succeeding five years.

It is understood that due diligence will be exercised in the restoration of the destroyed mines in the Nord and the Pas de Calais.

3.

Germany undertakes to deliver to Belgium eight million tons of coal annually for ten years.

4.

Germany undertakes to deliver to Italy up to the following quantities of coal:

July 1919 to June		1920	4½	million tons.
— 1920	—	1921	6	—
— 1921	—	1922	7½	—
— 1922	—	1923	8	—
— 1923	—	1924	8½	—
and each of the following five years				

At least two-thirds of the actual deliveries to be land-borne.

5.

Germany further undertakes to deliver annually to Luxemburg, if directed by the Reparation Commission, a quantity of coal equal to the pre-war annual consumption of German coal in Luxemburg.

6.

The prices to be paid for coal delivered under these options shall be as follows:

(*a*) For overland delivery, including delivery by barge, the German pithead price to German nationals, plus the freight to French, Belgian, Italian or Luxemburg frontiers, provided that the pithead price does not exceed the pithead price of British coal for export.

In the case of Belgian bunker coal, the price shall not exceed the Dutch bunker price.

Railroad and barge tariffs shall not be higher than the lowest similar rates paid in Germany.

(*b*) For sea delivery, the German export price f. o. b. the German ports, or the British export price f. o. b. British ports, whichever may be lower.

7.

The Allied and Associated Governments interested may demand the delivery, in place of coal, of metallurgical coke in the proportion of 3 tons of coke to 4 tons of coal.

8.

Germany undertakes to deliver to France, and to transport to the French frontier by rail or by water the following products, during each of the three years following the coming into force of this Treaty:

Benzol	35,000 tons.
Coal tar	50,000 tons.
Sulphate of ammonia	30,000 tons.

All or part of the coal tar may, at the option of the French Government, be replaced by corresponding quantities of products of distillation, such as light oils, heavy oils, anthracene, naphthaline, or pitch.

9.

The price paid for coke and for the articles referred to in the preceding paragraph shall be the same as the price paid by German nationals under the same conditions of shipment to

the French frontier or to the German ports, and shall be subject to any advantages which may be accorded similar products furnished to German nationals.

10.

The foregoing options shall be exercised through the intervention of the Reparation Commission, which, subject to the specific provisions hereof, shall have power to determine all questions relative to procedure and the qualities and quantities of products, the quantity of coke which may be substituted for coal, and the times and modes of delivery and payment. In giving notice to the German Government of the foregoing options the Commission shall give at least 120 days' notice of deliveries to be made after the 1st January, 1920, and at least 30 days' notice of deliveries to be made between the coming into force of this Treaty and the 1st January, 1920. Until Germany has received the demands referred to in this paragraph, the provision of the Protocol of 25th December, 1918 (Execution of Article VI of the Armistice of 11th November, 1918) remain in force. The notice to be given to the German Government of the exercise of the right of substitution accorded by paragraphs 7 and 8 shall be such as the Reparation Commission may consider sufficient. If the Commission shall determine that the full exercise of the foregoing options would interfere unduly with the industrial requirements of Germany, the Commission is authorised to postpone or to cancel deliveries, and in so doing to settle all questions of priority; but the coal to replace coal from destroyed mines shall receive priority over other deliveries.

ANNEX VI.

1.

Germany accords to the Reparation Commission an option to require as part of reparation the delivery by Germany of such quantities and kinds of dyestuffs and chemical drugs as the Commission may designate, not exceeding 50 per cent. of the total stock of each and every kind of dyestuff and chemical drug in Germany or under German control at the date of the coming into force of the present Treaty.

This option shall be exercised within sixty days of the receipt by the Commission of such particulars as to stocks as may be considered necessary by the Commission.

2.

Germany further accords to the Reparation Commission an option to require delivery during the period from the date of the coming into force of the present Treaty until the 1st January, 1920, and during each period of six months thereafter until the 1st January, 1925, of any specified kind of dyestuff and chemical drug up to an amount not exceeding 25 per cent. of the German production of such dyestuffs and chemical drugs during the previous six months period. If in any case the production during such previous six months was, in the opinion of the Commission, less than normal, the amount required may be 25 per cent. of the normal production.

Such option shall be exercised within four weeks after the receipt of such particulars as to production and in such form as may be considered necessary by the Commission: these particulars shall be furnished by the German Government immediately after the expiration of each six-months period.

3.

For dyestuffs and chemical drugs delivered under paragraph 1, the price shall be fixed by the Commission having regard to pre-war net export prices and to subsequent increases of cost.

For dyestuffs and chemical drugs delivered under paragraph 2 the price shall be fixed by the Commission having regard to pre-war net export prices and subsequent variations of cost or the lowest net selling price of similar dyestuffs and chemical drugs to any other purchaser.

4.

All details, including mode and times of exercising the options, and making delivery, and all other questions arising under this arrangement shall be determined by the Reparation Commission; the German Government will furnish to the Commission all necessary information and other assistance which it may require.

5.

The above expression "dyestuffs and chemical drugs" includes all synthetic dyes and drugs and intermediate or other products used in connection with dyeing, so far as they are manufactured for sale. The present arrangement shall also apply to cinchona bark and salts of quinine.

ANNEX VII.

Germany renounces on her own behalf and on behalf of her nationals in favour of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers all rights, titles or privileges of whatever nature in the submarine cables set out below, or in any portions thereof:

Emden-Vigo: from the Straits of Dover to off Vigo;
Emden-Brest: from off Cherbourg to Brest;
Emden-Teneriffe: from off Dunkirk to off Teneriffe;
Emden-Azores (1): from the Straits of Dover to Fayal;
Emden-Azores (2): from the Straits of Dover to Fayal;
Azores-New-York (1): from Fayal to New-York;
Azores-New-York (2): from Fayal to the longitude of Halifax;
Teneriffe-Monrovia: from off Teneriffe to off Monrovia;
Monrovia-Lome:

from about	lat.	2° 30′ N.;
	long.	7° 40′ W. of Greenwich;
to about	lat.	2° 20′ N.;
	long.	5° 30′ W. of Greenwich;
and from about	lat.	3° 48′ N.;
	long.	0° 00′,

to Lome;

Lome-Duala: from Lome to Duala;
Monrovia-Pernambuco: from off Monrovia to off Pernambuco;
Constantinople-Constanza: from Constantinople to Constanza;
Yap-Shanghai, Yap-Guam, and Yap-Menado (Celebes): from Yap Island to Shanghai, from Yap Island to Guam Island, and from Yap Island to Menado.

The value of the above-mentioned cables or portions thereof in so far as they are privately owned, calculated on the basis of the original cost less a suitable allowance for depreciation, shall be credited to Germany in the reparation account.

Section II. Special provisions.

ARTICLE 245.

Within six months after the coming into force of the present Treaty the German Government must restore to the French Government the trophies, archives, historical souvenirs or works of art carried away from France by the German authorities in the course of the war of 1870–1871 and during this last war in accordance with a list which will be communicated to it by the French Government; particularly the French flags taken in the course of the war of 1870–1871 and all the political papers taken by the German authorities on October 10, 1870, at the chateau of Cercay, near Brunoy (Seine-et-Oise) belonging at the time to Mr. Rouher, formerly Minister of State.

ARTICLE 246.

Within six months from the coming into force of the present Treaty, Germany will restore to His Majesty the King of the Hedjaz the original Koran of the Caliph Othman, which was removed from Medina by the Turkish authorities and is stated to have been presented to the ex-Emperor William II.

Within the same period Germany will hand over to His Britannic Majesty's Government the skull of the Sultan Mkwawa which was removed from the Protectorate of German East Africa and taken to Germany.

The delivery of the articles above referred to will be effected in such place and in such conditions as may be laid down by the Governments to which they are to be restored.

ARTICLE 247.

Germany undertakes to furnish to the University of Louvain, within three months after a request made by it and transmitted through the intervention of the Reparation Commission, manuscripts, incunabula, printed books, maps, and objects of collection corresponding in number and value to those destroyed in the burning by Germany of the Library of Louvain. All details regarding such replacement will be determined by the Reparation Commission.

7. Germany undertakes to deliver to Belgium, through the Reparation Commission, within six months of the coming into force of the present Treaty, in order to enable Belgium to reconstitute her two great artistic works:

(*a*) The leaves of the triptych of the Mystic Lamb painted by the Van Eyck brothers, formerly in the Church of St. Bavon at Ghent, now in the Berlin Museum.

(*b*) The leaves of the triptych of the Last Supper, painted by Dierick Bouts, formerly in the Church of St. Peter at Louvain, two of which are now in the Berlin Museum and two in the former Pinakothek at Munich.

PART IX.
FINANCIAL CLAUSES.

ARTICLE 248.

The first charge upon all the assets and revenues of the German Empire and its constituent States shall be the cost of reparation and all other costs arising under the present Treaty or any treaties or agreements supplementary thereto or under arrangements concluded between Germany and the Allied and Associated Powers during the Armistice or its extensions.

Up to the May 1st, 1921, the German Government shall not export or dispose of, and shall forbid the export or disposal of, gold without the previous approval of the Allied and Associated Powers acting through the Reparation Commission.

ARTICLE 249.

There shall be paid by the German Government the total cost of all armies of the Allied and Associated Governments in occupied German territory from the date of the signature of the Armistice of the 11th November, 1918, including the keep of men and beasts, lodging and billeting, pay and allowances, salaries and wages, bedding, heating, lighting, clothing, equipment, harness and saddlery, armament and rolling-stock, air services, treatment of sick and wounded, veterinary and remount services, transport service of all sorts (such as by rail, sea or river, motor lorries), communications and correspondence, and in general the cost of all administrative or technical services the working of which is necessary for the training of troops and for keeping their numbers up to strength and preserving their military efficiency.

The cost of such liabilities under the above heads so far as they relate to purchases or requisitions by the Allied and Associated Governments in the occupied territories shall be paid by the German Government to the Allied and Associated Governments in marks at the current or agreed rate of exchange. All other of the above costs shall be paid in gold marks.

ARTICLE 250.

Germany confirms the surrender of all material handed over to the Allied and Associated Powers in accordance with the Armistice Agreement of the 11th November, 1918, and subsequent Armistice Agreements, and recognises the title of the Allied and Associated Powers to such material.

There shall be credited to the German Government, against the sums due from it to the Allied and Associated Powers for reparation, the value, as assessed by the Reparation Commission, referred to in Article 233 of Part VIII (Reparation) of the present Treaty, of the material handed over in accordance with Article VII of the Armistice Agreement of the 11th November, 1918, Article III of the Armistice Agreement of the 16th January, 1919, as well as of any other material handed over in accordance with the Armistice Agreement of the 11th November, 1918, and of subsequent Armistice Agreements, for which, as having non-military value, credit should in the judgment of the Reparation Commission be allowed to the German Government.

Property belonging to the Allied and Associated Governments or their nationals restored or surrendered under the Armistice Agreements in specie shall not be credited to the German Government.

ARTICLE 251.

The priority of the charges established by Article 248 shall, subject to the qualifications made below, be as follows:—

(*a*) The cost of the armies of occupation as defined under Article 249 during the Armistice and its extensions;

(*b*) The cost of any armies of occupation as defined under Article 249 after the coming into force of the present Treaty;

(*c*) The cost of reparation arising out of the present Treaty or any treaties or conventions supplementary thereto;

(*d*) The cost of all other obligations incumbent on Germany under the Armistice Conventions or under this Treaty or any treaties or conventions supplementary thereto.

The payment for such supplies of food and raw material for Germany and such other payments as may be judged by the Allied and Associated Powers to be essential to enable Germany to meet her obligations in respect of reparation will have priority to the extent and upon the conditions which have been or may be determined by the Governments of the said Powers.

ARTICLE 252.

The right of each of the Allied and Associated Powers to dispose of enemy assets and property within its jurisdiction at the date of the coming into force of the present Treaty is not affected by the foregoing provisions.

ARTICLE 253.

Nothing in the foregoing provisions shall prejudice in any manner charges or mortgages lawfully effected in favour of the Allied or Associated Powers or their nationals, respectively, before the date at which a state of war existed between Germany and the Allied or Associated Power concerned, by the German Empire or its constituent States, or by German nationals, on assets in their ownership at that date.

ARTICLE 254.

The Powers to which German territory is ceded shall, subject to the qualifications made in Article 255, undertake to pay:—

(i.) A portion of the debt of the German Empire as it stood on the 1st August, 1914, calculated on the basis of the ratio between the average for the three financial years 1911, 1912, 1913, of such revenues of the ceded territory, and the average for the same years of such revenues of the whole German Empire as in the judgment of the Reparation Commission are best calculated to represent the relative ability of the respective territories to make payment;

(ii.) A portion of the debt as it stood on the 1st August, 1914, of the German State to which the ceded territory belonged, to be determined in accordance with the principle stated above.

Such portions shall be determined by the Reparation Commission.

The method of discharging the obligation, both in respect of capital and of interest, so assumed shall be fixed by the Reparation Commission. Such method may take the form, *inter alia*, of the assumption by the Power to which the territory is ceded of Germany's liability for the German debt held by her nationals. But in the event of the method adopted involving any payments to the German Government, such payments shall be transferred to the Reparation Commission on account of the sums due for reparation so long as any balance in respect of such sums remains unpaid.

ARTICLE 255.

(1) As an exception to the above provision and inasmuch as in 1871 Germany refused to undertake any portion of the burden of the French debt, France shall be, in respect of Alsace-Lorraine, exempt from any payment under Article 254.

(2) In the case of Poland that portion of the debt which, in the opinion of the Reparation Commission, is attributable to the measures taken by the German and Prussian Governments for the German colonisation of Poland shall be excluded from the apportionment to be made under Article 254.

(3) In the case of all ceded territories other than Alsace-Lorraine, that portion of the debt of the German Empire or German States which, in the opinion of the Reparation Commission represents expenditure by the Governments of the German Empire or States upon the Government properties referred to in Article 256 shall be excluded from the apportionment to be made under Article 254.

ARTICLE 256.

Powers to which German territory is ceded shall acquire all property and possessions situated therein belonging to the German Empire or to the German States, and the value of such acquisitions shall be fixed by the Reparation Commission, and paid by the State acquiring the territory to the Reparation Commission for the credit of the German Government on account of the sums due for Reparation.

For the purposes of this Article the property and possessions of the German Empire and States shall be deemed to include all the property of the Crown, the Empire or the States, and the private property of the former German Emperor and other Royal personages.

In view of the terms on which Alsace-Lorraine was ceded to Germany in 1871, France shall be exempt in respect thereof from making any payment or credit under this Article for any property or possessions of the German Empire or States situated therein.

Belgium also shall be exempt from making any payment or any credit under this Article for any property or possessions of the German Empire or States situated in German territory ceded to Belgium under the present Treaty.

ARTICLE 257.

In the case of the former German territories, including colonies, protectorates, or dependencies, administered by a Mandatory under Article 22 of Part I (League of Nations) of the present Treaty, neither the territory nor the Mandatory Power

shall be charged with any portion of the debt of the German Empire or States.

All property and possessions belonging to the German Empire or to the German States situated in such territories shall be transferred with the territories to the Mandatory Power in its capacity as such and no payment shall be made nor any credit given to those Governments in consideration of this transfer.

For the purposes of this Article the property and possessions of the German Empire and of the German States shall be deemed to include all the property of the Crown, the Empire or the States and the private property of the former German Emperor and other Royal personages.

ARTICLE 258.

Germany renounces all rights accorded to her or her nationals by Treaties, Conventions or Agreements, of whatsoever kind, to representation upon or participation in the control or administration of commissions, state banks, agencies or other financial or economic organisations of an international character, exercising powers of control or administration, and operating in any of the Allied or Associated States, or in Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria or Turkey, or in the dependencies of these States, or in the former Russian Empire.

ARTICLE 259.

(1) Germany agrees to deliver within one month from the date of the coming into force of the present Treaty, to such authority as the Principal Allied and Associated Powers may designate, the sum in gold deposited in the Reichsbank in the name of the Council of the Administration of the Ottoman Public Debt as security for the first issue of Turkish Government currency notes.

(2) Germany recognises her obligation to make annually for the period of twelve years the payments in gold for which provision is made in the German Treasury Bonds deposited by her from time to time in the name of the Council of the Administration of the Ottoman Public Debt as security for the second and subsequent issues of Turkish Government currency notes.

(3) Germany undertakes to deliver, within one month from the coming into force of the present Treaty, to such authority as the Principal Allied and Associated Powers may designate, the sum deposited in gold in the Reichsbank, representing the residue of the advance in gold agreed to on the 5th of May, 1915, by the Council of the Administration of the Ottoman Public Debt to the Imperial Ottoman Government.

(4) Germany agrees to transfer to the Principal Allied and Associated Powers any title that she may have to the sum in gold and silver transmitted by her to the Turkish Ministry of Finance in November, 1918, in anticipation of the payment to be made in May, 1919, for the service of the Turkish Internal Loan.

(5) Germany undertakes to transfer to the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, within a period of one month from the coming into force of the present treaty, any sums in gold transferred as pledge or as collateral security to the German Government or its nationals in connection with loans made by them to the Austro-Hungarian Government.

(6) Without prejudice to Article 292 of Part X (Economic Clauses) of the present Treaty, Germany confirms the renunciation provided for in Article XV of the Armistice Convention of the 11th November, 1918, of any benefit disclosed by the Treaties of Bucharest and of Brest-Litovsk and by the Treaties supplementary thereto.

Germany undertakes to transfer, either to Roumania or to the Principal Allied and Associated Powers as the case may be, all monetary instruments, specie, securities and negotiable instruments, or goods, which she has received under the aforesaid Treaties.

(7) The sums of money and all securities, instruments and goods of whatsoever nature, to be delivered, paid and transferred under the provisions of this article, shall be disposed of by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers in a manner hereafter to be determined by those Powers.

ARTICLE 260.

Without prejudice to the renunciation of any rights by Germany on behalf of herself or of her nationals in the other provisions of the present Treaty, the Reparation Commission may within one year from the coming into force of the present Treaty demand that the German Government become possessed of any rights and interests of the German nationals in any public utility undertaking or in any concession operating in Russia, China, Turkey, Austria, Hungary and Bulgaria, or in the possessions or dependencies of these States or in any territory formerly belonging to Germany or her allies, to be ceded by Germany or her allies to any Power or to be administered by a Mandatory under the present Treaty, and may require that the German Government transfer, within six months of the date of demand, all such rights and interests and any similar rights and interests the German Government may itself possess to the Reparation Commission.

Germany shall be responsible for indemnifying her nationals so dispossessed, and the Reparation Commission shall credit Germany on account of sums due for reparation, with such sums in respect of the value of the transferred rights and interests as may be assessed by the Reparation Commission, and the German Government shall, within six months from the coming into force of the present Treaty, communicate to the Reparation Commission all such rights and interests, whether already granted, contingent or not yet exercised, and shall renounce on behalf of itself and its nationals in favour of the Allied and Associated Powers all such rights and interests which have not been so communicated.

ARTICLE 261.

Germany undertakes to transfer to the Allied and Associated Powers any claims she may have to payment or repayment by the Governments of Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria or Turkey, and, in particular, any claims which may arise, now or hereafter, from the fulfilment of undertakings made by Germany during the war to those Governments.

ARTICLE 262.

Any monetary obligation due by Germany arising out of the present Treaty and expressed in terms of gold marks shall be payable at the option of the creditors in pounds sterling payable in London; gold dollars of the United States of America payable in New York; gold francs payable in Paris; or gold lire payable in Rome.

For the purpose of this Article the gold coins mentioned above shall be defined as being of the weight and fineness of gold as enacted by law on the 1st January, 1914.

ARTICLE 263.

Germany gives a guarantee to the Brazilian Government that all sums representing the compulsory sale of coffee belonging to the State of Sao Paolo in the ports of Hamburg, Bremen, Antwerp and Trieste, which were deposited with the Bank of Bleichröder at Berlin, shall be reimbursed together with interest at 5 per cent. from the day of the deposit. Germany, having prevented the transfer of the sums in question to the State of Sao Paolo at the proper time, guarantees also that the reimbursement shall be effected at the rate of exchange of the day of the deposit.

PART X.

ECONOMIC CLAUSES.

Section I. Commercial relations.

Chapter I. Customs regulations, duties, and restrictions.

ARTICLE 264.

Germany undertakes that goods the produce or manufacture of any one of the Allied or Associated States imported into German territory, from whatsoever place arriving, shall not be subjected to other or higher duties or charges (including internal charges) than those to which the like goods the produce or manufacture of any other such State or of any other foreign country are subject.

Germany will not maintain or impose any prohibition or restriction on the importation into German territory, of any goods the produce or manufacture of the territories of any one of the Allied or Associated States, from whatsoever place arriving, which shall not equally extend to the importation of the like goods the produce or manufacture of any other such State or of any other foreign country.

ARTICLE 265.

Germany further undertakes that, in the matter of the *régime* applicable on importation, no discrimination against the commerce of any of the Allied and Associated States as compared with any other of the said States or any other foreign country shall be made, even by indirect means, such as customs regulations or procedure, methods of verification or analysis, conditions of payment of duties, tariff classification or interpretation, or the operation of monopolies.

ARTICLE 266.

In all that concerns exportation Germany undertakes that goods, natural products or manufactured articles, exported from German territory to the territories of any one of the Allied or Associated States shall not be subjected to other or higher duties of charges (including internal charges) than those paid on the like goods exported to any other such State or to any other foreign country.

Germany will not maintain or impose any prohibition or restriction on the exportation of any goods sent from her territory to any one of the Allied or Associated States which shall not equally extend to the exportation of the like goods, natural products or manufactured articles, sent to any other such State or to any other foreign country.

ARTICLE 267.

Every favour, immunity, or privilege in regard to the importation, exportation or transit of goods granted by Germany to any Allied or Associated State or to any other foreign country whatever shall simultaneously and unconditionally, without request and without compensation, be extended to all the Allied and Associated States.

ARTICLE 268.

The provisions of Articles 264 to 267 inclusive of this Chapter and of Article 323 of Part XII (Ports, Waterways and Rail-ways) of the present Treaty are subject to the following exceptions:

(*a*) For a period of five years from the coming into force of the present Treaty, natural or manufactured products which both originate in and come from the territories of Alsace and Lorraine reunited to France shall, on importation into German customs territory, be exempt from all customs duty.

The French Government shall fix each year, by decree communicated to the German Government, the nature and amount of the products which shall enjoy this exemption.

The amount of each product which may be thus sent annually into Germany shall not exceed the average of the amounts sent annually in the years 1911–1913.

Further, during the period above mentioned the German Government shall allow the free export from Germany, and the free re-importation into Germany, exempt from all customs duties and other charges (including internal charges), of yarns, tissues, and other textile materials or textile products of any kind and in any condition, sent from Germany into the territories of Alsace or Lorraine, to be subjected there to any finishing process, such as bleaching, dyeing, printing, mercerisation, gassing, twisting or dressing.

(*b*) During a period of three years from the coming into force of the present Treaty natural or manufactured products which both originate in and come from Polish territories which before the war were part of Germany shall, on importation into German customs territory, be exempt from all customs duty.

The Polish Government shall fix each year, by decree communicated to the German Government, the nature and amount of the products which shall enjoy this exemption.

The amount of each product which may be thus sent annually into Germany shall not exceed the average of the amounts sent annually in the years 1911–1913.

(*c*) The Allied and Associated Powers reserve the right to require Germany to accord freedom from customs duty, on importation into German customs territory, to natural products and manufactured articles which both originate in and come from the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, for a period of five years from the coming into force of the present Treaty.

The nature and amount of the products which shall enjoy the benefits of this *régime* shall be communicated each year to the German Government.

The amount of each product which may be thus sent annually into Germany shall not exceed the average of the amounts sent annually in the years 1911–1913.

ARTICLE 269.

During the first six months after the coming into force of the present Treaty, the duties imposed by Germany on imports from Allied and Associated States shall not be higher than the most favourable duties which were applied to imports into Germany on the 31st July, 1914.

During a further period of thirty months after the expiration of the first six months, this provision shall continue to be applied exclusively with regard to products which, being comprised in Section A of the First Category of the German Customs Tariff of the 25th December, 1902, enjoyed at the above-mentioned date (31st July, 1914) rates conventionalised by treaties with the Allied and Associated Powers, with the addition of all kinds of wine and vegetable oils, of artificial silk and of washed or scoured wool, whether or not they were the subject of special Conventions before the 31st July, 1914.

ARTICLE 270.

The Allied and Associated Powers reserve the right to apply to German territory occupied by their troops a special customs *régime* as regards imports and exports, in the event of such a measure being necessary in their opinion in order to safeguard the economic interests of the population of these territories.

Chapter II. Shipping.

ARTICLE 271.

As regards sea fishing, maritime coasting trade, and maritime towage, vessels of the Allied and Associated Powers shall enjoy, in German territorial waters, the treatment accorded to vessels of the most favoured nation.

ARTICLE 272.

Germany agrees that, notwithstanding any stipulation to the contrary contained in the Conventions relating to the North Sea Fisheries and Liquor Traffic, all rights of inspection and police shall, in the case of fishing-boats of the Allied Powers, be exercised solely by ships belonging to those Powers.

ARTICLE 273.

In the case of vessels of the Allied or Associated Powers, all classes of certificates or documents relating to the vessel, which were recognised as valid by Germany before the war, or which may hereafter be recognised as valid by the principal maritime States, shall be recognised by Germany as valid and as equivalent to the corresponding certificates issued to German vessels.

A similar recognition shall be accorded to the certificates and documents issued to their vessels by the Governments of new States, whether they have a sea-coast or not, provided that such certificates and documents shall be issued in conformity with the general practice observed in the principal maritime States.

The High Contracting Parties agree to recognise the flag flown by the vessels of an Allied or Associated Power having no sea-coast which are registered at some one specified place situated in its territory; such place shall serve as the port of registry of such vessels.

Chapter III. Unfair competition.

ARTICLE 274.

Germany undertakes to adopt all the necessary legislative and administrative measures to protect goods the produce or manufacture of any one of the Allied and Associated Powers from all forms of unfair competition in commercial transactions.

Germany undertakes to prohibit and repress by seizure and by other appropriate remedies the importation, exportation, manufacture, distribution, sale or offering for sale in its territory of all goods bearing upon themselves or their usual get-up or wrappings any marks, names, devices, or descriptions whatsoever which are calculated to convey directly or indirectly a false indication of the origin, type, nature, or special characteristics of such goods.

ARTICLE 275.

Germany undertakes on condition that reciprocity is accorded in these matters to respect any law, or any administrative or judicial decision given in conformity with such law, in force in any Allied or Associated State and duly communicated to her by the proper authorities, defining or regulating the right to any regional appellation in respect of wine or spirits produced in the State to which the region belongs or the conditions under which the use of any such appellation may be permitted; and the importation, exportation, manufacture, distribution, sale or offering for sale of products or articles bearing regional appellations inconsistent with such law or order shall be prohibited by the German Government and repressed by the measures prescribed in the preceding article.

Chapter IV. Treatment of nationals of allied and associated powers.

ARTICLE 276.

Germany undertakes:—

(*a*) not to subject the nationals of the Allied and Associated Powers to any prohibition in regard to the exercise of occupations, professions, trade and industry, which shall not be equally applicable to all aliens without exception;

(*b*) not to subject the nationals of the Allied and Associated Powers in regard to the rights referred to in paragraph (*a*) to any regulation or restriction which might contravene directly or indirectly the stipulations of the said paragraph, or which shall be other or more disadvantageous than those which are applicable to nationals of the most favoured nation;

(*c*) not to subject the nationals of the Allied and Associated Powers, their property, rights or interests, including Companies and Associations in which they are interested, to any charge, tax or impost, direct or indirect, other or higher than those which are or may be imposed on her own nationals or their property, rights or interests;

(*d*) not to subject the nationals of any one of the Allied and Associated Powers to any restriction which was not applicable on the 1st July, 1914, to the nationals of such Powers unless such restriction is likewise imposed on her own nationals.

ARTICLE 277.

The nationals of the Allied and Associated Powers shall enjoy in German territory a constant protection for their persons and for their property, rights and interests, and shall have free access to the courts of law.

ARTICLE 278.

Germany undertakes to recognise any new nationality which has been or may be acquired by her nationals under the laws of the Allied and Associated Powers, and in accordance with the decisions of the competent authorities of these Powers pursuant to naturalisation laws or under treaty stipulations, and to regard such persons as having, in consequence of the acquisition of such new nationality, in all respects severed their allegiance to their country of origin.

ARTICLE 279.

The Allied and Associated Powers may appoint consuls-general, consuls, vice-consuls, and consular agents in German towns and ports. Germany undertakes to approve the designation of the consuls-general, consuls, vice-consuls, and consular agents, whose names shall be notified to her, and to admit them to the exercise of their functions in conformity with the usual rules and customs.

Chapter V. General articles.

ARTICLE 280.

The obligations imposed on Germany by Chapter I and by Articles 271 and 272 of Chapter II above shall cease to have effect five years from the date of the coming into force of the present Treaty, unless otherwise provided in the text, or unless the Council of the League of Nations shall, at least twelve months before the expiration of that period, decide that these obligations shall be maintained for a further period with or without amendment.

Article 276 of Chapter IV shall remain in operation, with or without amendment, after the period of five years for such further period, if any, not exceeding five years, as may be determined by a majority of the Council of the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 281.

If the German Government engages in international trade, it shall not in respect thereof have or be deemed to have any rights, privileges, or immunities of sovereignty.

Section II. Treaties.

ARTICLE 282.

From the coming into force of the present Treaty and subject to the provisions thereof the multilateral Treaties, conventions and agreements of an economic or technical character enumerated below and in the subsequent articles shall alone be applied as between Germany and those of the Allied and Associated Powers party thereto:

1. Conventions of the 14th March, 1884, 1st December, 1886, and 23rd March, 1887, and Final Protocol of the 7th July, 1887, regarding the Protection of Submarine Cables.
2. Convention of the 11th October, 1909, regarding the International Circulation of Motor-cars.
3. Agreement of the 15th May, 1886, regarding the sealing of Railway trucks subject to Customs Inspection, and Protocol of 18th May, 1907.
4. Agreement of the 15th May, 1886, regarding the technical standardisation of Railways.
5. Convention of the 5th July, 1890, regarding the publication of Customs Tariffs and the organisation of an International Union for the publication of Customs Tariffs.
6. Convention of the 31st December, 1913, regarding the unification of Commercial Statistics.
7. Convention of the 25th April, 1907, regarding the raising of the Turkish Customs Tariff.
8. Convention of the 14th March, 1857, for the redemption of toll dues on the Sound and Belts.
9. Convention of the 22nd June, 1861, for the redemption of the Stade Toll on the Elbe.
10. Convention of the 16th July, 1863, for the redemption of Toll dues on the Scheldt.
11. Convention of the 29th October, 1888, regarding the establishment of a definite arrangement guaranteeing the free use of the Suez Canal.
12. Conventions of the 23rd September, 1910, respecting the unification of certain regulations regarding collisions and salvage at sea.
13. Convention of the 21st December, 1904, regarding the exemption of hospital ships from dues and charges in ports.
14. Convention of the 4th February, 1898, regarding the tonnage measurement of vessels for inland navigation.
15. Convention of the 26th September, 1906, for the suppression of nightwork for women.
16. Convention of the 26th September, 1906, for the suppression of the use of white prosphorus in the manufacture of matches.
17. Conventions of the 18th May, 1904, and the 4th May, 1910, regarding the suppression of the White Slave Traffic.
18. Convention of the 4th May, 1910, regarding the suppression of obscene publications.
19. Sanitary Conventions of Paris and Venice of the 3rd April, 1894, 19th March, 1897, and 3rd December, 1903.
20. Convention of the 20th May, 1875, regarding the unification and improvement of the metric system.
21. Convention of the 29th November, 1906, regarding the unification of pharmacopœial formulæ for potent drugs.
22. Convention of the 16th and 19th November, 1885, regarding the establishment of a concert pitch.
23. Convention of the 7th June, 1905, regarding the creation of an International Agriculatural Institute at Rome.
24. Conventions of the 3rd November, 1881, and the 15th April, 1889, regarding precautionary measures against phylloxera.
25. Convention of the 19th March, 1902, regarding the protection of birds useful to agriculture.

ARTICLE 283.

From the coming into force of the present Treaty the High Contracting Parties shall apply the conventions and agreements hereinafter mentioned, in so far as concerns them, on condition that the special stipulations contained in this Article are fulfilled by Germany.

Postal Conventions:

Conventions and agreements of the Universal Postal Union concluded at Vienna, 4th July, 1891.

Conventions and agreements of the Postal Union signed at Washington, 15th June, 1897.

Conventions and agreements of the Postal Union signed at Rome, 26th May, 1906.

Telegraphic Conventions:

International Telegraphic Conventions signed at St. Petersburg 10/22 July, 1875.

Regulations and Tariffs drawn up by the International Telegraphic Conference, Lisbon, June 11th, 1908.

Germany undertakes not to refuse her assent to the conclusion by the new States of the special arrangements referred to in the Conventions and Agreements relating to the Universal Postal Union and to the International Telegraphic Union, to which the said new States have adhered or may adhere.

ARTICLE 284.

From the coming into force of the present Treaty the High Contracting Parties shall apply, in so far as concerns them, the International Radio-Telegraphic Convention of the 5th July, 1912, on condition that Germany fulfils the provisional regulations which will be indicated to her by the Allied and Associated Powers.

When a new convention regulating international radio-telegraphic communications has been concluded to take the place of the Convention of the 5th July, 1912, this new Convention shall bind Germany even if Germany should refuse either to take part in drawing up the convention, or to subscribe thereto.

This new convention will likewise replace the provisional regulations in force.

ARTICLE 285.

From the coming into force of the present Treaty, the High Contracting Parties shall apply in so far as concerns them and under the conditions stipulated in Article 272, the conventions hereinafter mentioned:

1. The Conventions of the 6th May, 1882, and the 1st February, 1889, regulating the Fisheries in the North Sea outside territorial waters.
2. The Conventions and Protocols of the 16th November, 1887, 14th February, 1893, and 11th April, 1894, regarding the North Sea liquor traffic.

ARTICLE 286.

The International Convention of Paris of the 20th March, 1883, for the protection of industrial property, revised at Washington on the 2nd June, 1911; the agreement of the 14th April, 1891, regarding the suppression of false indications of origin of goods; the agreement of the 14th April, 1891, concerning the international registration of trade marks; and the International Convention of Berne of the 9th September, 1886, for the protection of literary and artistic works, revised at Berlin on the 13th November, 1908, and completed by the additional Protocol signed at Berne on the 20th March, 1914, will again

come into effect as from the coming into force of the present Treaty, in so far as they are not affected or modified by the exceptions and restrictions resulting therefrom.

ARTICLE 287.

From the coming into force of the present Treaty the High Contracting Parties shall apply, in so far as concerns them, the Convention of the Hague of the 17th July, 1905, relating to civil procedure. This renewal, however, will not apply to France, Portugal and Roumania.

ARTICLE 288.

The special rights and privileges granted to Germany by Article 3 of the Convention of the 2nd December, 1899, relating to Samoa shall be considered to have terminated on August 4th, 1914.

ARTICLE 289.

Each of the Allied or Associated Powers, being guided by the general principles or special provisions of the present Treaty, shall notify to Germany the bilateral treaties or conventions which such Allied or Associated Power wishes to revive with Germany.

The Allied and Associated Powers undertake among themselves not to revive with Germany any conventions or treaties which are not in accordance with the terms of the present Treaty. In case of any difference of opinion, the League of Nations will be called on to decide.

The notification referred to in the present Article shall be made either directly or through the intermediary of another Power. Receipt thereof shall be acknowledged in writing by Germany. The date of the revival shall be that of the notification.

The notification shall mention any provisions of the said Conventions and Treaties which, not being in accordance with the terms of the present Treaty, shall not be considered as revived.

A period of six months from the coming into force of the present Treaty is allowed to the Allied and Associated Powers within which to make the notification.

Only those bilateral treaties and conventions which have been the subject of such a notification shall be revived between the Allied and Associated Powers and Germany; all the others are and shall remain abrogated.

The above regulations apply to all bilateral treaties or conventions existing between all the Allied and Associated Powers signatories to the present Treaty and Germany, even if the said Allied and Associated Powers have not been in a state of war with Germany.

ARTICLE 290.

Germany recognises that all the treaties, conventions or agreements which she has concluded with Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria or Turkey since the 1st August, 1914, until the coming into force of the present Treaty are and remain abrogated by the present Treaty.

ARTICLE 291.

Germany undertakes to secure to the Allied and Associated Powers, and to the officials and nationals of the said Powers, the enjoyment of all the rights and advantages of any kind which she may have granted to Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria or Turkey, or to the officials and nationals of these States by treaties, conventions or arrangements concluded before the 1st August, 1914, so long as those treaties, conventions or arrangements remain in force.

The Allied and Associated Powers reserve the right to accept or not the enjoyment of these rights and advantages.

ARTICLE 292.

Germany recognises that all treaties, conventions, or arrangements which she concluded with Russia, or with any State or Government of which the territory previously formed a part of Russia, or with Roumania, before the 1st August, 1914, or after that date until the coming into force of the present Treaty, are and remain abrogated.

ARTICLE 293.

Should an Allied or Associated Power, Russia, or a State or Government of which the territory formerly constituted a part of Russia, have been forced since the 1st August, 1914, by reason of military occupation or by any other means or for any other cause, to grant or to allow to be granted by the act of any public authority, concessions, privileges and favours of any kind to Germany or to a German national, such concessions, privileges and favours are *ipso facto* annulled by the present Treaty.

No claims or indemnities which may result from this annulment shall be charged against the Allied or Associated Powers or the Powers, States, Governments or Public authorities which are released from their engagements by the present Article.

ARTICLE 294.

From the coming into force of the present Treaty Germany undertakes to give the Allied and Associated Powers and their nationals the benefit *ipso facto* of the rights and advantages of any kind which she has granted by treaties, conventions, or arrangements to non-belligerent States or their nationals since the 1st August, 1914, until the coming into force of the present Treaty, so long as those treaties, conventions or arrangements remain in force.

ARTICLE 295.

Those of the High Contracting Parties who have not yet signed, or who have signed but not yet ratified, the Opium Convention signed at The Hague on January 23rd, 1912, agree to bring the said Convention into force, and for this purpose to enact the necessary legislation without delay and in any case within a period of twelve months from the coming into force of the present Treaty.

Furthermore, they agree that ratification of the present Treaty should in the case of Powers which have not yet ratified the Opium Convention be deemed in all respects equivalent to the ratification of that Convention and to the signature of the Special Protocol which was opened at The Hague in accordance with the resolutions adopted by the Third Opium Conference in 1914 for bringing the said Convention into force.

For this purpose the Government of the French Republic will communicate to the Government of the Netherlands a certified copy of the protocol of the deposit of ratifications of the present Treaty, and will invite the Government of the Netherlands to accept and deposit the said certified copy as if it were a deposit of ratifications of the Opium Convention and a signature of the Additional Protocol of 1914.

Section III. Debts.

ARTICLE 296.

There shall be settled through the intervention of clearing offices to be established by each of the High Contracting Parties within three months of the notification referred to in paragraph (*e*) hereafter the following classes of pecuniary obligations:

1. Debts payable before the war and due by a national of one of the Contracting Powers, residing within its territory, to a national of an Opposing Power, residing within its territory.

2. Debts which became payable during the war to nationals of one Contracting Power residing within its territory and arose out of transactions or contracts with the nationals of an Opposing Power, resident within its territory, of which the total or partial execution was suspended on account of the declaration of war.

3. Interest which has accrued due during the war to a national of one of the Contracting Powers in respect of securities issued by an Opposing Power, provided that the payment of interest on such securities to the nationals of that Power or to neutrals has not been suspended during the war.

4. Capital sums which have become payable during the war to nationals of one of the Contracting Powers in respect of securities issued by one of the Opposing Powers, provided that the payment of such capital sums to nationals of that Power or to neutrals has not been suspended during the war.

The proceeds of liquidation of enemy property, rights, and interests mentioned in Section IV and in the Annex thereto will be accounted for through the clearing offices, in the currency and at the rate of exchange hereinafter provided in paragraph (*d*), and disposed of by them under the conditions provided by the said Section and Annex.

The settlements provided for in this Article shall be effected according to the following principles and in accordance with the Annex to this Section:

(*a*) Each of the High Contracting Parties shall prohibit, as from the coming into force of the present Treaty, both the payment and the acceptance of payment of such debts, and also all communications between the interested parties with regard to the settlement of the said debts otherwise than through the clearing offices.

(*b*) Each of the High Contracting Parties shall be respectively responsible for the payment of such debts due by its nationals, except in the cases where before the war the debtor was in a state of bankruptcy or failure, or had given formal indication of insolvency or where the debt was due by a company whose business has been liquidated under emergency legislation during the war. Nevertheless, debts due by the inhabitants of territory invaded or occupied by the enemy be-

fore the Armistice will not be guaranteed by the States of which those territories form part.

(c) The sums due to the nationals of one of the High Contracting Parties by the nationals of an Opposing State will be debited to the clearing office of the country of the debtor, and paid to the creditor by the clearing office of the country of the creditor.

(d) Debts shall be paid or credited in the currency of such one of the Allied and Associated Powers, their colonies or protectorates, or the British Dominions or India, as may be concerned. If the debts are payable in some other currency they shall be paid or credited in the currency of the country concerned, whether an Allied or Associated Power, Colony, Protectorate, British Dominion or India, at the pre-war rate of exchange.

For the purpose of this provision the pre-war rate of exchange shall be defined as the average cable transfer rate prevailing in the Allied or Associated country concerned during the month immediately preceding the outbreak of war between the said country concerned and Germany.

If a contract provides for a fixed rate of exchange governing the conversion of the currency in which the debt is stated into the currency of the Allied or Associated country concerned, then the above provisions concerning the rate of exchange shall not apply.

In the case of new States the currency in which and the rate of exchange at which debts shall be paid or credited shall be determined by the Reparation Commission provided for in Part VIII (Reparation).

(e) The provisions of this Article and of the Annex hereto shall not apply as between Germany on the one hand and any one of the Allied and Associated Powers, their colonies or protectorates, or any one of the British Dominions or India on the other hand, unless within a period of six months from the coming into force of the present Treaty notice to that effect is given to Germany by the Government of such Allied or Associated Power or of such Dominion or of India as the case may be.

(f) The Allied and Associated Powers who have adopted this Article and the Annex hereto may agree between themselves to apply them to their respective nationals established in their territory so far as regards matters between their nationals and German nationals. In this case the payments made by application of this provision will be subject to arrangements between the allied and associated clearing offices concerned.

ANNEX.

1.

Each of the High Contracting Parties will, within three months from the notification provided for in Article 296, paragraph (e), establish a clearing office for the collection and payment of enemy debts.

Local clearing offices may be established for any particular portion of the territories of the High Contracting Parties. Such local clearing offices may perform all the functions of a central clearing office in their respective districts, except that all transactions with the clearing office in the Opposing State must be effected through the central clearing office.

2.

In this Annex the pecuniary obligations referred to in the first paragraph of Article 296 are described as "enemy debts", the persons from whom the same are due as "enemy debtors," the persons to whom they are due as "enemy creditors", the clearing office in the country of the creditor is called the "Creditor Clearing Office", and the clearing office in the country of the debtor is called the "Debtor Clearing Office".

3.

The High Contracting Parties will subject contraventions of paragraph (a) of Article 296 to the same penalties as are at present provided by their legislation for trading with the enemy. They will similarly prohibit within their territory all legal process relating to payment of enemy debts, except in accordance with the provisions of this Annex.

4.

The Government guarantee specified in paragraph (b) of Article 296 shall take effect whenever, for any reason, a debt shall not be recoverable, except in a case where at the date of the outbreak of war the debt was barred by the laws of prescription in force in the country of the debtor, or where the debtor was at that time in a state of bankruptcy or failure or had given formal indication of insolvency, or where the debt was due by a company whose business has been liquidated under emergency legislation during the war. In such case the procedure specified by this Annex shall apply to payment of the dividends.

The terms "bankruptcy" and "failure" refer to the application of legislation providing for such juridical conditions. The expression "formal indication of insolvency" bears the same meaning as it has in English law.

5.

Creditors shall give notice to the Creditor Clearing Office within six months of its establishment of debts due to them, and shall furnish the Clearing Office with any documents and information required of them.

The High Contracting Parties will take all suitable measures to trace and punish collusion between enemy creditors and debtors. The clearing offices will communicate to one another any evidence and information which might help the discovery and punishment of such collusion.

The High Contracting Parties will facilitate as much as possible postal and telegraphic communication at the expense of the parties concerned and through the intervention of the clearing offices between debtors and creditors desirous of coming to an agreement as to the amount of their debt.

The Creditor Clearing Office will notify the Debtor Clearing Office of all debts declared to it. The Debtor Clearing Office will, in due course, inform the Creditor Clearing Office which debts are admitted and which debts are contested. In the latter case, the Debtor Clearing Office will give the grounds for the non-admission of debt.

6.

When a debt has been admitted, in whole or in part, the Debtor Clearing Office will at once credit the Creditor Clearing Office with the amount admitted, and at the same time notify it of such credit.

7.

The debt shall be deemed to be admitted in full and shall be credited forthwith to the Creditor Clearing Office unless within three months from the receipt of the notification or such longer time as may be agreed to by the Creditor Clearing Office notice has been given by the Debtor Clearing Office that it is not admitted.

8.

When the whole or part of a debt is not admitted the two clearing offices will examine into the matter jointly and will endeavour to bring the parties to an agreement.

9.

The Creditor Clearing Office will pay to the individual creditor the sums credited to it out of the funds placed at its disposal by the Government of its country and in accordance with the conditions fixed by the said Government, retaining any sums considered necessary to cover risks, expenses or commissions.

10.

Any person having claimed payment of an enemy debt which is not admitted in whole or in part shall pay to the clearing office, by way of fine, interest at 5 per cent. on the part not admitted. Any person having unduly refused to admit the whole or part of a debt claimed from him shall pay, by way of fine, interest at 5 per cent. on the amount with regard to which his refusal shall be disallowed.

Such interest shall run from the date of expiration of the period provided for in paragraph 7 until the date on which the claim shall have been disallowed or the debt paid.

Each clearing office shall in so far as it is concerned take steps to collect the fines above provided for, and will be responsible if such fines cannot be collected.

The fines will be credited to the other clearing office, which shall retain them as a contribution towards the cost of carrying out the present provisions.

11.

The balance between the clearing offices shall be struck monthly and the credit balance paid in cash by the debtor State within a week.

Nevertheless, any credit balances which may be due by one or more of the Allied and Associated Powers shall be retained until complete payment shall have been effected of the sums due to the Allied or Associated Powers or their nationals on account of the war.

12.

To facilitate discussion between the clearing offices each of them shall have a representative at the place where the other is established.

13.

Except for special reasons all discussions in regard to claims will, so far as possible, take place at the Debtor Clearing Office.

14.

In conformity with Article 296, paragraph (*b*), the High Contracting Parties are responsible for the payment of the enemy debts owing by their nationals.

The Debtor Clearing Office will therefore credit the Creditor Clearing Office with all debts admitted, even in case of inability to collect them from the individual debtor. The Governments concerned will, nevertheless, invest their respective clearing offices with all necessary powers for the recovery of debts which have been admitted.

As an exception, the admitted debts owing by persons having suffered injury from acts of war shall only be credited to the Creditor Clearing Office when the compensation due to the person concerned in respect of such injury shall have been paid.

15.

Each Government will defray the expenses of the clearing office set up in its territory, including the salaries of the staff.

16.

Where the two clearing offices are unable to agree whether a debt claimed is due, or in case of a difference between an enemy debtor and an enemy creditor or between the clearing offices, the dispute shall either be referred to arbitration if the parties so agree under conditions fixed by agreement between them, or referred to the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal provided for in Section VI hereafter.

At the request of the Creditor Clearing Office the dispute may, however, be submitted to the jurisdiction of the Courts of the place of domicile of the debtor.

17.

Recovery of sums found by the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal, the Court, or the Arbitration Tribunal to be due shall be effected through the clearing offices as if these sums were debts admitted by the Debtor Clearing Office.

18.

Each of the Governments concerned shall appoint an agent who will be responsible for the presentation to the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal of the cases conducted on behalf of its clearing office. This agent will exercise a general control over the representatives or counsel employed by its nationals.

Decisions will be arrived at on documentary evidence, but it will be open to the Tribunal to hear the parties in person, or according to their preference by their representatives approved by the two Governments, or by the agent referred to above, who shall be competent to intervene along with the party or to re-open and maintain a claim abandoned by the same.

19.

The clearing offices concerned will lay before the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal all the information and documents in their possession, so as to enable the Tribunal to decide rapidly on the cases which are brought before it.

20.

Where one of the parties concerned appeals against the joint decision of the two clearing offices he shall make a deposit against the costs, which deposit shall only be refunded when the first judgment is modified in favour of the appellant and in proportion to the success he may attain, his opponent in case of such a refund being required to pay an equivalent proportion of the costs and expenses. Security accepted by the Tribunal may be substituted for a deposit.

A fee of 5 per cent. of the amount in dispute shall be charged in respect of all cases brought before the Tribunal. This fee shall, unless the Tribunal directs otherwise, be borne by the unsuccessful party. Such fee shall be added to the deposit referred to. It is also independent of the security.

The Tribunal may award to one of the parties a sum in respect of the expenses of the proceedings.

Any sum payable under this paragraph shall be credited to the clearing office of the successful party as a separate item.

21.

With a view to the rapid settlement of claims, due regard shall be paid in the appointment of all persons connected with the clearing offices or with the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal to their knowledge of the language of the other country concerned. Each of the clearing offices will be at liberty to correspond with the other, and to forward documents in its own language.

22.

Subject to any special agreement to the contrary between the Governments concerned, debts shall carry interest in accordance with the following provisions:—

Interest shall not be payable on sums of money due by way of dividend, interest, or other periodical payments which themselves represent interest on capital.

The rate of interest shall be 5 per cent. per annum except in cases where, by contract, law, or custom, the creditor is entitled to payment of interest at a different rate. In such cases the rate to which he is entitled shall prevail.

Interest shall run from the date of commencement of hostilities (or, if the sum of money to be recovered fell due during the war, from the date at which it fell due) until the sum is credited to the clearing office of the creditor.

Sums due by way of interest shall be treated as debts admitted by the clearing offices and shall be credited to the Creditor Clearing Office in the same way as such debts.

23.

Where by decision of the clearing offices or the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal a claim is held not to fall within Article 296, the creditor shall be at liberty to prosecute the claim before the Courts or to take such other proceedings as may be open to him.

The presentation of a claim to the clearing office suspends the operation of any period of prescription.

24.

The High Contracting Parties agree to regard the decisions arrived at in accordance with the provisions of this Annex as final and conclusive, and to render them binding upon their nationals.

25.

In any case where a Creditor Clearing Office declines to notify a claim to the Debtor Clearing Office, or to take any step provided for in this Annex, intended to make effective in whole or in part a request of which it has received due notice, the enemy creditor shall be entitled to receive from the clearing office a certificate setting out the amount of the claim, and shall then be entitled to prosecute the claim before the courts or to take such other proceedings as may be open to him.

Section IV. Property, rights and interests.

ARTICLE 297.

The question of private property, rights and interests in an enemy country shall be settled according to the principles laid down in this Section and to the provisions of the Annex hereto:

(*a*) The exceptional war measures and measures of transfer (defined in paragraph 3 of the Annex hereto) taken by Germany with respect to the property, rights and interests of nationals of Allied or Associated Powers, including companies and associations in which they are interested, when liquidation has not been completed, shall be immediately discontinued or stayed and the property, rights, and interests concerned restored to their owners, who shall enjoy full rights therein in accordance with the provisions of Article 298.

(*b*) Subject to any contrary stipulations which may be provided for in the present Treaty, the Allied and Associated Powers reserve the right to retain and liquidate all property, rights and interests of German nationals, or companies controlled by them, within their territories, colonies, possessions and protectorates including territories ceded to them by the present Treaty.

The liquidation shall be carried out in accordance with the laws of the Allied or Associated State concerned, and the German owner shall not be able to dispose of such property, rights or interests nor to subject them to any charge without the consent of that State.

German nationals who acquire *ipso facto* the nationality of an Allied or Associated Power in accordance with the provisions of the present Treaty will not be considered as German nationals within the meaning of this paragraph.

(*c*) The price or the amount of compensation in respect of the exercise of the right referred to in the preceding paragraph (*b*) will be fixed in accordance with the methods of sale or valuation adopted by the laws of the country in which the property has been retained or liquidated.

(*d*) As between the Allied and Associated Powers or their nationals on the one hand and Germany or her nationals on the other hand, all the exceptional war measures, or measures of transfer, or acts done or to be done in execution of such measures as defined in paragraphs 1 and 3 of the Annex hereto shall be considered as final and binding upon all persons except as regards the reservations laid down in the present Treaty.

(*e*) The nationals of Allied and Associated Powers shall be entitled to compensation in respect of damage or injury inflicted upon their property, rights or interests, including any company or association in which they are interested, in German territory as it existed on August 1, 1914, by the application either of the exceptional war measures or measures of transfer mentioned in paragraphs 1 and 3 of the Annex hereto. The claims made in this respect by such nationals shall be investigated, and the

total of the compensation shall be determined by the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal provided for in Section VI or by an Arbitrator appointed by that Tribunal. This compensation shall be borne by Germany, and may be charged upon the property of German nationals within the territory or under the control of the claimant's State. This property may be constituted as a pledge for enemy liabilities under the conditions fixed by paragraph 4 of the Annex hereto. The payment of this compensation may be made by the Allied or Associated State, and the amount will be debited to Germany.

(*f*) Whenever a national of an Allied or Associated Power is entitled to property which has been subjected to a measure of transfer in German territory and expresses a desire for its restitution, his claim for compensation in accordance with paragraph (*e*) shall be satisfied by the restitution of the said property if it still exists in specie.

In such case Germany shall take all necessary steps to restore the evicted owner to the possession of his property, free from all encumbrances or burdens with which it may have been charged after the liquidation, and to indemnify all third parties injured by the restitution.

If the restitution provided for in this paragraph cannot be effected, private agreements arranged by the intermediation of the Powers concerned or the clearing offices provided for in the Annex to Section III may be made, in order to secure that the national of the Allied or Associated Power may secure compensation for the injury referred to in paragraph (*e*) by the grant of advantages or equivalents which he agrees to accept in place of the property, rights or interests of which he was deprived.

Through restitution in accordance with this Article, the price or the amount of compensation fixed by the application of paragraph (*e*) will be reduced by the actual value of the property restored, account being taken of compensation in respect of loss of use or deterioration.

(*g*) The rights conferred by paragraph (*f*) are reserved to owners who are nationals of Allied or Associated Powers within whose territory legislative measures prescribing the general liquidation of enemy property, rights or interests were not applied before the signature of the Armistice.

(*h*) Except in cases where, by application of paragraph (*f*), restitutitons in specie have been made, the net proceeds of sales of enemy property, rights or interests wherever situated carried out either by virtue of war legislation, or by application of this Article, and in general all cash assets of enemies, shall be dealt with as follows:—

(1) As regards Powers adopting Section III and the Annex thereto, the said proceeds and cash assets shall be credited to the Power of which the owner is a national, through the clearing office established thereunder, any credit balance in favour of Germany resulting therefrom shall be dealt with as provided in Article 243.

(2) As regards Powers not adopting Section III and the Annex thereto, the proceeds of the property, rights and interests, and the cash assets, of the nationals of Allied or Associated Powers held by Germany shall be paid immediately to the person entitled thereto or to his Government; the proceeds of the property, rights and interests, and the cash assets, of German nationals received by an Allied or Associated Power shall be subject to disposal by such Power in accordance with its laws and regulations and may be applied in payment of the claims and debts defined by this Article or paragraph 4 of the Annex hereto. Any property, rights and interests or proceeds thereof or cash assets not used as above provided may be retained by the said Allied or Associated Power and if retained the cash value thereof shall be dealt with as provided in Article 243.

(*i*) Germany undertakes to compensate its nationals in respect of the sale or retention of their property, rights or interests in Allied or Associated States.

ARTICLE 298.

Germany undertakes, with regard to the property, rights and interests, including companies and associations in which they were interested, restored to nationals of Allied and Associated Powers in accordance with the provisions of Article 297, paragraph (*a*) or (*f*):

(*a*) to restore and maintain, except as expressly provided in the present Treaty, the property, rights and interests of the nationals of Allied or Associated Powers in the legal position obtaining in respect of the property, rights and interests of German nationals under the laws in force before the war.

(*b*) not to subject the property, rights or interests of the nationals of the Allied or Associated Powers to any measures in derogation of property rights which are not applied equally to the property, rights and interests of German nationals, and to pay adequate compensation in the event of the application of these measures.

ANNEX.

1.

In accordance with the provisions of Article 297, paragraph (*d*), the validity of vesting orders and of orders for the winding up of businesses or companies, and of any other orders, directions, decisions or instructions of any court or any department of the Government of any of the High Contracting Parties made or given, or purporting to be made or given, in pursuance of war legislation with regard to enemy property, rights and interests is confirmed. The interests of all persons shall be regarded as having been effectively dealt with by any order, direction, decision or instruction dealing with property in which they may be interested, whether or not such interests are specifically mentioned in the order, direction, decision, or instruction. No question shall be raised as to the regularity of a transfer of any property, rights or interests dealt with in pursuance of any such order, direction, decision or instruction. Every action taken with regard to any property, business, or company, whether as regards its investigation, sequestration, compulsory administration, use, requisition, supervision, or winding up, the sale or management of property, rights or interests, the collection or discharge of debts, the payment of costs, charges or expenses, or any other matter whatsoever, in pursuance of orders, directions, decisions, or instructions of any court or of any department of the Government of any of the High Contracting Parties, made or given, or purporting to be made or given, in pursuance of war legislation with regard to enemy property, rights or interests, is confirmed. Provided that the provisions of this paragraph shall not be held to prejudice the titles to property heretofore acquired in good faith and for value and in accordance with the laws of the country in which the property is situated by nationals of the Allied and Associated Powers.

The provisions of this paragraph do not apply to such of the above-mentioned measures as have been taken by the German authorities in invaded or occupied territory.

2.

No claim or action shall be made or brought against any Allied or Associated Power or against any person acting on behalf of or under the direction of any legal authority or Department of the Government of such a Power by Germany or by any German national wherever resident in respect of any act or omission with regard to his property, rights or interests during the war or in preparation for the war. Similarly no claim or action shall be made or brought against any person in respect of any act or omission under or in accordance with the exceptional war measures, laws or regulations of any Allied or Associated Power.

3.

In Article 297 and this Annex the expression "exceptional war measures" includes measures of all kinds, legislative, administrative, judicial, or others, that have been taken or will be taken hereafter with regard to enemy property, and which have had or will have the effect of removing from the proprietors the power of disposition over their property, though without affecting the ownership, such as measures of supervision, of compulsory administration, and of sequestration; or measures which have had or will have as an object the seizure of, the use of, or the interference with enemy assets, for whatsoever motive, under whatsoever form or in whatsoever place. Acts in the execution of these measures include all detentions, instructions, orders or decrees of Government departments or courts applying these measures to enemy property, as well as acts performed by any person connected with the administration or the supervision of enemy property, such as the payment of debts, the collecting of credits, the payment of any costs, charges, or expenses, collecting of fees.

Measures of transfer are those which have affected or will affect the ownership of enemy property by transferring it in whole or in part to a person other than the enemy owner, and without his consent, such as measures directing the sale, liquidation, or devolution of ownership in enemy property, the cancelling of titles or securities.

4.

All property, rights and interests of German nationals within the territory of any Allied or Associated Power and the net proceeds of their sale, liquidation or other dealing therewith may be charged by that Allied or Associated Power in the first place with payment of amounts due in respect of claims by the nationals of that Allied or Associated Power with regard to their property, rights, and interests, including companies and asso-

ciations in which they are interested in German territory, or debts owing to them by German nationals, and with payment of claims growing out of acts committed by the German Government or by any German authorities since the 31st July, 1914, and before that Allied or Associated Power entered into the war. They may be charged in the second place with payment of the amounts due in respect of claims by the nationals of such Allied or Associated Power with regard to their property, rights, and interests in the territory of other enemy Powers, or debts owing to them by nationals of such Powers in so far as those claims or debts are otherwise unsatisfied.

5.

Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 297, where immediately before the outbreak of war a company incorporated in an Allied or Associated State had rights in common with a company controlled by it and incorporated in Germany to the use of trade-marks in third countries, or enjoyed the use in common with such company of unique means of reproduction of goods or articles for sale in third countries, the former company shall alone have the right to use these trade-marks in third countries to the exclusion of the German company, and these unique means of reproduction shall be handed over to the former company, notwithstanding any action taken under German war legislation with regard to the latter company or its business, industrial property or shares. Nevertheless, the former company, if requested, shall deliver to the latter company derivative copies permitting the continuation of reproduction of articles for use within German territory.

6.

Up to the time when restitution is carried out in accordance with Article 297, Germany is responsible for the conservation of property, rights and interests of the nationals of Allied or Associated Powers, including companies and associations in which they are interested, that have been subjected by her to exceptional war measures.

7.

Within one year from the coming into force of the present Treaty the Allied or Associated Powers will specify the property, rights and interests over which they intend to exercise the rights provided in Article 297, paragraph (*f*).

8.

The restitution provided in Article 297 will be carried out by order of the German Government or of the authorities which have been substituted for it. Detailed accounts of the action of administrators shall be furnished to the interested persons by the German authorities upon request, which may be made at any time after the coming into force of the present Treaty.

9.

Until completion of the liquidation provided for by Article 297, paragraph (*b*), the property, rights and interests of German nationals will continue to be subject to exceptional war measures that have been or will be taken with regard to them.

10.

Germany will, within six months from the coming into force of the present Treaty, deliver to each Allied or Associated Power all securities, certificates, deeds, or other documents of title held by its nationals and relating to property, rights or interests situated in the territory of that Allied or Associated Power, including any shares, stock, debentures, debenture stock, or other obligations of any company incorporated in accordance with the laws of that Power.

Germany will at any time on demand of any Allied or Associated Power furnish such information as may be required with regard to the property, rights and interests of German nationals within the territory of such Allied or Associated Power, or with regard to any transactions concerning such property, rights or interests effected since the 1st July, 1914.

11.

The expression "cash assets" includes all deposits or funds established before or after the declaration of war, as well as all assets coming from deposits, revenues, or profits collected by administrators, sequestrators, or others from funds placed on deposit or otherwise, but does not include sums belonging to the Allied or Associated Powers or to their component States, Provinces, or Municipalities.

12.

All investments wheresoever effected with the cash assets of nationals of the High Contracting Parties, including companies and associations in which such nationals were interested, by persons responsible for the administration of enemy properties or having control over such administration, or by order of such persons or of any authority whatsoever shall be annulled. These cash assets shall be accounted for irrespective of any such investment.

13.

Within one month from the coming into force of the present Treaty, or on demand at any time, Germany will deliver to the Allied and Associated Powers all accounts, vouchers, records, documents, and information of any kind which may be within German territory, and which concern the property, rights and interests of the nationals of those Powers, including companies and associations in which they are interested, that have been subjected to an exceptional war measure, or to a measure of transfer either in German territory or in territory occupied by Germany or her allies.

The controllers, supervisors, managers, administrators, sequestrators, liquidators, and receivers shall be personally responsible under guarantee of the German Government for the immediate delivery in full of these accounts and documents, and for their accuracy.

14.

The provisions of Article 297 and this Annex relating to property, rights and interests in an enemy country, and the proceeds of the liquidation thereof, apply to debts, credits and accounts, Section III regulating only the method of payment.

In the settlement of matters provided for in Article 297 between Germany and the Allied or Associated States, their colonies or protectorates, or any one of the British Dominions or India, in respect of any of which a declaration shall not have been made that they adopt Section III, and between their respective nationals, the provisions of Article 296 respecting the currency in which payment is to be made and the rate of exchange shall apply unless the Government of the Allied or Associated Power concerned shall within six months of the coming into force of the present Treaty notify Germany that the said provisions are not to be applied.

15.

The provisions of Article 297 and this Annex apply to industrial, literary and artistic property which has been or will be dealt with in the liquidation of property, rights, interests, companies or businesses under war legislation by the Allied or Associated Powers, or in accordance with the stipulations of Article 297, paragraph (*b*).

Section V. Contracts, prescriptions, judgments.

ARTICLE 299.

(*a*) Any contract concluded between enemies shall be regarded as having been dissolved as from the time when any two of the parties became enemies, except in respect of any debt or other pecuniary obligation arising out of any act done or money paid thereunder, and subject to the exceptions and special rules with regard to particular contracts or classes of contracts contained herein or in the Annex hereto.

(*b*) Any contract of which the execution shall be required in the general interest, within six months from the date of coming into force of the present Treaty, by the Allied or Associated Governments of which one of the parties is a national, shall be excepted from dissolution under this Article.

When the execution of the contract thus kept alive would, owing to the alteration of trade conditions, cause one of the parties substantial prejudice the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal provided for by Section VI shall be empowered to grant to the prejudiced party equitable compensation.

(*c*) Having regard to the provisions of the constitution and law of the United States of America, of Brazil, and of Japan, neither the present Article, nor Article 300, nor the Annex hereto shall apply to contracts made between nationals of these States and German nationals; nor shall Article 305 apply to the United States of America or its nationals.

(*d*) The present Article and the annex hereto shall not apply to contracts the parties to which became enemies by reason of one of them being an inhabitant of territory of which the sovereignty has been transferred, if such party shall acquire under the present Treaty the nationality of an Allied or Associated Power, nor shall they apply to contracts between nationals of the Allied and Associated Powers between whom trading has been prohibited by reason of one of the parties being in Allied or Associated territory in the occupation of the enemy.

(*e*) Nothing in the present Article or the annex hereto shall be deemed to invalidate a transaction lawfully carried out in accordance with a contract between enemies if it has been carried out with the authority of one of the belligerent Powers.

ARTICLE 300.

(a) All periods of prescription, or limitation of right of action, whether they began to run before or after the outbreak of war, shall be treated in the territory of the High Contracting Parties, so far as regards relations between enemies, as having been suspended for the duration of the war. They shall begin to run again at earliest three months after the coming into force of the present Treaty. This provision shall apply to the period prescribed for the presentation of interest or dividend coupons or for the presentation for repayment of securities drawn for repayment or repayable on any other ground.

(b) Where, on account of failure to perform any act or comply with any formality during the war, measures of execution have been taken in German territory to the prejudice of a national of an Allied or Associated Power, the claim of such national shall, if the matter does not fall within the competence of the Courts of an Allied or Associated Power, be heard by the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal provided for by Section VI.

(c) Upon the application of any interested person who is a national of an Allied or Associated Power the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal shall order the restoration of the rights which have been prejudiced by the measures of execution referred to in paragraph (b), wherever, having regard to the particular circumstances of the case, such restoration is equitable and possible.

If such restoration is inequitable or impossible the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal may grant compensation to the prejudiced party to be paid by the German Government.

(d) Where a contract has been dissolved by reason either of failure on the part of either party to carry out its provisions or of the exercise of a right stipulated in the contract itself the party prejudiced may apply to the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal for relief. The Tribunal will have the powers provided for in paragraph (c).

(e) The provisions of the preceding paragraphs of this Article shall apply to the nationals of Allied and Associated Powers who have been prejudiced by reason of measures referred to above taken by Germany in invaded or occupied territory, if they have not been otherwise compensated.

(f) Germany shall compensate any third party who may be prejudiced by any restitution or restoration ordered by the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal under the provisions of the preceding paragraphs of this Article.

(g) As regards negotiable instruments, the period of three months provided under paragraph (a) shall commence as from the date on which any exceptional regulations applied in the territories of the interested Power with regard to negotiable instruments shall have definitely ceased to have force.

ARTICLE 301.

As between enemies no negotiable instrument made before the war shall be deemed to have become invalid by reason only of failure within the required time to present the instrument for acceptance or payment or to give notice of non-acceptance or non-payment to drawers or indorsers or to protest the instrument, nor by reason of failure to complete any formality during the war.

Where the period within which a negotiable instrument should have been presented for acceptance or for payment, or within which notice of non-acceptance or non-payment should have been given to the drawer or indorser, or within which the instrument should have been protested, has elapsed during the war, and the party who should have presented or protested the instrument or have given notice of non-acceptance or non-payment has failed to do so during the war, a period of not less than three months from the coming into force of the present Treaty shall be allowed within which presentation, notice of non-acceptance or non-payment or protest may be made.

ARTICLE 302.

Judgments given by the Courts of an Allied or Associated Power in all cases which, under the present Treaty, they are competent to decide, shall be recognised in Germany as final, and shall be enforced without it being necessary to have them declared executory.

If a judgment in respect of any dispute which may have arisen has been given during the war by a German Court against a national of an Allied or Associated State in a case in which he was not able to make his defence, the Allied and Associated national who has suffered prejudice thereby shall be entitled to recover compensation, to be fixed by the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal provided for in Section VI.

At the instance of the national of the Allied or Associated Power the compensation above-mentioned may, upon order to that effect of the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal, be effected where it is possible by replacing the parties in the situation which they occupied before the judgment was given by the German Court.

The above compensation may likewise by obtained before the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal by the nationals of Allied or Associated Powers who have suffered prejudice by judicial measures taken in invaded or occupied territories, if they have not been otherwise compensated.

ARTICLE 303.

For the purpose of Sections III, IV, V and VII, the expression "during the war" means for each Allied or Associated Power the period between the state of war between that Power and Germany and the coming into force of the present Treaty.

ANNEX.

I. *General provisions.*

1.

Within the meaning of Articles 299, 300 and 301, the parties to a contract shall be regarded as enemies when trading between them shall have been prohibited by or otherwise became unlawful under laws, orders or regulations to which one of those parties was subject. They shall be deemed to have become enemies from the date when such trading was prohibited or otherwise became unlawful.

2.

The following classes of contracts are excepted from dissolution by Article 299 and, without prejudice to the rights contained in Article 297 (b) of Section IV, remain in force subject to the application of domestic laws, orders or regulations made during the war by the Allied and Associated Powers and subject to the terms of the contracts:

(a) Contracts having for their object the transfer of estates or of real or personal property where the property therein had passed or the object had been delivered before the parties became enemies;

(b) Leases and agreements for leases of land and houses;

(c) Contracts of mortgage, pledge, or lien;

(d) Concessions concerning mines, quarries or deposits;

(e) Contracts between individuals or companies and States, provinces, municipalities, or other similar juridical persons charged with administrative functions, and concessions granted by States, provinces, municipalities, or other similar juridical persons charged with administrative functions.

3.

If the provisions of a contract are in part dissolved under Article 299, the remaining provisions of that contract shall, subject to the same application of domestic laws as is provided for in paragraph 2, continue in force if they are severable, but where they are not severable the contract shall be deemed to have been dissolved in its entirety.

II. *Provisions relating to certain classes of contracts.*

Stock exchange and commercial exchange contracts.

4.

a) Rules made during the war by any recognised Exchange or Commercial Association providing for the closure of contracts entered into before the war by an enemy are confirmed by the High Contracting Parties, as also any action taken thereunder, provided:—

(i.) That the contract was expressed to be made subject to the rules of the Exchange or Association in question;

(ii.) That the rules applied to all persons concerned;

(iii.) That the conditions attaching to the closure were fair and reasonable.

b) The preceding paragraph shall not apply to rules made during the occupation by Exchanges or Commercial Associations in the districts occupied by the enemy.

c) The closure of contracts relating to cotton "futures", which were closed as on the 31st July, 1914, under the decision of the Liverpool Cotton Association, is also confirmed.

Security.

5.

The sale of a security held for an unpaid debt owing by an enemy shall be deemed to have been valid irrespective of notice to the owner if the creditor acted in good faith and with reasonable care and prudence, and no claim by the debtor on the ground of such sale shall be admitted.

This stipulation shall not apply to any sale of securities effected by an enemy during the occupations in regions invaded or occupied by the enemy.

Negotiable instruments.

6.

As regards Powers which adopt Section III and the Annex thereto the pecuniary obligations existing between enemies and resulting from the issue of negotiable instruments shall be adjusted in conformity with the said Annex by the instrumentality of the Clearing Offices, which shall assume the rights of the holder as regards the various remedies open to him.

7.

If a person has either before or during the war become liable upon a negotiable instrument in accordance with an undertaking given to him by a person who has subsequently become an enemy, the latter shall remain liable to indemnify the former in respect of his liability notwithstanding the outbreak of war.

III. *Contracts of insurance.*

8.

Contracts of insurance entered into by any person with another person who subsequently became an enemy will be dealt with in accordance with the following paragraphs:—

Fire insurance.

9.

Contracts for the insurance of property against fire entered into by a person interested in such property with another person who subsequently became an enemy shall not be deemed to have been dissolved by the outbreak of war, or by the fact of the person becoming an enemy, or on account of the failure during the war and for a period of three months thereafter to perform his obligations under the contract, but they shall be dissolved at the date when the annual premium becomes payable for the first time after the expiration of a period of three months after the coming into force of the present Treaty.

A settlement shall be effected of unpaid premiums which became due during the war, or of claims for losses which occurred during the war.

10.

Where by administrative or legislative action an insurance against fire effected before the war has been transferred during the war from the original to another insurer, the transfer will be recognised and the liability of the original insurer will be deemed to have ceased as from the date of the transfer. The original insurer will, however, be entitled to receive on demand full information as to the terms of the transfer, and if it should appear that these terms were not equitable they shall be amended so far as may be necessary to render them equitable.

Furthermore, the insured shall, subject to the concurrence of the original insurer, be entitled to retransfer the contract to the original insurer as from the date of the demand.

Life insurance.

11.

Contracts of life insurance entered into between an insurer and a person who subsequently became an enemy shall not be deemed to have been dissolved by the outbreak of war, or by the fact of the person becoming an enemy.

Any sum which during the war became due upon a contract deemed not to have been dissolved under the preceding provision shall be recoverable after the war with the addition of interest at five per cent per annum from the date of its becoming due up to the day of payment.

Where the contract has lapsed during the war owing to non-payment of premiums, or has become void from breach of the conditions of the contract, the assured or his representatives or the persons entitled shall have the right at any time within twelve months of the coming into force of the present Treaty to claim from the insurer the surrender value of the policy at the date of its lapse or avoidance.

Where the contract has lapsed during the war owing to non-payment of premiums the payment of which has been prevented by the enforcement of measures of war, the assured or his representative or the persons entitled shall have the right to restore the contract on payment of the premiums with interest at five per cent per annum within three months from the coming into force of the present Treaty.

12.

Any Allied or Associated Power may within three months of the coming into force of the present Treaty cancel all the contracts of insurance running between a German insurance company and its nationals under conditions which shall protect its nationals from any prejudice.

To this end the German insurance company will hand over to the Allied or Associated Government concerned the proportion of its assets attributable to the policies so cancelled and will be relieved from all liability in respect of such policies. The assets to be handed over shall be determined by an actuary appointed by the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal.

13.

Where contracts of life insurance have been entered into by a local branch of an insurance company established in a country which subsequently became an enemy country, the contract shall, in the absence of any stipulation to the contrary in the contract itself, be governed by the local law, but the insurer shall be entitled to demand from the insured or his representatives the refund of sums paid on claims made or enforced under measures taken during the war, if the making or enforcement of such claims was not in accordance with the terms of the contract itself or was not consistent with the laws or treaties existing at the time when it was entered into.

14.

In any case where by the law applicable to the contract the insurer remains bound by the contract notwithstanding the non-payment of premiums until notice is given to the insured of the termination of the contract, he shall be entitled where the giving of such notice was prevented by the war to recover the unpaid premiums with interest at five per cent. per annum from the insured.

15.

Insurance contracts shall be considered as contracts of life assurance for the purpose of paragraphs 11 to 14 when they depend on the probabilities of human life combined with the rate of interest for the calculation of the reciprocal engagements between the two parties.

Marine insurance.

16.

Contracts of marine insurance including time policies and voyage policies entered into between an insurer and a person who subsequently became an enemy, shall be deemed to have been dissolved on his becoming an enemy, except in cases where the risk undertaken in the contract had attached before he became an enemy.

Where the risk had not attached, money paid by way of premium or otherwise shall be recoverable from the insurer.

Where the risk had attached effect shall be given to the contract notwithstanding the party becoming an enemy, and sums due under the contract either by way of premiums or in respect of losses shall be recoverable after the coming into force of the present Treaty.

In the event of any agreement being come to for the payment of interest on sums due before the war to or by the nationals of States which have been at war and recovered after the war, such interest shall in the case of losses recoverable under contracts of marine insurance run from the expiration of a period of one year from the date of the loss.

17.

No contract of marine insurance with an insured person who subsequently became an enemy shall be deemed to cover losses due to belligerent action by the Power of which the insurer was a national or by the allies or associates of such Power.

18.

Where it is shown that a person who had before the war entered into a contract of marine insurance with an insurer who subsequently became an enemy entered after the outbreak of war into a new contract covering the same risk with an insurer who was not an enemy, the new contract shall be deemed to be substituted for the original contract as from the date when it was entered into, and the premiums payable shall be adjusted on the basis of the original insurer having remained liable on the contract only up till the time when the new contract was entered into.

Other insurances.

19.

Contracts of insurance entered into before the war between an insurer and a person who subsequently became an enemy other than contracts dealt with in paragraphs 9 to 18 shall be treated in all respects on the same footing as contracts of fire insurance between the same persons would be dealt with under the said paragraphs.

Re-insurance.

20.

All treaties of re-insurance with a person who became an enemy shall be regarded as having been abrogated by the person becoming an enemy, but without prejudice in the case of life or marine risks which had attached before the war to the right to recover payment after the war for sums due in respect of such risks.

Nevertheless if, owing to invasion, it has been impossible for the re-insured to find another re-insurer, the treaty shall remain in force until three months after the coming into force of the present Treaty.

Where a re-insurance treaty becomes void under this paragraph, there shall be an adjustment of accounts between the parties in respect both of premiums paid and payable and of liabilities for losses in respect of life or marine risks which had attached before the war. In the case of risks other than those mentioned in paragraphs 11 to 18 the adjustment of accounts shall be made as at the date of the parties becoming enemies without regard to claims for losses which may have occurred since that date.

21.

The provisions of the preceding paragraph will extend equally to re-insurances existing at the date of the parties becoming enemies of particular risks undertaken by the insurer in a contract of insurance against any risks other than life or marine risks.

22.

Re-insurance of life risks effected by particular contracts and not under any general treaty remain in force.

The provisions of paragraph 12 apply to treaties of re-insurance of life insurance contracts in which enemy companies are the re-insurers.

23.

In case of a re-insurance effected before the war of a contract of marine insurance, the cession of a risk which had been ceded to the re-insurer shall, if it had attached before the outbreak of war, remain valid and effect be given to the contract notwithstanding the outbreak of war; sums due under the contract of re-insurance in respect either of premiums or of losses shall be recoverable after the war.

24.

The provisions of paragraphs 17 and 18 and the last part of paragraph 16 shall apply to contracts for the re-insurance of marine risks.

Section VI. Mixed Arbitral Tribunal.

ARTICLE 304.

(*a*) Within three months from the date of the coming into force of the present Treaty, a Mixed Arbitral Tribunal shall be established between each of the Allied and Associated Powers on the one hand and Germany on the other hand. Each such Tribunal shall consist of three members. Each of the Governments concerned shall appoint one of these members. The President shall be chosen by agreement between the two Governments concerned.

In case of failure to reach agreement, the President of the Tribunal and two other persons either of whom may in case of need take his place, shall be chosen by the Council of the League of Nations, or, until this is set up, by M. Gustave Ador if he is willing. These persons shall be nationals of Powers that have remained neutral during the war.

If any Government does not proceed within a period of one month in case there is a vacancy to appoint a member of the Tribunal, such member shall be chosen by the other Government from the two persons mentioned above other than the President.

The decision of the majority of the members of the Tribunal shall be the decision of the Tribunal.

(*b*) The Mixed Arbitral Tribunals established pursuant to paragraph (*a*), shall decide all questions within their competence under Sections III, IV, V and VII.

In addition, all questions, whatsoever their nature, relating to contracts concluded before the coming into force of the present Treaty between nationals of the Allied and Associated Powers and German nationals shall be decided by the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal, always excepting questions which, under the laws of the Allied, Associated or Neutral Powers, are within the jurisdiction of the National Courts of those Powers. Such questions shall be decided by the National Courts in question, to the exclusion of the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal. The party who is a national of an Allied or Associated Power may nevertheless bring the case before the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal if this is not prohibited by the laws of his country.

(*c*) If the number of cases justifies it, additional members shall be appointed and each Mixed Arbitral Tribunal shall sit in divisions. Each of these divisions will be constituted as above.

(*d*) Each Mixed Arbitral Tribunal will settle its own procedure except in so far as it is provided in the following Annex, and is empowered to award the sums to be paid by the loser in respect of the costs and expenses of the proceedings.

(*e*) Each Government will pay the remuneration of the member of the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal appointed by it and of any agent whom it may appoint to represent it before the Tribunal. The remuneration of the President will be determined by special agreement between the Governments concerned; and this remuneration and the joint expenses of each Tribunal will be paid by the two Governments in equal moieties.

(*f*) The High Contracting Parties agree to regard the decisions of the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal as final and conclusive, and to render them binding upon their nationals.

ANNEX.

1.

Should one of the members of the Tribunal either die, retire, or be unable for any reason whatever to discharge his functions, the same procedure will be followed for filling the vacancy as was followed for appointing him.

2.

The Tribunal may adopt such rules of procedure as shall be in accordance with justice and equity and decide the order and time at which each party must conclude its arguments, and may arrange all formalities required for dealing with the evidence.

3.

The agent and counsel of the parties on each side are authorized to present orally and in writing to the tribunal arguments in support or in defence of each case.

4.

The Tribunal shall keep record of the questions and cases submitted and the proceedings thereon, with the dates of such proceedings.

5.

Each of the Powers concerned may appoint a secretary. These secretaries shall act together as joint secretaries of the Tribunal and shall be subject to its direction. The tribunal may appoint and employ any other necessary officer or officers to assist in the performance of its duties.

6.

The Tribunal shall decide all questions and matters submitted upon such evidence and information as may be furnished by the parties concerned.

7.

Germany agrees to give the Tribunal all facilities and information required by it for carrying out its investigations.

8.

The language in which the proceedings shall be conducted shall be determined by the Allied or Associated Power concerned.

9.

The place and time for the meetings of each Tribunal shall be determined by the Allied or Associated Power concerned.

ARTICLE 305.

Whenever a competent Tribunal has given or gives a decision in a case covered by Sections III, IV, V or VII, and such decision is inconsistent with the provisions of such Sections, the party who is prejudiced by the decision shall be entitled to obtain redress which shall be fixed by the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal. At the request of the national of an Allied or Associated Power, the redress may, whenever possible, be effected by the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal directing the replacement of the parties in the position occupied by them before the judgment was given by the German Court.

Section VII. Industrial property.

ARTICLE 306.

Subject to the stipulations of the present Treaty, rights of industrial, literary, and artistic property, as such property is defined by the International Conventions of Paris and of Berne, mentioned in Article 286, shall be re-established or restored, as from the coming into force of the present Treaty, in the territories of the High Contracting Parties, in favour of the persons entitled to the benefit of them at the moment when the state of war commenced or their legal representatives. Equally, rights which, except for the war, would have been acquired during the war in consequence of an application made for the protection of industrial property, or the publication of a literary or artistic work, shall be recognised and established in favour of those persons who would have been entitled thereto, from the coming into force of the present Treaty.

Nevertheless, all acts done by virtue of the special measures taken during the war under legislative executive or administrative authority of any Allied or Associated Power in regard to the rights of German nationals in industrial literary or

artistic property shall remain in force and shall continue to maintain their full effect.

No claim shall be made or action brought by Germany or German nationals in respect of the use during the war by the Government of any Allied or Associated Power, or by any persons acting on behalf or with the assent of such Government of any rights in industrial, literary, or artistic property, nor in respect of the sale, offering for sale, or use of any products, articles, or apparatus whatsoever to which such rights applied.

Unless the legislation of any one of the Allied or Associated Powers otherwise directs, sums due or paid in virtue of any act or operation resulting from the execution of the special measures mentioned in paragraph I of this article shall be dealt with in the same way as other sums due to German nationals are directed to be dealt with by the present Treaty; and sums produced by any special measures taken by the German Government in respect of rights in industrial, literary, or artistic property belonging to the nationals of the Allied or Associated Powers shall be considered and treated in the same way as other debts due from German nationals.

Each of the Allied and Associated Powers reserves to itself the right to impose such limitations, conditions, or restrictions on rights of industrial, literary, or artistic property (with the exception of trade-marks) acquired before or during the war, or which may be subsequently acquired in accordance with its legislation, by German nationals, whether by granting licences, or by the working, or by preserving control over their exploitation, or in any other way, as may be considered necessary for national defence, or in the public interest, or for assuring the fair treatment by Germany of the rights of industrial, literary, and artistic property held in German territory by its nationals, or for securing the due fulfilment of all the obligations undertaken by Germany in the present Treaty.

Each of the Allied or Associated Powers reserves the right to treat as void and of no effect any transfer in whole or in part of or other dealing with rights of or in respect of industrial, literary, or artistic property effected after August 1, 1914, or in the future, which would have the result of defeating the objects of the provisions of this article.

The provisions of this article shall not apply to rights in industrial, literary, or artistic property which have been dealt with in the liquidation of businesses or companies under war legislation by the Allied or Associated Powers, or which may be so dealt with by virtue of Article 297 paragraph (*b*).

ARTICLE 307.

A minimum of one year after the coming into force of the present Treaty shall be accorded to the nationals of the High Contracting Parties, without extension fees or other penalty, in order to enable such persons to accomplish any act, fulfil any formality, pay any fees, and generally satisfy any obligation prescribed by the laws or regulations of the respective States relating to the obtaining, preserving, or opposing rights to, or in respect of, industrial property either acquired before the 1st August, 1914, or which, except for the war, might have been acquired since that date as a result of an application made before the war or during its continuance, but nothing in this Article shall give any right to reopen interference proceedings in the United States of America where a final hearing has taken place.

All rights in, or in respect of, such property which may have lapsed by reason of any failure to accomplish any act, fulfil any formality, or make any payment, shall revive, but subject in the case of patents and designs to the imposition of such conditions as each Allied or Associated Power may deem reasonably necessary for the protection of persons who have manufactured or made use of the subject matter of such property while the rights had lapsed. Further, where rights to patents or designs belonging to German nationals are revived under this article, they shall be subject to the same provisions as would have been applicable to them during the war, as well as to all the provisions of the present Treaty.

The period from the 1st August, 1914, until the coming into force of the present Treaty shall be excluded in considering the time within which a patent should be worked or a trade mark or design used, and it is further agreed that no patent, registered trade mark or design in force on the 1st August, 1914, shall be subject to revocation or cancellation by reason only of the failure to work such patent or use such trade mark or design for two years after the coming into force of the present Treaty.

ARTICLE 308.

The rights of priority, provided by Article IV of the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property of Paris, of the 20th March, 1883, revised at Washington in 1911 or by any other Convention or Statute, for the filing or registration of applications for patents or models of utility, and for the registration of trade marks designs and models which had not expired on the 1st August, 1914, and those which have arisen during the war, or would have arisen but for the war, shall be extended by each of the High Contracting Parties in favour of all nationals of the other High Contracting Parties for a period of six months after the coming into force of the present Treaty.

Nevertheless, such extension shall in no way affect the right of any of the High Contracting Parties or of any person who before the coming into force of the present Treaty was *bonâ fide* in possession of any rights of industrial property conflicting with rights applied for by another who claims rights of priority in respect of them, to exercise such rights by itself or himself personally, or by such agents or licensees as derived their rights from it or him before the coming into force of the present Treaty; and such persons shall not be amenable to any action or other process of law in respect of infringement.

ARTICLE 309.

No action shall be brought and no claim made by persons residing or carrying on business within the territories of Germany on the one part and of the Allied or Associated Powers on the other, or persons who are nationals of such Powers respectively, or by any one deriving title during the war from such persons, by reason of any action which has taken place within the territory of the other party between the date of the declaration of war and that of the coming into force of the present Treaty, which might constitute an infringement of the rights of industrial property or rights of literary and artistic property, either existing at any time during the war or revived under the provisions of Articles 307 and 308.

Equally, no action for infringement of industrial, literary or artistic property rights by such persons shall at any time be permissible in respect of the sale or offering for sale for a period of one year after the signature of the present Treaty in the territories of the Allied or Associated Powers on the one hand or Germany on the other, of products or articles manufactured, or of literary or artistic works published, during the period between the declaration of war and the signature of the present Treaty, or against those who have acquired and continue to use them. It is understood, nevertheless, that this provision shall not apply when the possessor of the rights was domiciled or had an industrial or commercial establishment in the districts occupied by Germany during the war.

This Article shall not apply as between the United States of America on the one hand and Germany on the other.

ARTICLE 310.

Licences in respect of industrial, literary, or artistic property concluded before the war between nationals of the Allied or Associated Powers or persons residing in their territory or carrying on business therein, on the one part, and German nationals, on the other part, shall be considered as cancelled as from the date of the declaration of war between Germany and the Allied or Associated Powers. But, in any case, the former beneficiary of a contract of this kind shall have the right, within a period of six months after the coming into force of the present Treaty, to demand from the proprietor of the rights the grant of a new license, the conditions of which, in default of agreement between the parties, shall be fixed by the duly qualified tribunal in the country under whose legislation the rights had been acquired, except in the case of licenses held in respect of rights acquired under German law. In such cases the conditions shall be fixed by the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal referred to in Section VI of this Part. The tribunal may, if necessary, fix also the amount which it may deem just should be paid by reason of the use of the rights during the war.

No licence in respect of industrial, literary, or artistic property, granted under the special war legislation of any Allied or Associated Power, shall be affected by the continued existence of any licence entered into before the war, but shall remain valid and of full effect, and a licence so granted to the former beneficiary of a licence entered into before the war shall be considered as substituted for such licence.

Where sums have been paid during the war by virtue of a licence or agreement concluded before the war in respect of rights of industrial property or for the reproduction or the representation of literary, dramatic, or artistic works, these sums shall be dealt with in the same manner as other debts or credits of German nationals, as provided by the present Treaty.

This Article shall not apply as between the United States of America on the one hand and Germany on the other.

ARTICLE 311.

The inhabitants of territories separated from Germany by virtue of the present Treaty shall, notwithstanding this separation and the change of nationality consequent thereon, continue to enjoy in Germany all the rights in industrial, literary, and artistic property to which they were entitled under German legislation at the time of the separation.

Section XIII. Social and State Insurance in Ceded Territory.

ARTICLE 312.

Without prejudice to the provisions contained in other Articles of the present Treaty the German Government undertakes to transfer to any Power to which German territory in Europe is ceded, and to any Power administering former German territory as a mandatory under Article 22 of Part I (League of Nations), such portion of the reserves accumulated by the Government of the German Empire or of German States, or by public or private organisations under their control, as is attributable to the carrying on of Social or State Insurance in such territory.

The Powers to which these funds are transferred must apply them to the performance of the obligations arising from such insurances.

The conditions of the transfer will be determined by special conventions to be concluded between the German Government and the Governments concerned.

PART XI.

AERIAL NAVIGATION.

ARTICLE 313.

The aircraft of the Allied and Associated Powers shall have full liberty of passage and landing over and in the territory and territorial waters of Germany, and shall enjoy the same privileges as German aircraft, particularly in case of distress by land or sea.

ARTICLE 314.

The aircraft of the Allied and Associated Powers shall, while in transit to any foreign country whatever, enjoy the right of flying over the territory and territorial waters of Germany without landing, subject always to any regulations which may be made by Germany, and which shall be applicable equally to the aircraft of Germany and those of the Allied and Associated countries.

ARTICLE 315.

All aerodromes in Germany open to national public traffic shall be open for the aircraft of the Allied and Associated Powers, and in any such aerodrome such aircraft shall be treated on a footing of equality with German aircraft as regards charges of every description, including charges for landing and accommodation.

ARTICLE 316.

Subject to the present provisions, the rights of passage, transit and landing, provided for in Articles 313, 314 and 315, are subject to the observance of such regulations as Germany may consider it necessary to enact, but such regulations shall be applied without distinction to German aircraft and to the aircraft of Allied and Associated Countries.

ARTICLE 317.

Certificates of nationality, airworthiness, or competency, and licences, issued or recognised as valid by any of the Allied or Associated Powers, shall be recognised in Germany as valid and as equivalent to the certificates and licences issued by Germany.

ARTICLE 318.

As regards internal commercial air traffic, the aircraft of the Allied and Associated Powers shall enjoy in Germany most favoured nation treatment.

ARTICLE 319.

Germany undertakes to enforce the necessary measures to ensure that all German aircraft flying over her territory shall comply with the Rules as to lights and signals, Rules of the Air and Rules for Air Traffic on and in the neighbourhood of aerodromes, which have been laid down in the Convention relative to Aerial Navigation concluded between the Allied and Associated Powers.

ARTICLE 320.

The obligations imposed by the preceding provisions shall remain in force until the 1st January 1923, unless before that date Germany shall have been admitted into the League of Nations or shall have been authorised, by consent of the Allied and Associated Powers, to adhere to the Convention relative to Aerial Navigation concluded between those Powers.

PART XII.

PORTS, WATERWAYS AND RAILWAYS.

Section I. General provisions.

ARTICLE 321.

Germany undertakes to grant freedom of transit through her territories on the routes most convenient for international transit, either by rail, navigable waterway, or canal, to persons, goods, vessels, carriages, wagons and mails coming from or going to the territories of any of the Allied and Associated Powers (whether contiguous or not); for this purpose the crossing of territorial waters shall be allowed. Such persons, goods, vessels, carriages, wagons and mails shall not be subjected to any transit duty or to any undue delays or restrictions, and shall be entitled in Germany to national treatment as regards charges, facilities, and all other matters.

Goods in transit shall be exempt from all Customs or other similar duties.

All charges imposed on transport in transit shall be reasonable, having regard to the conditions of the traffic. No charge, facility or restriction shall depend directly or indirectly on the ownership or on the nationality of the ship or other means of transport on which any part of the through journey has been, or is to be, accomplished.

ARTICLE 322.

Germany undertakes neither to impose nor to maintain any control over transmigration traffic through her territories beyond measures necessary to ensure that passengers are *bona fide* in transit; nor to allow any shipping company or any other private body, corporation or person interested in the traffic to take any part whatever in, or to exercise any direct or indirect influence over, any administrative service that may be necessary for this purpose.

ARTICLE 323.

Germany undertakes to make no discrimination or preference, direct or indirect, in the duties, charges and prohibitions relating to importations into or exportations from her territories, or, subject to the special engagements contained in the present Treaty, in the charges and conditions of transport of goods or persons entering or leaving her territories, based on the frontier crossed; or on the kind, ownership, or flag of the means of transport (including aircraft) employed; or on the original or immediate place of departure of the vessel, wagon or aircraft or other means of transport employed, or its ultimate or intermediate destination; or on the route of or places of transshipment on the journey; or on whether any port through which the goods are imported or exported is a German port or a port belonging to any foreign country or on whether the goods are imported or exported by sea, by land or by air.

Germany particularly undertakes not to establish against the ports and vessels of any of the Allied and Associated Powers any surtax or any direct or indirect bounty for export or import by German ports or vessels, or by those of another Power, for example by means of combined tariffs. She further undertakes that persons or goods passing through a port or using a vessel of any of the Allied and Associated Powers shall not be subjected to any formality or delay whatever to which such persons or goods would not be subjected if they passed through a German port or a port of any other Power, or used a German vessel or a vessel of any other Power.

ARTICLE 324.

All necessary administrative and technical measures shall be taken to shorten, as much as possible, the transmission of goods across the German frontiers and to ensure their forwarding and transport from such frontiers, irrespective of whether such goods are coming from or going to the territories of the Allied and Associated Powers or are in transit from or to those territories, under the same material conditions in such matters as rapidity of carriage and care *en route* as are enjoyed by other goods of the same kind carried on German territory under similar conditions of transport.

In particular, the transport of perishable goods shall be promptly and regularly carried out, and the customs formalities shall be effected in such a way as to allow the goods to be carried straight through by trains which make connection.

ARTICLE 325.

Germany undertakes not to take any measures the effect of which would be to divert traffic of any kind from its normal itinerary for the benefit of her own transport routes.

ARTICLE 326.

The seaports of the Allied and Associated Powers are entitled to all favours and to all reduced tariffs granted on German

railways or navigable waterways for the benefit of German ports or of any port of another Power.

Germany may not refuse to participate in the tariffs or combinations of tariffs intended to secure for ports of any of the Allied and Associated Powers advantages similar to those granted by Germany to her own ports or the ports of any other Power.

Section II. Navigation.

Chapter 1. Freedom of navigation.

ARTICLE 327.

The nationals of any of the Allied and Associated Powers as well as their vessels and property shall enjoy in all German ports and on the inland navigation routes of Germany the same treatment in all respects as German nationals, vessels and property.

In particular the vessels of any one of the Allied or Associated Powers shall be entitled to transport goods of any description, and passengers, to or from any ports or places in German territory to which German vessels may have access, under conditions which shall not be more onerous than those applied in the case of national vessels; they shall be treated on a footing of equality with national vessels as regards port and harbour facilities and charges of every description, including facilities for stationing, loading and unloading, and duties and charges of tonnage, harbour, pilotage, lighthouse, quarantine, and all analagous duties and charges of whatsoever nature, levied in the name of or for the profit of the Government, public functionaries, private individuals, corporations or establishments of any kind.

In the event of Germany granting a preferential regime to any of the Allied or Associated Powers or to any other foreign Power, this regime shall be extended immediately and unconditionally to all the Allied and Associated Powers.

There shall be no impediment to the movement of persons or vessels other than those arising from prescriptions concerning customs, police, sanitation, emigration and immigration, and those relating to the import and export of prohibited goods. Such regulations must be reasonable and uniform and must not impede traffic unnecessarily.

Chapter 2. Free zones in ports.

ARTICLE 328.

The free zones existing in German ports on the 1st August, 1914, shall be maintained. These free zones, and any other free zones which may be established in German territory by the present Treaty, shall be subject to the régime provided for in the following Articles.

Goods entering or leaving a free zone shall not be subjected to any import or export duty, other than those provided for in Article 330.

Vessels and goods entering a free zone may be subjected to the charges established to cover expenses of administration, upkeep and improvement of the port, as well as to the charges for the use of various installations, provided that these charges shall be reasonable having regard to the expenditure incurred, and shall be levied in the conditions of equality provided for in Article 327.

Goods shall not be subjected to any other charge except a statistical duty which shall not exceed 1 per mille *ad valorem*, and which shall be devoted exclusively to defraying the expenses of compiling statements of the traffic in the port.

ARTICLE 329.

The facilities granted for the erection of warehouses, for packing and for unpacking goods, shall be in accordance with trade requirements for the time being. All goods allowed to be consumed in the free zone shall be exempt from duty, whether of excise or of any other description, apart from the statistical duty provided for in Article 328 above.

There shall be no discrimination in regard to any of the provisions of the present article between persons belonging to different nationalities or between goods of different origin or destination.

ARTICLE 330.

Import duties may be levied on goods leaving the free zone for consumption in the country on the territory of which the port is situated. Conversely, export duties may be levied on goods coming from such country and brought into the free zone. These import and export duties shall be levied on the same basis and at the same rates as similar duties levied at the other Customs frontiers of the country concerned. On the other hand, Germany shall not levy, under any denomination, any import, export or transit duty on goods carried by land or water across her territory to or from the free zone from or to any other State.

Germany shall draw up the necessary regulations to secure and guarantee such freedom of transit over such railways and waterways in her territory as normally give access to the free zone.

Chapter III. Clauses relating to the Elbe, the Oder, the Niemen (Russstrom-Memel-Niemen) and the Danube.

(1) General clauses.

ARTICLE 331.

The following rivers are declared international:

the Elbe (*Labe*) from its confluence with the Vltava (*Moldau*), and the Vltava (*Moldau*) from Prague;
the Oder (*Odra*) from its confluence with the Oppa;
the Niemen (*Russstrom-Memel-Niemen*) from Grodno;
the Danube from Ulm;

and all navigable parts of these river systems which naturally provide more than one State with access to the sea, with or without transhipment from one vessel to another; together with lateral canals and channels constructed either to duplicate or to improve naturally navigable sections of the specified river system, or to connect two naturally navigable sections of the same river.

The same shall apply to the Rhine-Danube navigable waterway, should such a waterway be constructed under the conditions laid down in Article 353.

ARTICLE 332.

On the waterways declared to be international in the preceding Article, the nationals, property and flags of all Powers shall be treated on a footing of perfect equality, no distinction being made to the detriment of the nationals, property or flag of any Power between them and the nationals, property or flag of the riparian State itself or of the most favoured nation.

Nevertheless, German vessels shall not be entitled to carry passengers or goods by regular services between the ports of any Allied or Associated Power, without special authority from such Power.

ARTICLE 333.

Where such charges are not precluded by any existing conventions, charges varying on different sections of a river may be levied on vessels using the navigable channels or their approaches, provided that they are intended solely to cover equitably the cost of maintaining in a navigable condition, or of improving, the river and its approaches, or to meet expenditure incurred in the interests of navigation. The schedule of such charges shall be calculated on the basis of such expenditure and shall be posted up in the ports. These charges shall be levied in such a manner as to render any detailed examination of cargoes unnecessary, except in cases of suspected fraud or contravention.

ARTICLE 334.

The transit of vessels, passengers and goods on these waterways shall be effected in accordance with the general conditions prescribed for transit in Section I above.

When the two banks of an international river are within the same State goods in transit may be placed under seal or in the custody of customs agents. When the river forms a frontier goods and passengers in transit shall be exempt from all customs formalities; the loading and unloading of goods, and the embarkation and disembarkation of passengers, shall only take place in the ports specified by the riparian State.

ARTICLE 335.

No dues of any kind other than those provided for in the present Part shall be levied along the course or at the mouth of these rivers.

This provision shall not prevent the fixing by the riparian States of customs, local octroi or consumption duties, or the creation of reasonable and uniform charges levied in the ports, in accordance with public tariffs, for the use of cranes, elevators, quays, warehouses, etc.

ARTICLE 336.

In default of any special organisation for carrying out the works connected with the upkeep and improvement of the international portion of a navigable system, each riparian State shall be bound to take suitable measures to remove any obstacle or danger to navigation and to ensure the maintenance of good conditions of navigation.

If a State neglects to comply with this obligation any riparian State, or any State represented on the International Commission, if there is one, may appeal to the tribunal instituted for this purpose by the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 337.

The same procedure shall be followed in the case of a riparian State undertaking any works of a nature to impede navigation in the international section. The tribunal mentioned

in the preceding article shall be entitled to enforce the suspension or suppression of such works, making due allowance in its decisions for all rights in connection with irrigation, water-power, fisheries, and other national interests, which, with the consent of all the riparian States or of all the States represented on the International Commission, if there is one, shall be given priority over the requirements of navigation.

Appeal to the tribunal of the League of Nations does not require the suspension of the works.

ARTICLE 338.

The régime set out in Articles 332 to 337 above shall be superseded by one to be laid down in a General Convention drawn up by the Allied and Associated Powers, and approved by the League of Nations, relating to the waterways recognised in such Convention as having an international character. This Convention shall apply in particular to the whole or part of the above-mentioned river systems of the Elbe (*Labe*), the Oder (*Odra*), the Niemen (*Russstrom-Memel-Niemen*), and the Danube, and such other parts of these river systems as may be covered by a general definition.

Germany undertakes, in accordance with the provisions of Article 379, to adhere to the said General Convention as well as to all projects prepared in accordance with Article 343 below for the revision of existing international agreements and regulations.

ARTICLE 339.

Germany shall cede to the Allied and Associated Powers concerned, within a maximum period of three months from the date on which notification shall be given her, a proportion of the tugs and vessels remaining registered in the ports of the river systems referred to in Article 331 after the deduction of those surrendered by way of restitution or reparation. Germany shall in the same way cede material of all kinds necessary to the Allied and Associated Powers concerned for the utilisation of those river systems.

The number of the tugs and boats, and the amount of the material so ceded, and their distribution, shall be determined by an arbitrator or arbitrators nominated by the United States of America, due regard being had to the legitimate needs of the parties concerned, and particularly to the shipping traffic during the five years preceding the war.

All craft so ceded shall be provided with their fittings and gear, shall be in a good state of repair and in condition to carry goods, and shall be selected from among those most recently built.

The cessions provided for in the present article shall entail a credit of which the total amount, settled in a lump sum by the arbitrator or arbitrators shall not in any case exceed the value of the capital expended in the initial establishment of the material ceded, and shall be set off against the total sums due from Germany; in consequence, the indemnification of the proprietors shall be a matter for Germany to deal with.

(2) *Special Clauses relating to the Elbe, the Oder and the Niemen (Russstrom-Memel-Niemen).*

ARTICLE 340.

The Elbe (*Labe*) shall be placed under the administration of an International Commission which shall comprise:

4 representatives of the German States bordering on the river;
2 representatives of the Tchecko-Slovak State;
1 representative of Great Britain;
1 representative of France;
1 representative of Italy;
1 representative of Belgium.

Whatever be the number of members present, each delegation shall have the right to record a number of votes equal to the number of representatives allotted to it.

If certain of these representatives cannot be appointed at the time of the coming into force of the present Treaty, the decisions of the Commission shall nevertheless be valid.

ARTICLE 341.

The Oder (*Odra*) shall be placed under the administration of an International Commission, which shall comprise:

1 representative of Poland;
1 representative of Prussia;
1 representative of the Tchecko-Slovak State;
1 representative of Great Britain;
1 representative of France;
1 representative of Denmark;
1 representative of Sweden.

If certain of these representatives cannot be appointed at the time of the coming into force of the present Treaty, the decisions of the Commission shall nevertheless be valid.

ARTICLE 342.

On a request being made to the League of Nations by any riparian State, the Niemen (*Russstrom-Memel-Niemen*) shall be placed under the administration of an International Commission, which shall comprise one representative of each riparian State, and three representatives of other States specified by the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 343.

The International Commissions referred to in Articles 340 and 341 shall meet within three months of the date of the coming into force of the present Treaty. The International Commission referred to in Article 342 shall meet within three months from the date of the request made by a riparian State. Each of these Commissions shall proceed immediately to prepare a project for the revision of the existing international agreements and regulations, drawn up in conformity with the General Convention referred to in Article 338, should such Convention have been already concluded. In the absence of such Convention, the project for revision shall be in conformity with the principles of Articles 332 to 337 above.

ARTICLE 344.

The projects referred to in the preceding Article shall, *inter alia:*

(*a*) designate the headquarters of the International Commission, and prescribe the manner in which its President is to be nominated;

(*b*) specify the extent of the Commission's powers, particularly in regard to the execution of works of maintenance, control, and improvement on the river system, the financial régime, the fixing and collection of charges, and regulations for navigation;

(*c*) define the sections of the river or its tributaries to which the international régime shall be applied.

ARTICLE 345.

The international agreements and regulations at present governing the navigation of the Elbe (*Labe*), the Oder (*Odra*), and the Niemen (*Russstrom-Memel-Niemen*) shall be provisionally maintained in force until the ratification of the above-mentioned projects. Nevertheless, in all cases where such agreements and regulations in force are in conflict with the provisions of Articles 332 to 337 above, or of the General Convention to be concluded, the latter provisions shall prevail.

(3) *Special Clauses relating to the Danube.*

ARTICLE 346.

The European Commission of the Danube reassumes the powers it possessed before the war. Nevertheless, as a provisional measure, only representatives of Great Britain, France, Italy and Roumania shall constitute this Commission.

ARTICLE 347.

From the point where the competence of the European Commission ceases, the Danube system referred to in Article 331 shall be placed under the administration of an International Commission composed as follows:

2 representatives of German riparian States;
1 representative of each other riparian State;
1 representative of each non-riparian State represented in the future on the European Commission of the Danube.

If certain of these representatives cannot be appointed at the time of the coming into force of the present Treaty, the decisions of the Commission shall nevertheless be valid.

ARTICLE 348.

The International Commission provided for in the preceding Article shall meet as soon as possible after the coming into force of the present Treaty, and shall undertake provisionally the administration of the river in conformity with the provisions of Articles 332 to 337, until such time as a definitive statute regarding the Danube is concluded by the Powers nominated by the Allied and Associated Powers.

ARTICLE 349.

Germany agrees to accept the regime which shall be laid down for the Danube by a Conference of the Powers nominated by the Allied and Associated Powers, which shall meet within one year after the coming into force of the present Treaty.

ARTICLE 350.

The mandate given by Article 57 of the Treaty of Berlin of the 13th July, 1878, to Austria-Hungary, and transferred by her to Hungary, to carry out works at the Iron Gates, is abrogated. The Commission entrusted with the administration of this part of the river shall lay down provisions for the settle-

ment of accounts subject to the financial provisions of the present Treaty. Charges which may be necessary shall in no case be levied by Hungary.

ARTICLE 351.

Should the Tchecko-Slovak State, the Serb-Croat-Slovene State or Roumania, with the authorisation of or under mandate from the International Commission, undertake maintenance, improvement, weir, or other works on a part of the river system which forms a frontier, these States shall enjoy on the opposite bank, and also on the part of the bed which is outside their territory, all necessary facilities for the survey, execution and maintenance of such works.

ARTICLE 352.

Germany shall be obliged to make to the European Commission of the Danube all restitutions, reparations and indemnities for damages inflicted on the Commission during the war.

ARTICLE 353.

In the event of all the Allied and Associated Powers represented on the Central Commission for the Rhine and on the International Commission charged with the administration of the Upper Danube respectively deciding within 25 years from the coming into force of the present Treaty upon the creation of a deep-draught Rhine-Danube navigable waterway, Germany shall be bound to construct such waterway in accordance with plans to be communicated to her by the said Powers.

For this purpose the Central Commission for the Rhine shall have the right to undertake all necessary surveys.

Should Germany fail to carry out all or part of the works, the Central Commission for the Rhine shall be entitled to carry them out instead.

For this purpose the Commission shall be qualified to decide upon and fix the limits of the necessary sites and to occupy the ground after a period of 2 months after notification, subject to the payment of indemnities to be fixed by the Commission and paid by Germany.

This navigable waterway shall be placed under the same administrative régime as the Rhine itself, and the distribution of the initial cost of construction, including the above indemnities, among the States concerned, shall be made by a tribunal to be appointed by the Council of the League of Nations.

Chapter IV. Clauses relating to the Rhine and the Moselle.

ARTICLE 354.

As from the coming into force of the present Treaty, the Convention of Mannheim of 17th October, 1868, together with the Final Protocol thereof, shall continue to govern navigation on the Rhine, subject to the conditions hereinafter laid down.

In the event of any provisions of the said Convention being in conflict with those laid down by the General Convention referred to in Article 338 (which shall apply to the Rhine) the provisions of the General Convention shall prevail.

Within a maximum period of six months from the coming into force of the present Treaty, the Central Commission referred to in Article 355 shall meet to draw up a project of revision of the Convention of Mannheim. This project shall be drawn up in harmony with the provisions of the General Convention referred to above, should this have been concluded by that time, and shall be submitted to the Powers represented on the Central Commission. Germany hereby agrees to adhere to the project so drawn up.

Further, the modifications set out in the following articles shall immediately be made in the Convention of Mannheim.

The Allied and Associated Powers reserve to themselves the right to arrive at an understanding in this connection with Holland, and Germany hereby agrees to acceed if required to any such understanding.

ARTICLE 355.

The Central Commission provided for in the Convention of Mannheim shall consist of nineteen members, viz.:

Two representatives of the Netherlands;

Two representatives of Switzerland;

Four representatives of German riparian States;

Four representatives of France, which in addition shall appoint the President of the Commission;

Two representatives of Great Britain;

Two representatives of Italy;

Two representatives of Belgium.

The headquarters of the Central Commission shall be at Strasburg.

Whatever be the number of members present, each Delegation shall have the right to record a number of votes equal to the number of representatives allotted to it.

If certain of these representatives cannot be appointed at the time of the coming into force of the present Treaty, the decisions of the Commission shall nevertheless be valid.

ARTICLE 356.

Vessels of all nations, and their cargoes, shall have the same rights and privileges as those which are granted to vessels belonging to the Rhine navigation, and to their cargoes.

None of the provisions contained in Articles 15 to 20 and 26 of the above-mentioned Convention of Mannheim, in Article 4 of the Final Protocol thereof, or in later Conventions, shall impede the free navigation of vessels and crews of all nations on the Rhine and on waterways to which such Conventions apply, subject to compliance with the regulations concerning pilotage and other police measures drawn up by the Central Commission.

The provisions of Article 22 of the Convention of Mannheim and of Article 5 of the Final Protocol thereof shall be applied only to vessels registered on the Rhine. The Central Commission shall decide on the steps to be taken to ensure that other vessels satisfy the conditions of the general regulations applying to navigation on the Rhine.

ARTICLE 357.

Within a maximum period of three months from the date on which notification shall be given Germany shall cede to France tugs and vessels, from among those remaining registered in German Rhine ports after the deduction of those surrendered by way of restitution or reparation, or shares in German Rhine navigation companies.

When vessels and tugs are ceded, such vessels and tugs, together with their fittings and gear, shall be in good state of repair, shall be in condition to carry on commercial traffic on the Rhine, and shall be selected from among those most recently built.

The same procedure shall be followed in the matter of the cession by Germany to France of—

(1) the installations, berthing and anchorage accommodation, platforms, docks, warehouses, plant, etc., which German subjects or German companies owned on the 1st August, 1914, in the port of Rotterdam, and

(2) the shares or interests which Germany or German nationals possessed in such installations at the same date.

The amount and specifications of such cessions shall be determined within one year of the coming into force of the present Treaty by an arbitrator or arbitrators appointed by the United States of America, due regard being had to the legitimate needs of the parties concerned.

The cessions provided for in the present article shall entail a credit of which the total amount, settled in a lump sum by the arbitrator or arbitrators mentioned above, shall not in any case exceed the value of the capital expended in the initial establishment of the ceded material and installations, and shall be set off against the total sums due from Germany; in consequence, the indemnification of the proprietors shall be a matter for Germany to deal with.

ARTICLE 358.

Subject to the obligation to comply with the provisions of the Convention of Mannheim or of the Convention which may be substituted therefor, and to the stipulations of the present Treaty, France shall have on the whole course of the Rhine included between the two extreme points of the French frontiers—

(*a*) the right to take water from the Rhine to feed navigation and irrigation canals (constructed or to be constructed) or for any other purpose, and to execute on the German bank all works necessary for the exercise of this right;

(*b*) the exclusive right to the power derived from works of regulation on the river, subject to the payment to Germany of the value of half the power actually produced, this payment, which will take into account the cost of the works necessary for producing the power, being made either in money or in power and in default of agreement being determined by arbitration. For this purpose France alone shall have the right to carry out in this part of the river all works of regulation (weirs or other works) which she may consider necessary for the production of power. Similarly, the right of taking water from the Rhine is accorded to Belgium to feed the Rhine-Meuse canal provided for below.

The exercise of the rights mentioned under (*a*) and (*b*) of the present Article shall not interfere with navigability nor reduce the facilities for navigation, either in the bed of the

Rhine or in the derivations which may be substituted therefor, nor shall it involve any increase in the tolls formerly levied under the Convention in force. All proposed schemes shall be laid before the Central Commission in order that that Commission may assure itself that these conditions are complied with.

To ensure the proper and faithful execution of the provisions contained in (*a*) and (*b*) above, Germany:

(i) binds herself not to undertake or to allow the construction of any lateral canal or any derivation on the right bank of the river opposite the French frontiers;

(ii) recognises the possession by France of the right of support on and the right of way over all lands situated on the right bank which may be required in order to survey, to build, and to operate weirs which France, with the consent of the Central Commission, may subsequently decide to establish. In accordance with such consent, France shall be entitled to decide upon and fix the limits of the necessary sites, and she shall be permitted to occupy such lands after a period of two months after simple notification, subject to the payment by her to Germany of indemnities of which the total amount shall be fixed by the Central Commission. Germany shall make it her business to indemnify the proprietors whose property will be burdened with such servitudes or permanently occupied by the works.

Should Switzerland so demand, and if the Central Commission approves, the same rights shall be accorded to Switzerland for the part of the river forming her frontier with other riparian States;

(iii) shall hand over to the French Government, during the month following the coming into force of the present Treaty, all projects, designs, drafts of concessions and of specifications concerning the regulation of the Rhine for any purpose whatever which have been drawn up or received by the Governments of Alsace-Lorraine or of the Grand Duchy of Baden.

ARTICLE 359.

Subject to the preceding provisions, no works shall be carried out in the bed or on either bank of the Rhine where it forms the boundary of France and Germany without the previous approval of the Central Commission or of its agents.

ARTICLE 360.

France reserves the option of substituting herself as regards the rights and obligations resulting from agreements arrived at between the Government of Alsace-Lorraine and the Grand Duchy of Baden concerning the works to be carried out on the Rhine; she may also denounce such agreements within a term of five years dating from the coming into force of the present Treaty.

France shall also have the option of causing works to be carried out which may be recognised as necessary by the Central Commission for the upkeep or improvement of the navigability of the Rhine above Mannheim.

ARTICLE 361.

Should Belgium, within a period of 25 years from the coming into force of the present Treaty decide to create a deep-draught Rhine-Meuse navigable waterway, in the region of Ruhrort, Germany shall be bound to construct, in accordance with plans to be communicated to her by the Belgian Government, after agreement with the Central Commission, the portion of this navigable waterway situated within her territory.

The Belgian Government shall, for this purpose, have the right to carry out on the ground all necessary surveys.

Should Germany fail to carry out all or part of these works, the Central Commission shall be entitled to carry them out instead; and, for this purpose, the Commission may decide upon and fix the limits of the necessary sites and occupy the ground after a period of two months after simple notification, subject to the payment of indemnities to be fixed by it and paid by Germany.

This navigable waterway shall be placed under the same administrative regime as the Rhine itself, and the division of the cost of initial construction, includng the above indemnities, among the States crossed thereby shall be made by the Central Commission.

ARTICLE 362.

Germany hereby agrees to offer no objection to any proposals of the Central Rhine Commission for extending its jurisdiction:

(1) to the Moselle below the Franco-Luxemburg frontier down to the Rhine, subject to the consent of Luxemburg;

(2) to the Rhine above Basle up to the Lake of Constance, subject to the consent of Switzerland;

(3) to the lateral canals and channels which may be established either to duplicate or to improve naturally navigable sections of the Rhine or the Moselle, or to connect two naturally navigable sections of these rivers, and also any other parts of the Rhine river system which may be covered by the General Convention provided for in Article 338 above.

Chapter V. Clauses giving to the Tchecko-Slovak State the use of northern ports.

ARTICLE 363.

In the ports of Hamburg and Stettin Germany shall lease to the Tchecko-Slovak State, for a period of 99 years, areas which shall be placed under the general régime of free zones and shall be used for the direct transit of goods coming from or going to that State.

ARTICLE 364.

The delimitation of these areas, and their equipment, their exploitation, and in general all conditions for their utilisation, including the amount of the rental, shall be decided by a Commision consisting of one delegate of Germany, one delegate of the Tchecko-Slovak State and one delegate of Great Britain. These conditions shall be susceptible of revision every ten years in the same manner.

Germany declares in advance that she will adhere to the decisions so taken.

Section III. Railways.

Chapter I. Clauses relating to international transport.

ARTICLE 365.

Goods coming from the territories of the Allied and Associated Powers, and going to Germany, or in transit through Germany from or to the territories of the Allied and Associated Powers, shall enjoy on the German railways as regards charges to be collected (rebates and drawbacks being taken into account), facilities, and all other matters, the most favourable treatment applied to goods of the same kind carried on any German lines, either in internal traffic, or for export, import or in transit, under similar conditions of transport, for example as regards length of route. The same rule shall be applied, on the request of one or more of the Allied and Associated Powers, to goods specially designated by such Power or Powers coming from Germany and going to their territories.

International tariffs established in accordance with the rates referred to in the preceding paragraph and involving through way-bills shall be established when one of the Allied and Associated Powers shall require it from Germany.

ARTICLE 366.

From the coming into force of the present Treaty the High Contracting Parties shall renew, in so far as concerns them and under the reserves indicated in the second paragraph of the present Article, the conventions and arrangements signed at Berne on the 14th October, 1890, the 20th September, 1893, the 16th July, 1895, the 16th June, 1898, and the 19th September, 1906, regarding the transportation of goods by rail.

If within five years from the date of the coming into force of the present Treaty a new convention for the transportation of passengers, luggage and goods by rail shall have been concluded to replace the Berne Convention of the 14th October 1890 and the subsequent additions referred to above, this new convention and the supplementary provisions for international transport by rail which may be based on it shall bind Germany, even if she shall have refused to take part in the preparation of the convention or to subscribe to it. Until a new convention shall have been concluded, Germany shall conform to the provisions of the Berne Convention and the subsequent additions referred to above, and to the current supplementary provisions.

ARTICLE 367.

Germany shall be bound to co-operate in the establishment of through ticket services (for passengers and their luggage) which shall be required by any of the Allied and Associated Powers to ensure their communication by rail with each other and with all other countries by transit across the territories of Germany; in particular Germany shall, for this purpose, accept trains and carriages coming from the territories of the Allied and Associated Powers and shall forward them with a speed at least equal to that of her best long-distance trains on the same lines. The rates applicable to such through services shall not in any case be higher than the rates collected on German internal services for the same distance, under the same conditions of speed and comfort.

The tariffs applicable under the same conditions of speed and comfort to the transportation of emigrants going to or coming from ports of the Allied and Associated Powers and using the German railways, shall not be at a higher kilometric rate than the most favourable tariffs (drawbacks and rebates being taken into account) enjoyed on the said railways by emigrants going to or coming from any other ports.

ARTICLE 368.

Germany shall not apply specially to such through services, or to the transportation of emigrants going to or coming from the ports of the Allied and Associated Powers, any technical, fiscal or administrative measures, such as measures of customs examination, general police, sanitary police, and control, the result of which would be to impede or delay such services.

ARTICLE 369.

In case of transport partly by rail and partly by internal navigation, with or without through way-bill, the preceding Articles shall apply to the part of the journey performed by rail.

Chapter II. Rolling-stock.

ARTICLE 370.

Germany undertakes that German wagons shall be fitted with apparatus allowing:

(1) of their inclusion in goods trains on the lines of such of the Allied and Associated Powers as are parties to the Berne Convention of May 15, 1886, as modified on May 18, 1907, without hampering the action of the continuous brake which may be adopted in such countries within ten years of the coming into force of the present Treaty, and

(2) of the acceptance of wagons of such countries in all goods trains on the German lines.

The rolling stock of the Allied and Associated Powers shall enjoy on the German lines the same treatment as German rolling stock as regards movement, upkeep and repairs.

Chapter III. Cessions of railway lines.

ARTICLE 371.

Subject to any special provisions concerning the cession of ports, waterways and railways situated in the territories over which Germany abandons her sovereignty, and to the financial conditions relating to the concessionnaires and the pensioning of the personnel, the cession of railways will take place under the followig conditions:

1. The works and installations of all the railroads shall be handed over complete and in good condition.

2. When a railway system possessing its own rolling-stock is handed over in its entirety by Germany to one of the Allied and Associated Powers, such stock shall be handed over complete, in accordance with the last inventory before November 11th, 1918, and in a normal state of upkeep.

3. As regards lines without any special rolling-stock, Commissions of experts designated by the Allied and Associated Powers, on which Germany shall be represented, shall fix the proportion of the stock existing on the system to which those lines belong to be handed over. These Commissions shall have regard to the amount of the material registered on these lines in the last inventory before November 11th, 1918, the length of track (sidings included), and the nature and amount of traffic. These Commissions shall also specify the locomotives, carriages and wagons to be handed over in each case; they shall decide upon the conditions of their acceptance, and shall make the provisional arrangements necessary to ensure their repair in German workshops.

4. Stocks of stores, fittings and plant shall be handed over under the same conditions as the rolling-stock.

The provisions of paragraphs 3 and 4 above shall be applied to the lines of former Russian Poland converted by Germany to the German gauge, such lines being regarded as detached from the Prussian State System.

Chapter IV. Provisions relating to certain railway lines.

ARTICLE 372.

When as a result of the fixing of new frontiers a railway connection between two parts of the same country crosses another country, or a branch line from one country has its terminus in another, the conditions of working, if not specifically provided for in the present Treaty, shall be laid down in a convention between the railway administrations concerned. If the administrations cannot come to an agreement as to the terms of such convention, the points of difference shall be decided by commissions of experts composed as provided in the preceding Article.

ARTICLE 373.

In the absence of any special agreements, Germany shall be bound, within a period of 25 years from the coming into force of the present Treaty, to allow, on the request of one of the Allied and Associated Powers made with the consent of the League of Nations, and accompanied by an undertaking to defray the initial cost, the construction or improvement on her territory of lines and connections which may be needed for the establishment of good through services or for the improvement of communication between the territory of the Power making the request and that of any other Power.

Nevertheless, it may be stipulated by particular provisions of the present Treaty, or of supplementary agreements, that, in the case of the construction or improvement of certain specified lines, the initial cost shall be divided among the Powers concerned in proportion to the advantages derived by them. Such division, in default of agreement between the Powers concerned, shall be made by an arbitrator appointed by the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 374.

Germany undertakes to accept, within ten years of the coming into force of the present Treaty, on request being made by the Swiss Government after agreement with the Italian Government, the denunciation of the International Convention of the 13th October 1909 relative to the St. Gothard railway. In the absence of agreement as to the conditions of such denunciation, Germany hereby agrees to accept the decision of an arbitrator designated by the United States of America.

Chapter V. Transitory provisions.

ARTICLE 375.

Germany shall carry out the instructions given her, in regard to transport, by an authorised body acting on behalf of the Allied and Associated Powers:

1. For the carriage of troops under the provisions of the present Treaty, and of material, ammunition and supplies for army use,

2. As a temporary measure, for the transportation of supplies for certain regions, as well as for the restoration, as rapidly as possible, of the normal conditions of transport, and for the organization of postal and telegraphic services.

Section IV. Disputes and revision of permanent clauses.

ARTICLE 376.

Disputes which may arise between interested Powers with regard to the interpretation and application of the preceding articles shall be settled as provided by the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 377.

At any time the League of Nations may recommend the revision of such of these Articles as relate to a permanent administrative régime.

ARTICLE 378.

The stipulations in Articles 321 to 330, 332, 365, and 367 to 369 shall be subject to revision by the Council of the League of Nations at any time after five years from the coming into force of the present Treaty.

Failing such revision, no Allied or Associated Power can claim after the expiration of the above period of five years the benefit of any of the stipulations in the Articles enumerated above on behalf of any portion of its territories in which reciprocity is not accorded in respect of such stipulations. The period of five years during which reciprocity cannot be demanded may be prolonged by the Council of the League of Nations.

Section V. Special provision.

ARTICLE 379.

Without prejudice to the special obligations imposed on her by the present Treaty for the benefit of the Allied and Associated Powers, Germany undertakes to adhere to any General Conventions regarding the international régime of transit, waterways, ports or railways which may be concluded by the Allied and Associated Powers, with the approval of the League of Nations, within five years of the coming into force of the present Treaty.

Section VI. Clauses relating to the Kiel Canal.

ARTICLE 380.

The Kiel Canal and its approaches shall be maintained free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations at peace with Germany on terms of entire equality.

ARTICLE 381.

The nationals, property and vessels of all Powers shall, in respect of charges, facilities, and in all other respects, be treated on a footing of perfect equality in the use of the Canal, no distinction being made to the detriment of nationals, property and vessels of any Power between them and the nationals, property and vessels of Germany or of the most favoured nation.

No impediment shall be placed on the movement of persons or vessels other than those arising out of police, customs, sanitary, emigration or immigration regulations and those relating to the import or export of prohibited goods. Such regulations must be reasonable and uniform and must not unnecessarily impede traffic.

ARTICLE 382.

Only such charges may be levied on vessels using the Canal or its approaches as are intended to cover in an equitable manner the cost of maintaining in a navigable condition, or of improving, the Canal or its approaches, or to meet expenses incurred in the interests of navigation. The schedule of such charges shall be calculated on the basis of such expenses, and shall be posted up in the ports.

These charges shall be levied in such a manner as to render any detailed examination of cargoes unnecessary, except in the case of suspected fraud or contravention.

ARTICLE 383.

Goods in transit may be placed under seal or in the custody of customs agents; the loading and unloading of goods, and the embarkation and disembarkation of passengers, shall only take place in the ports specified by Germany.

ARTICLE 384.

No charges of any kind other than those provided for in the present Treaty shall be levied along the course or at the approaches of the Kiel Canal.

ARTICLE 385.

Germany shall be bound to take suitable measures to remove any obstacle or danger to navigation, and to ensure the maintenance of good conditions of navigation. She shall not undertake any works of a nature to impede navigation on the Canal or its approaches.

ARTICLE 386.

In the event of violation of any of the conditions of Articles 380 to 386, or of disputes as to the interpretation of these Articles, any interested Power can appeal to the jurisdiction instituted for the purpose by the League of Nations, and can demand the formation of an International Commission.

In order to avoid reference of small questions to the League of Nations, Germany will establish a local authority at Kiel qualified to deal with disputes in the first instance and to give satisfaction so far as possible to complaints which may be presented through the consular representatives of the interested powers.

PART XIII.

LABOUR.

Section I. Organisation of labour.

Whereas the League of Nations has for its object the establishment of universal peace, and such a peace can be established only if it is based upon social justice;

And whereas conditions of labour exist involving such injustice, hardship and privation to large numbers of people as to produce unrest so great that the peace and harmony of the world are imperilled; and an improvement of those conditions is urgently required: as, for example, by the regulations of the hours of work, including the establishment of a maximum working day and week, the regulation of the labour supply, the prevention of unemployment, the provision of an adequate living wage, the protection of the worker against sickness, disease and injury arising out of his employment, the protection of children, young persons and women, provision for old age and injury, protection of the interests of workers when employed in countries other than their own, recognition of the principle of freedom of association, the organisation of vocational and technical education and other measures;

Whereas also the failure of any nation to adopt humane conditions of labour is an obstacle in the way of other nations which desire to improve the conditions in their own countries;

The HIGH CONTRACTING PARTIES, moved by sentiments of justice and humanity as well as by the desire to secure the permanent peace of the world, agree to the following:

Chapter I. Organisation.

ARTICLE 387.

A permanent organisation is hereby established for the promotion of the objects set forth in the Preamble.

The original Members of the League of Nations shall be the original Members of this organisation, and hereafter membership of the League of Nations shall carry with it membership of the said organisation.

ARTICLE 388.

The permanent organisation shall consist of:

(i) a General Conference of Representatives of the Members and,

(ii) an International Labour Office controlled by the Governing Body described in Article 393.

ARTICLE 389.

The meetings of the General Conference of Representatives of the Members shall be held from time to time as occasion may require, and at least once in every year. It shall be composed of four Representatives of each of the Members, of whom two shall be Government Delegates and the two others shall be Delegates representing respectively the employers and the workpeople of each of the Members.

Each Delegate may be accompanied by advisers, who shall not exceed two in number for each item on the agenda of the meeting. When questions specially affecting women are to be considered by the Conference, one at least of the advisers should be a woman.

The Members undertake to nominate non-Government Delegates and advisers chosen in agreement with the industrial organisations, if such organisations exist, which are most representative of employers or workpeople, as the case may be, in their respective countries.

Advisers shall not speak except on a request made by the Delegate whom they accompany and by special authorization of the President of the Conference, and may not vote.

A Delegate may by notice in writing addressed to the President appoint one of his advisers to act as his deputy, and the adviser, while so acting, shall be allowed to speak and vote.

The names of the Delegates and their advisers will be communicated to the International Labour Office by the Government of each of the Members.

The credentials of Delegates and their advisers shall be subject to scrutiny by the Conference, which may, by two-thirds of the votes cast by the Delegates present, refuse to admit any Delegate or adviser whom it deems not to have been nominated in accordance with this Article.

ARTICLE 390.

Every Delegate shall be entitled to vote individually on all matters which are taken into consideration by the Conference.

If one of the Members fails to nominate one of the non-Government Delegates whom it is entitled to nominate, the other non-Government Delegate shall be allowed to sit and speak at the conference, but not to vote.

If in accordance with Article 389 the Conference refuses admission to a Delegate of one of the Members, the provisions of the present Article shall apply as if that Delegate had not been nominated.

ARTICLE 391.

The meetings of the Conference shall be held at the seat of the League of Nations, or at such other place as may be decided by the Conference at a previous meeting by two-thirds of the votes cast by the Delegates present.

ARTICLE 392.

The International Labour Office shall be established at the seat of the League of Nations as part of the organisation of the League.

ARTICLE 393.

The International Labour Office shall be under the control of a Governing Body consisting of twenty-four persons, appointed in accordance with the following provisions:

The Governing Body of the International Labour Office shall be constituted as follows:—

Twelve persons representing the Governments;

Six persons elected by the Delegates to the Conference representing the employers;

Six persons elected by the Delegates to the Conference representing the workers.

Of the twelve persons representing the Governments eight shall be nominated by the Members which are of the chief industrial importance, and four shall be nominated by the Members selected for the purpose by the Government Delegates to the Conference, excluding the Delegates of the eight Members mentioned above.

Any question as to which are the Members of the chief industrial importance shall be decided by the Council of the League of Nations.

The period of office of the Members of the Governing Body will be three years. The method of filling vacancies and other similar questions may be determined by the Governing Body subject to the approval of the Conference.

The Governing Body shall, from time to time, elect one of its members to act as its Chairman, shall regulate its own procedure and shall fix its own times of meeting. A special meeting shall be held if a written request to that effect is made by at least ten members of the Governing Body.

ARTICLE 394.

There shall be a Director of the International Labour Office, who shall be appointed by the Governing Body, and, subject to the instructions of the Governing Body, shall be responsible for the efficient conduct of the International Labour Office and for such other duties as may be assigned to him.

The Director or his deputy shall attend all meetings of the Governing Body.

ARTICLE 395.

The staff of the International Labour Office shall be appointed by the Director, who shall, so far as is possible with due regard to the efficiency of the work of the Office, select persons of different nationalities. A certain number of these persons shall be women.

ARTICLE 396.

The functions of the International Labour Office shall include the collection and distribution of information on all subjects relating to the international adjustment of conditions of industrial life and labour, and particularly the examination of subjects which it is proposed to bring before the Conference with a view to the conclusion of international conventions, and the conduct of such special investigations as may be ordered by the Conference.

It will prepare the agenda for the meetings of the Conference.

It will carry out the duties required of it by the provisions of this Part of the present Treaty in connection with international disputes.

It will edit and publish in French and English, and in such other languages as the Governing Body may think desirable, a periodical paper dealing with problems of industry and employment of international interest.

Generally, in addition to the functions set out in this Article, it shall have such other powers and duties as may be assigned to it by the Conference.

ARTICLE 397.

The Government Departments of any of the Members which deal with questions of industry and employment may communicate directly with the Director through the Representative of their Government on the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, or failing any such Representative, through such other qualified official as the Government may nominate for the purpose.

ARTICLE 398.

The International Labour Office shall be entitled to the assistance of the Secretary-General of the League of Nations in any matter in which it can be given.

ARTICLE 399.

Each of the Members will pay the travelling and subsistence expenses of its Delegates and their advisers and of its Representatives attending the meetings of the Conference or Governing Body, as the case may be.

All the other expenses of the International Labour Office and of the meetings of the Conference or Governing Body shall be paid to the Director by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations out of the general funds of the League.

The Director shall be responsible to the Secretary-General of the League for the proper expenditure of all moneys paid to him in pursuance of this Article.

Chapter II. Procedure.

ARTICLE 400.

The agenda for all meetings of the Conference will be settled by the Governing Body, who shall consider any suggestion as to the agenda that may be made by the Government of any of the Members or by any representative organisation recognised for the purpose of Article 389.

ARTICLE 401.

The Director shall act as the Secretary of the Conference, and shall transmit the agenda so as to reach the Members four months before the meeting of the Conference, and, through them, the non-Government Delegates when appointed.

ARTICLE 402.

Any of the Governments of the Members may formally object to the inclusion of any item or items in the agenda. The grounds for such objection shall be set forth in a reasoned statement addressed to the Director, who shall circulate it to all the Members of the Permanent Organisation.

Items to which such objection has been made shall not, however, be excluded from the agenda, if at the Conference a majority of two-thirds of the votes cast by the Delegates present is in favour of considering them.

If the Conference decides (otherwise than under the preceding paragraph) by two-thirds of the votes cast by the Delegates present that any subject shall be considered by the Conference, that subject shall be included in the agenda for the following meeting.

ARTICLE 403.

The Conference shall regulate its own procedure, shall elect its own President, and may appoint committees to consider and report on any matter.

Except as otherwise expressly provided in this Part of the present Treaty, all matters shall be decided by a simple majority of the votes cast by the Delegates present.

The voting is void unless the total number of votes cast is equal to half the number of the Delegates attending the Conference.

ARTICLE 404.

The Conference may add to any committees which it appoints technical experts, who shall be assessors without power to vote.

ARTICLE 405.

When the Conference has decided on the adoption of proposals with regard to an item in the agenda, it will rest with the Conference to determine whether these proposals should take the form: (*a*) of a recommendation to be submitted to the Members for consideration with a view to effect being given to it by national legislation or otherwise, or (*b*) of a draft international convention for ratification by the Members.

In either case a majority of two-thirds of the votes cast by the Delegates present shall be necessary on the final vote for the adoption of the recommendation or draft convention, as the case may be, by the Conference.

In framing any recommendation or draft convention of general application the Conference shall have due regard to those countries in which climatic conditions, the imperfect development of industrial organisation or other special circumstances make the industrial conditions substantially different and shall suggest the modifications, if any, which it considers may be required to meet the case of such countries.

A copy of the recommendation or draft convention shall be authenticated by the signature of the President of the Conference and of the Director and shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. The Secretary-General will communicate a certified copy of the recommendation or draft convention to each of the Members.

Each of the Members undertakes that it will, within the period of one year at most from the closing of the session of the Conference, or if it is impossible owing to exceptional circumstances to do so within the period of one year, then at the earliest practicable moment and in no case later than eighteen months from the closing of the session of the Conference, bring the recommendation or draft convention before the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies, for the enactment of legislation or other action.

In the case of a recommendation, the Members will inform the Secretary-General of the action taken.

In the case of a draft convention, the Member will, if it obtains the consent of the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies, communicate the formal ratification of the convention to the Secretary-General and will take such action as may be necessary to make effective the provisions of such convention.

If on a recommendation no legislative or other action is taken to make a recommendation effective, or if the draft convention fails to obtain the consent of the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies, no further obligation shall rest upon the Member.

In the case of a federal State, the power of which to enter into conventions on labour matters is subject to limitations, it shall be in the discretion of that Government to treat a draft convention to which such limitations apply as a recommendation only, and the provisions of this article with respect to recommendations shall apply in such case.

The above Article shall be interpreted in accordance with the following principle:

In no case shall any Member be asked or required, as a result of the adoption of any recommendation or draft convention by the Conference, to lessen the protection afforded by its existing legislation to the workers concerned.

ARTICLE 406.

Any convention so ratified shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, but shall only be binding upon the Members which ratify it.

ARTICLE 407.

If any convention coming before the Conference for final consideration fails to secure the support of two-thirds of the votes cast by the Delegates present, it shall nevertheless be within the right of any of the Members of the Permanent Organisation to agree to such convention among themselves.

Any convention so agreed to shall be communicated by the Governments concerned to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall register it.

ARTICLE 408.

Each of the Members agrees to make an annual report to the International Labour Office on the measures which it has taken to give effect to the provisions of conventions to which it is a party. These reports shall be made in such form and shall contain such particulars as the Governing Body may request. The Director shall lay a summary of these reports before the next meeting of the Conference.

ARTICLE 409.

In the event of any representation being made to the International Labour Office by an industrial association of employers or of workers that any of the Members has failed to secure in any respect the effective observance within its jurisdiction of any convention to which it is a party, the Governing Body may communicate this representation to the Government against which it is made and may invite that Government to make such statement on the subject as it may think fit.

ARTICLE 410.

If no statement is received within a reasonable time from the Government in question, or if the statement when received is not deemed to be satisfactory by the Governing Body, the latter shall have the right to publish the representation and the statement, if any, made in reply to it.

ARTICLE 411.

Any of the Members shall have the right to file a complaint with the International Labour Office if it is not satisfied that any other Member is securing the effective observance of any convention which both have ratified in accordance with the foregoing articles.

The Governing Body may, if it thinks fit, before referring such a complaint to a Commission of Enquiry, as hereinafter provided for, communicate with the Government in question in the manner described in Article 409.

If the Governing Body does not think it necessary to communicate the complaint to the Government in question, or if, when they have made such communication, no statement in reply has been received within a reasonable time which the Governing Body considers to be satisfactory, the Governing Body may apply for the appointment of a Commission of Enquiry to consider the complaint and to report thereon.

The Governing Body may adopt the same procedure either of its own motion or on receipt of a complaint from a Delegate to the Conference.

When any matter arising out of Articles 410 or 411 is being considered by the Governing Body, the Government in question shall, if not already represented thereon, be entitled to send a representative to take part in the proceedings of the Governing Body while the matter is under consideration. Adequate notice of the date on which the matter will be considered shall be given to the Government in question.

ARTICLE 412.

The Commission of Enquiry shall be constituted in accordance with the following provisions:

Each of the Members agrees to nominate within six months of the date on which the present Treaty comes into force three persons of industrial experience, of whom one shall be a representative of employers, one a representative of workers, and one a person of independent standing, who shall together form a panel from which the Members of the Commission of Enquiry shall be drawn.

The qualifications of the persons so nominated shall be subject to scrutiny by the Governing Body, which may by two-thirds of the votes cast by the representatives present refuse to accept the nomination of any person whose qualifications do not in its opinion comply with the requirements of the present article.

Upon the application of the Governing Body, the Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall nominate three persons, one from each section of this panel, to constitute the Commission of Enquiry, and shall designate one of them as the President of the Commission. None of these three persons shall be a person nominated to the panel by any Member directly concerned in the complaint.

ARTICLE 413.

The Members agree that, in the event of the reference of a complaint to a Commission of Enquiry under Article 411, they will each, whether directly concerned in the complaint or not, place at the disposal of the Commission all the information in their possession which bears upon the subject-matter of the complaint.

ARTICLE 414.

When the Commission of Enquiry has fully considered the complaint, it shall prepare a report embodying its findings on all questions of fact relevant to determining the issue between the parties and containing such recommendations as it may think proper as to the steps which should be taken to meet the complaint and the time within which they should be taken.

It shall also indicate in this report the measures, if any, of an economic character against a defaulting Government which it considers to be appropriate, and which it considers other Governments would be justified in adopting.

ARTICLE 415.

The Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall communicate the report of the Commission of Enquiry to each of the Governments concerned in the complaint, and shall cause it to be published.

Each of these Governments shall within one month inform the Secretary-General of the League of Nations whether or not it accepts the recommendations contained in the report of the Commission; and if not, whether it proposes to refer the complaint to the Permanent Court of International Justice of the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 416.

In the event of any Member failing to take the action required by Article 405, with regard to a recommendation or draft Convention, any other Member shall be entitled to refer the matter to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

ARTICLE 417.

The decision of the Permanent Court of International Justice in regard to a complaint or matter which has been referred to it in pursuance of Article 415 or Article 416 shall be final.

ARTICLE 418.

The Permanent Court of International Justice may affirm, vary or reverse any of the findings or recommendations of the Commission of Enquiry, if any, and shall in its decision indicate the measures, if any, of an economic character which it considers to be appropriate, and which other Governments would be justified in adopting against a defaulting Government.

ARTICLE 419.

In the event of any Member failing to carry out within the time specified the recommendations, if any, contained in the report of the Commission of Enquiry, or in the decision of the Permanent Court of International Justice, as the case may be, any other Member may take against that Member the measures of an economic character indicated in the report of the Commission or in the decision of the Court as appropriate to the case.

ARTICLE 420.

The defaulting Government may at any time inform the Governing Body that it has taken the steps necessary to comply with the recommendations of the Commission of Enquiry or with those in the decision of the Permanent Court of International Justice, as the case may be, and may request it to apply to the Secretary-General of the League to constitute a Commission of Enquiry to verify its contention. In this case the provisions of Articles 412, 413, 414, 415, 417 and 418 shall apply, and if the report of the Commission of Enquiry or the decision of the Permanent Court of International Justice is in favour of the defaulting Government, the other Governments shall forthwith discontinue the measures of an economic character that they have taken against the defaulting Government.

Chapter III. General.

ARTICLE 421.

The Members engage to apply conventions which they have ratified in accordance with the provisions of this Part of the present Treaty to their colonies, protectorates and possessions which are not fully self-governing:

1. Except where owing to the local conditions the convention is inapplicable, or

2. Subject to such modifications as may be necessary to adapt the convention to local conditions.

And each of the Members shall notify to the International Labour Office the action taken in respect of each of its colonies, protectorates and possessions which are not fully self-governing.

ARTICLE 422.

Amendments to this Part of the present Treaty which are adopted by the Conference by a majority of two-thirds of the votes cast by the Delegates present shall take effect when ratified by the States whose representatives compose the Council of the League of Nations and by three-fourths of the Members.

ARTICLE 423.

Any question or dispute relating to the interpretation of this Part of the present Treaty or of any subsequent Convention concluded by the Members in pursuance of the provisions of this Part of the present Treaty shall be referred for decision to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

Chapter IV. Transitory provisions.

ARTICLE 424.

The first meeting of the Conference shall take place in October, 1919. The place and agenda for this meeting shall be as specified in the Annex hereto.

Arrangements for the convening and the organisation of the first meeting of the Conference will be made by the Government designated for the purpose in the said Annex. That Government shall be assisted in the preparation of the documents for submission to the Conference by an International Committee constituted as provided in the said Annex.

The expenses of the first meeting and of all subsequent meetings held before the League of Nations has been able to establish a general fund, other than the expenses of Delegates and their advisers, will be borne by the Members in accordance with the apportionment of the expenses of the International Bureau of the Universal Postal Union.

ARTICLE 425.

Until the League of Nations has been constituted all communications which under the provisions of the foregoing Articles should be addressed to the Secretary-General of the League will be preserved by the Director of the International Labour Office, who will transmit them to the Secretary-General of the League.

ARTICLE 426.

Pending the creation of a Permanent Court of International Justice, disputes which in accordance with this Part of the present Treaty would be submitted to it for decision will be referred to a tribunal of three persons appointed by the Council of the League of Nations.

ANNEX.

FIRST MEETING OF ANNUAL LABOUR CONFERENCE, 1919.

The place of meeting will be Washington.

The Government of the United States of America is requested to convene the Conference.

The International Organising Committee will consist of seven Members, appointed by the United States of America, Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, Belgium and Switzerland. The Committee may, if it thinks necessary, invite other Members to appoint representatives.

Agenda:

1. Application of principle of the 8-hours day or of the 48-hours week.
2. Question of preventing or providing against unemployment.
3. Women's employment:
   - *a*) Before and after child-birth, including the question of maternity benefit.
   - *b*) During the night.
   - *c*) In unhealthy processes.
4. Employment of children:
   - *a*) Minimum age of employment.
   - *b*) During the night.
   - *c*) In unhealthy processes.
5. Extension and application of the International Conventions adopted at Berne in 1906 on the prohibition of night work for women employed in industry and the prohibition of the use of white phosphorus in the manufacture of matches.

Section II. General principles.

ARTICLE 427.

The High Contracting Parties, recognising that the well-being, physical, moral and intellectual, of industrial wage-earners is of supreme international importance, have framed, in order to further this great end, the permanent machinery provided for in Section I and associated with that of the League of Nations.

They recognise that differences of climate, habits and customs, of economic opportunity and industrial tradition, make strict uniformity in the conditions of labour difficult of immediate attainment. But, holding as they do, that labour should not be regarded merely as an article of commerce, they think that there are methods and principles for regulating labour conditions which all industrial communities should endeavour to apply, so far as their special circumstances will permit.

Among these methods and principles, the following seem to the High Contracting Parties to be of special and urgent importance:

First.—The guiding principle above enunciated that labour should not be regarded merely as a commodity or article of commerce,

Second.—The right of association for all lawful purposes by the employed as well as by the employers.

Third.—The payment to the employed of a wage adequate to maintain a reasonable standard of life as this is understood in their time and country.

Fourth.—The adoption of an eight hours day or a forty-eight hours week as the standard to the aimed at where it has not already been attained.

Fifth.—The adoption of a weekly rest of at least twenty-four hours, which should include Sunday wherever practicable.

Sixth.—The abolition of child labour and the imposition of such limitations on the labour of young persons as shall permit the continuation of their education and assure their proper physical development.

Seventh.—The principle that men and women should receive equal remuneration for work of equal value.

Eighth.—The standard set by law in each country with respect to the conditions of labour should have due regard to the equitable economic treatment of all workers lawfully resident therein.

Ninth.—Each State should make provision for a system of inspection in which women should take part in order to ensure the enforcement of the laws and regulations for the protection of the employed.

Without claiming that these methods and principles are either complete or final, the High Contracting Parties are of opinion that they are well fitted to guide the policy of the League of Nations; and that, if adopted by the industrial communities who are members of the League, and safeguarded in practice by an adequate system of such inspection, they will confer lasting benfits upon the wage-earners of the world.

PART XIV.

GUARANTEES.

Section I. Western Europe.

ARTICLE 428.

As a guarantee for the execution of the present Treaty by Germany, the German territory situated to the west of the Rhine, together with the bridgeheads, will be occupied by Allied and Associated troops for a period of fifteen years from the coming into force of the present Treaty.

ARTICLE 429.

If the conditions of the present Treaty are faithfully carried out by Germany, the occupation referred to in Article 428 will be successively restricted as follows:

(i) At the expiration of five years there will be evacuated:—the bridgehead of Cologne and the territories north of a line running along the Ruhr, then along the railway Jülich, Duren, Euskirchen, Rheinbach, thence along the road Rheinbach to Sinzig, and reaching the Rhine at the confluence with the Ahr; the roads, railways and places mentioned above being excluded from the area evacuated.

(ii) At the expiration of ten years, there will be evacuated:—the bridgehead of Coblenz and the territories north of a line to be drawn from the intersection between the frontiers of Belgium, Germany and Holland, running about 4 kilometres south of Aix-la-Chapelle, then to and following the crest of Forst Gemünd, then east of the railway of the Urft Valley, then along Blankenheim, Valdorf, Dreis, Ulmen to and following the Moselle from Bremm to Nehren, then passing by Kappel and Simmern, then following the ridge of the heights between Simmern and the Rhine and reaching this river at Bacharach; all the places, valleys, roads and railways mentioned above being excluded from the area evacuated.

(iii) At the expiration of fifteen years there will be evacuated:—the bridgehead of Mainz, the bridgehead of Kehl and the remainder of the German territory under occupation.

If at that date the guarantees against unprovoked aggression by Germany are not considered sufficient by the Allied and Associated Governments, the evacuation of the occupying troops may be delayed to the extent regarded as necessary for the purpose of obtaining the required guarantees.

ARTICLE 430.

In case either during the occupation or after the expiration of the fifteen years referred to above, the Reparation Commission finds that Germany refuses to observe the whole or part of

her obligations under the present Treaty with regard to Reparation, the whole or part of the areas specified in Article 429 will be re-occupied immediately by the Allied and Associated forces.

ARTICLE 431.

If before the expiration of the period of fifteen years Germany complies with all the undertakings resulting from the present Treaty, the occupying forces will be withdrawn immediately.

ARTICLE 432.

All matters relating to the occupation and not provided for by the present Treaty shall be regulated by subsequent agreements, which Germany hereby undertakes to observe.

Section II. Eastern Europe.

ARTICLE 433.

As a guarantee for the execution of the provisions of the present Treaty, by which Germany accepts definitely the abrogation of the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, and of all treaties, conventions and agreements entered into by her with the Maximalist Government in Russia, and in order to ensure the restoration of peace and good government in the Baltic Provinces and Lithuania, all German troops at present in the said territories shall return to within the frontiers of Germany as soon as the Governments of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers shall think the moment suitable, having regard to the internal situation of these territories. These troops shall abstain from all requisitions and seizures and from any other coercive measures, with a view to obtaining supplies intended for Germany, and shall in no way interfere with such measures for national defence as may be adopted by the Provisional Governments of Esthonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

No other German troops shall, pending the evacuation or after the evacuation is complete, be admitted to the said territories.

PART XV.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

ARTICLE 434.

Germany undertakes to recognise the full force of the Treaties of Peace and Additional Conventions which may be concluded by the Allied and Associated Powers with the Powers who fought on the side of Germany and to recognise whatever dispositions may be made concerning the territories of the former Austro-Hungarian Monarch, of the Kingdom of Bulgaria and of the Ottoman Empire, and to recognize the new States within their frontiers as there laid down.

ARTICLE 435.

The High Contracting Parties, while they recognize the guarantees stipulated by the treaties of 1815, and especially by the Act of 20th November, 1815, in favour of Switzerland, the said guarantees constituting international obligations for the maintenance of peace, declare nevertheless that the provisions of these treaties, conventions, declarations and other supplementary Acts concerning the neutralized zone of Savoy, as laid down in paragraph 1 of Article 92 of the Final Act of the Congress of Vienna and in paragraph 2 of Article 3 of the Treaty of Paris of 20th November, 1815, are no longer consistent with present conditions. For this reason the High Contracting Parties take note of the agreement reached between the French Government and the Swiss Government for the abrogation of the stipulations relating to this zone which are and remain abrogated.

The High Contracting Parties also agree that the stipulations of the Treaties of 1815 and of the other supplementary Acts concerning the free zones of Upper Savoy and the Gex district are no longer consistent with present conditions, and that it is for France and Switzerland to come to an agreement together with a view to settling between themselves the status of these territories under such conditions as shall be considered suitable by both countries.

ANNEX.

The Swiss Federal Council has informed the French Government that after examining the provisions of Article 435 in a like spirit of sincere friendship it has happily reached the conclusion that it was possible to acquiesce in it under the following conditions and reservations:

1 The neutralized zone of Haute-Savoie:

a) It will be understood that as long as the Federal Chambers have not ratified the agreement come to between the two Governments concerning the abrogation of the stipulations in respect of the neutralized zone of Savoy, nothing will be definitively settled, on one side or the other, in regard to this subject.

b) The assent given by the Swiss Government to the abrogation of the above mentioned stipulations presupposes, in conformity with the text adopted, the recognition of the guarantees formulated in favour of Switzerland by the treaties of 1815 and particularly by the Declaration of 20th November 1815.

c) The agreement between the Governments of France and Switzerland for the abrogation of the above mentioned stipulations will only be considered as valid if the Treaty of Peace contains this article in its present wording. In addition the Parties to the Treaty of Peace should endeavour to obtain the assent of the signatory Powers of the treaties of 1815 and of the Declaration of 20th November 1815 which are not signatories of the present Treaty of Peace.

2 Free zone of Haute-Savoie and the district of Gex.

a) The Federal Council makes the most express reservations to the interpretation to be given to the statement mentioned in the last paragraph of the above article for insertion in the Treaty of Peace, which provides that the stipulations of the Treaties of 1815 and other supplementary acts concerning the free zones of Haute-Savoie and the Gex district are no longer consistent with the present circumstances. The Federal Council would not wish that its acceptance of the above wording should lead to the conclusion that it would agree to the suppression of a system intended to give neighbouring territory the benefit of a special regime appropriate to the geographical and economical situation and which has been well tested.

In the opinion of the Federal Council the question is not the modification of the customs system of the zones as set up by the treaties mentioned above, but only the regulation in a manner more appropriate to the economic conditions of the present day; the terms of the exchange of goods between the regions in question. The Federal Council has been led to make the preceding observations by the perusal of the draft convention concerning the future constitution of the zones which was annexed to the note of April 26 from the French Governmentations. While making the above reserve the Federal Council declares its readiness to examine in the most friendly spirit any proposals which the French Government may deem it convenient to make on the subject.

b) It is conceded that the stipulations of the treaties of 1815 and other supplementary acts relative to the free zones will remain in force until a new arrangement is come to between France and Switzerland to regulate matters in this territory.

ARTICLE 436.

The High Contracting Parties declare and place on record that they have taken note of the treaty signed by the Government of the French Republic on July 17th, 1918, with His Serene Highness the Prince of Monaco defining the relations between France and the Principality.

ARTICLE 437.

The High Contracting Parties agree that, in the absence of a subsequent agreement to the contrary, the Chairman of any Commission established by the present Treaty shall in the event of an equality of votes be entitled to a second vote.

ARTICLE 438.

The Allied and Associated Powers agree that where Christian religious missions were being maintained by German societies or persons in territory belonging to them, or of which the government is entrusted to them in accordance with the present Treaty, the property which these missions or missionary societies possessed, including that of trading societies whose profits were devoted to the support of missions, shall continue to be devoted to missionary purposes. In order to ensure the due execution of this undertaking the Allied and Associated Governments will hand over such property to boards of trustees appointed by or approved by the Governments and composed of persons holding the Christian faith. It will be the duty of such boards of trustees to see that the property continues to be applied to missionary purposes.

The obligations undertaken by the Allied and Associated Governments in this Article will not in any way prejudice their control or authority as to the individuals by whom the missions are conducted.

Germany, taking note of the above undertaking, agrees to accept all arrangements made or to be made by the Allied or Associated Government concerned for carrying on the work of the said missions or trading societies and waives all claims on their behalf.

ARTICLE 439.

Without prejudice to the provisions of the present Treaty, Germany undertakes not to put forward directly or indirectly against any Allied or Associated Power, Signatory of the present Treaty, including those which without having declared war, have broken off diplomatic relations with the German Empire, any pecuniary claim based on events which occurred at any time before the coming into force of the present Treaty.

The present stipulation will bar completely and finally all claims of this nature, which will be thenceforward extinguished, whoever may be the parties in interest.

ARTICLE 440.

Germany accepts and recognises as valid and binding all decrees and orders concerning German ships and goods and all orders relating to the payment of costs made by any Prize Court of any of the Allied or Associated Powers, and undertakes not to put forward any claim arising out of such decrees or orders on behalf of any German national.

The Allied and Associated Powers reserve the right to examine in such manner as they may determine all decisions and orders of German Prize Courts, whether affecting the property rights of nationals of those Powers or of neutral Powers. Germany agrees to furnish copies of all the documents constituting the record of the cases, including the decisions and orders made, and to accept and give effect to the recommendations made after such examination of the cases.

The present Treaty, of which the French and English texts are both authentic, shall be ratified.

The deposit of ratifications shall be made at Paris as soon as possible.

Powers of which the seat of the Government is outside Europe will be entitled merely to inform the Government of the French Republic through their diplomatic representative at Paris that their ratification has been given; in that case they must transmit the instrument of ratification as soon as possible.

A first procès-verbal of the deposit of ratifications will be drawn up as soon as the Treaty has been ratified by Germany on the one hand, and by three of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers on the other hand.

From the date of this first procès-verbal the Treaty will come into force between the High Contracting Parties who have ratified it. For the determination of all periods of time provided for in the present Treaty this date will be the date of the coming into force of the Treaty.

In all other respects the Treaty will enter into force for each Power at the date of the deposit of its ratification.

The French Government will transmit to all the signatory Powers a certified copy of the procès-verbaux of the deposit of ratifications.

In faith whereof the above-named Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty.

Done at Versailles, in a single copy which will remain deposited in the archives of the French Republic, and of which authenticated copies will be transmitted to each of the Signatory Powers.

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE CONTROL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 120) to repeal chapter 154 of the act of the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, being the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the bill under consideration is a bill introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] to repeal the act of July 16, 1918, which gave to the President the power or authority to take possession of and operate the cable, telegraph, and telephone systems of the United States.

I do not intend to enter upon the disputed question with regard to the necessity for this act of Congress or the subsequent act of the President. I regard both as immaterial. I think, however, that it can be said with a fair degree of assurance that it is now the desire of the people of this country that these systems of cable, telegraphic, and telephonic communication shall be returned to their owners for private operation, at least until some scheme is devised for a change in regulation and control. I think it can be safely said that this is the view of the President of the United States. I think it can be said with equal assurance that this is the view of the Postmaster General, who has had control during the period that has intervened since the Government took possession. The act takes effect immediately upon its approval, and at that time these wire systems of communication will be returned completely to those who have heretofore operated them.

With respect to the desirability of return I shall say nothing, assuming that all Senators have made up their minds upon the subject and that they are in accord. The committee, however, to which the bill was referred has added to the measure an amendment which, I think, it is incumbent upon me to explain very briefly. During the period of Federal control or possession the Postmaster General increased by order or approval many of the rates which had theretofore governed the service. I am now speaking entirely of the telephone, for the amendment to which I have referred does not embrace either the cable or the telegraph lines. When I say "amendment" I do not mean that the cable and telegraph lines are not to be returned to their owners; but the amendment, which relates to rates which have been established by the Postmaster General, does not embrace either cable or telegraph systems.

As I remarked a moment ago, the Postmaster General found it necessary to increase the rates both in the toll service and in the exchange service. Senators, of course, will recognize the difference between the two. The toll service is that service which is rendered by telephone companies in the transmission of long-distance communications. The exchange service is that rendered to the people of a given community or city, and which enables one person to connect himself with another for the purpose of talking over small or limited areas.

The order which increased the toll rates is known as Bulletin No. 22. The order itself is No. 2495. The order was somewhat modified subsequently but not in any material way, and the paper which I now hold in my hand and which was laid before the committee shows the rates as they were increased by order of the Postmaster General. These applied to the entire toll service of the country, not only the toll service rendered by what is known as the Bell system, operated by the American Telegraph & Telephone Co., but the service rendered by the independent companies throughout the country as well. There is no uniformity in the increase in rates; that is to say, the increase as applied to one company may not have been and was not, in fact, the same increase as experienced by another company, but I make no criticism in that respect.

The probable increase, although that can not be stated with absolute certainty, in the toll rates was something like 18 or 20 per cent. Some of those who have estimated the matter think it was even less. The increase in the exchange rates was made in a great number of orders of approval by the Postmaster General, which I have in my hand.

In order that the RECORD may show just what has been done by the Postmaster General in this regard, I desire to incorporate as a part of my observations, first, the order, No. 2495, relating to the toll service and, second, a synopsis of the various orders relating to an increase in exchange rates.

There are in the United States more than 50,000 telephone companies. Most of those companies, however, render a very limited service.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Fifty thousand companies?

Mr. CUMMINS. There are in the United States more than 50,000 telephone companies. That may need a moment's explanation. By far the greater number of these companies are what are known as farmers' mutual telephone companies; companies in which a few men or a small community band themselves together for the purpose of furnishing each other telephonic communication and which are really without profit, intended merely as a convenience for those who are in that particular community. Some of these telephone companies have connection with larger companies having a switchboard, and which in turn connect the small companies with the larger ones doing a general business. There are more than 10,000 companies, however, in this country which do a general exchange business; that is to say, which have a switchboard located at some central point and that enables the subscribers or patrons of that system to use it in the way which is perfectly well known to all of us. These companies, so far as they are supposed to render service of an interstate character, report to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and of them the Interstate Commerce Commission has the same full complete authority that it has over the railways of the country. I beg to read a communication which came to me from the office of the Postmaster General, which explains the situation so far as the increases of rates in exchange service are concerned. This communication says:

MEMORANDUM ON TELEPHONE EXCHANGE RATE INCREASES APPROVED BY THE POSTMASTER GENERAL.

According to the special census of telegraphs and telephones in the United States, taken in 1917, the preliminary results of which have recently been made available, the total number of telephone systems and lines in the United States at that time was 53,035. Their income from all sources amounted to $391,476,926. The income of the Bell System—

That refers to companies which are operated under the direction and control of the American Telegraph & Telephone Co.—

alone amounted to $311,918,260, or approximately 80 per cent of this total.

That means that the companies which I have just mentioned transact substantially 80 per cent of the telephone business of the United States.

Of the independent lines and systems, those with a gross annual revenue of $5,000 or more reported a total income of $60,583,540; the other independent lines and systems reported a total income of $18,975,126.

Far the greater number of these independent lines and systems are the property of small rural companies, or of so-called mutual companies or cooperative associations, or are farmers' individual or party lines. The vast majority of them make no regular reports to any agency of the Federal Government.

The Interstate Commerce Commission receives annual reports from nearly 9,000 of these lines and systems. Companies reporting annual operating revenues of $250,000 or more are designated as class A companies; those reporting annual operating revenues exceeding $50,000, but less than $250,000, as class B companies; those reporting annual operating revenues exceeding $10,000 but less than $50,000, as class C companies. These three classes together, whose reports are made in accordance with a system of accounts prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, account for less than 1,000 of the total number of the companies reporting to the Interstate Commerce Commission. The remainder, slightly over 8,000 companies, are designated as class D, but make no complete annual returns, and keep no standard or uniform accounts. From the numerous small companies and lines no returns whatever are received.

For the year 1917 class A, B, and C companies reported to the Interstate Commerce Commission a total operating revenue of $346,101,039. This figure excludes all nonoperating revenue reported by class A, B, and C companies, as well as the revenue from all sources of all the other companies covered by the special census of the same year. Of the total operating revenue reported by the class A, B, and C companies, $295,616,146, or approximately 85 per cent, was reported by the companies of the Bell System. The balance, $50,484,893, was reported by independent class A, B, and C companies. Of the independent companies operating exchange systems, 23 belong to class A, 109 to class B, and the balance, approximately 530, to class C. The total number of independent telephone companies, for which rate increases have been approved by the Postmaster General since the wire systems were taken over into Federal control, is 211.

I am reading this communication largely in order that this latter fact may be well known to the Senate.

Of the 23 class A companies, 15 have participated in rate increases approved by the Postmaster General. Of the 109 class B companies, 25 have participated in rate increases approved by the Postmaster General. The balance is divided between the class C and class D companies.

According to the latest reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission, the majority being for the year 1918, the independent class A companies had a total operating revenue of more than $26,000,000, of which more than $20,000,000 was received by the companies in this class which participated in rate increases approved by the Postmaster General. It has not been possible in the time available to complete a corresponding calculation for the other classes of companies. The total operating revenues, however, of the independent class D companies, according to the latest reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission, were approximately twelve and one-half millions, or less than half of the total for the class A companies, and the proportion of companies participating in rate increases in this class as in class A was greater among the larger than the smaller companies. It is apparent, therefore, that the companies which do the bulk of the business of the independent companies reporting to the Interstate Commerce Commission have participated in the rate increases made effective by the Postmaster General.

Before I go further, Mr. President, I wish to say that the amendment which was reported by the committee is withdrawn by authority of the committee and the following is offered in its stead. It is an amendment to section 1 of the bill. Section 1 refers first to chapter 154 of the acts of the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, which is the act authorizing the President to take over these systems. As it was originally introduced, it concluded:

Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war and to provide just compensation therefor," approved on the 16th day of July, 1918, be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

The committee proposes the following amendment:

Provided, however, That the existing toll and exchange telephone rates as established or approved by the Postmaster General on or prior to June 6, 1919, shall continue in force for a period of 90 days, but not longer, after this act takes effect, unless they shall be sooner modified or changed by the public authorities—State, municipal, or otherwise—having control thereof prior to the time the Government took possession of the telephone systems under the act of July 16, 1918, or by contract or by voluntary reduction; it being the intent that after the approval of this act the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission and all the authority of the States, municipalities, or other public control over the properties of which the United States assumed the possession and operation under the act of July 16, 1918, shall be immediately restored.

There is a great difference of opinion, Mr. President, among lawyers with regard to the continuing effect of the rates which have been established, approved, and promulgated by the Postmaster General. There are some students of the subject who believe that those rates all cease immediately upon the restoration of the properties to their owners. There are others who believe—and I confess that I am one of the others—that without legislation rates which have been lawfully established by the Postmaster General—and the Supreme Court held, as you will remember, last Monday, a week ago to-day, that the action of the Postmaster General in establishing these increased rates was lawful—will continue until they are set aside by proceedings instituted by some one who has the right to institute proceedings of that character, whether the time be 1 month or 6 months or 12 months.

It was thought better, therefore, by the committee, in view of the difficult question of law—which can not possibly be settled, for there is no opportunity to settle it, at least within any reasonable time—that we should continue the rates which had been promulgated by the Postmaster General for a specified time, leaving all of the companies and the public and all who are interested in the subject at liberty to apply instantly to the various controlling authorities of the States and municipalities for such modifications of the order or orders as they might be advised was necessary in order to protect the various interests involved in these enterprises.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, would it disturb the Senator if I should ask him a question at this point?

Mr. CUMMINS. Not at all.

Mr. THOMAS. Can the Senator state approximately what the aggregate amount of the annual or monthly increase is?

Mr. CUMMINS. We were not able to ascertain that. The best information that we could procure in the limited time we had for consideration was that the increase was somewhere in the neighborhood of 20 per cent. The communication which I have read indicates for those companies which have reported to the Interstate Commerce Commission their revenues for the year 1917; so that the application of that percentage to those revenues will indicate the average increase.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit an inquiry?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. KING. I did not quite hear all of the amendment. Does it perpetuate the rates of the cable companies and the telegraph companies or only of the telephone companies?

Mr. CUMMINS. It only applies to the telephone companies. I can say, with regard to that, that the cable companies have been already really retransferred, and neither the Western Union Telegraph Co. nor the Postal Telegraph & Cable Co. asked for a continuation of the higher rates, although the representative of one of the companies stated that he thought they ought to be continued. The reason the committee did not take up or consider that phase of the matter was probably this: The representative of the Postal Telegraph & Cable Co. came before the committee and said that it was entirely satisfied with the rates that existed before the Government took possession of the property, and that the moment the possession and control of the property is restored to the corporation it intended to reduce the rates 20 per cent, the amount which it is understood the rates were raised by the Government. If the Postal Telegraph & Cable Co. reduces these rates, as the committee was advised would be done by the chief officer of the corporation, the Western Union Telegraph Co. will be compelled, of course, to follow the decrease or the reduction. For that reason the committee did not even consider the necessity of maintaining the telegraph rates at their present point, but left that entirely with the law. I repeat that in my opinion—although I express it with great diffidence and with no assurance from any adjudicated case—these rates will continue until they are set aside by some properly constituted authority or until the companies actually reduce them of their own accord.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit another inquiry?

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think that if it were wise to perpetuate the rates of the telephone companies, exchange rates, and so on, for a limited period, the same reason would prompt legislation perpetuating the rates of the telegraph companies?

Mr. CUMMINS. The committee thought it was wise to continue the rates for the telephone companies for a period of 90 days for two reasons: The first is the reason that I have already stated, the doubt with regard to the interpretation of the law respecting the continuance, without legislative interference, of the rates established by the Postmaster General; second, because unquestionably the cost of operation on the part of the telephone companies of the country has very greatly increased. No one can doubt the fact that the labor cost, the material cost, and every other expense incident to maintenance and operation have increased more than 20 per cent during the last year and a half. Many of these companies, I suppose most of them, had applications before their respective State authorities pending at the time the Government took possession for an increase of rates by reason of increases in the cost of maintenance and operation. The assumption by the Government of this business ended all that undertaking and suspended for the time being the jurisdiction of the various State authorities. The committee believes with regard to the telephone companies, assuming that they were not earning any more than they should have earned before the Government took possession, that they ought to have

the benefit of the continuance of these increased rates until they have had an opportunity to present their cases to the State authorities and secure from those bodies of regulation and control such orders as to the States may seem necessary to sustain these companies and to make their income equal to their outgo.

It is perfectly apparent that we could not enter upon an inquiry with regard to the financial situation of each of the eight or ten thousand companies which report to the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is an impossible task; and we had to assume—and I think we could properly assume—that there could be no great injustice wrought by perpetuating the orders of the Postmaster General for a period of 90 days, so that each company can present its particular case, its particular necessities, to the State authorities or to the Interstate Commerce Commission, as he case may be, and there receive such an award with regard to rates as will be just and equitable.

These are the reasons which have led the committee to the recommendation which it has made, and which I have endeavored to explain.

I was originally very doubtful with regard to the continuance of these rates as applied to exchange systems which, in my judgment, are of purely State concern; and whatever may be the movement of the future with regard to them, I can not but hope that the Federal Government will never undertake to control their affairs or to establish their rates; but we can not ignore the fact that it will require some time to enable these companies to make the transition from Government possession and control to the control of the several States, and, therefore, we presented this amendment.

It will be found that the increases in exchange rates cover a very large part of all the exchange business in the United States. The orders cover a few companies, comparatively, but the companies which are embraced in the orders of the Postmaster General do so large a part of the business that I think it can not be charged that to establish an increase with respect to them without at the same time establishing an increase with respect to others will do injustice. In any event, the period will soon elapse, and then the State authorities will deal with the subject, as they may, indeed, from the date the act is passed, as seems to them just.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment in behalf of the committee, which I read a moment ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the amendment already printed in the bill, on page 2, it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, however, That the existing toll and exchange telephone rates as established or approved by the Postmaster General on or prior to June 6, 1919, shall continue in force for a period of 90 days, but not longer, after this act takes effect, unless they shall be sooner modified or changed by the public authorities—State, municipal, or otherwise—having control thereof prior to the time the Government took possession of the telephone systems under the act of July 16, 1918, or by contract or by voluntary reduction; it being the intent that after the approval of this act the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission and all the authority of the States, municipalities, or other public control over the properties of which the United States assumed the possession and operation under the act of July 16, 1918, shall be immediately restored.

Mr. CURTIS and Mr. POMERENE addressed the Chair.

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand the amendment can hardly be acted upon to-night, and I wish to ask the Senator from Iowa if he will not consent temporarily to lay aside his bill so that I may present a conference report on the Indian appropriation bill, which will take but a few moments.

Mr. POMERENE. Will the Senator from Iowa permit me a word?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. I rose for the purpose of inquiring whether or not the chairman of the committee was going to insist upon having this matter disposed of to-night?

Mr. CUMMINS. No, Mr. President; I do not think it would be wise to insist upon a disposition of the matter to-night. I know there are Senators not here just now who desire possibly to make some observations in regard to it, and I know that the amendment which I have just offered will be better understood if it is printed in the RECORD and Senators have an opportunity to examine it. I had it in mind, after offering the amendment, to move an adjournment of the Senate.

Mr. POMERENE. I wish to submit a few observations; but, if the matter is to go over, I will defer them until to-morrow morning.

Mr. CUMMINS. In view of the request made by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. CURTIS. I present the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. It is a unanimous report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the conference report.

The Secretary read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2480) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 14, 15, 17, 28, 36, 37, 38, and 46.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, and 48, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter covered in amendment 6 and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"That the amounts of $42,500 appropriated by the Indian appropriation act approved March 2, 1917 (39 Stat. L., p. 975), and $5,000 appropriated by the Indian appropriation act approved May 25, 1918 (Public, No. 159), in all $47,500, for the construction of two bridges over the Little Colorado and Canyon Diablo Rivers, near the Leupp Indian Agency, Ariz., are hereby reappropriated for the same purposes as provided in said acts, reimbursable as provided in said acts, and to remain a charge and lien upon the lands and funds of the Navajo Tribe of Indians until paid."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter covered by amendment No. 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, and under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to cause to be issued to the Gospel Missionary Union, which has engaged in mission work among the Navajo Indians since 1896, a patent in fee for mission purposes only for that particular tract of land on the Western Navajo Reservation, in Arizona, not exceeding 160 acres in area, which it has continuously used and occupied for mission purposes from a date prior to the Executive order of January 8, 1900, withdrawing from sale and settlement the lands which now constitute the said reservation; said patent in fee shall be issued on a legal description of the land so used: *Provided*, That if said land shall cease to be used for mission purposes the same shall revert to the Navajo Tribe of Indians.

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "two thousand dollars" and insert "one thousand dollars" in lieu thereof; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter contained in amendment 34 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"*Provided further*, That from the sums heretofore appropriated for said Pottawatomie Indians the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay to Erik O. Morstad, of Leona, Wis., in person and in full satisfaction for services rendered, the sum of $2,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by Senate amendment No. 35 insert the following:

"For the purchase of subsistence supplies in relieving cases of actual distress and suffering among those needy St. Croix Indians of Wisconsin whose cases are referred to in report of January 30, 1915, transmitted by the Secretary of the Interior to the House of Representatives March 3, 1915, pursuant to the provisions of the act of Congress of August 1, 1914 (38 Stat. L., pp. 582–605), and printed as House Document No. 1663, Sixty-third Congress, third session, $1,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by Senate amendment No. 39 insert:

"For the construction of a road from the village of Odanah, in the Bad River Reservation, to the south line of said reservation, $20,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, said sum to be reimbursable from any funds now or hereafter placed in the Treasury to the credit of the Indians on the Bad River Reservation, to remain a charge and lien upon the funds of said tribe of Indians until paid: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the construction of said road: *Provided further*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be expended until the Secretary of the Interior shall have obtained from the proper authorities of the State of Wisconsin satisfactory guaranties of the payment by the said State of at least one-half of the cost of the construction of said road."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CHARLES CURTIS,
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE,
HENRY F. ASHURST,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

HOMER P. SNYDER,
P. P. CAMPBELL,
C. D. CARTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, June 10, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *June 9, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Great Spirit, author of the vast universe, Father of all souls, inspire us, we beseech Thee, with an earnest desire to use the faculties of mind and soul, which Thou hast bestowed upon us, for the betterment of all mankind.

Turn all evil hearts to good and all good hearts to servants in the vineyard of the Lord, that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done in earth as in heaven, through the precepts and example of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House to-day, being the second Monday in the month, is set apart for the consideration of such business as may be presented by the Committee on the District of Columbia. It is well known, however, that there are several important appropriation bills, including among others the Army and the naval appropriation bills, which have not yet been considered and, as everybody knows, which should be enacted into law before the 1st of July. For that reason, and following out the suggestion of the Speaker and the majority leader, as chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia I shall not ask the House to-day to consider the District bills reported and on the calendar, although there are two bills which the committee would be glad to have the House consider.

I would like, however, to take advantage of this opportunity to say that I hope after the supply bills are passed the regular District days, the second and fourth Mondays of each month, will be used for the consideration of District legislation. To that end I am assured of the cooperation of the Speaker and the majority leader. For the present it is perhaps as important to the District as to anyone that the supply bills should be passed without any unnecessary delay.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering H. R. 5227, making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering H. R. 5227, the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. KAHN. Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue until adjournment to-day; that the time be equally divided between the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] and myself.

The SPEAKER. And the gentleman asks unanimous consent that general debate be continued until adjournment to-day, the time to be divided, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT]. Is there objection?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand the gentleman's request is that general debate be carried on to-day without any agreement as to limitation?

Mr. KAHN. Until adjournment to-day, and that the time be equally divided between the gentleman from Alabama and myself.

Mr. DENT. May I ask the gentleman from California what the program is for to-morrow?

Mr. KAHN. I am advised that it is probable that the railroad deficiency bill may come in to-morrow.

Mr. DENT. And the Army appropriation bill will be set aside to-morrow?

Mr. KAHN. I understand so.

Mr. DENT. Will Calendar Wednesday be set aside and then the Army bill resumed on Wednesday?

Mr. MONDELL. We hope so.

Mr. KAHN. I understand that the gentleman from Alabama would like to finish his remarks in general debate on Wednesday, or when the Army bill is again taken up. I shall ask that general debate close immediately after the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama on Wednesday.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But we have not yet done away with Calendar Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would suggest that the gentleman amend his request so that the gentleman from Alabama may conclude his remarks on the next day when the Army bill is taken up. It might not be taken up Wednesday.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why does not the gentleman ask unanimous consent now to dispense with the business on Calendar Wednesday?

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I make that request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the business on Calendar Wednesday next be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, what is there on the calendar?

The SPEAKER. Only one or two bills.

Mr. MONDELL. There are two bills reported by the District of Columbia Committee, one having to do with appointing a commission to study the water question and the other refers to game birds.

Mr. GARNER. Has not the daylight-saving bill been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

The SPEAKER. It is not yet reported.

Mr. GARD. Further reserving the right to object, how much of to-day does the gentleman from California intend to consume? What time will the committee rise?

Mr. KAHN. I hope to rise not later than 5.30.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Reserving the right to object for the purpose of making the situation clear, is it intended that general debate will have closed at the adjournment this afternoon, with the exception of the reservation of time for the gentleman from Alabama, to conclude when the Army bill is next resumed?

Mr. KAHN. That is my understanding. How much time will the gentleman from Alabama consume in his remarks in general debate?

Mr. DENT. Not to exceed one hour, and I hope not over 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California to dispense with business on Calendar Wednesday?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that general debate be concluded and finished to-day, except one hour reserved for the gentleman from Alabama when the bill is next taken up. Is there objection?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I did not understand the request to be that way. I would like to state to the gentleman from California that I understood from the conversation we had this morning that we would not undertake to close debate to-day, but would run on and make an agreement to close debate on Wednesday.

Mr. KAHN. The understanding was that we would conclude general debate to-day, except as to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. If the gentleman would simply ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be equally divided, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT], these other matters would take care of themselves.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me, in addition to that there must be some understanding as to how long general debate is to continue.

Mr. GARRETT. They do not seem to be able to reach any agreement as to that. It is not necessary to agree that general debate shall run during the day. If they want it to run, it will run. All that is necessary for them to do is to agree on a division of the time, one-half to be controlled by each.

Mr. KAHN. That is all we are trying to do.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. My understanding is that the gentleman from California desires unanimous consent that general debate shall continue on the Army appropriation bill for to-day and for an hour when the bill shall again be taken up for consideration, and that the time for general debate be equally divided between the gentleman from Alabama and himself.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not think that is a fair agreement.

Mr. DENT. That is not the agreement.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman from Alabama ought to be permitted to conclude his remarks, whenever he makes his speech, and not be limited to one hour.

Mr. KAHN. That was the suggestion of the gentleman himself.

Mr. DENT. But that was not the understanding that I had with the gentleman from California. The understanding I had with the gentleman from California over the telephone was that we would run on to-day with general debate and that we would fix the closing of general debate on Wednesday.

Mr. KAHN. My understanding was that the gentleman would not be ready to make his remarks to-day, because he had been absent from the city and had not been able to scrutinize the bill.

Mr. DENT. That is true. I have not had a chance to read it yet. I got it only an hour and a half ago.

Mr. KAHN. I suggest that we conclude general debate to-day, with the exception of the gentleman from Alabama, and that the gentleman from Alabama may have time to conclude his remarks on Wednesday.

Mr. DENT. Does the gentleman from California say that he did not have the understanding with me that we would fix the time for concluding debate Wednesday instead of to-day?

Mr. KAHN. I suggest that as to the gentleman from Alabama, I was willing to conclude debate on Wednesday. That was my understanding.

Mr. DENT. I did not understand the gentleman from California to limit it to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GARNER. Why not talk to-day and close the time for debate on Wednesday?

Mr. KITCHIN. Do I understand it is proposed to take up the railroad appropriation bill to-morrow?

Mr. KAHN. That is my understanding.

Mr. KITCHIN. And that this bill should be continued on Wednesday?

Mr. KAHN. Yes; after to-day.

Mr. GARNER. I think we better go on for to-day and close up general debate on Wednesday.

Mr. KAHN. Then I modify my request to this effect: That we continue with general debate upon this bill to-day until the hour of adjournment, and that the time be equally divided between the gentleman from Alabama and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that would not limit general debate to to-day?

The SPEAKER. No. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think we ought to be able at this time to determine the length of general debate upon this bill. We have six bills to pass, six important bills, before the 1st day of July. One day of general debate on a single bill is very liberal under the circumstances. In addition to that, the House is perfectly willing to give the gentleman from Alabama opportunity to speak for an hour after the close of this day's general debate on Wednesday. It seems to me that is a very liberal arrangement. I can not understand why the gentleman is not satisfied.

Mr. DENT. If the gentleman will yield, I will state why I am not satisfied. I notified the chairman of this committee, with whom I have always had the most cordial relations, I could not possibly be present Friday and Saturday of last week. We finished the hearings on the bill late Wednesday evening. We started the preparation of the bill on Thursday. We spent the entire day on Thursday undertaking to prepare the bill. It was not finished. I had to leave here Friday morning and was gone two days. When I returned I saw in the newspapers that the bill would be taken up on Tuesday. Immediately this morning I undertook to get in touch with the situation, and found, very much to my surprise, that the bill would be taken up to-day. I understand that the gentleman from California made the statement in the RECORD Saturday afternoon—and I have read the RECORD—that he hoped to take the bill up on Monday. I was not able to get a copy of the bill until about half past 10 o'clock this morning, and I find that although the bill which was passed in the last session of the last Congress was the basis for the consideration of this bill, yet the amount of the bill has been reduced by something like $400,000,000. I have not had the opportunity to consider where those reductions occur. I notice from the newspapers that they have reduced the pay of the Army, the transportation of the Army, and the subsistence of the Army—three items which I think it might be unwise to reduce. I do not say that the committee has not reported a bill that I shall not be satisfied with, but I want an opportunity to investigate it, and I think I am making a reasonable request.

Mr. HAMILTON. I can not understand why the gentleman objects to the arrangement made when he said——

Mr. DENT. Oh, but I can not investigate this proposition and sit here upon the floor of this House while debate is going on all the time.

Mr. BAER. When does the gentleman want to speak?

Mr. HAMILTON. I understood the gentleman to say he would not want more than 30 minutes, and thought that he could easily finish within an hour.

Mr. DYER. When does the gentleman desire the time?

Mr. DENT. Of course, the gentleman from California has very kindly consented for me to close general debate on the bill, and I do not want the time until then.

Mr. DYER. Well, Wednesday?

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman permit me to answer his question?

Mr. DYER. I will yield.

Mr. DENT. I have called the minority members of the committee together this morning to know how much time they wanted and to ascertain if they were prepared to go on to-day, and not one of them was aware of the fact the bill was going to be taken up to-day, and they were not prepared to go on.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is to be given all day to-morrow to prepare, and the next day he is to make his speech, and that ought to be satisfactory.

Mr. DENT. I will say to the gentleman from Wyoming that so far as I am personally concerned that is satisfactory, but it is not satisfactory to the other members of the minority who have not had a chance to prepare what they have to say on the bill.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, just briefly replying to the statement of the gentleman from Alabama, the committee reduced the estimates he spoke of because we agreed to appropriate for an Army of 400,000 men and 22,149 officers. The estimate submitted to the committee contemplated an Army of 509,000 men, as the gentleman well knows, and when you cut the Army by 109,000 you can cut appropriations for pay, subsistence, and transportation in proportion.

Mr. QUIN. Will the gentleman be able to have the hearings printed?

Mr. KAHN. The hearings will be printed in ample time, so that when the bill is taken up under the five-minute rule they will be in the hands of Members. I want to say to the gentleman that the hearings are printed as speedily as we get them back from the War Department, and they will all be ready by the time we begin debate under the five-minute rule.

Mr. QUIN. But they will not be here to-day, and gentlemen who speak to-day will not have the advantage of the hearings?

Mr. KAHN. Well, I imagine——

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order. I do not think we ought to delay this question any longer.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California that general debate continue until adjournment to-day, the time to be divided equally between the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming objects.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I move that general debate conclude to-day, except for one hour for the gentleman from Alabama——

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion.

Mr. KITCHIN. I desire to state to the gentleman that he can not do that now; he has to go into the Committee of the Whole and have some debate, and then come back into the House.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5227, the Army appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5227, the Army appropriation bill, with Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill may be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The time is to be equally divided between the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Alabama——

SEVERAL MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRISP. I would like to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that there was no agreement as to who would control the time.

Mr. KAHN. No; there was no agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair stands corrected.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, happily the great World War, so far as the fighting is concerned, has come to an end. But I take it that so long as the world goes round and so long as human nature is constituted as it is there will continue to be wars and therefore our country for its own protection must continue to maintain a Military Establishment worthy of the American people. [Applause.] I can remember when, in 1916, Congress was considering the national defense act and the allied nations had been struggling with a powerful and relentless foe for almost two years, I offered on this floor an amendment to that bill which authorized the President of the United States to increase our Regular Army to 250,000 men. That amendment was substantially voted down in this House. That amendment was offered, as I now recall it, in the latter part of April or the early part of May, 1916, about nine months before the Imperial Government of Germany served her notice on us that she would sink and destroy ruthlessly our merchant vessels if they dared to cross certain lines on the Atlantic Ocean which Germany herself drew and which, under international law, we had an absolute right to cross at our will. Nine months before Germany served that notice on us I tried to increase our Army to 250,000 men. It is my belief that Germany served that notice because she knew we were helpless as a nation, because she knew that we were not ready to defend our rights, and because she knew it would take months for us to get ready in case she attempted to interfere with our commerce on the high seas.

In traveling through Europe recently I saw the graves of thousands of American boys who had been killed on the battle fields of France.

At Romagne, in the northern part of the Meuse-Argonne battle field, our labor troops were digging trenches where 26,000 Americans are to sleep the everlasting sleep. At Suresnes, just outside of Paris, I saw a cemetery where 3,000 Americans will rest until the judgment day. I was not able to go to the cemetery at Thiaucourt where those who died in the St. Mihiel battle are to find a resting place. But all around Belleau Woods, and near Vaux, near Chateau-Thierry, near Soissons, and near Cantigny there are graveyards where rest the remains of American soldiers killed in this war. I was told by the officers of the Medical Department that 206,000 Americans have given their blood and many of them their limbs as the result of wounds received in the battles in which they participated.

I know that we have incurred indebtedness to the extent of $34,000,000,000, $10,000,000,000 of which represents loans to the cobelligerent Nations. I maintain that if we had been prepared on the 31st of January, 1917, if Congress had voted for my amendment to increase the Army to 250,000 men, this cost of life and blood and treasure would have been saved to the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. ASWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. Does the gentleman think that 250,000 men would have bluffed Germany at that time?

Mr. KAHN. I firmly believe 250,000 men at that time would have prevented the German Government from making their demands upon us then.

Mr. ASWELL. That is merely a matter of opinion.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman knows full well that all through this war the hope of the German Emperor and his people was that they would be able to defeat the Allies before we could get ready.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. KAHN. I can not yield just now.

Mr. BLACK. Just for a question?

Mr. KAHN. I can not yield just now.

Now, the question, therefore, that confronts us is this: Will we in the future run along as we have been running in the past, drifting, waiting, until something happens before we take action to prepare our country for possible emergencies? I have said repeatedly on this floor that no nation is the sole arbiter of its own destinies. No man can repeat that statement too often. It ought to sink deep into the minds of all Americans.

Take the case of little Belgium. In July, 1914, the people of Belgium were contented, prosperous, and happy. They had nothing to do with the assassination of the Archduke of Austria, that took place at Sarajevo. It did not concern them. They paid little attention to it. They went on about their business. Suddenly, as if a bolt from the blue sky had stricken them, they found their territory invaded, their cities bombarded, their inhabitants killed, and their country devastated. That war was not of their seeking; it was not of their choosing; and yet they were forced into it.

And take our own situation. The American people did not want to go into this war. They tried to avoid it. They did avoid it for several years. The President of the United States was elected for a second term on the slogan of "He kept us out of war." We were peacefully attending to our own affairs when suddenly, on the night of the 31st of January, 1917, our ambassador in Berlin was sent for, was given a map by the German chancellor, and was told that he should communicate with his own country and tell the people of that country that at midnight Germany would sink our ships, as I detailed a moment ago.

That came as a terrific shock to us. Congress was then in session. Congress is the war-declaring body. The President can not declare war. We were in session for practically five weeks after that. Germany did not carry out her threat, and we hoped that we might still avoid the struggle. But after Congress had adjourned, after the Members had gone home, she did carry out her threat. She sunk our ships.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I can not yield now. She sunk our ships, she drowned our people, and then the President called Congress together in an extraordinary session. In a ringing message he asked that we pass a resolution that a state of war existed, which Congress promptly did. That is how we got into the war. But some of us have constantly been saying ever since that we went to war "to fight for humanity" and "to make the world safe for democracy" and other altruistic and idealistic purposes. These were only incidental. They were not the cause of the war, and it is time that we state the cause properly. We went to war to protect American rights. [Applause.] The President stated about that time that in the event that Germany should carry out her threats against our commerce he would ask from Congress authority to use the national power to protect American citizens engaged in peaceful and lawful errands on the high seas. Germany carried out her threats. The President did ask for the authority. Congress promptly voted to give it to him. I hope that at no time in the

history of our country will the American people become so supine or so craven that they will not fight to maintain their rights as a great nation. [Applause.] We won the war. We need not blush to say it. We need not apologize for saying it.

I remember when the war resolution was passed France and England shortly after sent their war commissions over here. I recall a dinner at the home of Mr. Henry White, in this city, at which Marshal Joffre and Mr. Viviani, of the French Republic, were present. Marshal Joffre straightforwardly told us the situation. There were about 20 Members of the Senate and House present on that occasion. He spoke frankly to this effect:

We are at the end of our resources. The morale of our armies and of our people is low. We know that you are in the war, and so do the people of France. But we have been led to believe that it will take a year before you can get your soldiers to the other side. I beg of you see to it that one division of your Regular Army troops is sent immediately. We need them to revive our waning morale. If the soldiers of France and of England see your troops on the soil of France, it will give them courage to withstand the enemy until you can come over in force. The situation is serious; is exceedingly precarious. Do not wait until you have trained the men of your conscripted army. That will take too long. But your Regular Army men have already had the training that has established their morale. We can teach them trench fighting in two or three months behind the lines. But send them to us if you want to save the situation.

That was his plea. That was his appeal. He spoke for the French Government, and he spoke for the people of France, when he spoke to those Members of Congress as he did. The administration was deeply impressed by his plea. They met his wishes, and they prepared to send a division of Regular Army men to France as speedily as possible.

That was the situation, gentlemen, in Europe when we entered the conflict. I traveled into Belgium in March—at the end of March. I saw the devastated cities of Nieuport and Ypres and Dixmude and St. Julien. All that is left of St. Julien is a signboard with the name of the city printed on it. There is not a building or a portion of a building left. No man could go through that devastated area without becoming impressed with the wonderful valor and the splendid fortitude of the soldiers of Belgium and England, who held that sector during almost four years of war. [Applause.] Belgium had opened the sluice gates of her dikes. She permitted the waters to cover her land. The trenches, which in some places were not more than 50 feet apart, were constructed above the water. The men held the area, as I have stated, for four years. If they had given way at any time the Germans would undoubtedly have reached Calais, and the history of the war might have been different; for if German troops had occupied that port on the Channel and England had been unable to use it for sending supplies and men across the narrow strait, it would have made a tremendous difference in England's ability to meet the enormous requirements that were made of her in that sector of Belgium.

And just at this point to show incidentally how our American Army was made up, I want to recite a little experience that occurred at Dixmude, in southwestern Belgium. There is not a thing left of the town, not a habitable home. But one enterprising couple has come back and has built a little wooden shack which they use as a little coffee house. They sell coffee to the individuals who might be interested in visiting that section. The couple found out that we were Americans. They spoke French. I managed to get along with them as well as I could with the little French I know, and finally the wife said to me, "Come here; I have had four boys in this war; I want to show you something." Then she opened the door of her adjoining room, and there occupying the place of honor was a picture of an American soldier. She said, "Three of my boys have fought with the Belgian Army. The other boy enlisted in Montana and is fighting with your Americans." [Applause.]

We heard a great deal during the war about German atrocities in Belgium. I tried to verify those stories. I was told frankly that such as did occur happened in the early days of the war. But there is no doubt that the Germans deliberately looted Belgium and rendered her incapable of starting up her factories immediately upon the conclusion of peace. The King's secretary, Mr. Gerard, and a member of the Belgian Parliament, Mr. Boël, who had been tried with Burgomaster Max, of Brussels, and convicted by the German authorities and imprisoned for two years and a half in Germany, took me to his extensive plant at Louviere, which was not in the fighting area; in fact, it was some distance away from any place where fighting had been going on. It was a steel works. The owner had employed 3,000 mechanics and laborers at the works before the war. The Germans had stolen and removed every bit of machinery that had been in the place. And then, in order to make the wreckage all the more complete, they deliberately dynamited the cement foundations on which the machinery had rested. I heard from Belgian officials that the Belgian population, by reason of the situation in which they found themselves, have become more or less pauperized. They depend upon the charity of the world. They have had no work for some years. In the streets of their cities you can see to-day large aggregations of men and women in idleness talking with each other. They can not go back to work because the factories and mills and workshops are closed. The people who own them have not the means to put in new machinery, which at present would cost them two or three times more than it cost when it was purchased originally. That is one of the difficulties that the peace commissioners at Paris have to deal with. There are so many angles to this thing that we can not be surprised at what seems to us interminable delay in formulating definitive terms of peace.

When our troops began to arrive in Europe the English high command and the French high command wanted to use our soldiers as replacement divisions and depot divisions. In other words, if the French or the English had a thousand or two thousand men killed in an engagement, Americans were to be put into their units to fill up the places of those who had fallen. To the credit of Gen. Pershing be it said that from the start he fought for an American Army in Europe. [Applause.] And to the credit of President Wilson and Secretary Baker, they supported him constantly in this desire. [Applause.] The situation at one time became exceedingly tense. The French and the English both were still insisting that we must go in as replacement troops, and then I am told that the commander in chief of our forces emphatically said that we would fight as an American Army if we fought at all. [Applause.] And both Gen. Haig and Gen. Foch finally yielded.

When the Germans pressed down from the Aisne in May and drove everything before them on their great drive for Paris, Gen. Pershing immediately sent three American divisions to fight under Gen. Mangin, the French commander of that sector, in an effort to try to stay the German advance. The first division had been in that area for some little time. They had started out to make the first attempt of an American unit to capture and then to hold the captured German territory.

The attempt was made at Cantigny, I think, on the 25th of May, 1918. An artillery barrage preceded the onslaught of our infantry. It cleared, as far as was possible, the area in front of our troops, and I was told by some of those who participated in that fight that they met with little resistance in sweeping across the narrow valley and going up the little hill on which Cantigny is located. They took the town and held it. Then the German forces sent their shock troops against our men in counterattacks. During the succeeding three days the Germans made seven of these counterattacks. They had been told by their commanders that they must break the morale of the American troops. The best soldiers of Germany tried it at Cantigny and failed. [Applause.] That gave courage to all the allied nations. That inspired a sentiment in our own men that we could defeat Germany at her own game. [Applause.]

Right after that the German hordes came down and seized the territory, which is almost on a line from Soissons to Chateau-Thierry, including the famous Belleau Woods and Vaux. The Second Division was not then in the fighting area, but the men of that division were immediately rushed up into the area. They were brought up in motor trucks. Everything that could be utilized to bring our men to the front was rushed into the service. That led to the statement which gained considerable currency that the French people were making a charge to the Americans for bringing our troops to the front to save, among other things, the Republic of France. We heard it over here. I heard it in Europe, and therefore I thought it incumbent upon myself to investigate the matter. I found it was true.

They did make charges for the use of their camions, as they call them, but it was under a mutual agreement with our country that whenever we used their vehicles we would pay for their use, and whenever the French used our vehicles France would pay us for their use. So there was nothing wrong about it in any way, shape, or manner, and these stories about France charging us when we were defending French territory ought to be buried in oblivion once and for all. [Applause.]

What I do believe, and what I think history will give us credit for, is that the third division of the American troops, especially the Thirty-eighth Infantry Regiment at Mézy, near the Surmalin River, just where it empties into the bend of the Marne, east of Chateau-Thierry, actually was the organization that stopped the Germans in their advance and turned the tide of battle so that the cobelligerent forces could begin the offensive instead of fighting as we had been doing theretofore—on the defensive. [Applause.]

That battle occurred on the 15th of July. The Thirty-eighth Regiment of Infantry were in line on the south bank of the

Marne. They were to be protected on their right by a French regiment and on the left by the Thirtieth Regiment of Infantry of our own forces. When this great onslaught was made by the German forces it was found that the Thirtieth, on the left of the Thirty-eighth, had retired a little. It was found that the French regiment had retreated. Col. McAlexander, of the Thirty-eighth, had planted his men not due east and west as the lay of the land would seem to have indicated was the best for his forces but to protect his right flank he had thrown them into position in a northwesterly and southeasterly direction. The men of the Thirty-eighth were defending three sides of their front at one time. Those men remained at their posts for 16 hours without intermission, and it was their proud boast and is the proud boast of all Americans that of the great German horde that had come down to cross the Marne on their way to Paris on that occasion not one dead German soldier could be found south of the little railroad track that ran along the valley of the Surmalin about 400 yards south of the Marne River.

The Germans never reached that advanced position at that point on account of the wonderful courage and the matchless daring of those American soldiers, who prevented their crossing the Marne. [Applause.] It is a bright page in American history. But what I fear is that somebody will again rise up and say that you can call a million men to arms in this country overnight and defeat the trained troops of some mighty, warlike people. Let me remind you that it took us 13 months to get ready; 13 months before we could accomplish that. It was not done overnight. It was the work of many days and many months spent in the trenches and the camps in training. Indeed, we were singularly fortunate in this war that France and England held the lines against the enemy until we were ready to take our part in the titanic struggle. [Applause.]

After that second battle of the Marne, the whole tide of affairs turned. That battle occurred, as I said, on the 15th of July. On the 18th Marshal Foch ordered an advance along the entire front on the part of the allied nations and our forces. That continued successfully for days. We drove the enemy constantly from the 15th day of July until the end of the war.

Great operations during that period were largely under the American command. The Battle of St. Mihiel was planned by the Americans. It was carried through by Gen. Pershing and his forces. And a very interesting sidelight on that battle might be stated at this time. I was told by men in whom I have every confidence that about the 2d or 3d of September the statement was made in a public restaurant in Paris that the Americans were going to start a drive on St. Mihiel on the 10th of September. The statement was made openly and publicly. At that time spies were everywhere, and it was known that the Germans would get the information. Gen. Pershing immediately remonstrated. He protested against the open discussion of the war plans of the Americans or of any of the allied nations.

Thereupon the Americans used a bit of strategy. The military attaché at the capital of one of the neutral States was sent for to come to general headquarters. He was told that it was the purpose of the American command to throw the Germans off the track and that he would be expected to carry out his part of the program. They hurriedly prepared the plan of an attack near Belfort, in southwestern France. That plan was given to this military attaché, who was told to get it into the hands of the enemy. He returned to his capital, gave it to one of the younger officers serving under him, with instructions to lose it in a certain place where many individuals suspected of German leanings nightly congregated. The young man carried out this plan to perfection. He went to the place indicated. After chatting most pleasantly with some of the suspects he quietly excused himself for a moment and incidentally dropped the papers out of his pocket. He went outside of the room and in about two minutes returned with a look of great distress on his face. Feeling his pockets and looking furtively about he said, "Did anyone see a paper that I dropped?" Of course nobody had seen it. Then he went on to tell how important that paper was and that his personal future was involved in the recovery of that paper. He said he would probably be court-martialed and his entire career ruined if it were not forthcoming. Of course it was not forthcoming and he left the place. Several days after that Germany sent four divisions to defend her front near Belfort, and a few days after that, not on the 10th of September but on the 12th of September, the battle of St. Mihiel began.

The Germans found that not only could the Americans fight, not only would the Americans fight, but they could employ strategy in their plans just as the Germans had employed it during all the years they had been preparing for this war. [Applause.]

The salient of St. Mihiel was won in 27 hours. For four years it had been held by the enemy. Attempts had been made time and again to take it. France sacrificed something like 50,000 men in trying to take one spur of the salient known as Les Esparges. They took it and lost it again, and 50,000 of their men bit the dust in the attempt.

We started off on that attack with a great force of Artillery. We advanced over the territory successfully. Every objective was gained right from the start.

In the meantime the next battle—the Meuse-Argonne fight—had been projected. It was intended that our Artillery should be rushed up to that sector without delay. It was intended that we should go in and finish the work at St. Mihiel with our Infantry. Suddenly our Signal Corps men heard a wireless station in operation in the salient. The Germans had not all been driven out. I mention this merely to show you that every branch of our service performed its part efficiently and effectively for the honor of American arms. [Applause.] They gave notice, and we drove out the remnant of the Germans that were there without much trouble.

Soon after that the Meuse-Argonne fight began. It was started by a simultaneous bombardment coming from the throats of 2,275 pieces of artillery. That bombardment kept up for some hours. Any man who goes over that field, any man who traverses that terrain for any distance, will realize the magnitude of the great task the American forces undertook. It took us nearly a month to clean up that area. We got to Montfaucon, a point of vantage near the center of the field, without much difficulty. We lost a great many men. We took Montfaucon, which seemed an impregnable fortress. Then we went beyond it. We reached and crossed the Kremhilde Stellung, a part of the Hindenburg line which the Germans had felt could never be taken by mortal man. We went through it as if it did not exist. [Applause.]

We had some tanks helping us in that drive. The Germans were mortally afraid of the tanks. I found some of their literature on the tank near Moraigne Ferme, north of Verdun. They said, in effect, "Do not be afraid of the tank. It can not travel as fast as you can. [Laughter.] There is nothing to be afraid of. Just wait until it gets pretty close up and then shoot at a vulnerable part and you can accomplish your purpose."

The mere fact that they gave out that kind of propaganda was an indication to me that they were, in fact, afraid of the tanks. And during all the war Germany was never able to manufacture a good, serviceable tank.

I saw some other pieces of their literature and some of them were pretty blood-thirsty. I saw one in particular which referred to the failure of the cobelligerent nations to accept Austria's request for peace. In that leaflet they said, in effect, that "the Allies do not intend to accept our request for the cessation of hostilities; they have refused to listen to peace terms. It must be evident to you that they intend the thorough annihilation and destruction of the people of the Central Empires. Do not show any mercy to these enemies. Shoot to kill or to mortally wound." Those circulars were tacked on the wall of the farmhouse which we afterwards took, and when they retreated from that place they were found on the walls of that building.

After we had won the battle of the Meuse-Argonne and when we were preparing to move onward toward the German territory the enemy asked for an armistice. It was granted. And even then the insidious propaganda against Americans in Europe was going on.

We all know what the situation was when the armistice came. France and England had been in the war over four years. They had suffered enormous losses. Their people were war weary and they welcomed an opportunity to agree upon a cessation of hostilities.

A very estimable French lady, whom I know very well and have known for years, told me that she had heard that the reason why the Allies did not follow up the victory after the Meuse-Argonne was because President Wilson had called a halt, and that neither France nor England would dare to go on after that.

Now, that was insidious propaganda meant to injure the good name and fame, in my humble opinion, of the American people. I do not know who is responsible for it, but I do know that the longer we remain in Europe the more slanders of that sort will be sent forth and the worse the situation will grow. [Applause.]

If I had my way, as I have said repeatedly, every American soldier, except military attachés, would speedily be taken out of Europe. [Applause.] If we had some tangible things to protect in the treaty of peace, perhaps we would have to see to it that its terms are carried out. But we went into the war not seeking territory, not seeking indemnities, not for revenge, not

seeking anything but the acknowledgment of American rights on the high seas. [Applause.]

Oh, I could spend a long time in taking you with me through the "leave areas" of France, where our men are given an opportunity to get a breath of fresh air and to see the land which many of them had visited for the first time. I want to say here that I have heard a great many criticisms at the hands of soldiers and others about the welfare associations. But no man could have gone into the "leave areas" of Europe and have witnessed the kindness, the consideration, and the open hospitality that was showered on our men through the instrumentality of the Y. M. C. A. and the Knights of Columbus and the Salvation Army and the Jewish Welfare Board and all those activities without admitting that they were doing a great work for the young men of America. [Applause.] I glory in what they were able to accomplish for our soldiers and for having brought a great deal of happiness into the hearts of these troops of the Republic who were thousands of miles away from kith and kin and who probably otherwise would not have enjoyed many of the creature comforts that came to them through the instrumentality of these organizations.

I would like to go with you through the ports of embarkation and show you the wonderful work that was accomplished in a comparatively few months through the skill and the ability of American engineers and American troops. I would like to take you through the stations of the service of supplies, those immense warehouses which held the material that was essential for the men at the front. Oh, we frequently hear sneers about the men who stayed behind the battle lines in the services of supply. They, too, performed valiant service. I want to say that if those men had not performed their duty as effectively and as efficiently as they did, the men in the fighting line could not have performed their services either. It was an important work and it was mighty well done, and the Nation owes those men just as great a debt of gratitude as it does the soldiers who fought in the ranks at the front.

At Tours there was a German prison camp of about 4,000 men. All through the war there had been much speculation as to the age of the German soldiers. I remember the debate on the floor of this House very well when we were passing the man-power bill, which proposed to take the men between 18 and 45 years of age for our Army. It was said in that debate that even Germany had not taken her 18-year-old boys. At Tours I found some German prisoners who were 18 years of age at the time I visited the camp. I asked them how long they had been in the service before the armistice was signed. They said they had been in for nine months. The armistice had been in effect for six months at the time I visited the camp, so that those men could not have been more than 17 years old when they went into the German Army. One of their noncommissioned officers stated frankly that in the closing years of the war Germany had accepted boys of 15 years of age as volunteers, and boys of 16 years as volunteers, but had actually drafted them at 17. He said that during the war they did not want such information to get out, but now the war is over there could be no harm in telling it at this time.

We hear much of the German propaganda literature that was disseminated in our own ranks by the enemy. We likewise disseminated our literature in the ranks of the Germans. One of the leaflets that were scattered rather plentifully stated just what the American soldiers were receiving in the way of rations. The list was printed with considerable care and was dropped into the German lines from our airplanes. American officers told me that toward the closing days of the war when large numbers of Germans were surrendering they would pull from the sleeves of their coats copies of these leaflets, especially those showing the food they were to get. They would point to it as if to say, "Make good on that." [Laughter.] So that, at least, one kind of our propaganda work seems to have been a success.

After the armistice, when the men in all countries began to return to their homes, new troubles began to beset the world. The peace council met in Paris in January. It soon became evident that the world was looking upon us as the Lady Bountiful of the universe. All kinds of propositions were submitted. One was that all the allied nations were to throw their indebtedness into a general pool, and that the nation which had been in the war the shortest length of time and had lost the fewest men should bear the greatest burden of the indebtedness.

Then there was another proposition: By reason of their helplessness Belgium and France should get money immediately from Germany to restore conditions in these war-ridden countries, so that their people could at once begin to work. How authoritative the source of the information was I do not know; but I learned that a proposition had been put forth that Germany was to pay the demands at once, and was to issue a series of bonds, and that the United States should guarantee the payment of the bonds. [Laughter.] Many such propositions of course were to be expected. It was inevitable. But one thing is sure, absolutely certain, and that is that the people of Europe do not understand our plain, blunt way of doing things, and we do not understand the intrigues and the hatreds and jealousies of the people of Europe. I saw a map the other day, a very recent map of Europe. It showed the various countries and the various races that inhabit the various sections of the various countries. Twenty-seven different well-defined races and peoples are depicted on that map. They differ racially, they differ ethnologically, they do not speak the same languages. They are poles apart, and they hate each other with an unholy hatred. Yet we are trying to mix up in this maelstrom and fix boundary lines for those peoples! Do you think we can do it? Do you believe it can be successfully done? I do not believe so. I called on Mr. Hoover the very day I left Paris; I think it was the 12th of May. He showed me on the map of Europe where in 17 different places men under arms were fighting and killing each other. And this while the peace council was sitting at Paris, trying to bring peace to all the world!

We have great problems ahead of us; great problems. The fixing of the boundary line at Fiume has brought on a great deal of discontent right in this country. Our population is made up of people from every portion of the globe. They are ready to fight for this country, this land of their adoption, whenever our country calls. Many of them, I believe, way down in their hearts have lurking a bit of love for the land in which they were born, but if a struggle should come between this country and that land, they would be ready to march under the flag of the Republic against the very land in which they first saw the light of day. [Applause.]

But in these questions of boundaries their heart is really with their native land. And why should we, interfering in European politics [applause on the Republican side] and European affairs, throw this apple of discord among any part of our American citizens. [Applause on the Republican side.] We have an equally distressing situation with respect to China and Japan. The Chinese for a long time have looked upon America as their one true friend among the nations of the earth. This is practically the only country that never tried to despoil her of her territory. We have held out the hand of friendship to her on many an occasion. But the Chinese complain most bitterly now that we have given over to Japan the province of Shantung. True, they say that Japan asserts that it is only for 15 years. But they call attention to what Japan said about Korea in 1904 when she went to war with Russia, in a rescript issued by the Emperor of Japan at that time; that she intended to maintain the independence and integrity of Korea. She also entered into treaties with Korea which set those things forth in so many words. Then, year after year, she began to encroach upon the independence of Korea until in 1910 she swallowed Korea and deposed her emperor. The Chinese say, "Can you Americans place any dependence upon a nation that in the past has violated sacred compacts and that is apt to do it again in the case of this richest part of the Chinese Empire, the part that is dear to us because it is the birthplace of our great teacher, Confucius?" These are all problems that confront us. These are all questions which the American people ought to discuss thoroughly before the treaty of peace is ratified. I hope that that treaty will be published in full before the Senate acts——

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield just there?

Mr. KAHN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman will be glad to note that the Senate by a vote of 46 to 24 has ordered the treaty published, which they now have. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. It is exceedingly gratifying to know that, and I thank the gentleman for having given me and the committee that information.

Mr. POU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I do.

Mr. POU. I would like to inquire if the treaty that the Senate has ordered published is what purports to be the stolen copy of the treaty sent over here——

Mr. KAHN. I can not inform the gentleman; I do not know. The first I learned of it was through the information I received just now from the gentleman from Ohio; but I have here a copy of the summary of the conditions of peace which I will vouch for as authentic.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Has not that been published?

Mr. KAHN. I do not know. If it was published, it was published at a time when I was not in this country.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I thought we had all seen that.

Mr. KAHN. But this I secured, and it is undoubtedly authentic.

Mr. KITCHIN and Mr. HARDY of Texas rose.

Mr. KITCHIN. Would it embarrass the gentleman——

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen desiring to interrupt the speaker will address the Chair and secure the speaker's permission.

Mr. KAHN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KITCHIN. Would it embarrass the gentleman to say from what source he obtained that summary? I can understand——

Mr. KAHN. I can say to the gentleman this much about it, that I received it at the Hotel Crillon in Paris. [Applause.]

Mr. KITCHIN. If the gentleman will permit, I presume more than one person is stopping at that hotel?

Mr. KAHN. Oh, yes; but I can say there was no attempt to withhold these summaries. They were passed to the German delegates to the peace conference——

Mr. KITCHIN. I am informed by a gentleman near me that that has been published.

Mr. KAHN. It probably has. It is a résumé of the treaty itself, and the gentleman has been a legislator for many years, and a good one at that——

Mr. KITCHIN. I admit it.

Mr. KAHN. And he knows that summaries are often vague. I want to say that I saw the treaty of peace, a printed copy of it; it covered 208 printed pages. It was printed in English and in French. It contained 15 different parts. This summary covers 27 pages, so that it takes an average of about 8 pages of the treaty to make 1 page of this.

Mr. KITCHIN. If I may again interrupt the gentleman, I assume the gentleman is going to publish it in the RECORD?

Mr. KAHN. I will publish it in the RECORD; yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. I would like to see it.

Mr. KAHN. Well, I admit it is interesting, and if the committee will indulge me a few moments I can state a few things about it now. It refers, for instance, to the German cables and their disposition. The details, of course, are not in here. I understand that the German cables have been divided into about 17 different sections. Some of them are used now by the French Government and others by the British Government. There are three or four sections that are not being used by anybody, because they are absolutely worthless to anybody. Now, the disposition of those cables is a most important thing for the United States, and if we do nothing else, I hope this Government will endeavor to make arrangements with some country in Europe whereby we will have a station on the other side of the Atlantic for an European end for an American cable. [Applause.] It is all essential for our commerce if we hope to become that great commercial nation of which we hear so much from so many mouths these days. If we do not have it, every cablegram that is sent from a business firm in Europe to an American manufacturer will pass under the scrutiny of the officials of that Government that controls the European end of the cable.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question, if I may.

Mr. KAHN. I will yield for a brief question.

Mr. JUUL. Does the gentleman think that it is at present a military necessity that letters sent from a neutral country, a country with which we are not at war, should be opened by the British and every piece of trade information that we might want to get at first hand should be known to the British people before we get the information?

Mr. KAHN. I can not tell the gentleman; I do not know under what agreement that is being done.

But I do know that it was done largely while the world was at war; and I believe that every telegram of a business nature that passed between Europe and this country was likewise known to the officials of the countries on the other side of the Atlantic. I do not doubt that the information thus obtained was made use of for the purpose of upbuilding the trade and commerce of those countries. I think that it was freely stated in the British Parliament at the time the censorship was being invoked on American correspondence that the information was being used for the upbuilding of British trade. But I do not know about it personally.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. KAHN. I can not yield further. I can not answer the question. I do not know under what conditions the letters are being opened. I presume our Government is making protests if they are being opened in violation of any agreement; but I assume that there is some agreement.

Now, I notice in this summary, if the gentleman will allow me, that Germany is to restore to the Allies ton for ton their shipping that was destroyed by the Central Powers during the war. This refers to their ships of commerce and even the Allies' fishing trawlers that were destroyed. But the treaty is painfully silent as to the restoration of ship tonnage to any other nation but the Allies. In other words, the Associated Powers, of which the treaty speaks in conjunction with the Allies, are sedulously left out of that section of the treaty. And I honestly believe that a thorough scrutiny of the treaty will enlighten the American people and will enable them to learn many things about which they ought to be enlightened and which they do not know at the present time.

There was much discussion of the league of nations while I was in Europe. There was a difference of opinion over there, just as there is a difference of opinion over here, as to its efficacy as an antidote against future wars.

There was much interest manifested and considerable surprise expressed at the announcement of President Wilson that he would recommend to the Senate that a treaty of alliance should be entered into between the United States and the Republic of France, and also with Great Britain. Many Frenchmen of prominence asked me what I thought of the prospect for such an alliance. I told them frankly that our country had from its birth avoided foreign alliances, and I did not believe that a majority of my countrymen would countenance such treaties now or at any time in the future. From the beginning of our history Americans have been taught that we must avoid entangling alliances. That is a part of our political creed as a Nation. Of course those with whom I discussed the matter doubted my judgment. I am still of the opinion that America will never ratify such treaties. But I have often thought that the mere announcement by the President that he would ask for such treaties was a tacit acknowledgment on his part that the league of nations was not altogether a dependable panacea. If it is to preserve the peace of the world, why the necessity for additional separate alliances with France and England. The mere fact that such alliances are asked for by these countries would indicate to me, at least, that they have not much confidence in the efficacy of the league as a war preventative. And if England, France, and the United States can form a separate alliance, why can not Germany, Russia, and Japan also form an alliance. To me the whole plan seems to be indefinite and vague. Many in Europe, and I believe that most thinking men and women in America, know that the league will not prevent war. In fact many publicists and thinkers believe it will, if anything, tend to bring about wars more frequently.

I am convinced that we ought not to be drawn into controversies concerning this boundary line or that boundary line or the aspirations of this people or that people. We know that Europe is a hell hole of political plotting and intrigue. We know that the statesmen of one European country lie awake at night planning and plotting to get an advantage for their country over some rival country. We know of their jealousies, their rivalries, their hatreds. The league of nations is not going to alter the human emotions of people who for centuries have nursed and cherished these hatreds and jealousies that all too frequently in the past have led to bitter warfare.

Ah, gentlemen, let us stay on our side of the Atlantic Ocean. [Applause.] We have many great problems confronting us. We have a glorious destiny if we will just mind our own business [applause], and not try to regulate the affairs of the universe. I am a nationalist. [Applause.] I believe in my own country, in my own people, in our own Constitution. Our country has stood forth a beacon for the oppressed of every land for over a century. It has inspired the confidence of the world.

I remember standing on the public square in the city of Liege recently. There was a little Belgian boy that came to our little group of Americans. He said in a forceful way: "When I am 20 and 1 years of age, I am going to America." He was only 13 or 14 years old. I said to him, "Why, my boy, do you want to go to America?" He said, "Here we have to work hard, but we have nothing when we are through. Over in America when you work hard you can save a little something and have a little home and a little comfort, and that is more than we get here." And that was only a child; but he had learned to know of the great opportunities and the great advantages and the great benefits that accrue to any man who is honest and industrious and faithful and loyal in America.

I can only say in conclusion to this part of my remarks, that never before did those lines of James Russell Lowell appeal to me as they did when I saw the Statue of Liberty as I sailed up New York Bay:

> Oh, beautiful, my country; * * *
> What were our lives without thee!
> What all our lives to save thee;
> We reck not what we gave thee;
> We do not dare to doubt thee;
> But ask whatever else, and we will dare.

[Applause.]

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from California yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. QUIN. You spoke of the treaty that is being made in Paris. Could you state whether or not it provides that the Government of the United States will keep soldiers in the Saar Valley or elsewhere in Europe, or for the protection of mandatories, and for how long?

Mr. KAHN. The summary does not state that. It has this provision, however. tI says, in effect, that if Germany for five years carries out faithfully the obligations that are imposed upon her, the troops of the nations occupying German territory will be withdrawn from the Cologne bridgehead and the territory adjacent to it in five years. If for 10 years she carries out her obligations under the treaty, the troops that might be occupying the Coblenz bridgehead and the territory contiguous to it will be withdrawn in 10 years. And if for 15 years she carries out her obligations under the treaty, then all the troops that might be in the Mayence bridgehead or the territory contiguous to it, and in any other part of Germany, will be finally withdrawn after 15 years. And while the summary of the treaty does not indicate what soldiers those troops are to consist of, what forces they are to consist of, we have a right to assume that possibly—I say possibly—we may be called upon to keep some of our troops at Coblenz for the next 10 years.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. QUIN. Will the gentleman yield for another question there?

Mr. KAHN. I will.

Mr. QUIN. Would the gentleman favor this House appropriating money to keep American soldiers over there for 10 years after this treaty is signed?

Mr. KAHN. I hope not. I hope every vote in this House will be against such a proposition. [Applause.]

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. It may be information to the gentleman from California to know that since he began to make his speech, the Senate has adopted a resolution for the publication of the treaty as a whole.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] stated that to the House a few moments ago.

Mr. MADDEN. Very well. I will withdraw it. [Laughter.]

Mr. KAHN. Now, for these reasons, I say, the people of America have a vital interest in knowing what is in this treaty, and I am glad that at the other end of the Capitol an effort is being made to print it in full for the information of the citizens of this Republic. [Applause.]

Now, a few words on the pending bill. I am afraid I have trespassed upon the time of the House too long. But the Committee on Military Affairs felt, in view of the rapid demobilization of our armies, that it would not be necessary at this time to appropriate for a force of 509,000 enlisted men and over 28,000 officers. When the War Department officials came to the committee in January and presented their estimates they frankly told us that they could not tell us how rapidly the Army could or would be demobilized.

The question of shipping and tonnage was then very important but they said they would try to get them back as speedily as possible. Our information at the recent hearing was that the force in Europe by the 1st of July would be materially reduced—considerably below the figures that had been previously estimated.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Has the committee any recent or inside information as to when all the American troops will be withdrawn from Russia, and what they went there for?

Mr. KAHN. The committee, as I recall, was informed that the troops at Archangel were to be brought home at once, and that they are all being withdrawn. The committee was also told that about 8,000 men are in Siberia, and that it was desirable to retain them there so as to maintain the Siberian Railroad open to the allied nations, so that they could take food to the starving people of Russia and Siberia; that that was being done under an international agreement, as I recall, each nation having guaranteed to furnish a certain number of men to maintain that transit across Siberia for that purpose.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have appreciated the thoroughness of the gentleman's most interesting review of the situation in Europe. I also recall that when the gentleman first came back from Europe he submitted to an interview which pleased me very much. His statement of affairs there was clear and lucid. In that interview he stated that he hoped that the Army might be reduced to 100,000 men. This bill makes provision for 400,000 men. The War Department had asked for 500,000 men. I would like to ask the gentleman if he will explain how it is we come to reach 400,000, seeing that there is a demand in the country for the speedy demobilization of the military forces?

Mr. KAHN. Of course the gentleman can readily see that, having appropriated for an average Army of 400,000 men, the number must be largely reduced below that number soon after the middle of the next fiscal year. In other words, at the beginning of the fiscal year the Army will be at its apex, so far as the fiscal year is concerned. There will probably be 700,000 or 800,000 soldiers in our armies on the 1st of July. Probably on the 1st of August that number will have been reduced by 300,000. By the 1st of September it will have been still further reduced, and so the reduction will continue until the end of the fiscal year—that is, until June 30, 1920—at which time I imagine there will not be many more than 200,000 soldiers left in our Army.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask the gentleman upon just what he bases his suggestion that the Army can be reduced to 100,000 men?

Mr. KAHN. I base that on my own opinion. I have repeatedly said, and I said it in this House even before I went to Europe, that, in my opinion, a country like this could well get along with a Regular Army of 100,000 men if they were to be used as a training cadre for the universal training of American youths between the ages of 18 and 19.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes. The gentleman did couple universal training with his suggestion. But the difference between 100,000 as a peace organization and 400,000 is rather marked.

Mr. KAHN. As I stated before, the language of the bill does not contemplate in any way a standing Army for this coming fiscal year of 1920 of 400,000 men.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It does not contemplate that?

Mr. KAHN. Certainly not. It means an average Army of 400,000 men.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The Secretary of War was quoted sometime ago as suggesting that we would probably have all the troops out of Europe, I think, by the 1st of August. I may be inaccurate as to that. It was either the 1st of August or the 1st of September. In view of what the gentleman has said, this new provision for as many as 400,000 men might imply that we are going to be obliged to keep in Europe 200,000 men for an indefinite period, or at least for a period of 10 years. I am speaking in the interest of economy purely, I will say to the gentleman. I am interested in the revenues, and I want to know where we are to get off.

Mr. KAHN. I am also interested in that question; I am interested also in the welfare of my country, as to its Army, and I have always believed in preparedness. But I do not approve now, and never will approve, in this country a standing Army of 400,000 men. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then this suggestion of 400,000 men, to be carried in the bill as presented, is simply in continuation of the war measures, or the emergency that is still upon us?

Mr. KAHN. It is an Army that during this coming fiscal year will average about 400,000 men, being much larger at the beginning of the fiscal year than 400,000, and being considerably less than 400,000 at the end of the year.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The Secretary of War asked for 500,000 men.

Mr. KAHN. Five hundred and nine thousand men.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And provision was made in the preceding bill, if I remember, for that number?

Mr. KAHN. Yes. The committee was justified at that time in appropriating for that number. It seemed to the committee that it would not be possible to demobilize our forces as rapidly as they have been brought home and demobilized.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. As the gentleman sees it now, does it look to him as if at the end of 1920 we would have as many as 300,000 men in the Army of the United States?

Mr. KAHN. No; I do not think so. I think at that time we shall have come down to the basis of the volunteer army which was authorized in the closing days of the last session of Congress. We authorized an army of volunteers under the national-defense act which would provide a force of about 175,000 combat troops plus about 50,000 auxiliary troops.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Am I right about this: If we vote for this bill we are voting to reduce the Army 100,000 less than the Secretary of War asked for when the former bill was before the House?

Mr. KAHN. Yes; an average Army of 400,000 men, a 22½ per cent smaller Army than he had asked for at the beginning of 1919.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. So that there is a very distinct cut in this bill?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee what the committee has done in reference to aviation in connection with preparedness.

Mr. KAHN. The committee has adopted a provision that was in the last bill as it passed the House. The Army appropriation bill was very fully discussed on this floor, and the aviation section in particular. Several statements have been made to the committee. The matter was frankly considered and it was deemed inadvisable in this bill to take up any projects that would seem to indicate the future policy of Congress and of the War Department as to the future of our Army. It was deemed advisable to make this an appropriation bill, and it was deemed necessary to pass it very quickly, because, as we all know, if the 30th of June comes before this bill is enacted into law not a dollar of the money in the Treasury will be available to pay those men who would be discharged on July 1 and thereafter until this bill becomes a law, and give them their final pay and their transportation to their homes. So the committee thought it advisable to let such matters as aviation and ordnance and all those other questions wait for the present until we take up a complete Army reorganization bill.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. I notice that the bill calls for additional pay of 20 per cent.

Mr. KAHN. That is the existing law.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. I have just heard from a soldier in France who says he was paid in French money. He saved up an amount equivalent to $270 in United States money. He can not get away from there without sacrificing $40 exchange, due to some combination of French bankers.

Mr. KAHN. Then he was in a sector where they did business differently from what they did in another sector that I visited. At Brest I went into the treasury building which we have constructed there, and the steamer *Leviathan* had just brought dozens of cases—enormous cases—filled with United States paper money to pay the troops. They were being paid in new United States bills. If this man got French money, the matter ought to be investigated, because our Government, I take it, never contemplated that any American soldier should have to pay the exchange for converting French money into American money, but, on the other hand, it was intended to give the American soldier the benefit of the exchange if he wanted to change his American money into French money.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. He says that many of the soldiers are paid in the same way, and that they can not get American money. I called the attention of the War Department to it, and they said it was a serious matter, and that thousands of dollars had been lost to our soldiers. They contemplated bringing a bill into Congress; and I want the provision incorporated into this bill to enable these soldiers to be reimbursed where they could not get American money after they had served under our colors over there.

Mr. KAHN. I would want to investigate fully any such statement as to American soldiers in France being paid in French money, when I know that there was plenty of American money over there to pay them.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. For the gentleman's information I will state that all our troops during the war were paid in French currency or Italian currency, wherever they were stationed, and the money which was brought over which the gentleman saw was brought over there to give the men their last pay in Brest before coming home. I will state to the gentleman that the exchange was not fixed by the French bankers, but was fixed by our Treasury Department.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Fifteen per cent?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Whatever it was.

Mr. KAHN. When I left France the exchange was six French francs for one American dollar. At the various places that I visited I was informed that the American soldiers were getting American money.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. They did not get it during the war.

Mr. KAHN. Of course I was not over there during the war.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. They were paid in the currency of the country wherever they happened to be.

Mr. KAHN. If that was the case and the American soldier lost anything on the exchange, I believe this Government owes it to the American soldier to make up his loss in that particular. [Applause.]

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LITTLE. Twenty years ago American soldiers were paid in American gold. I do not know what the custom is now.

Mr. KAHN. I saw great chests of American money in Brest.

Mr. LITTLE. I have seen thousands of dollars paid out in American gold to our soldiers abroad. I want to ask the distinguished gentleman if I understood him to express the opinion that 100,000 men in our Army would take care of the duties of our Army abroad and also take care of the military training of the boys of 18 to 19?

Mr. KAHN. Of the boys between 18 and 19. I think it can be done.

Mr. LITTLE. And do all the other work?

Mr. KAHN. I think so. It will keep the Army busy; but, for God's sake, let us keep them busy.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. In connection with this matter of exchange I was told in Coblenz that the Army of occupation there had been paid in marks and that the American commissary refused to accept payments for purchases made in the very money which the paymasters of the Army had passed out to the soldiers in payment for their services.

Mr. KAHN. Of course, the mark is a very much depreciated form of currency. One franc is equivalent to two marks now.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. The complaint was that the American soldier was paid in marks and that then the American Quartermaster's Department refused to accept that same money in payment for purchases made by the soldiers.

Mr. KAHN. That certainly should be investigated, and I shall be glad to bring the matter to the attention of the War Department.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to ask the chairman of the committee, merely for information, as to the demobilization of the Army. What is the present policy of the War Department with reference to the average Army in this country at the present time? In other words, how many men are they keeping in the various camps as an average Army?

Mr. KAHN. I understand there are in the camps about 400,000 men.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Are they keeping up that average?

Mr. KAHN. It is being kept up because about as many men are returning from Europe daily as are being demobilized, so that the average is being kept up just at present. When our forces fail to come in such numbers from the other side of the Atlantic, the demobilization in our camps undoubtedly will be much greater.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Certainly.

Mr. EMERSON. Has the gentleman studied the bonus that is given by England, France, Canada, and Italy to their discharged soldiers in comparison with ours?

Mr. KAHN. No; I will say frankly that I have not looked into that matter at all.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENISON. In the course of the hearings on the bill did the Secretary of War express his view as to what our permanent Army should be?

Mr. KAHN. No; he did not. I think the committee and the Secretary had an informal discussion. He frankly stated and the committee frankly told him that in this bill it was not desirable to take up Army reorganization. It was to be an appropriation bill simply, and that later on we would take up the matter of our military policy and Army reorganization.

Mr. DENISON. So there is no legislation in the bill?

Mr. KAHN. No. There are two or three provisos in the bill which, I think, the House will adopt.

Mr. DENISON. Changing existing law?

Mr. KAHN. One proviso changes existing law; that is the one with reference to the purchase of real estate. But there are several provisos which enable the financial officer to give the enlisted man upon certain conditions his final pay, notwithstanding the fact that his papers have been lost or destroyed. We think that it is essential that they should be enacted into law, because instances of this kind occur: While his organization was moving from one place to another along the front, a wagon carrying the records of the organization was struck by a shell and all the papers of that organization were destroyed. Of course, the man should get his money on making a proper affidavit showing that condition.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAUGEN. To what number will the American Army be reduced, or likely to be reduced, by July?

Mr. KAHN. I think it will be down to the law which Congress enacted in February of this year; that is 175,000 combat troops, plus auxiliaries, which will make a total of approximately 215,000 men.

Mr. HAUGEN. By the 1st of July coming?

Mr. KAHN. Oh, no; I thought the gentleman meant the 1st of July, 1920.

Mr. HAUGEN. I meant the 1st of July next.

Mr. KAHN. I think in the neighborhood of 900,000 men.

Now, I thank the House for its indulgence. If there is no further question, I will yield the floor.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KAHN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman state whether or not the troops are being removed from Europe to this country with all possible expedition?

Mr. KAHN. I believe the troops are being brought expeditiously from France and from England and various other areas in which our troops have been quartered; but how rapidly they are being brought from the occupied area, the bridgehead at Coblenz and the territory behind it, I do not know.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Let me put the question in this way: Does the gentleman think it is possible to bring any more troops home than are being brought monthly?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Have we more bottoms to bring them in? Where can you get additional bottoms to bring them home in?

Mr. KAHN. I am under the impression that we can take some of our ships that we are building, that are being completed, and put them into the service so as to bring more home.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am speaking of present conditions; you can not put ships into the service until they are completed.

Mr. KAHN. I understand that more tonnage is being put into the service day after day.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Are they bringing home troops?

Mr. KAHN. Yes; I think they are used also as cargo carriers. But I want to say in all frankness and fairness to the gentleman from Virginia that I think the War Department is making every effort to bring home every soldier in France with the facilities it has at its command. [Applause.] I think that is so, but I do not agree with the policy, if that be the policy of the War Department, of keeping troops over there in the occupied territory.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am not speaking of the occupation forces; I am speaking of troops available for transportation. Does the gentleman know, or does he not know, that we are crowding troops on ships coming home so that they not infrequently sleep in shifts?

Mr. KAHN. I have not heard of that. I came over on a very large ship. It was crowded, but I did not hear of anything of that kind.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We have been bringing troops home on some of our warships, have we not?

Mr. KAHN. Comparatively few.

Mr. MONTAGUE. A good many cruisers have been converted into transports, have they not?

Mr. KAHN. Yes; but compared with the great number of troops we have had over there the cruisers do not bring a great many home. All the transports now are manned by the Navy.

I want to say this about the Navy, and probably I should have said it earlier in my remarks: No man can go aboard one of those giant transports like the *Leviathan* without having the greatest admiration for the American boys who went into the engine rooms and the firerooms of those ships during the war. They went to their posts and served their country when it was exceedingly dangerous to take those positions. A submarine firing a torpedo at one of those ships and perchance sinking it would have sent every young American in the fireroom and in the engine room to the bottom of the sea, I honestly believe. Yet those young men fearlessly and patriotically went to their posts of duty in the face of imminent danger, and I do not hesitate to say that they deserve as much credit as those who fought in the Army. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Recently it was indicated in the press that all but seven divisions, 250,000 men, were to be returned to the United States by the 1st of July, and that all would be released in this country except 150,000 in the camps, which would make a total number of 400,000 in the Army immediately after the 1st of July. What does the gentleman say as to that?

Mr. KAHN. I saw in this morning's paper or yesterday's papers that the War Department had withdrawn all of our combat troops that were in the National Army and the National Guard from Europe; that only regulars were over there at this time. Seven divisions would be in the neighborhood of 250,000 men. Many of those men who have been transferred to regular divisions are really drafted men or men who volunteered for the war. They have a right to be brought home within four months after the signing of the peace treaty. I imagine that the War Department will bring them home. I imagine that they are making every effort to bring them home. The policy of keeping soldiers over there at all is one that is an Executive matter, but voicing the opinion of one legislator in this body I say that I hope every soldier will be brought from Europe not later than the beginning of next October. [Applause.]

I thank the House for its indulgence. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DENT. As I understand there was no agreement made as to a limit of time for general debate.

The CHAIRMAN. That is true. Each gentleman securing the floor will be recognized for one hour.

Mr. KAHN. Will my colleague yield? How much time did I consume?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman used 2 hours and 15 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Then the gentleman from California was entitled to an hour and has used 2 hours and 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is true.

Mr. DENT. I was under the impression that the gentleman from California was going to move to go back into the House to see if we could reach an agreement, and I would like to know exactly how we are proceeding.

The CHAIRMAN. We are proceeding in this way: A Member being recognized secures the floor for one hour.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from California whether it is the intention of the gentleman to go on with the debate this afternoon, and that at adjournment it will be regarded by him as closed except that the gentleman from Alabama shall have two hours on Wednesday next?

Mr. KAHN. After we proceed a little while this afternoon, I think we can reach an agreement about the time.

Mr. KITCHIN. Then it is the gentleman's intention to go back into the House and try to reach an agreement?

Mr. KAHN. Yes; before we finally adjourn. I have not had an opportunity to consult with my colleagues on this side of the House.

Mr. KITCHIN. I knew that the gentleman was going to do the fair thing, and I know that that side of the House is going to do the fair thing, but we want to know how the matter stands.

Mr. KAHN. Before long I shall be able to take up the matter with the gentleman from Alabama with the hope of reaching an agreement.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I desire recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for one hour.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, suppose the gentleman from Kentucky occupies only 15 minutes and reserves the remainder of his time, would he have the right to yield that to some one?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky, of course, can yield such portion as he does not occupy.

Mr. KITCHIN. I knew that was the procedure we had last Saturday a week ago on the luxury bill, but that had not prevailed before. I think it is right.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I indorse in part the speech just made by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] and disapprove it in part. I agree with his indorsement of the President as Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States, his indorsement of

the Secretary of War in the performance of the arduous duties which have devolved upon him in the prosecution of the war, and his indorsement of the efforts of the American Army in France; but I do not agree with his contention that had America had an army of 250,000 men prior to the war she would not have become involved in the war. Mr. Chairman, it was not our lack of a large army that induced or led Germany to violate the sovereignty of the United States and murder our women and children on the seas. It was her deliberate design to wage a war of conquest for world supremacy and her belief that she could accomplish that result that led her to disregard our rights under international law and murder our people in violation of the dictates of humanity.

Germany knew the man-power, the resources, and strength of our country before we entered the war. It is contended, and I believe the contention to be true, that she had acquired, through her spy system, better military maps of our country than we had ourselves. She knew the temperament of the American people; the pep and skill of American men and their daring courage in the execution of their decisions. She knew all that, but notwithstanding her thorough knowledge of it all, her desire for conquest, her dreams of world supremacy, supported by her self-conceit, led her to force a condition of war upon us.

We recall that in 1908 she attempted to plant a colony in South America and reluctantly withdrew when the President of the United States demanded her withdrawal. No doubt she felt then that her withdrawal was only temporary, because her plans were not then ripe for armed controversy with the United States. She realized that her first step by armed force must be toward conquering Europe; and it almost makes me shudder when I realize how near she came to accomplishing that result. France and England were fighting with their backs to the wall, unable to make an offensive move anywhere on the whole battle line when America entered the struggle. But at that the free peoples of the world owe to France and England and their European allies a debt of everlasting gratitude for the courage with which they withstood the German onslaught until assistance could reach them from across the seas.

The German Army was within 31 miles of Paris, the French capital, and was dropping bombs upon it from her master guns in the rear of her front lines when the first American engagement was started. If Paris had fallen, France would have fallen and London would have been the next German objective; and let us remember, gentlemen, that while Germany was reducing Belgium and northern France to ruins in her movement toward Paris, and prior to our entry into the war, she was attempting by negotiation to bring Mexico and Japan into the war as her allies and against the United States, as a result of which Mexico was to be given territory from the southern side of the United States and Japan from the western side and the islands of the Pacific. And these negotiations were being attempted by Count von Bernstorff, the German Ambassador to the United States, at that time living in Washington by the courtesy of this Government and under its protection. While all that was occurring, Germany was secretly organizing in Atlantic waters a fleet of submarines which she believed would be impregnable, which she believed would prevent America from transporting an army across the water. She knew that we would enter the war, for she designed to force us to do so; it was a part of her scheme. She believed that she would conquer and become the master of Europe with and by the strength of her land forces and at the same time defeat the United States on the seas with her submarines.

Then, with Europe conquered and America driven from Atlantic waters by her submarines and involved with Mexico on land and with Japan in the Pacific, she could without interference from the United States renew her efforts to plant her colonies in South America and ultimately monopolize or conquer those countries; and had she defeated France and England, who knows that she would not have occupied Canada and attacked us from Canadian soil, and, as the ally of Mexico, from Mexican soil also? She had prepared in advance for the transportation of troops by water. The great steamer *Leviathan*, on which our party went to Europe, which is the largest ship afloat, was constructed by Germany for a troop ship. Its captain made the proud boast during a banquet given by him on her first trip across the water that she would carry 10,000 troops. A foreign ambassador, a guest at the banquet, asked him the question, "Carry them across the Atlantic?" and, apparently without realizing the significance of the question so suddenly propounded, the captain answered, "Yes; across the Atlantic." And, Mr. Chairman, the *Leviathan* is carrying not only 10,000 but upward of 12,000 troops across the Atlantic, but they are American and not German troops. [Applause.] The *Emperatta*, the sister ship of the *Leviathan*, which has also been taken over by us, carries an equal number of troops and has practically the same amount of tonnage, and the *Mount Vernon*, on which our party returned from Europe, and her sister ship, the *Agamemnon*, both German vessels, each carry upward of 6,000 persons; and these constitute only a few of the ships of the once powerful German fleet, which were designed to carry German troops and German supplies in Germany's war of conquest. Had her submarine campaign been successful, she in all probability would have been operating them across the Atlantic ere this, waging war against us on the Western Hemisphere and probably upon our own soil from Canada on the north or from Mexico on the south, or from both.

Mr. Chairman, we sometimes hear it said by unthinking or uninformed people that our soldiers crossed the water to fight for France or for England. I regret to hear remarks of that character. Our Army went to Europe to fight for America. We attacked there because it was the shortest route to an early victory and because the defeat of Germany there meant to save American women, American children, American homes, and American territory from the outrages suffered by France, Belgium, and Russia at the hands of the German Army. Our losses and our suffering were heavy, but not so heavy as it would have been had Germany got a footing on the shores of our own country.

I talked with a German Army officer in an American prison camp in France. He spoke English fluently, as do about 25 per cent of the German people. I asked him how long before the signing of the armistice did his people realize that they had lost the war. "A quarter of a year," was his reply. "Our people, our rulers," he continued, "realized that they had made a mistake by precipitating trouble with America when they found that they could not prevent America from landing an army in France." "It was their belief, then," I asked, "that our Army would not be able to get by their submarines?" "That is correct," he answered, and continued with the statement: "Had our people known that America would put an army in France, despite the submarines, their course would have been different." His statement adds strength to the contention that Germany calmly and deliberately planned to force America into the war, believing that she would be able to accomplish our defeat on the sea while accomplishing the defeat of her European enemies on land, thereby becoming the master of Europe and the master of the seas, which would have been a long step toward the mastership of the world. But, notwithstanding her submarine nests, our splendid Navy transported men and supplies across the Atlantic on the most colossal scale that the world had ever known, and our forces, as they landed in France, proceeded in the same manner in their preparation for the prosecution of the war. In fact, the work that was done and the rapidity with which it was done is inconceivable. At Brest docks were constructed for landing men and supplies and many miles of railroad track was constructed for handling them after reaching land; at St. Nazaire 140 miles of railroad track were planned, 110 miles of which had been completed when the armistice was signed; and 138 warehouses were constructed, 4 of which are 440 by 500 feet, the remainder are 50 by 500 feet, all of which were filled with supplies as fast as they were completed.

At Bordeaux 40 master cranes, operated by electricity, were constructed for unloading ships. The system is so complete that they can unload an average cargo in one hour. At that point 210 miles of railroad track were planned for handling the men and supplies after reaching land, 139 of which had been completed when the armistice was signed. Adequate camps and warehouses were also constructed to take care of the men and supplies arriving at that port.

When the American engineers presented their plans for the docks at Bordeaux the French authorities said it would require eight years to complete their construction, but American engineers, with American mechanics, American labor, and American skill, completed their construction in eight weeks.

Marseille is also a great harbor where much improvement was made by our forces to prepare for handling our shipping at that point. Gieves, which is an inland point, was constructed by our forces from the ground up as a supply depot and was our main source of supplies for the front. It contains about 150 miles of railroad track, a monster cold-storage plant and warehouses 50 by 500 feet, sufficient to cover a distance of six miles if built in a continuous line end to end. Then, there are other small supply depots and numerous salvage (repair) depots, together with the records division and all other divisions and auxiliaries necessary to the care, protection, and successful operation of the Army.

It is only fair to say that in some instances the labor forces were not provided with proper quarters while constructing some, and perhaps many, of these plants. The officers claimed that

the demand and necessity for supplies at the front forced them to press the construction of warehouses and railroad trackage to the exclusion of living quarters for the construction forces. In addition to the ports and supply depots that I have mentioned, and many others too numerous to mention, our forces constructed or repaired hundreds of miles of railroad and turnpike for the transportation of troops and supplies from the various ports and supply depots to the front.

As an economic proposition the effort in France was one of gross extravagance, but as a military proposition every dollar expended represented a good investment, because of the depressing effect that our colossal efforts had upon Germany.

When our work was well under way Gen. Pershing had a military observer from one of the neutral countries of Europe carried around by American Army officers and shown the whole effort with its entire plan. The information obtained by the observer was given, either by direction or indirection, to German officials and German papers, and realizing, as that information forced them to do, that despite their submarines we had entered Europe and were preparing to wage war on the most gigantic scale that military science had ever planned, their courage began to fail them, their enthusiasm began to wane, and their army began to fail, all of which hurried the end, saved American lives and American blood. I therefore indorse that or any other investment of money which saves human life.

Of course mistakes were made in the organization of the Army and the expenditure of the funds. There never was an Army of such size gotten together so quickly, and in an Army of such proportions it would be impossible not to get some incompetency and some dishonesty; and while the incompetents and crooks were weeded out as fast as they were discovered the rush was too great to permit their discovery in time to entirely prevent mistakes and mischief. There were miscarriages of justice in courts-martial trials which should be corrected and corrected speedily as far as correction is possible.

As a whole, no army was ever so well supplied with food, clothing, and medical supplies. There were some inexcusable cases of neglect, miscarriage of supplies, or misunderstanding which resulted in great hardships to the men. There were also instances where Army officers were cruel and inhumane to their men, because their positions afforded them the privilege, not the right, to do so; and if I had my way I would force every devil who, under his authority as an Army officer, mistreated his men to serve as a private for the remainder of his natural life.

I realize the necessity of Army discipline. The success of the Army demands it and the well-being of the men themselves demand it; but there is a clear distinction between discipline administered by a conscientious Army officer who loves his men, who realizes that they have rights and who recognizes those rights, and unwarranted insults and cruelty inflicted by the narrow-minded arrogant cur in the uniform of an officer who believes and contends that privates have no rights. God created all men with certain inalienable rights which even the military has no right to invade or disregard, and the sooner all Army officers learn that fact and recognize those rights the better it will be for the Army. For several reasons the Army would profit by a uniform recognition of that fact, chief of which is the fact that while the officer, if he is a Regular officer, continues in the military service, and may contribute much to the military policy of the country, he is, by the very nature of his position, prevented from participation in the civil affairs of the Government; while on the other hand the private, who may be, and who in many instances is, the intellectual and moral superior of his officer, returns to civil life and becomes a factor in the civil affairs of the Government, which, under our Constitution and practice, dominate and regulate the Military Establishment. The private or noncommissioned officer who has received at the hands of his superiors the treatment and consideration to which he was entitled, returns to civil life with a kindly feeling for the military authorities and a mind unprejudiced against them, but he who feels and especially he who knows that he has not received it, returns to his civil pursuit with a heart full of bitterness and resentment which may in years to come impel him to mold sentiment against the Military Establishment to its serious detriment.

I have discussed the subject with many Army officers; some of them, in fact most of them, are in accord with my views; some are not. I desire to say in passing that the most liberal-minded man with whom I have discussed the subject is Gen. Smedley Butler, of the United States Marines, who was connected with the Army at Brest when I was in Europe and who, by the way, is a son of our worthy colleague from Pennsylvania.

In discussing the subject Gen. Butler said: "We came to Europe with a single object in view, the defeat of Germany. We have accomplished that object, and with that accomplished we have another single object in view, to wit, the return of these boys to their parents and their civil pursuits; and it is the duty of every officer to exert the best that there is in him to have them carry back with them the most kindly feeling for every officer under whom they have served or with whom they have come in contact; first, because we owe it to them for the service that they have rendered; second, because the success of the Government and our success as officers all depended and still depend upon the fidelity and service of the men; and, third, because we owe it to the Government and its Military and Naval Establishments of the future to have these men return to civil life with a feeling of mutual interest in those establishments."

Next to Gen. Butler, in liberal views on the question of the treatment of the enlisted personnel, was Maj. Gen. Chas. P. Summerall, who commanded the First Division at the beginning of the Meuse-Argonne offensive, and who was immediately promoted to the position of corps commander, and, I will add, who is one of the most, if not the most conspicuous figure of the American Expeditionary Forces, because of his character as a man, his courage and ability, and his success on the battle field. Gen. Summerall has the reputation of being one of the world's hardest fighters in battle; and I am told by officers who were associated with him in action that one of the thoughts at all times uppermost in his mind was the welfare of his men, and that during operations he would spend his nights canvassing the trenches to see if the men were being supplied with food, water, and other necessities. During several days' association with him I heard him refer repeatedly to his men and express his love for them as though they were his own children, and with tears in his eyes which apparently sprang from the depth of his strong and courageous heart I have seen him, on the scene of action, relate how his men had fallen there, and at other times in his reference to the returning soldiers his greatest concern was apparently for their future welfare.

Then, on the other hand, I saw and talked with some officers who apparently had no more regard for the men under them than they would have had for that many dumb brutes, and some of them not so much.

I am glad that I can say that in my opinion only a small per cent of the officers are of the class last referred to, but that class, though small, is not only a detriment to the Military Establishment, but is also a curse to the Government; for the bitterness engendered in the enlisted personnel by the conduct of that class is fraught with the danger of germinating the seeds of anarchy and Bolshevism, against which we guard.

Mr. Chairman, as I have previously stated, some mistakes have been made and shortcomings have asserted themselves in the prosecution of the war which are proper subjects of criticism, but let us not magnify them. Let us not criticize where criticism is unwarranted, but let us carefully weigh the good along with the bad; let us weigh the achievements of the Army along with its failures here and there, and when we do this we will, I am sure, reach the conclusion that no army has ever met its task with greater rapidity or success than has our Army, and that no military force ever acquitted itself more beautifully than did the American Expeditionary Force, which has crushed autocracy in Europe. [Applause.] And let me say in this connection that every branch of the service was a potent factor and contributed its full part to the winning of the war. The men of the Navy also contributed their full share. It required men in the Navy to transport troops and supplies across the seas; it required labor to handle the supplies. The fighting forces of an army can not fight, can not exist, without supplies. It required office and clerical force to keep the records as required by law, and without which the Army would become disorganized, revolutionized, and ineffective. As the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] has so well said, every branch of the service was essential to the success so gloriously achieved by the American Army, for which the American people owe it a debt of everlasting gratitude. [Applause.] Our first and greatest gratitude is, of course, to the men who engaged in battle, for their burdens, their efforts, their sufferings, and their sacrifices were the greatest. In fact, so great were they that none except those who endured them can realize the burdens and sufferings they imposed. I therefore wonder if the American people fully appreciate the services of these brave and noble men and fully estimate the burdens they have borne and the sacrifices they have made. Why, the scenes of action as we find them now, several months after the cessation of hostilities, are indescribable. We spent nearly 30 days on European soil, traveling in automobiles by day and by rail at night from one scene of action to another. We traveled 4,636 miles in France, Belgium, Italy, and Germany, and Mr. DENT and I visited London and intermediate points in England. Yet

we did not see all the fields of activity and could not visualize what we did see because of the extent and character of the destruction. We spent nine days in the battle fields of eastern and northern France, during which we covered the fields of Belleau Wood, Chateau-Thierry, St. Mihiel, Verdun, the Meuse-Argonne, Soissons, Champaign Valley, Vimy Ridge, Mount Kemmel, and Flanders, where millions of soldiers fell and where billions of dollars were expended in war materials and supplies, and where the destruction can not be described by human pen or human tongue.

In an area of 4,000 square miles in France and Belgium there is hardly a habitable house left. Cities ranging in size from 200,000 population down to small villages averaging one to every one and one-half square miles were totally destroyed by artillery. Many of them were blown and broken into heaps of broken stone and sand. No regard was had by the enemy for churches, schools, hospitals, asylums, orphanages, or charitable institutions. They were all accorded the same treatment, reduced to the same wanton destruction. The few houses within the battle area that were not destroyed by shell shot were deliberately burned by the Germans as they withdrew in their retreat. Hundreds of acres of forest were killed. The land of practically the entire area is destroyed by trenches, dugouts, and fox holes dug by the soldiers for their protection and shell holes caused by artillery fire, the land being damaged to such an extent that it will cost millions of dollars to reclaim it for agriculture or industrial purposes. Not a hoof of live stock is to be seen in all the devastated area. In addition to the cost in labor, the reclamation service will be extremely dangerous, because of the unexploded shells which failed to explode when fired from the heavy guns and lie buried in the earth. Their failure to explode was due to a lack of certain elements which they contract from the earth by contact with it. Therefore the longer they lie buried in the ground the more dangerous they become; so much so that the slightest jar is likely to explode them, which means death to anyone near. In fact, the whole devastated area of 400 miles in length and averaging 10 miles in width is worse than a barren waste. It is full of destructive elements both in the unexploded shells and disease which the poisoned condition of the soil and water must naturally produce. A country on which rivers of blood have flown and in which thousands of bodies of men and animals are buried can not be other than a hotbed of disease for years to come. The bodies were buried where they fell or in small groups near where they fell, but the Graves Registration Service is now collecting them and reinterring them in central cemeteries. Four central cemeteries have been made for the American dead, one at Suresnes, just out of Paris, where 3,000 of our precious dead are laid to rest; one at Romagne, in the northern part of the Meuse-Argonne, where 26,000 lie; one at Thiancourt, where those who fell in the St. Mihiel battle are to be laid; and another in the vicinity of Chateau-Thierry and Belleau Wood, where the brave boys who fell in those engagements are to sleep until the judgment or until disinterred and returned to their native land for which they fought and died on foreign soil.

At the head of each grave is a small wooden cross about 24 inches high on which hangs the identification tag of the soldier whose grave it marks; also an aluminum plate about 2 by 4 inches, on which is embossed the name and organization of the soldier, is nailed on the cross. Mr. Chairman, as I stood by those graves my thoughts went out to and my heart ached for the parents, and especially the mothers, of the heroes whose remains they contained. I wish it were possible for a generous Government to compensate them for the contribution they have made to civilization and liberty, but it is not. I wish it were possible for sympathetic friends to comfort them in their sorrow, but it is not. God alone is able to compensate their loss and comfort them in their bereavement; and I pray that He may bless and comfort them.

Now, some inquiries have been made during the discussion as to how soon we expect to get our troops out of Europe. There has been a great deal of speculation as to how soon that will be accomplished and a great deal of criticism because the troops have not been returned more rapidly; but, my friends, the War Department is doing everything within its power to bring the men back from Europe as speedily as possible. Every available inch of ship space is being utilized to its maximum capacity in transporting them. I was told by the directors of transportation at Brest and Bordeaux that they leave no bunk unfilled on any ship sailing to the United States; that when an organization that is to board a ship fails to fill it men are called from other organizations to finish filling it; that if there is only room for a dozen or half dozen more men there is a supply always held on which to draw to fill up that empty space.

So the Government is leaving no stone unturned to bring back the American boys as rapidly as it is possible to bring them. Of course, when the armistice was signed people became impatient. Fathers and mothers all over the land began to ask themselves the question, "Why do they not send my boy home? The war is over; they do not need him over there any longer, and why do they keep him?" I received letters containing inquiries of that kind. Doubtless every Member of Congress received them. And we sometimes grew impatient because we believed, or felt, that men were being kept in Europe who were not needed there. But we failed to stop and realize that it was impossible to return within a few weeks or a few months the men that we had transported, covering a period of 18 months, with the best facilities available and the best efforts we could put forth. But since the people have begun to understand that the Government is returning the men as rapidly as it is possible to return them they are accepting the situation and reconciling themselves to it. Of course, we want the men back as rapidly as they can be brought back, and that is what is being done. They are coming back now at the rate of more than 300,000 men a month, with the rate increasing each month, and at that rate all the men will be back by late summer or early fall.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. FIELDS. I will.

Mr. HARRISON. Do you recall the declaration of President Wilson to the committee as to what the policy of the Government would be in that regard?

Mr. FIELDS. I do. The President said it was his policy, as I recall—and if I do not state it correctly I stand to be corrected—to get the men out of Europe just as rapidly as it was possible to get them out, and it was his intention to have them out by late summer or early fall. He stated that the Allies were anxious to keep the American flag on the Rhine for a time, and were urging him to leave a handful of soldiers there to maintain the flag, but he had not even assured them or promised them that he would do that. I inferred from the statement of the President that he was, like every other American citizen that I have talked with or heard of, anxious to get the American Army out of Europe at the earliest date possible.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FIELDS. I will.

Mr. FESS. My question is as to our ability to get the men out, what our tonnage is, and so on. I hold in my hand a letter from Mr. Hurley on the shipping situation, but I find that he does not in any place say what number of vessels we have completed. He says, "With this sum we have built and expect to build 2,434 vessels, aggregating thirteen million plus dead-weight tons," and so on. But I find no place where we have the figures as to the number of vessels that can be used now for this purpose. Has the gentleman those figures?

Mr. FIELDS. I have not the number of vessels, but I will say that in April we transported 289,000 troops; in May, 330,000. At that rate the gentleman will see that within a few months we will have our troops back.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman permit me to reply there?

Mr. FIELDS. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. Gen. March stated that they had a gross tonnage which would bring 363,000 men a month; but that you can not expect that many, because they can not use the full space for troops.

Mr. FESS. In taking troops over we never took over more than 300,000 a month, did we?

Mr. FIELDS. I think not.

Mr. FESS. And we called upon Great Britain to assist us to a very large extent?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes; we had the help of Great Britain in transporting our troops to Europe; but she withdrew her ships to send her own troops home to Australia, Canada, and India after the armistice was signed.

Mr. FESS. Is that continuing now, or have we the help of Great Britain now?

Mr. FIELDS. We were told that we would get help from Great Britain as soon as she should complete the task of transporting her own troops.

Mr. FESS. In other words, in your judgment the transportation is going on as rapidly as the facilities will permit?

Mr. FIELDS. Absolutely so.

Mr. FESS. I am glad to know that.

Mr. FIELDS. As I said a moment ago, every available ship is being used and is being rushed back and forth across the Atlantic at its maximum speed. Why, they are loading ships

in from two to nine hours. The biggest ship afloat, the *Leviathan*, was in Brest Harbor only nine hours; the *Mount Vernon*, one of the next largest, was in the harbor but a little over five hours; and some of them are loaded in two hours. I believe they told me of one small ship that was loaded in an hour.

The system is this: Of course, they know by wireless at what time a ship will arrive. Everything is in readiness. The men are at the dock with their packs, ready to go on board, and when the ship anchors out in the bay, as the large ships must do at Brest, there is a portion of the men on the tugs ready to go on board, and other tugs follow in rapid succession until the ship is loaded. Each man goes in and takes a bunk and remains in it until the entire ship is loaded. So there is no obstruction. No one gets in the other fellow's way. By that system they are loaded with the greatest possible speed. And the moment the loading is done the ship weighs anchor and sails for America. There is not, I will say, one moment of time wasted. In fact, I have never seen anything carried on so systematically and so rapidly as the movement of our troops from Europe. When we were there the men were going on board at the rate of seven per minute for each minute of every day, and, as previously stated, the rate is continually increasing. The system and the achievement by reason of it will stand as a monument to the American Navy as long as there is an American Navy.

Mr. FESS. Has the gentleman estimated what time it will take to remove all of the troops that will not be required to remain over there?

Mr. FIELDS. Well, as I said a moment ago, at the present rate—which, of course, they are increasing right along—we should get them back by late summer or early autumn.

Mr. FESS. Then the cut in the appropriation seems to be justified.

Mr. FIELDS. I think so.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. But is it not stated that they expected to bring over 300,000 in the month of June and as many more in July, which would return all of the troops except the five Regular divisions which are retained in the Army of occupation, and at the present time all of the National Army and all National Guard organizations or divisions are either at home or on the sea, and that four or six divisions, as I understand it, are now being brought across, and by the 1st of August they expect to have all back except the Army of occupation and a few men they expect to keep in the Service of Supply Division, which are to remain after the other troops depart, in order to clean up? One of the reasons why they are able to do this is on account of the fact that many of the ships which were necessary to be used as cargo ships while we had our men over there in full strength have been transformed into troop ships for the carrying of passengers, which required some little time for making the change, but at the present time, while they have aimed at the maximum of 310,000, in May they brought over something like 330,000.

Mr. FIELDS. The gentleman's observations are in harmony with my contentions. If I grasp his statement, it is that all troops will be transported by July, with the exception of a few men in the Service of Supply and the Army of occupation, and it will require from six to eight weeks to transport those, which will carry us into late summer or early autumn. In any event, everything is being done that is humanly possible to expedite the movement of our troops from Europe.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman inform the House how many troops we have in the United States that are not now in the course of being discharged, that are not having their final accounts made up for their immediate discharge?

Mr. FIELDS. I have not the exact figures at hand. I did not know until 10.30 this morning that this bill would be called up to-day. I had intended to collect certain data on it to-day, which would include the figures that the gentleman refers to, but I did not have time to collect any data between that hour and the time that the House convened. I am, therefore, unable to give the gentleman the exact number in camp in this country at this time who are not in the course of being discharged.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. When I was last informed on the subject we had about 400,000 men in the United States who were not in the course of being discharged, most of them being in Quartermaster and Medical Services, some few others being retained as skeleton organizations of units that were contemplated to be retained. I am wondering how long we are going to keep those men in the service. There is a very great demand on the part of the people to get their sons out who are hanging around the camps, guarding stores, and doing things of that sort. I notice that this bill makes no provision to enforce their discharge.

Mr. FIELDS. I will remind the gentleman that this is an appropriation and not a legislative bill.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. There is no limitation on the use of the appropriations for that purpose?

Mr. FIELDS. No; the gentleman is no more anxious than I am to have the men demobilized as rapidly as it is possible to demobilize them; and the gentleman will probably recall that I stated when the last Army appropriation bill was under discussion in this House that while it was necessary to keep men to maintain a few demobilization camps, I was of the opinion that demobilization had not been expedited in this country as much as it should have been. I think that every man should be turned loose in this country, every man that the Government can spare, as quickly as it is possible to turn him loose.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman permit me to call his attention to the fact that men conscripted for service during the war are being retained to perform ordinary mechanical duties in repair shops, and things of that kind, and to take charge of clerical work and other things that can be better done by civilians, and yet they are taking advantage of these men to hold them there because they happen to have them there?

Mr. FIELDS. Of course, certain clerical work and other work must be done at demobilization camps in handling the returning soldiers, and men must be kept to do it; but I repeat what I have previously said on this floor, that the men in this country should be demobilized down to the minimum as rapidly as possible. In fact, that should have been done a good while ago.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Does not the gentleman think we ought to adopt some proviso in this bill not permitting the use of the money we are appropriating in keeping these unwilling men in the service performing duties that would be better done by civilians?

Mr. FIELDS. No. We would probably cut off the pay of a large number of the men by attempting to prevent the Army from paying a few of them. If I should offer a proviso, it would be a proviso forcing the Army to turn them out.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. That is what I had in contemplation, some provision that would make it necessary for these men to be turned loose and to come home and have their places filled by civilians hired by the Government at perhaps no greater expense than it is now incurring.

Mr. FIELDS. I have no quarrel with the gentleman as to that. I agree with him that the men should be discharged as rapidly as it is possible to discharge them.

Mr. FOSTER. I might add that we have a proposition out in Ohio, at Camp Sherman, 60 miles from my home, right now where men are doing work of that kind when they are badly needed on the farms.

Mr. FIELDS. I trust that gentlemen will not take too much of my time.

Mr. WELTY. The gentleman spoke about using all available shipping for the purpose of transporting our troops, in addition to our own shipping. Will the gentleman inform the House what other shipping we are using now?

Mr. FIELDS. I did not deem it necessary to ask for a detailed statement as to the countries the shipping was coming from. We were told by a naval officer and by the Secretary of War that they were getting all the shipping that it was possible for them to get, and were using all of it to its maximum capacity.

Mr. WELTY. Are we using the ships of Denmark and other countries?

Mr. FIELDS. I think my statement that I did not ask for detailed information is a sufficient answer.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I know that the Government is engaging space on commercial boats of other countries, just as much as it can get. I came home on a Holland boat chartered by the Government, and they are chartering all the boats they can get from other countries.

Mr. WELTY. Did they have troops on board the boat on which the gentleman came home?

Mr. ASHBROOK. They did.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to refer to one other thought in regard to the work of American soldiers on the battle fields of Europe. Without going to Europe and going over the fields where the battles were fought no one can realize fully what the men who participated in those battles endured and what they accomplished. As I have previously stated, we saw shell hole after shell hole, mountains almost blown down, trench by the side of trench, and acres after acres of barbed wire,

much of the ordinary fencing wire that we see used by the farmers of this country, but much of it a heavy wire, a single strand almost as large as one's little finger with a barb three-quarters of an inch long. I have a piece of it in my office among my souvenirs. Had I known before I left my office that this bill was coming up to-day I would have brought it over.

One of the striking features of the whole effort was the courage that the American soldier showed in meeting the barbed-wire difficulties. In my limited time I can not refer to many of their daring adventures, all of which make our hearts swell with pride and gratitude, but I do want to refer to this one. Some of the generals told us that one of the great problems when they started the American offensive was the barbed-wire menace.

The Germans had occupied this territory for four years, had established the Hindenburg line until it was, as they thought, impregnable, and our forces were confronted with miles and miles of trenches, well fortified, behind which and between which were nets and entanglements of barbed wire. They decided that they would attempt to invent a machine to cut the wire, and that such a machine, if invented, would be one of the most valuable machines in use in the war, because of the extent of the barbed-wire menace and its effectiveness in delaying troop movements; but when the first engagement came the American soldiers went over the top of the barbed wire as though it was not there. They apparently paid no attention to it. I remember that one officer stated that he made inquiries of the officers and men after one fight was over as to how they got over the wire. They were over, their leggings and trousers were torn into shreds, but only two of them remembered anything about going over it. They had their hearts in the fight and they had rushed forward with that "pep" and vigor that carried them through every undertaking and made it possible for them to win the war in so brief a period as they did. The "pep" and individuality of the American soldier did more to win this war speedily than anything else upon which the American Army had to rely or did rely.

And one thing I particularly noticed in talking to the men. I asked them if in the engagements they observed the manual of arms; if in actual combat they observed the teachings laid down in the manual of arms, and each one answered no, that he had fought upon his own initiative; that he depended upon his own judgment; that he relied upon his own skill; that he depended upon his own ability to outdo the other fellow. Therefore it was the American skill, American spirit, American ability, and not military training that made our men fight as they did, which is a credit to the manhood of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, summing up the whole situation, it is putting it mildly to say that the battle area presents "destruction, destruction, destruction until destruction sickens," and how any man in whose bosom beats a human heart can look upon, read of, or hear of the desolation it has left, the distress, the sorrow, the pain, the misery, and death that it has caused, saying nothing of the financial burdens it has imposed, and oppose a legitimate effort to prevent a recurrence of it, is beyond my understanding. When we entered the war it was the hope of everybody that out of the war would come a settlement that would prevent future wars, a settlement that would guarantee the future peace of the world, and men went to battle believing that their sacrifices would each be a contribution to that glorious achievement. But now that the war is over, and peace terms are being negotiated, we see organized effort to defeat that part of the peace treaty—namely, the league of nations—that undertakes to prevent future wars. They say, leave conditions and international relations as they are. Yet under those conditions and relations we have just been involved in the bloodiest war of all time. The opponents of the league of nations assert that the league, if adopted, will involve us in foreign disputes and difficulties. But their assertion is without a fact to support it or a reason upon which to rest. We have just been involved in a foreign difficulty, and can have no assurance that we will not become involved in future difficulties if present conditions are perpetuated. International difficulties may continue to arise; in fact, they will continue to arise. Difficulties will continue to arise between nations just as they will continue to arise between individuals; and what civilization and humanity want and demand is that nations shall be compelled, like individuals have long since been compelled, to submit their difficulties to a court of justice for trial and settlement.

The time was when there were no courts to restrain the action or adjudicate the difficulties between individuals. The time was when each individual was a law unto himself without any limitation upon his own sovereignty except such limitations as his fellow man was able to impose by physical force. Therefore, the settlement of each difficulty between individuals meant war between those individuals until reason asserted itself in the minds of men, causing them to adopt rules under which to live and by which to settle their difficulties. Those rules were called law. The law was first established by local communities.

As local communities grew and their moral, social, economic, and financial interests expanded, they recognized the necessity for an expansion of the law, or of forming a group of local communities into a larger community under a uniform system of laws; then from the larger community to the county or township, and from the county or township to the state or province, and from the state or province to the nation, and I venture the assertion that no law was ever written that did not place a limitation upon the sovereignty of some individual, community, county, or state in some form or other, the limitation being imposed not for the detriment of him or them upon whom imposed but for the welfare of society and the protection of all alike in their legitimate and peaceful pursuits.

The opponents of the league of nations also urge as an objection to it that it, if adopted, will limit the sovereignty of the United States. Limitation upon sovereignty is in the main self-restraint adopted by individuals collectively under normal conditions for their own guidance and protection under abnormal conditions. If each individual were capable of exercising proper self-restraint under all conditions, and at all times inclined to do so, the adoption and enforcement of laws would be unnecessary. But man possesses neither the ability nor inclination to do so, hence the necessity of laws and their enforcement. Nations are not different from the individual units which compose them—no stronger, no weaker, no better, no worse. That which is good for the individual units of a nation is also good for the nation itself, and that which is bad for the individual units is likewise bad for the nation itself. If the individual units profit and are made secure in their rights by submitting their difficulties to the courts for adjudication instead of settling them by physical force, the nation must likewise enjoy the same profit and security by submitting its difficulties with other nations to the courts for adjudication.

Oh, some say that it would affect the honor of the Nation for it to limit its sovereignty by submitting its difficulties with other nations to a tribunal created for the purpose of adjudicating such difficulties. The same arguments were made as to individuals when dueling was permitted under the law. While dueling was permitted by individuals, the individual who declined to accept a challenge to fight a duel disgraced himself by his declination, and was ostracized by society, but when society revolted at the cruelty of dueling and enacted a law prohibiting it, it immediately became as dishonorable in the eyes of all men to give a challenge to fight a duel as it had been prior to the enactment of the law to decline a challenge; and men who had previously advocated dueling and who had believed that they could not protect their honor under certain conditions without resorting to the cruel and inhumane process found that they could maintain their honor by submitting their controversies with individuals to courts of justice.

And I venture the prophecy here that the time will come when the society of nations the world over will hold in contempt and ostracize the nation that is unwilling to submit its difficulties with other nations to a court of justice, and when that day shall come men will read the history of past wars and marvel that civilized nations ever went to war for the settlement of difficulties, just as we marvel at the fact that dueling was once legalized by law and received public sanction. The same process of evolution that has developed the character and broadened the reason of men sufficiently to impel them to establish civil tribunals for the adjustment of their difficulties must inevitably impel the nations to pursue a like course and establish like tribunals.

The opponents of the league of nations say that the league will have no power to enforce its recommendations. It is true that the league within itself would have no such power; neither has a civil court the power within itself to execute its own decisions. But public sentiment crystallized into law, which created and maintains the courts, carries into execution their judgments, and when the public sentiment of the world creates a league of nations, a council of nations, a union of nations, or a confederation of nations, or whatever you choose to call it, out of which will come a civil tribunal for the orderly settlement of difficulties between nations, the same public sentiment will sustain the court, affirm and execute its judgments.

The opponents of the league ask by what process can the mandates of an international court be carried into execution. I would say that there may be many methods by which that result could be accomplished, but to my mind the power of boycott, as was suggested by Theodore Roosevelt several years ago and

for which the draft of the league of nations provides, will be the most effective method. Under that plan nations becoming involved in difficulties which threaten the peace of the world will be obligated by the league to submit their case to the international court for adjudication, and if they, or either of them, refuse to submit the case for trial, or having submitted it fail to accept the judgment of the court, the court will then recommend that the signatories of the league set up a boycott against the nation refusing to accept the verdict, or which, in open disregard of the verdict, should proceed to make war. And public sentiment based upon the universal desire of a large majority of the peoples of the world to maintain peace, would execute the order for a boycott. What would that mean to the nation against which directed? It would mean that all member nations of the league would sever diplomatic, social, commercial, and financial relations with it. Cable communications between it and other nations would be discontinued.

The ships of other nations would not be permitted to go into its ports or railroad trains to cross its boundary lines. Nor would its ships be permitted to land in other ports or its railroad trains permitted to cross its boundary line into other countries. In other words, the power of boycott exercised against any nation would mean its isolation from the rest of the world, a condition under which no nation could prosecute a war or long endure. In this day of international relations and international trade through which every nation draws a portion of its supplies from other nations and sells its surplus products to them, a boycott would throw any nation into a panic in 48 hours; and greater than the sting of a panic would be the sting of its consciousness of the fact that it was held in disrepute by the rest of the world. I venture the assertion, and do it without fear of successful contradiction, that any nation would endure longer under fire than it would under boycott. The time was when many nations of the world were so far removed from other parts of the world that the difficulties of the one did not affect the other, but that condition has passed. Modern means of communication and transportation have eliminated distances and have brought the nations of the entire world so close together that the relations of each is interwoven with the others to such an extent that the peace can hardly be disturbed in any part of the world without affecting the whole world. It was the belief of our pioneer fathers when establishing this Government that it was so far removed from Europe that it would never be affected by European wars or European difficulties; but recent events have proven that we may become involved in European troubles regardless of our good intentions and our efforts to escape them. God knows that the President and the American people tried to keep out of the European war, but were unable to do so.

It was the belief of many eminent scholars and statesmen in the early days of our Government that our geographic position, with 3,000 miles of water to east of us and over 10,000 miles to the west of us, rendered us secure from European or Asiatic complications and immune from attack from either source. Those views were entertained by some until recently. I have heard the opinion expressed on this floor during my brief service here and within the last four years that it would be an impossibility to transport a formidable army across the Atlantic; but gentlemen who expressed those views have lived to see 2,000,000 troops with much of their supplies transported across the Atlantic with greater facility than they could have been transported across one of our average-sized States during our Civil War. In 1807 a New York paper announced with a great deal of pride that it was only three months behind London in the publication of London news; to-day the American papers report the news of London as early as the London papers report it; to-day we read of the happenings on the other side of the earth as quickly as we read of the happenings in our own country.

In former days when one part of the world became involved in war, the rest of the world knew but little about it and for that reason felt but little concern because of it. But with present international relations and present means of transportation and communication, war in any section of the world is seen and understood by the rest of the world and its effects are felt by all; and, Mr. Chairman, it is that condition that is causing the best brains of the entire world to attempt to devise means by which to prevent future wars.

The league of nations as drafted may not be, in fact, is not, perfect, but it is a start in the right direction, and can be improved as time and events demonstrate the necessity for its improvement. The organic law of our own country was not made perfect and is not now perfect. Eighteen amendments to our Constitution have been adopted since the original Constitution was written. Other amendments making further necessary improvements will doubtless be adopted in the future; and I will say in passing that that instrument in which every American finds security and protection in his legitimate pursuits was not adopted without criticism and without a struggle. The opponents of the league of nations say that the league would not be an absolute guaranty against war among nations. I will answer that argument by saying that the Constitution of the United States was not from the start an absolute guaranty against war between the States. One war was required to demonstrate the efficacy of the Constitution, but one was enough to demonstrate its strength and assure its perpetuity; and to-day every man under its flag from east to west, from north to south, except an anarchist here and there, glories in its maintenance and the preservation of the Union under it.

The league of nations may fail as did our Federal Constitution to serve as an absolute guaranty against war from the date of its adoption. Under it as under the Constitution one war may be necessary to demonstrate its strength and guarantee obedience to its provisions. The opponents of the league contend for the absolute and unlimited sovereignty of the United States. I ask them what will be the result when the absolute, unlimited sovereignty of the United States according to their term and definition conflicts with the absolute, unlimited sovereignty of another great power. The result will be an orderly settlement by an international tribunal, as proposed in the league covenant, or a settlement by war in which thousands and probably millions of American lives will be sacrificed.

The principle of unlimited sovereignty, coupled with the refusal to submit controversies growing out of either the exercise or infringement of that sovereignty to properly constituted tribunals for orderly settlement, would if practiced by individuals constitute anarchy and outlawry. The individual attempting to maintain and exercise such a principle must ultimately submit to the force of other individuals or destroy himself by his own evil force. The same is true of nations.

Germany advocated the principle of unlimited sovereignty and made herself the world's greatest military power to enable her to exercise it. She refused to participate in conventions to promote the peace of the world; she refused to submit controverted questions to disinterested parties for settlement; she disregarded every right which conflicted with her unlimited sovereignty. But with all her effort and all her power she failed and is to-day on her knees before the world. Rome attempted to exercise unlimited sovereignty and she fell. Persia also attempted it in the days of Xerxes, before Christ, and Persia fell. Shall we follow the unprofitable and destructive example of Germany, Rome, and Persia, or shall we heed the voice of reason and join in this great effort that is under way to guard and maintain the peace of the world?

Some oppose the league of nations because of their reactionary tendencies which impel them to oppose everything progressive. There are others who oppose it because its main purpose is to prevent war and war makes millionaires overnight; and then there are others still who oppose the movement for the reason that it is being led by Woodrow Wilson, whose politics is different from theirs. I will say to that class that while President Wilson is the recognized leader in the movement by virtue of his position he is not the only great man who has advocated the principle of a league of nations for the orderly settlement of international difficulties. The principle is advocated by ex-President Taft. It was also advocated by former President Roosevelt. It is advocated by former Justice Charles E. Hughes, Republican nominee for the Presidency in 1916. It is now and has long since been advocated by scholars and statesmen of the entire world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. FIELDS. I ask unanimous consent to continue for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FIELDS. The rank and file of all countries who bear the chief burdens of war are demanding its establishment. The fathers and mothers of the belligerent nations who suffered the loss of their sons in the recent war are demanding it. Those who are to produce the sons of the future are demanding it. The voice of humanity the world over is demanding the establishment of such a covenant, and it will be established now or in the early future. [Applause.]

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia].

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair understand. Does the gentleman from Illinois take the floor for one hour in his own right?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes; in order that I may be able to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. And he yields 30 minutes of that time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA]?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I shall not discuss the league of nations nor the peace treaty, but will use my time in discussion of the bill before the committee. The committee, I believe, unanimously agreed that the Army should return home at the earliest possible moment. The committee also agreed to a man, I believe, that the size of the Army should be reduced, and to accomplish this the amount necessary to get the boys home, to transport them and demobilize them, has been appropriated. Up to that point I agree entirely with the committee. I do not agree with the committee, however, that it is necessary to appropriate for an average Army of 400,000 men, and my reason for that is that I did not understand from the testimony of the Chief of Staff that the Army would be demobilized as soon as it returned from Europe. All of the estimates submitted by the various departments were scrutinized and approved by the General Staff, and the General Staff in its contemplation of the needed appropriations made all its calculations on an Army of 509,000 men plus 28,000 officers. Gen. March did not say that these men would be demobilized as soon as they returned home. I gathered from what he said that he had the 509,000 men Army pretty well fixed in his mind. We have now in this country nearly 500,000 soldiers and 400,000 could be demobilized at once. My reason for cutting down the appropriation in this bill is not to give the General Staff an opportunity, after they get the men home, to keep them up to the last hour of the last day of the four-month period after peace is proclaimed.

We have talked and talked and talked about getting these men home. Now let us legislate a bit and get them home. This is our first opportunity and let us do it.

Gen. March is a very efficient Chief of Staff, they tell me. I was not impressed with his testimony. He has no consideration for the desires of Congress. He has all of the despotic will and autocratic characteristics of Ludendorf and the military genius of the Crown Prince.

He stated, I am informed, after testifying before the Committee on Military Affairs, during the last Congress, that he would have an Army of 509,000 men and 29,000 officers, no matter what Congress did. We were unable to pin him down to just how many men would be continued in the establishment of the Army if we gave him the full amount he asked, and for that reason when we reach page 12, line 4, "pay of officers," I shall move to amend by striking out the figures "$28,605,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "$20,300,000." That would reduce it to a basis of an average Army of 300,000 men. When we reach line 19 of the same page, "pay of enlisted men," I shall move to strike out the figures "$106,795,000" and to insert in lieu thereof the figures "$75,728,230." With the men now in the service, the department would be compelled to speed up the present rate of demobilization, in order to have funds to carry it on to the end of the fiscal year. That will give notice to the War Department that Congress, the legislative branch of this Government, expects it to demobilize the troops the minute they return, and to bring the Army down to the figures provided for in the national-defense act. Then if they keep the men under arms too long, and have a deficiency, the burden will be upon the department or General Staff to prove the necessity for the deficiency and the reason for delaying the demobilization of the Army. The General Staff is making every effort to keep the appropriation high. I want to keep it down. Not a soldier will suffer or lose a cent of pay. There is no force in that argument. If the department or General Staff keeps more men than it should, they will be held responsible. If we give them the money—allowing a large margin—they will simply laugh at us, keep the men as long as they can, and say, "Well, what are you going to do about it?"

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Just for a question.

Mr. FESS. I am in sympathy with what the gentleman is saying and I am wondering what is the argument for not demobilizing the troops when they come back, at the time they come back.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Exactly. I do not see it, except that Gen. March is stubborn about it and is going to keep as many men as he can under arms as long as he can, and we are helping him do that right here, sir.

Mr. FESS. That does not seem possible.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It does not, but it is a fact.

Mr. FESS. There must be some grounds——

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio, let us take the means we have of control by appropriation. The time of the emergency is over; we have blindly followed everything they have asked for in time of an emergency. When I was a soldier I soldiered and I obeyed orders, and when I legislate I want to legislate, and I do not want Peyton C. March to tell me what I have to legislate. Now, let us see some of the items in this bill. I will ask the gentleman to turn to page 2, "Contingencies of the Army," where you find an item for $1,000,000. Gentlemen, do you know what that item is for? It is to provide the salaries of the Bureau of Sales of Surplus Supplies.

Mr. HULINGS. Of what?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Of sales of surplus supplies. Here is a bureau that directs the policy of the disposing of the surplus supplies. The chief of that bureau testified, Mr. Chairman, and he said that he had to have this appropriation, that he needed it. Why? Because he said he had to pay his assistants a higher salary. We asked him what salary his assistants were getting, and they are getting $10,000 a year. His salary is $25,000 a year. I will ask my colleagues to carefully read his testimony as soon as the printed hearings are available.

Now, let me tell you what this bureau is doing. They testify that if it were not for them the surplus supplies of the Army would be dumped on the market and that it would disturb industry and that the Government would not receive the highest price. So we asked him how he disposed of his copper, and he said that he took his copper, turned it over to the copper people, and they would dispose of it each month, 10 per cent of the amount they sold; that we would take the price they got for their copper and we would pay them for selling the copper, and in that way we would not disturb the market—incidentally cinch the copper monopoly. So here we have the copper people who sold us this copper and made a profit at the time they sold to the Government now being paid a commission to sell it in such a manner that it will not disturb their profits. That is the copper. Now, let us see what this $25,000 beauty says about meats and foodstuffs. We have got I do not know how many millions of pounds of bacon, surplus bacon, and millions of cans of corned beef and roast-beef hash. This quantity is surplus and to be sold. We asked him why he did not dispose of it. "Oh," he said, "that is a very perplexing question," and he said that he had sought the advice of the packers and they told him that the American people could not eat bacon which the Government bought for the soldiers. [Laughter.] They said that this bacon was salted for three days and smoked I do not know how many days, and the people could not eat it. I have often eaten it and can say it is excellent. Then we asked what is to be done. "Well," he said, "perhaps we can send it back to the packers to have it recured." He said that we could not sell corned-beef hash and the roast beef because it was in 6-pound cans and there was no family in the country who could use 6 pounds of corned-beef hash. Evidently this corps of experts are not familiar with vital statistics or appetites of families. We asked him what he was going to do with it. He said he thought he might find a market in Roumania or Bosnia or Herzegovina or some other country like that. The gentleman does not know that those countries never use canned beef; that they use very little, if any, meat; that you could not find a can opener in all of Roumania, and yet we are paying this gentleman $25,000 and his assistants $10,000 a year each for expert advice. Perhaps when we increase the salaries we will get better advice.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In just a minute. He said that he had sent out several hundred circulars to dispose of this product, and we asked him to whom he had sent these circulars. He said, "To the Salvation Army." Perhaps he does not know the Salvation Army specializes in doughnuts and not in bacon. It surprises me he did not offer this bacon to some Jewish synagogue. [Laughter.] So here we have an article which, let us concede for the sake of argument, is difficult to dispose of, and with all his $10,000 advisers and experts he is not able to sell it. Well, I will tell the Director of the Sales of Surplus Supplies that if he will put that stuff on the market in New York City or Philadelphia or Boston he will find that the bellies of the hungry people are in a receptive mood, and they will be able to digest Army bacon. It may interfere with the profits of the packers, but I am not interested in that. Now let us see another item——

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will for a question.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Is there any reason why these 6-pound packages might not be disposed of in the various State institutions, penitentiaries, hospitals, and institutions of learning throughout the country? Do not they buy in wholesale quantities because they buy for innumerable people?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Absolutely—restaurants, boarding houses, hotels, camps—there is a ready market right now; but we must maintain this office so as to expend this million dollars.

Mr. VARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. For a question.

Mr. VARE. Would not that have a tendency to reduce the cost of living if that was disposed of all over the country?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes; and give a surplus of fresh meat.

Mr. VARE. Of course, that might interfere with the profits of the packers.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Well, it would. Another item, Mr. Chairman; the Director of Sales gave us a beautiful chart showing the sales of various articles, and he had sold some aviation supplies, and we find that they had on hand a great many surplus planes made by the Curtiss people. These planes had been on the market, Mr. Chairman, and the Curtiss people served notice on the Government that if they should sell these planes they would sue the Government for breach of contract. Just how it would be done I do not know, neither do I know on what theory. At any rate there was considerable negotiations and correspondence concerning these planes.

In other words, the Curtiss people did everything possible to prevent the sale of these planes until the Director of Sales decided it would be as well to sell planes to the Curtiss people. So we find our experts deciding to sell, having at heart the best interests of the Government, 4,608 OX–5 motors, for which we paid $1,900 each, for $400 each; 1,616 Curtiss JN–4, for which we paid $5,700 each, for $400 each; 1,100 standard J, for which we paid $4,250 each, for $200 each, without motor.

So that we got something like $2,700,000 for this sale through this board of experts for the same articles for which we paid the same people $22,631,200.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. As I understand, the experts, as the gentleman calls them, were frightened into this kind of proceeding by threat of suit against the Government. I thought every schoolboy knew that the Government could not be sued.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. A little difference like that would make no difference to this commission.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I see.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I want to say that the sales up to $100,000 are made through the various branches of the Army, and all sales of $100,000 are cleared, as he says, through his office.

Now, gentlemen, when you get the hearings, perhaps some members of the committee may get the impression that on one item of sales we could save $10,000,000. This item is an item for machine tools, and the Ordnance Department said it would cost $8,000,000 to sluice these machines, or oil them. When the director was asked about it he did not know whether they had to be sluiced or oiled, and did not say whether or not it was necessary. He admitted he did not know whether these machines could be sold at best advantage without sluicing or not. When we reach the item I shall move, if no one else does, to reduce that $1,000,000 to $250,000, and perhaps we can get some business men who can draw less charts and tables, theorize less, less chummy with the copper and meat people, but who have horse sense and business ability to dispose of this property to the best interest of the Government and the people.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I want to ask him if he can conceive of some other amendment which will insure that the Government gets the benefit of these surplus supplies? They are being wasted now, it seems. We ought to save to the Government all we can get out of them.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Then the gentleman will agree with me that when this commission sells $27,000,000 of supplies for $2,700,000 to the same people they bought them from, that is not conserving the interests of the Government?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I am in hearty accord with the gentleman, and I am anxious that he offer some amendment to remedy that evil.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Another item that I want to call to the committee's attention is the "Air Service." I want to say that I have the highest regard for Gen. Menoher as a gallant officer, as an able general, as an expert on artillery and infantry, but when it comes to aviation he does not know a thing about it. And if you do not believe me, read the testimony. Gentlemen, it was pathetic to hear Gen. Menoher, the officer in charge of this service and intrusted to spend millions of dollars. He does not know a flying machine from a freight car. But he is the representative of the General Staff, and the General Staff has been fighting aviation ever since we started and is keeping up its scrap now. And the committee in its wisdom and good judgment reduced the item from $83,000,000 to $15,000,000. I expect to move another reduction of $5,000,000.

Now, let us look at the Aviation Service. The Secretary of War appeared before the committee, and in a very brief statement told us that he would not go into the question of policy. He told us about getting the men home, and the one recommendation that he made was that the future of the United States was at stake unless we purchased an aviation field at Dayton, Ohio. A field into which we have already dumped millions. Now, he wants to buy that field. And in comes Gen. Menoher and also asks to buy this field. The necessity for it was not explained to the committee. Before long we will be asked to buy Selfridge Field, on which we spent millions of dollars. It was a swamp and below water level. We drained it and made a habitable place of it, and spent our money there; and now they either have to give this land back to the proprietors or else buy it at their figure.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Which one of these fields is it that is part of a flood reservoir that is liable to be taken over by the State and flooded at any time?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Possibly it is not the Selfridge Field. The department had a sympathetic feeling for swamps. But the one I have referred to we have got to take back or buy it at an exorbitant figure. As I have said before on the floor of this House, we will never build up an aviation field in this country by buying land and spending millions first to drain land and then millions to buy that same land at an enhanced price because we made it suitable.

Gen. Mitchell, a gallant officer, one of the very few Regular Army officers who flew across the line, testified before the committee and told us that we had made no progress in lighter-than-air ships; that we were far behind in that style of ships; that we had no plans, no program. That we had nothing started. They testified that everything we had practically now was junk. Millions gone and not even a blue print of an up-to-date flying ship or plane.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I will.

Mr. LITTLE. Were there any graduates of West Point among the American aces?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Gen. Mitchell is not a graduate of West Point, although I may be wrong in that. No; there were not; perhaps one.

The question came up before the committee as to the advancement of our boys who were flying, why they were not given the J. M. A. and the M. A. rank. A colonel on Gen. Menoher's staff had the audacity to stand up before this committee and say, "We could not give them the M. A. test in Europe because it took so much time."

There is no such thing as an M. A. test. You get the M. A. rank automatically in three years. Then he said the J. M. A. test would take time. The test which our boys took at Issadoun, after taking advanced flying, was five times more difficult than the J. M. A. test. But that is a matter that has no bearing on this bill, and I will take that up at another time.

Gen. Menoher testified that he had to cooperate with the Navy in the matter of development and experimentation; that he had a joint board with the Navy, and that a good deal of production could be carried on along with the Navy; that regardless of the size of the Army an air service had to be kept up to a certain standard and size; and yet, when asked if he would support a separate air service, he said, "No"—because Gen. March is not for it, I suppose. When we arrive at this item of $15,000,000 I shall move to amend to reduce it to $10,000,000. Ten million dollars is enough to carry the Air Service on for the next fiscal year, to see what we are going to do, to decide upon a logical policy for our Air Service, to create a separate service, including the Army and the Navy, and Marine Corps, and the Post Office Department, and the Department of the Interior, which now wants planes, so that we can economize and not have overlapping services and really develop an aircraft industry in this country. To-day we are just as far behind in aviation as we were in 1917. We have squandered millions of dollars—I have said it many times on the floor of this House—and we have nothing to show for it except junk. We have not a pursuit plane; we have not a pursuit motor. We have 12,000 Liberty motors on hand. Gen. Menoher testified that he had one or two individual inquiries about the motors, but they are not able to sell a motor to any foreign country.

Another matter to which I wish to call the attention of the committee is the matter of military post exchanges. The director of that office appeared before the committee and asked

for over $5,000,000, of which he wanted to use $1,000,000, gentlemen, to buy the buildings erected on cantonments by the Red Cross and the Young Men's Christian Association. Why, Mr. Chairman, when the American people gave their donations to the Red Cross and the Young Men's Christian Association they did not give them to those organizations as organizations, but they gave the money to be spent for the American soldiers. It was their gift direct to the Army; those buildings belong to the American Army or the soldiers and not to the Red Cross or the Young Men's Christian Association, and the Red Cross and the Young Men's Christian Association can not say to the Army, "Buy these buildings from us," and we should not appropriate for that purpose. It is wrong. The Red Cross and the Young Men's Christian Association hold these buildings, perhaps in trust, but they belong to the Government; they belong to the Army and to the soldiers. I do not believe that the idea originated with either of these organizations. The committee did not allow this item to the Bureau of Post Exchanges, page 39, and instead of $5,875,000 the committee allows $150,000. But I wanted to bring this matter to your attention, so that this effort will not be repeated and so that no society or war organization may have a misapprehension as to its rights. I maintain that those buildings belong to the American soldiers right where they are, and the Red Cross and the Young Men's Christian Association have not the right to remove a single plank or nail from those buildings. They are the direct gift by the American people to the soldier boys of this country.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the committee recommended an appropriation of $150,000 for that purpose?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. No.

Mr. McKENZIE. But they did recommend that amount to Army post exchanges?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes. I am bringing this out—what they asked for—so that there will be no misunderstanding on future appropriations.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. If I understood the gentleman correctly, earlier in his remarks, he spoke of the disposition to hold troops in this country without demobilizing them. Is that something new? I thought there was great haste about demobilizing troops in the country for certain purposes. In New York City certain troops were wanted for the purpose of parading, and troops were held without being demobilized, so that they could parade. Has there been a change of attitude on the part of the department in that line?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I can not say that there has been a change of attitude on the part of the department, but I will ask the gentleman from Connecticut, who is one of the best military experts in this House, why should we have an Army of 535,000 men in the United States to-day?

Mr. TILSON. I was wondering whether there was a change of attitude in that respect, or what the trouble is.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I believe they are demobilizing rapidly now, as these men come in; but I say they will retard and delay demobilization when we have received the last number of men from Europe.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. The gentleman will recall the fact that Gen. March testified that the number of men in camp—400,000 or 500,000 men in cantonments in this country—was due to the fact that the returning soldiers and new recruits were counted as part of them, so that very few of the original drafted men are now in camp.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. About 41,000 are new recruits.

Mr. HARRISON. Forty-eight thousand.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. That is not a large figure in comparison with 400,000.

Mr. HARRISON. There are 200,000 returning troops in the cantonments.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I will accept the gentleman's figures of 200,000; but I say we still have 150,000 too many, and that will bear out my contention that we are appropriating too much money here. If we get these men back at the rate of 360,000 a month, that will leave us on the 1st of July with nothing but an army of occupation in Europe, and the President told us that we would get them back by September. When we get them back we should demobilize them and cut down the figure set out in the national defense act. We should cut down the appropriation to make such action certain.

Mr. HARRISON. If we appropriate only for those who are not discharged, it does not make any difference whether we appropriate for 400,000 or 500,000, because we do not increase or decrease the number demobilized.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. That is absolutely correct, except that the gentleman has implicit trust and faith that the War Department will do that, and I have not. I think the General Staff will keep an army lingering up to the very last hour of the very last day of the four months' period. That is what I am trying to avoid.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Can the gentleman from New York tell me how many men are still in the camps and cantonments in this country who went into the service under the draft, or volunteered prior to the draft?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I can not tell the gentleman that. The greater percentage of the men are war soldiers, volunteers for the duration of the war, or drafted boys.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. But you can not give any indication as to how many are still held in the service in this country?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. No; but it goes up into the hundreds of thousands. We have something like 48,000 Regular troops who have enlisted since the war, and some of those have been sent overseas. The remainder of them are in this country. The greater part of the rest of the men in the cantonments and camps in this country are men who enlisted for the duration of the war, war soldiers, or draft soldiers.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. But you can not tell exactly the number of those men?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. No; because the Chief of Staff would not give us those figures.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. May I have five minutes more?

Mr. KAHN. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I want to point out that there is nothing in this bill which goes to the real question of preparedness or the reorganization of the Army. It is purely an appropriation bill. There is no provision made for training. The sole purpose of this bill is to maintain this Army, and I believe that nothing constructive can possibly be carried out during this fiscal year.

Most of the time and effort of the department will be taken up with the actual demobilization, and questions pertaining to demobilization, so that we can cut off two or three hundred million dollars more of this bill, and still demobilize more rapidly than we will if we give too much money and put too much power in the hands of the General Staff. You may say that we have no right to do that by indirection, but I say that according to our system of government, where powers are divided under a system of checks and balances, the power of appropriation is given to us for that very purpose, in order to prevent the Executive department of the Government from abusing its powers. Inasmuch as it is the intent of the Congress to reduce the Army to the figure provided in the national defense act, I say that the way to do it is to appropriate only such an amount that will make nothing else possible. I say that no man who votes for this full amount will be able properly to stand up on the floor of this House and complain about the retarding of the demobilization. The way to do is to get at the very meat of the thing, cut it down, and you will see that your Army will be demobilized. [Applause.]

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I wish to say that the difference between the figures in this bill and the figures reported in the bill before the last Congress does not represent the change of a dollar in money saved or in the number of troops to be retained in the service. The appropriations in this bill are founded on exactly the same principle as the appropriations made in the bill before the last Congress. We are appropriating for the men that we believe will be held on an average during the year. We are appropriating for men who will not be discharged and not for an Army of any size whatever. As matters stood in the last session of Congress it seemed wise to appropriate for an Army of 500,000 men and so many officers, and at this session of Congress it has seemed wise to make the appropriation for 400,000 men, but in neither instance was the Army fixed at either of these figures. As soon as peace is proclaimed, by operation of the wording of the laws emergency acts pass out and the national defense act comes in. The number of enlisted men under that act can not exceed 175,000.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will it disturb the gentleman to ask him a question right there?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it not a fact that what you have stated just now represents the views and is the policy of the Congress of the United States? And is it not also a fact that the War Department asked us to appropriate in the last Congress, and that they insist that we ought to appropriate in this Congress, for an Army of 509,000 men, and insist that it is the duty of the

Congress to pass such legislation as will give them that Army of 509,000 men? Is not that where the cleavage comes between the War Department and the Congress?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Virginia indulge the Chair a moment? The Chair begs to notify the members of the committee that it is in violation of the rules of the House for Members to address each other in the second person, and the present occupant of the chair will enforce that rule.

Mr. HARRISON. We have in the military service at present 1,300,000 men. It is the duty of this Government to pay them what the law prescribes. It is the duty of this Government to furnish them subsistence, and it is the duty of this Government to transport them according to the necessities of the Government from one place to another, to provide for their transportation. Now, the supposed saving in this bill from the appropriation bill of last session is the difference in those three items, the difference in the pay of the Army, its subsistence, and its transportation. Yet while we are providing for only 400,000 men, we have in the Army 1,300,000 men, so that we are taking the responsibility of not providing for the pay of 1,300,000 men, because we are providing for the pay of only 400,000 men, and we can only do that on the assumption that the men will be discharged in accordance with the proposition of the Government. Now, the War Department has taken the view that it is dangerous at this time not to make provision for 500,000 men; that it is dangerous not to provide for an Army of 500,000 men on the average. We are at war. We have disturbing elements in this country. We have not reinstated the National Guard as yet, and the Government has asked us to provide for 500,000 men, not that it expects to have 500,000 men, but under possibilities that it may have 500,000 men.

If it should so turn out that the estimates of the Government are correct, and the appropriation by Congress is not in accordance with the estimates, who is the loss going to fall upon? Why, upon the soldiers, the men who have fought our battles, these men that we are holding in the service. Their subsistence will be cut and their transportation and pay will be cut. It does not mean that because the Government asked for 500,000 men that we are to have 500,000 men. Under the terms of the national defense act we can not have 500,000 men. The minute peace is proclaimed, that minute we go back to the national defense act. We would have under the national defense act 175,000 men.

When the Government comes before Congress and says it is safe to make provision for 500,000 men, it is only acting prudently; not that it asks for an army of 500,000 men, because there is not a line or word of legislation in the bill that would justify holding 500,000 men. It simply asks that this Congress so provide that if the necessities of the Government require it they will have enough money to pay 500,000 men and enough for their subsistence.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Sure.

Mr. KEARNS. Has it not been repeatedly stated by the Secretary of War that he intended to have all of our soldiers out of Europe by the latter part of September?

Mr. HARRISON. It has been stated by a higher authority.

Mr. KEARNS. The President?

Mr. HARRISON. The President met the Military Affairs Committee in Paris, and he was asked the question and he said, "It is my confident hope and expectation to have every soldier in Europe home by the 1st of September."

Mr. KEARNS. If that is true how could they have an average Army through the year of 500,000 men?

Mr. HARRISON. The gentleman asks a pertinent question—I do not believe they can. If things go as they should go we will not have 300,000 men, and yet to show how men can differ——

Mr. KEARNS. If the gentleman will pardon another question. Is it not a fact that we have a great many thousand men held in the camps and cantonments in the United States that have been there practically for a year?

Mr. HARRISON. Not according to my advices. There may be some ground of complaint, but I do not know this. Men in the service are anxious to get out and they see only their side. On the other hand, the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff, and all the officers charged with the duty of releasing the men, insist that all possible diligence is being used to this end. I do not believe men are being held in the service so that officers may hold their commissions. I have found officers with commissions unable to secure their release. An examination of the statistics of the camps and cantonments will reveal the fact that the situation as it appears is not the true situation. I have not the figures by me, as the debate this afternoon was unexpected, but if I remember aright there appear to be in the camps and cantonments about four or five hundred thousand men. This would seem an unreasonably large number, but we must reflect that in this number are the new recruits, some 50,000, and all the men returned from overseas, held for a few day awaiting their discharges. I should not say over 150,000 or 200,000 represent those actually held in the service. A large proportion of these are required in the hospitals to care for the wounded and the sick. Others are held to discharge the necessary military duties of the camps, so that those brought from overseas may be returned speedily to their homes and their work.

It is only right that those who have been to the firing line should be given a precedence in the order of discharge. Many are retained in order that the men who did go on the firing line may be discharged and sent home to their usual vocations. The officers have protested to our committee that not a man in this country is being retained beyond the necessities of the occasion for his retention.

Now, we can not tell about the complaints of these various men. A great many men think they ought to be discharged, and they think it is a great hardship that they are not discharged. If it is a question between retaining men who have been in this country and retaining men who have been over in France, I think we all agree that the men who have been in France and rendered service there should be given the first privilege of being discharged. In appropriating for 400,000 or 500,000 or 600,000 we are not spending one dollar more—I do not care how you figure it—than is necessary. How many men are we going to have in the service on an average during the year? That is the question. Some say 400,000, some say 500,000, some say 600,000; but the appropriation, for that matter, does not mean that the money is going to be spent. I say it is far safer and far wiser to appropriate money, so there shall be money here to pay these men in case they are not demobilized as rapidly as we hope.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I will.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman has had more experience on the committee than I have. In his experience has he ever known an appropriation for the Army turned back into the Treasury?

Mr. HARRISON. A number of times. Previous to the declaration of war an appropriation for machine guns was made and not a dollar was spent.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. DENT. So far as the pay of the Army is concerned, under the law if you have not the men to pay the money must be returned to the Treasury.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. May I ask the gentleman from Virginia to inquire of the gentleman from Alabama—I know the law requires the money to be refunded to the Treasury—but in his experience how many times have appropriations for the pay of the Army been kept lower than the limit and the balance refunded to the Treasury?

Mr. HARRISON. I can not tell the gentleman.

Mr. DENT. I really do not understand what my colleague on the committee means by that. If we appropriated for an Army of 100,000 men for the fiscal year and had only 75,000 men, the War Department would have to return the difference between the upkeep cost of the 75,000 men and the 100,000 men to the Treasury, or the officers would be guilty of embezzlement.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But they make every effort to expend it up to the very last moment.

Mr. DENT. They can not expend it if they have not the men.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is just the point. We do not want them to get the men.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. Do I understand the gentleman to be complaining that the Military Committee should have recommended appropriations for an Army of an average of 500,000 men instead of 400,000 men?

Mr. HARRISON. I said I thought it was safer to make that appropriation, but I agreed with the committee that in view of recent developments 400,000 would be safe. But it does not make a bit of difference whether we appropriate for 500,000 or 400,000 men. We are not authorizing an Army of either 500,000 or 400,000. When peace is declared the Army can not exceed 175,000.

Mr. ALMON. I understood the gentleman to say that if this appropriation which has been recommended by the Military Committee for an Army of 400,000 men on an average was not sufficient that the soldiers would be the sufferers, and I wanted

to know if that could not be provided for by a deficiency bill, in the event that it was not sufficient.

Mr. HARRISON. It could be provided for by a deficiency bill, but who is going to take care of the soldiers until we get the deficiency bill passed? That is the point. It just shows how much of guesswork this all is, when I recall the fact that at the last Congress in discussing this matter I tried to point out to the members of the Committee of the Whole House that the average number would not be 335,000, and I was ridiculed and scouted to some extent by my friends on the other side. I would like to refresh the memory of gentlemen for a moment or two by reading something that was said at that time. One very distinguished gentleman said:

> All the criticism that has been leveled at the bill for being too lavish falls to the ground, because it is a dead certainty that whether we want it or not we will have more men in the service next year than even this bill provides for. It is a physical impossibility for it to be otherwise.

Those are the words of the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. ANTHONY. Another distinguished gentleman, Mr. MANN, said that nobody who could add two and two and make it four but would say that under the figures of the bill it would be absolutely impossible to have as few men as 500,000 on the average. My very distinguished friend, the chairman of this committee, Mr. KAHN, said the War Department always took matters too optimistically, and he was sure there would not be as few as 500,000 men. But here he comes in with this bill and urges the Congress to cut it down to 400,000 men, because they all see that their foresight on the subject of how many men we will have in the service has been at fault, and that nobody can tell how many there will be. In this respect I wish to say that the fact that we can go down now to 400,000 men is not due to any Republican economy, but is due to Democratic efficiency. We have reduced the number. By virtue of efficient administration in the War Department we have not only done that which one distinguished gentleman said was a physical impossibility but we have done that which another distinguished gentleman said anybody who could add two and two and make four would say could not be done. It is Democratic efficiency that has done this, they must all admit. But I do not care whether it is 400,000 or 500,000 or 300,000 men. The sole proposition is this, that we should make an appropriation to protect our soldiers from having their pay withheld or their subsistence withheld.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman does not seriously contend that one soldier would lose his pay or go without food or transportation, assuming that the appropriation would fall short.

Mr. HARRISON. Perhaps the gentleman would take care of those soldiers who had no food, but there is no one else that I can think of who can do it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does the gentleman wish to convey the information that unless we appropriate——

Mr. HARRISON. Here is the only thing I meant to insist on: That if we do not make appropriations for their pay, they are not going to be paid. There is no other way to get it to them.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Can not we always pass a deficiency bill?

Mr. HARRISON. I will ask the gentleman to be generous and do it himself.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it not a fact that the pay of the Army is one of the great items of this bill?

Mr. HARRISON. There is subsistence and transportation, dependent upon the size of the Army.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it not true that in the estimate submitted to our committee by the War Department that, for instance, take the Engineer Corps, the Signal Corps, the Aviation Corps, for every possible branch the estimates were based on a proposed army of 509,000 men?

Mr. HARRISON. They wanted us to go ahead and make these appropriations now for what we would be called upon to do later, and that is to provide for the Engineer Corps, for the Aviation Corps, for the Transportation Corps. These were all left to be taken care of when we come to reorganize the Army. The only thing we have done in that respect is to postpone the appropriation until that time comes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Would the gentleman say that, under the national-defense act, which is the only law we have on the statute books fixing the size of the Army, under that law, the peace being signed, the troops home, demobilized, with an Army fixed at 175,000 men in the line, exclusive of the Quartermaster Corps and the Medical Corps and the Signal Corps, we should make appropriations, for instance, for the Engineer Corps on the basis of an Army of 509,000 men, when under the law it says we are to have an Army of 175,000 men? Now, if the gentleman will permit me, I agree with the gentleman about the unexpected efficiency in bringing the men home, and I hope that the gentleman from Virginia will join with us now in our effort to try to prevent extravagance.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Democratic Party can do it they are going to see to it you will not expend a dollar more than necessary, that is certain. On the declaration of peace we come to this national-defense act. That act is wholly unworkable, according to the testimony of Gen. March, Chief of Staff, and other officers who appeared before our committee, and it is going to be absolutely essential within the six months that the Overman Act is under operation to adopt a proper military policy, a permanent policy for this country. The present national-defense act would place the Air Service under the Signal Corps and destroy its efficiency. It would destroy the Tank Corps, it would destroy the Chemical Service Corps, and other corps which I do not just now recall. So if we are going to preserve the bureaus and the corps that have been found in this war to be essential to any efficient army we have got to legislate very soon upon some permanent peace policy. For my part I think that we can do nothing wiser than to go back to the old national-defense act as a basis and build on it. In spite of what the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] said this morning—that we made a great mistake in our national-defense preparations because we did not vote for his 250,000 Army amendment—the facts are that his amendment could not have possibly amounted to anything. The national-defense act authorized 175,000 men, and at the outbreak of the war we did not have anywhere near this number. The authorization of 250,000 would have therefore meant nothing. It might have displayed the desire to have an Army of that size without incurring the obligation of taxpayers to pay for it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I will.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. If the gentleman will permit me to remind him, I think it will recur to his memory that this 175,000 men were not all to be raised in one year, but were to be raised in five annual increments and only one increment had lapsed.

Mr. HARRISON. A great deal over 100,000 men were authorized, but we had not actually enrolled——

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Because the authorized strength had four-fifths of the increments to come in in four succeeding years.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman yield to me? Where does the gentleman get that statement?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. He gets it from the law itself, as he recalls it.

Mr. DENT. That is the National Guard and not the Regular Army.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. This applies to the Regular Army, and one of the first things we did in the war-time legislation was to authorize the Secretary of War to raise the five increments at once to bring the Regular Army to its maximum strength.

Mr. GARNER. The only difference between the 175,000 and the 225,000 the gentleman from California wanted was a difference in numbers and not a difference in method.

Mr. HARRISON. The fact is that if he wanted the 225,000 men he would not have had the men. He might have had the authorized strength.

Mr. GARNER. As I understood the gentleman, the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] only wanted to increase the number and not change the method of raising it.

Mr. HARRISON. That is true.

Mr. GARNER. So there would not have been more men under his method than the 175,000?

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offered was for an increase to 250,000 men.

Mr. HARRISON. At the time the war broke out the Regular Army was not enlisted anywhere near the strength authorized by the national-defense act.

Mr. GARNER. But it had to be raised under the same system as the 175,000 were raised?

Mr. KAHN. Oh, no.

Mr. GARNER. What system did you offer?

Mr. KAHN. Immediately.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] has the floor.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I submit to the Chair the gentleman permitted other gentlemen to interrupt him, and I am interrogating them.

May I ask the gentleman from California a question without being interrupted by the Chair, with the permission of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. HARRISON. I said if you did not take much time.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield? If not, the Chair will maintain the right of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] to the floor.

Mr. HARRISON. I was pointing out that the authorized number had no bearing, because of the fact that the Army could not be recruited up to the strength that was authorized.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentlemen yield? I want the gentleman from Virginia, if he can, to explain the difference between the proposition of the gentleman from California and the present law calling for 175,000 men. The gentleman from Virginia has said that, while we had authorized 175,000 men, there were about 100,000 men in the Army.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Now he contends that if we had adopted the plan of the gentleman from California we would have only had that number of men, but the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] says his plan is different from the one on the statute books. Will the gentleman point out the difference?

Mr. HARRISON. I do not think there was any difference, except in the number.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I do not remember exactly the wording of the amendment I offered, but I do remember this much of it, that I offered the amendment for immediate increase of the Army to 250,000 men. I am going to send for a copy of the amendment and will get it exact.

Mr. HARRISON. The amendment would not have brought any more troops than those that already were in the Army.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman from Virginia yield to me?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. HARRISON. I do.

Mr. DENT. Whatever the language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California may have been, the fact is that under the bill approved June 3, 1916, the Army was increased to 175,000 combatant men, and when we declared war on the 6th day of April, 1917, we had 127,000 officers and men. And so if we had had the amendment offered by the gentleman from California we would not have had the men or the officers in the Army.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Having in mind the statement of the gentleman from Alabama that at the outbreak of the war the national-defense act authorized 175,000 combatant troops, and that we had only 127,000, will the gentleman from Virginia supplement the statement of his colleague from Alabama by explaining to him that under the terms of the law as it then stood the maximum authorization of 175,000 men was only to be reached at the end of five years from the date of the approval of the act, which was June 3, 1916, or just one year before we went into the war at all?

Mr. DENT. I can not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. And one increment of the five had been raised, and only one. And at the meeting of the committee, attended by the Secretary of War, to propose war legislation, one of the first things written into the bill was authority to raise the other four increments at once and not wait four years.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman from Virginia permit me to ask my colleague from Vermont a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield for that purpose?

Mr. HARRISON. How much time have I used?

The CHAIRMAN. Thirty-five minutes.

Mr. DENT. I want to ask the gentleman from Vermont if he means to state that under the national-defense act, approved June 3, 1916, it is provided for a maximum combatant Army of 175,000, and that the first year only one-fifth of them can be raised?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Not that one-fifth of them could be raised, but that the gain over the status of the Army then, at that time, to make up the 175,000, was to be so raised.

Mr. DENT. The gentleman is talking enigmas now.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I am trying to answer the gentleman.

Mr. DENT. I want to know if the gentleman means——

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] declines to yield further.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not think it makes any difference as to the technical feature. The fact is that at the time of the declaration of war the men were not recruited to the full authorized strength, and it does not make a picayune of difference whether 125,000 or 175,000 or 225,000 were authorized. The saving of this Republic was the provision in regard to the National Guard. It was our National Guard that furnished the nucleus under the national-defense act which enabled us to put some strength on the Mexican border, and which eventually enabled us to play so conspicuous a part in the war in Europe. I know of no more brilliant service rendered by any branch of the Army than was rendered by the National Guard on the blood-stained fields of France. [Applause.] It was the Rainbow Division, the Twenty-ninth Division, the Wildcat Division, the Twenty-sixth Division, the Twenty-eighth Division—all composed of the National Guard of this country—that carried the American flag to victory on every field that they fought, and it was the National Guard that served its great purpose, not only in the prewar time but at the time when the actual hostilities began. I know of no more gallant service rendered by any division than that of the division which came from my own State and the States of West Virginia and Pennsylvania.

The Twenty-ninth Division took its place in the Argonne fight, and the Twenty-ninth Division was very instrumental in terminating that battle in favor of American arms; and when I mention the Twenty-ninth Division I do it simply because it came from my own section. Gallant men from all sections were found in the National Guard divisions, and the National Guard divisions and the National Army divisions can challenge any work that was done by any of the Regular Army divisions over there. [Applause.] The Regular Army divisions were all made up of freshly recruited men, and they had no advantage over the National Guard or the National Army in that respect.

I think it would be a deplorable thing in time of peace to force the youth into compulsory military training. I followed the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] when he amended the National Army act in providing for the selective draft. I believed in war time it was the duty of every man to rally around the flag, and the proper way of raising an army was to raise it by the selective draft; but I do not agree with him if it is his proposition that in time of peace we shall force men into the military service, I do not care whether they are 18-year-old boys or whether they are 30 years old or any other age. [Applause.] In war time we have the right to call on the manhood of this country, but in peace times it seems to me a very poor substitute policy to compel men to leave their homes and their occupations to enter the military service, I do not care what euphonious name it may bear. If the 100,000 Army means that we are going to compel military service of the young men of this country, then for one I am opposed to it.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. BAER. I am not an authority on militarism, and I am trying to get it straight in my mind whether it makes any difference whether a man is a reservist or not in peace times if when we declare war he immediately becomes of the reserve corps; so that if he is in the reserve in peace times, when we do not have war, and he can not get into war, still in war times he is in the reserve. I am in favor of the gentleman's position, but I do not know how it works out.

Mr. HARRISON. I am not a sufficiently competent authority to explain that. [Laughter.]

As I say, I think we have a right in war time to compel military service, but when it comes to compelling military service in peace times it is an entirely different proposition, and of an army of 100,000 men means that we are going to compel all the young men of this country to enter the military service of this country, then I think we had better have a larger army and do away with compulsory military service. I favor, of course, military instruction in the colleges and academies and public schools, and in that I have the indorsement of the Secretary of War in his testimony before the committee. To that extent I think this Congress can well go. But to provide for an army of 100,000 men, with compulsory military service, it seems to me is against the ideals of our country.

I desire to say that the billions of dollars that we have appropriated can all be found. Anybody who goes over to Europe will come back impressed with the magnitude of the work that America has done there. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] has detailed here in eloquent words and glowing language the work of America on French soil; I do not care whether it is the Military Committee that goes over there, or a partisan investigating committee, or a body of visiting statesmen, they will all come back impressed with

the magnificent work that America has done, in the supply branch, at the ports of embarkation and on the battle field. [Applause.] I think it was rather in poor taste for this Congress to determine to send over a partisan investigating committee to investigate what our brave and true men have done over in that country.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman believes, however, that there are some things on this side of the water that might well be investigated?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, a few things; but when you assail the Secretary of War you assail the men whom he employed to do the work. You can not separate the Secretary of War from the men who had charge of those works.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, for a question.

Mr. McKENZIE. My colleague does not mean to say that it is intended that this investigating committee shall investigate the character of the work done by the men in the Military Establishment. That is not the idea.

Mr. HARRISON. Is not it? I did not know what the idea was. I knew it was a Republican committee, and I did not know what they were going to do.

Mr. McKENZIE. My colleague will admit that there is a great deal of difference between the work of the soldier on the other side and the work of the men who had the contracts on this side, perhaps.

Mr. HARRISON. The men over there did wonderful work, I do not care whether it was on the field of battle or in the supply depots. They ran the great plants over there; they established those ports of debarkation over there. They did work that is simply marvelous, as you will agree when you go over there and contemplate it. It seems to me it is in mighty poor taste to send a partisan committee to investigate it; but I think I can speak for those men over there when I say that they will gladly welcome any investigation that you may institute. It was for this reason that I voted for the resolution.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I understood from the President himself that, treaty or no treaty, there was no intention on his part or on the part of the administration to keep any soldiers in any part of Europe, occupied territory or otherwise. He has stated that most emphatically, and if that is the case it seems to me we need have no fears that the treaty of peace will contain any provision warranting our doing police duty over there or retaining our soldiers there for any purpose. I hope, though, that something better will come out of that treaty than is indicated by the somewhat hopeless cry of the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN]. All he seems to think now is that we must get the boys home. There are two things, though, about that treaty of peace that I think we can contemplate without any worry. The first is that the Germans do not like it, and the second is that Americans are not going to lie down on the job until they complete the work they set out to do. [Applause.] We are not figuring on territory. It is a matter of no concern to us what is done about that, but our allies are concerned, and no treaty of peace can be reached without such matters being considered. They have got to settle their boundaries, and the American Government can be a beneficent factor in acting as adviser and friend. We are not concerned in their boundaries except to bring about peace.

Mr. EMERSON. Has not the President already taken a stand on some of their territorial questions?

Mr. HARRISON. The President may have decided to act as a friendly advisor. It makes no difference to this country whether the Italians or anybody else get certain territory, but if it is necessary as a member of the peace council to advise along certain lines I have no doubt he has done it.

Mr. EMERSON. He has indulged in some pretty strong language.

Mr. HARRISON. There are two things which I think that treaty emphasizes, which my colleague from Kentucky brought out this morning. There are two things that this country is vitally interested in. One is that the settlement of all international disputes should be by arbitration, and the next is the limitation upon the armaments of all countries.

We do not want a great military establishment over here, but we want to say to the people of the earth, "You shall not threaten our security and our safety by having great armaments over there." In that respect it seems to me there is something more hopeful than the gentleman from California has been able to find. He only wants to come home and get away from Europe. He seems to have nothing else to suggest. Is this all that American blood, so freely shed, can buy—a safe conduct home?

Let us hope that when we bring the American flag home we will bring a peace treaty which for the years to come will mean our future security under all the changes in the times to come.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I will.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How does the gentleman reconcile the reduction of armament and our having a Navy second to none in the world?

Mr. HARRISON. I believe we have not a Navy second to none in the world.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is the gentleman speaking for the administration?

Mr. HARRISON. I understood that program has been abandoned, but I am not up on naval matters.

Mr. IGOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. IGOE. Does the gentleman see how the chairman of the committee can reconcile his views—that before we went into the war we should have about 250,000 men to be prepared, and now, when America is to stand alone, notwithstanding all the lessons and experience we have had, he thinks the Army could get along with 100,000 men?

Mr. HARRISON. I do not know. Mr. Chairman, I have been so interrupted that I can not keep the thread of what I am trying to say. I was glad to vote for the proposition before this body the other day thanking our men for the efficient work that they had done. Whoever goes over to that country will come back greatly impressed, magnificently impressed, with what has been done. Even when I arrived at Brest, that much-maligned territory, the first person I met was that gallant soldier, Gen. Butler, son of the distinguished chairman of the naval committee. [Applause.] He has done wonders for that place. He has transformed it from being a mudhole into a place that makes as good a showing as any other camp in Europe. What I say about Gen. Butler is true of all the other generals in the several camps that I visited. They not only had a military duty to perform but they had great outside work to perform in taking care of the soldiers and meeting all the requirements of war. To the eternal glory of the American Army I do not believe any committee will find that a single American officer has stained his honor in any way or at any time or under any conditions. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, if I have any time I reserve it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used 50 minutes.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address the House in general debate if I can make some arrangement with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] in regard to time.

Mr. McKENZIE. I will yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I thought we had some time on this side and I am a member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is a member of the committee and if he asks for recognition the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama has informed me that he will not desire any time under general debate. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] would like to have 30 minutes and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] would like to have 10 minutes. I am perfectly willing that they should have that time. I presume they are entitled to it in their own right. I have consumed all my time, but when they have concluded I shall ask the committee to rise, and then take up the bill again under the five-minute rule on Wednesday.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from California a question?

Mr. KAHN. Certainly.

Mr. DENT. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] want his 30 minutes this evening?

Mr. KAHN. This evening.

Mr. DENT. And then the gentleman from Kansas wants 10 minutes?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. May I interrupt the gentleman? In view of the lateness of the hour, I do not want to keep the Members here, and I will wait until some more appropriate time.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] is not on the floor just now, therefore I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Thereupon the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 5227, the military appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend and revise his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia makes the same request. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

CLOSE OF GENERAL DEBATE.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I understand from the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] that he does not desire any time under general debate. Therefore I move that the general debate be now considered closed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California moves that general debate upon this bill be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I have the privilege of presenting the conference report on the bill H. R. 2480, the Indian appropriation bill, some time between now and midnight, and that it be printed in the RECORD under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER], chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, asks unanimous consent that the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill, H. R. 2480, may be printed in the RECORD if presented at any time up to midnight to-night. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

VICTOR BERGER.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate, back to the amendment stage, the proceedings by which the House passed the House resolution No. 6, providing for the appointment of a committee to report on the right of VICTOR BERGER to a seat in the House. My reason for making this request is that, owing to an error on the part of the former Clerk of the House in copying the name from the certificate, it appeared in the printed roll as "VICTOR BERGER," whereas the correct name is "VICTOR L. BERGER." If my request is granted, I shall move to amend the resolution so as to have the record correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I am not entirely clear as to what the gentleman desires to do. Is it important that it be done at this time? Can not the gentleman bring it up in the morning?

Mr. DALLINGER. I would like very much to have the matter disposed of at this time.

Mr. MONDELL. I realize that; but I think the gentleman might bring it up in the morning.

Mr. DALLINGER. I will state, Mr. Speaker, it will be very difficult for me to be here when the house convenes in the morning, on account of a hearing before the Committee on Elections No. 1 on the Kansas City case.

Mr. GARRETT. May I ask wherein it is important to make that amendment, anyway? Of what consequence is it?

Mr. DALLINGER. Because the resolution followed the printed roll of the House, and described the name as "VICTOR BERGER," whereas the name in the certificate from the governor of Wisconsin is "VICTOR L. BERGER."

Mr. GARRETT. It is just a question of identification.

Mr. DALLINGER. I think it would be well to have the record correct.

Mr. MONDELL. I suggest, if it is not important that action be taken now, the gentleman withdraw his request for the present.

Mr. DALLINGER. Of course, if the gentleman from Wyoming intends to object, I will withdraw my request at this time.

Mr. BLANTON. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 10, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

CALENDAR OF MOTIONS TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEES—NOTICE.

Under paragraph 4 of Rule XXVII,

Mr. RAKER submitted a motion in writing to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from further consideration of the bills of the following titles, the same having been referred to such committee 15 days prior to this date:

A bill (H. R. 5) to create in the War Department and the Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as the "Civil War volunteer officers' retired list."

A bill (H. R. 2492) to grant rank to the Army Nurse Corps and for other purposes.

Mr. MONDELL submitted a motion in writing to discharge the Committee on the Public Lands from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1408) providing for appeals from decisions of the Secretary of the Interior, the same having been referred to such committee 15 days prior to this date.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of War, submitting an estimate of appropriation to pay claims for damages by collision, river and harbor work, which have been adjusted and settled by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army (H. Doc. No. 83); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for "scales for customs service" for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 84); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting supplemental estimates of appropriations required by the Bureau of Education for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 85); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, recommending the enactment of a bill authorizing the President to invite each of the American Republics to send, after June 1, 1920, not more than two of its citizens at one time to receive instruction in the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis and the United States Military Academy at West Point, respectively, under the customary conditions (H. Doc. No. 86); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting report on the handling and disposal of waste paper in Government service, together with certain comments thereon from the Office of the Public Printer and the reply of the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 87); to the Committee on Printing and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GOOD, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5312) to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for carrying out the act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 26), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5249) to establish a fish cultural station on Salt River, in Ralls County, Mo.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5250) providing for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building at Bowling Green, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 5251) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and cannon balls, to the village of Brownsville, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 5252) to provide soldiers, sailors, and marines with capital for agricultural development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BOX: A bill (H. R. 5253) for the acquisition of a site for a post-office building at Jacksonville, Tex., and making appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 5254) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Gen. George Rodgers Clark at Clarksville, in the county of Clark, in the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 5255) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of North Woodstock, N. H., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 5256) donating a war tank to the village of South Orange, N. J., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 5257) for the remodeling of the United States Federal Building at Aberdeen, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 5258) to reimburse the surviving Civil War prisoners; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 5259) to provide relief for subcontractors under contracts connected with the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 5260) providing for the equitable distribution of captured German cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOODS of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 5261) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Virginia Polytechnic Institute of Blacksburg, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5262) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Roanoke, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5263) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Elks National Home, of Bedford, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5264) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lynchburg, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD: A bill (H. R. 5265) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Schulenburg, Tex., one piece of artillery or other trophy captured or obtained from the enemy during or at the close of the war with Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5266) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Goliad, Tex., one piece of artillery or other trophy captured or obtained from the enemy during or at the close of the war with Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 5267) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and shells, to the city of Cassville, Mo.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5268) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and shells, to the city of Aurora, Mo.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5269) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and shells, to the city of Mount Vernon, Mo.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5270) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and shells, to the city of Carthage, Mo.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5271) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and shells, to the city of Neosho, Mo.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5272) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and shells, to the city of Pineville, Mo.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5273) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and shells, to the city of Lamar, Mo.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5274) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and shells, to the city of Nevada, Mo.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5275) donating three captured German cannon or field guns and carriage to the city of Gary, Ind.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5276) donating a captured cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Goodland, Ind.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 5277) to provide for the erection of a public building at Rogersville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5278) to provide for the erection of a public building at Elizabethton, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 5279) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a post-office building at Tryon, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 5280) to authorize the President to dispose of real property by sale, exchange, lease, or otherwise; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SIEGEL: A bill (H. R. 5281) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the State of New York the cannon, machine guns, or other military equipment captured by the Twenty-seventh and Seventy-seventh Divisions, American Expeditionary Forces, during its service overseas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 5282) relating to the maintenance of actions for death on the high seas and other navigable waters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COADY: A bill (H. R. 5283) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Baltimore, State of Maryland, German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 5284) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the cities of Dubois and Soda Springs, State of Idaho; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 5285) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Uniontown, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 5286) to refund to the corporate authorities of Frederick City, Md., the sum of $200,000, exacted of them by the Confederate Army under Gen. Jubal Early, July 9, 1864, under penalty of burning said city; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 5287) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Calexico, Calif., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 5288) for the relief of contractors and subcontractors for the post offices and other buildings and work under the supervision of the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 5289) authorizing the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal immigration building at El Paso, Tex., and for housing and furnishing of offices to Federal employees and the various departments connected and attached to the Immigration Department, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GOODYKOONTZ: A bill (H. R. 5290) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the town of Mullens, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5291) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Pineville, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5292) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Princeton, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5293) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Union, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5294) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Logan, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5295) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Hinton, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5296) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Wayne, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5297) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Williamson, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5298) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Welch, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5299) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Bluefield, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5300) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Bramwell, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5301) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Hamlin, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5302) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building at Welch, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 5303) for the purchase of a post-office site at Bishopville, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5304) for the purchase of a post-office site at St. Matthews, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5305) for the purchase of a post-office site at Batesburg, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5306) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Columbia, S. C., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5307) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the cities of Sumter and Orangeburg, and to the towns of Lexington, St. Matthews, and Bishopville, all in South Carolina, each a German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5308) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish standards of classification of commercial feed, to regulate the sale and shipment thereof in interstate and foreign commerce, to prevent deception with reference thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5309) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish uniform standards of classification of fruits and vegetables, to provide for the use of such standards in interstate and foreign commerce, to prevent deception in reference thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5310) to stimulate the production, sale, and distribution of live-stock products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 5311) to reprint Senate Document No. 181, Fifty-eighth Congress, second session; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 5312) to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for carrying out the act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. WALSH: Resolution (H. Res. 100) requesting certain information from the Secretary of War in regard to the men inducted into the military service of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolution (H. Res. 101) for the appointment of a special committee to inquire into the methods of the Government in connection with certain financial functions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: Resolution (H. Res. 102) requesting information concerning real estate taxation in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WALSH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 105) relating to the powers and duties of the office of President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 106) providing for the disposition of the insurance of deceased officers and enlisted men of the military and naval forces; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 107) directing the payment of insurance to surviving relatives of officers and men of the U. S. S. *Cyclops;* to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 108) proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States to authorize uniform laws on the subject of marriage and divorce, and to provide penalties for enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODYKOONTZ: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 109) proposing that "Barnes's Federal Code, 1919," be prima facie evidence of the laws therein contained in all courts of the United States and of its several States and Territories; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial from the Legislature of Massachusetts, protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Florida, asking Congress to provide the wild game in the Ocala district of the Florida National Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DALLINGER: Memorial from the Legislature of Massachusetts, regarding the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of Massachusetts, regarding the Jews in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PAIGE: Memorial from the Legislature of Massachusetts, regarding the Jews in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of Massachusetts, regarding the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS: Memorial from the Legislature of Massachusetts, regarding the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio: Memorial from the Legislature of Ohio, requesting the Secretary of War to make provision that all trophies of war captured by Ohio troops be collected and sent to Ohio to be kept as perpetual memorials; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Memorial from the Legislature of Massachusetts, protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACKERMAN: A bill (H. R. 5313) granting an increase of pension to George W. Disbrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 5314) authorizing the Secretary of War to confer upon David Davis the congressional medal of honor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5315) granting a pension to Louis C. Baughman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5316) granting an increase of pension to George W. Snider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5317) granting an increase of pension to John Bonhomme; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5318) granting a pension to James P. Burns; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 5319) granting a pension to Helen Cecilia Schaarman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: A bill (H. R. 5320) granting a pension to Ruth Baker Wyman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5321) granting a pension to John C. Hardy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5322) granting an increase of pension to George W. Weeks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5323) granting an increase of pension to George D. Totman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5324) granting an increase of pension to Kate B. Horan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5325) granting an increase of pension to Edward P. Carman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5326) granting a pension to Jesse Trower; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COADY: A bill (H. R. 5327) for the relief of Louis A. Cornthwaite; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5328) for the relief of sundry building and loan associations; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5329) for the relief of sundry building and loan associations; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5330) for the relief of sundry building and loan associations; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5331) for the relief of the Patterson Park Permanent Loan & Building Association, of Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5332) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to make, execute, and deliver to the Safe Deposit & Trust Co., of Baltimore, trustee under the will of Florence B. Gelston, deceased, a deed in fee of lot 13 in reservation 11, in the city of Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 5333) to correct the military record of Peter Donnelly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 5334) granting a pension to Carrie Abbitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 5335) granting a pension to Jennie Lego; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 5336) granting an increase of pension to Martin W. Frisbie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5337) granting a pension to William Thornton Parker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOODYKOONTZ: A bill (H. R. 5338) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of Marion Workman, late of Company D, Fifth Virginia Infantry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 5339) granting a pension to Matilda Laswell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5340) granting a pension to Jennie Schofields; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5341) granting an increase of pension to Ina Sturdevant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULINGS: A bill (H. R. 5342) granting an increase of pension to Wesley Koonce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5343) for the relief of Samuel C. Koonce; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5344) for the relief of Gust Mihleder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND: A bill (H. R. 5345) for the relief of Arundel Sand & Gravel Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5346) for the relief of the Eastern Transportation Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 5347) granting a pension to George W. Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JEFFERIS: A bill (H. R. 5348) for the relief of Mrs. Thomas McGovern; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 5349) for the relief of Thomas E. Philips; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5350) granting a pension to Elissa Bahlkow; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 5351) granting a pension to Eugene Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5352) granting an increase of pension to Levi W. Easton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 5353) granting an increase of pension to William H. Crane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWE: A bill (H. R. 5354) for the relief of Margaret Speir; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5355) granting a pension to Dillion Collett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5356) granting an increase of pension to George W. Mason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 5357) granting an increase of pension to Henry Sonders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5358) granting an increase of pension to William A. Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5359) granting an increase of pension to John R. Holt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5360) granting an increase of pension to Fletcher P. Roberts; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5361) granting an increase of pension to Wiley Lambkin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5362) granting a pension to Nancy Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5363) granting a pension to Benjamin Hammonds; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5364) granting a pension to David A. Turner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5365) granting a pension to Jesse Kivette; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5366) granting a pension to Harry Noell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5367) granting a pension to Charles H. Ricker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5368) granting a pension to William Estes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5369) granting a pension to William Crawford; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5370) granting a pension to W. M. Balch; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5371) granting a pension to John Alford; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5372) granting a pension to W. A. Nicely; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5373) granting a pension to Julia Sprinkle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5374) granting a pension to Mary E. Hartsell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 5375) granting an increase of pension to James Fleming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 5376) granting an increase of pension to Aron Adamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5377) for the relief of Lawrence J. Kessinger; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5378) for the relief of Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co.; the Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Co.; and the St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 5379) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Ivers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 5380) granting a pension to Mary E. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5381) granting a pension to Richard Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAILE: A bill (H. R. 5382) for the relief of Elizabeth T. Wells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOIGT: A bill (H. R. 5383) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Gillson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5384) granting an increase of pension to Daniel B. W. Stocking; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5385) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin A. Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5386) granting an increase of pension to Martin Kohn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5387) granting an increase of pension to John P. Hanford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5388) granting a pension to Robert A. Carnegie; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 5389) to reimburse William H. Allen as postmaster of Fairhaven, Mass., for certain money orders unlawfully issued; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 5390) granting relief to Howard A. Moxley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5391) granting relief to Irving J. Kelley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 5392) granting a pension to Lucius P. Burress; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5393) granting a pension to Julius Scheuer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 5394) granting a pension to Mary C. Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Jewish citizens of South Bend, Ind., protesting against pogroms in Poland and Roumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Texas State Council of Defense, Dallas, indorsing the United States Employment Service and asking for continuance of same as permanent bureau under Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Union Label Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor, against men wearing the uniform of the United States Army being used as guards for plant and buildings of Willys-Overland Co., at Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Norwood Christian Church, Norwood, Ohio, to grant all American Indians full rights of American citizenship; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of Solomon Badesch, chairman of executive committee of the combined Jewish organizations of Bridgeport, Conn., for defense of Jews in Poland, Ukrainia, and Roumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of 5,000 Jews assembled at mass meeting in Kansas City, against the persecution of Jews in European countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BABKA: Petition of St. Nikala Society, No. 22, and others, relating to Jugo-Slav affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: Letter of Percival H. Safford, jeweler, Rochester, N. H., advocating the repeal of section 905 of the revenue act of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Wicwas Lake Grange, Meredith Center, N. H., requesting the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Loudon Center Grange, Loudon Center, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Mount Belknap Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Gilford, N. H., by Thomas E. Hunt and Addie M. Parker, committee on resolution (Lakeport, N. H.), advocating the immediate repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Sunday School of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Chester, N. H., by William T. Owen, superintendent, protesting against lifting the ban on beer and wines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Mount Belknap Grange, Gilford, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Junior Grange, No. 150, Patrons of Husbandry, by Ettie E. Swett, secretary, Grasmere, N. H., advocating the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of optical organizations of the State of New Hampshire, by Mr. George H. Brown, president New Hampshire State Board of Examiners in Optometry, and Willie F. Bean, president Granite State Optometrical Association, advocating repeal of the tax imposed upon eyeglasses and spectacles under sections 900–907 of the revenue act of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Enterprise Grange No. 281, by E. J. Manor, secretary, Salem, N. H., advocating the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Portsmouth (N. H.) Chamber of Commerce, by E. H. Baker, secretary, advocating the continuance of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Prof. Winthrop E. Fiske, the Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H., advocating the continuance of daylight saving; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of New Hampshire Retail Jewelers' Association, by A. J. Potter, secretary, advocating the repeal of sections 900–907 of Title IX of the revenue act of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Almon B. White Post No. 55, department of New Hampshire, Grand Army of the Republic, by Mr. J. H. Winslow, post commander, Whitefield, N. H., advocating larger pensions for Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of the New Hampshire Academy of Science, by W. C. O'Kane, secretary, Durham, N. H., advocating the continuance of the appropriation of $2,000,000 for the purchase of forest land in the White Mountains and southern Appalachians during the fiscal year 1919–20; to the Committee on Agricul-

By Mr. COLE: Petition of Ohio Association of Volunteer Retired List, asking for the passage of a volunteer officers' retired bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Whetstone Grange, No. 1953, Waldo, Ohio, for repeal of daylight-saving plan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of 34 employees of Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Western Lines, Crestline, Ohio; Bucyrus, Ohio, Local No. 142, Federation of Railroad Workers; and 167 members of the Kenton Lodge, No. 309, of the American Federation of Railroad Workers, favoring Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COPLEY: Petition of Local 558, J. B. of E. W., Sheffield, Ala., pertaining to nitrate plant, Muscle Shoals, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURRIE of Michigan: Petition of sundry citizens of Grayling, Mich., against tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: Petition of First Christian Church, of Holden, Mo., to pass laws for enforcement of eighteenth amendment and war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYER: Petitions of Gustin-Bacon Manufacturing Co., Kansas City; Charles S. Lewis & Co., St. Louis; Wells-Hine Trust Co., Savannah; Lumaghi Coal Co., St. Louis; Dempster Mill Manufacturing Co., Kansas City; Niehoff-Schulze Grocery Co., St. Louis, all of Missouri, opposing repeal of the present zone system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of the Boyd-Richardson Furnishing Goods Co. and Greenfield Bros., St. Louis, Mo., urging repeal of luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Lumbermen's Exchange of St. Louis, protesting against the Poindexter bill installing eight-hour day; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Mallinckrodt Chemical Works, Eugene Smith, B. F. Rohs, T. W. Van, Samuel Plant, C. L. Rodges, W. J. Jenkins, W. T. Meyer, Skinner & Kennedy Stationery Co., Chicago Mill & Lumber Co., Dolz Cooperage Corporation, H. B. Wallace, the Brecht Co., and T. A. Dooley, all of St. Louis, Mo., opposing the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Postal Telegraph & Cable Co., urging release of telegraphic lines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the National Live Stock Exchange of Chicago, Ill., for legislation deprecating unfair publicity of regulative bodies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution urging increased appropriation for the animal-disease eradication work of the Bureau of Animal Industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of R. E. P. on the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul system, per Edward Radtke, chairman, 546 Twentieth Street, Milwaukee, Wis., for Government control of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FESS: Petition of Clinton County (Ohio) Pomona Grange, on behalf of repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Brotherhood of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Bellefontaine, Ohio, protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of Armour & Co., of Chicago, Ill., opposing repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of New Amsterdam Casualty Co. and Almurall & Co. (Inc.), New York City, against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Columbia Graphophone Co., New York, against Department of Labor Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of National Live Stock Exchange, Chicago, Ill., favoring approved constructive legislation affecting live-stock and meat industries; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KENDALL: Petition of sundry Jugo-Slavic organizations of Uniontown, Republic, Shoaf, and Edenborn, in the twenty-third congressional district, State of Pennsylvania, against a subjugation of any part of their mother country to Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a petition signed by citizens of Brownsville, Pa., not to repeal war-time prohibition, as recommended in the President's message; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Resolution of Division No. 4, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Providence, R. I., in opposition to league of nations if Ireland is excluded therefrom as a free and independent State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petition of jewelers of San Diego, Calif., protesting against the tax on jewelry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Riverside Chamber of Commerce, Riverside, Calif., protesting against repeal of daylight-saving act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions from Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Big Pine; Presbyterian Church, Baptist Church, Methodist Church, Brawley; Fairmount Methodist Episcopal Church, East San Diego; Women's Home Missionary Society; Women's Foreign Missionary Society; and Ladies Aid Society of the First Methodist Church of Riverside, all in the State of California, protesting against repealing war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLECZKA: Petition of sundry citizens, 780 in number, of Milwaukee, Wis., urging against luxury tax and asking for repeal of same; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employees of Standard Paper Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., and the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Milwaukee, Wis., against repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of organizations of Jugo-Slavs, relative to peace treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of several hundred citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., for the repeal of the so-called luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: Petition of Harry Ward and sundry other citizens of Montclair, and citizens of Maplewood, N. J., protesting against luxury tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of organizations of Jugo-Slavs, relative to peace treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Resolutions adopted at meeting in Hartford, Conn., for withdrawal of American troops from Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions adopted by meeting of citizens of Hartford, Conn., for repeal of the espionage act; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Methodist Episcopal Church of West Granby, Conn., against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUFKIN: Resolutions adopted by the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of the Charles F. Slade Co., protesting against the passage of Senate bills 551 and 611; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. S. Greey, N. McDonald, Abraham C. Sperling, O. Brines, H. Wrights, Hugh A. Sloan, all of Buffalo, N. Y., for the repeal of section 907, subdivision 1 (toilet articles), and subdivision 2 (medicinal preparations); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of many hundred residents of Onondaga and Cortland Counties, N. Y., requesting the repeal of the present tax in the revenue law on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of many residents of Syracuse, N. Y., requesting the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of numerous members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Cincinnatus, N. Y., protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of many farmers of Dryden, Cortland County, N. Y., requesting the repeal of the daylight-saving act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of many residents of Manlius, N. Y., protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: Petition of Frank Kastl and Ludwick Smouse, of Bruno; W. A. Baldroen, of Broken Bow; John H. Brown, John Curry, D. E. Haney, R. T. Wilson, J. A. Van Matre, George Sahler, P. E. Drummond, Mrs. John Curry, Mrs. George Merrick, I. T. McCaskey, Mrs. G. W. Gates, R. C. Gormley, G. W. Gates, George Merrick, H. A. Merrick, Mrs. George Zahler, Mrs. M. Howe, Elizabeth Zellinger, M. E. Cyphers, Mrs. John Harper, Mrs. C. E. Hunter, Mrs. J. H. Brown, Mrs. C. H. Wandt, Mrs. A. T. Drawbaugh, Hugh Halen, C. E. Hunter, A. T. Isanbaugh, Dave Curry, and C. H. Wandt, of David City; Mrs. M. S. Burgess, Mrs. Edward Hallenbach, Maria Merscheim, Mrs. P. W. Dericks, Mrs. R. T. Wilson, Mrs. George Burgess, Mrs. Mae Stryker, Catharine Barker, Mrs. Ida Holdermoss, Mrs. R. Wilson, H. W. Burgess, N. V. Hill, A. E. Selden, A. L. Selden, B. F. Scott, J. P. Perine, Frances From, B. A. Kellenbach, P. W. Hericks, A. R. Brock, H. C. Stryker, R. E. Stryker, O. E. Wade, J. A. Johnson, J. H. Downing, George Merrick, George Dechert, A. W. Harris, Claude Merrick, A. O. Wickert, G. N. Chambers, and Anna Chambers, of Rising Sun; J. C. McGrew, P. H. Holcomb, B. A. Kollenbach, and Mrs. W. S. Funkherser, of Shelby; Robert Owens, Anton Schelley, H. E. Dixon, F. R. Leighty, A. R. Hughes, Llewelyn Jones, William G. Chase, E. J. Pyle, R. H. Jones, E. H. Closs, Edward A. Jones, H. D. Ebhard, Daniel Spoon, William Spoon, R. E. Robert, M. M. Miller, Hugh Williams, Hannah Roberts, Mrs. R. E. Roberts, Mrs. Evan Closs, Mrs. M. M. Miller, J. R. Clayton, E. Tradt, Ed Theissin, E. J. Hollister, Paul Schmiding, Theo. A. Hehmic, John Rickeir, jr., H. Marple, H. F. Henry, C. J. Werner, L. N. Adkins, E. G. Adkinson, J. T. Jones, H. O. Roberts, Chris Roberts, O. M. Robert, William Spoon, T. E. Roberts, W. H. Barg, Alfred Jones, William Class, E. Ingram, J. S. Dawson, D. R. Windle, A. Manz, R. L. Boswell, J. A. Kelly, W. J. Kelly, L. E. Kelly, Henry Kemp, A. T. Kemp, C. C. Ellis, R. H. Closs, F G. Reed, Thomas Jones, Stanley Miles, Clay Cole, Evan Hughes, U. G. Chapman, G. Halmrichs, John B. Goes, George Aden, C. E. Trump, F. T. McGrew, Mahlon Neumann, C. F. Finch, William Kelly, E. H. Ray, Joe Cole, Dave Humphreys, W. L. Jones, M. T. Bell, F. F. Roderick, J. Evans, J. E. Blevins, P. S. Goin, George G. Hardy, A. J. Ellison, Elmer West, H. H. Darner, H. S. Mathews, A. F. Dillow, G. E. O'Brien, J. A. Johnson, F. J. Sedalck, H. H. Neal, D. E. Hardy, T. A. Bradley, Guy Kinney, Roy L. Earnhart, J. C. Richardson, O. Wiederhold, Mrs. O. Wiederhold, F. H. Beedle, C. R. Palmer, Edith L. Cole, T. C. Woods, E. B. Jamison, and Oswald Jones, of Wymore; A. R. Zimmerman, B. P. Burke, M. C. Barmore, G. Rabel, M. E. Doenell, F. P. Perry, J. W. Beirmer, Elvin Beesmer, C. L. Barmon, H. Leinweber, and John Yostle, of Adams; A. R. Zimmerman, Vhtid Fitkd, M. Trauermeitt, W. H. Roberts, and Milton Pribyl, of Barneston; C. H. Doyle, A. T. Lam, L. E. Allgire, and W. Kaufmann, of Beatrice; T. A. Johnson, of Filley; G. B. Smith, W. E. Whittaker, W. E. Chamberlin, W. H. Steffenson, H. Limenmeyer, W. A. McMichael, A. R. Morris, C. H. Cavett, L. E. Smith, L. Hinman, W. J. Ellis, R. C. Wilson, J. F. Custer, S. F. Snyder, H. O. Dill, O. E. Bishop, Joseph W. Merrill, A. J. Reedy, H. C. Van Nest, F. W. Lewis, A. E. Chase, John Humphrey, A. C. Willis, R. Y. Martin, D. W. Yather, J. O. Vanbuskirk, B. Fritz, B. Williams, Lew Bolender, H. O. Smith, D. Wender, J. Jenkins, Mrs. F. D. Allington, W. C. Linscott, G. A. Thoman, Marce Witzenburg, Calvin Duncan, J. H. Neese, B. J. Wandersee, L. F. Haverland, W. W. Foreman, Robert Humphry, A. E. Barker, P. W. Whittaker, Mrs. R. W. Brownawell, Mrs. H. W. Stephenson, Mrs. Henry Packard, Lloyd Marvin, Mrs. Nelson Morris, Mrs. C. B. Marvin, Mrs. W. C. Linscott, Mrs. R. R. Steele, Edward W. Morris, Eldon Havelone, Alfred Morris, J. H. Childres, Earl Viney, J. J. Brownawell, E. Monon, H. D. Cavett, Roy M. Smith, Jess Kimberly, R. N. Woodruff, Rev. C. B. Hope, J. J. Blevins, A. Thomson, R. Cavett, F. E. Rice, Virgil Trunp, F. Patton, L. M. Smith, R. W. Wilson, John Humphrey, R. R. Steele, G. H. Hevelone, William Haverland, F. H. Wondersee, L. G. Berg, H. A. Fauver, W. F. Faweer, Oscar Humphrey, E. J. Delehaut, W. H. Steffenson, Nelson Morris, T. F. Whittaker, R. W. Brownawell, Henry Packard, Carl Linsenmeyer, P. R. Clinton, and J. W. Roberts, of Blue Springs; W. D. Cathcart, of Beatrice; I. J. Blyth and Thomas Vasey, of Blue Springs; G. H. Doyle, of Beatrice; W. H. Reed, G. G. Lewis, P. J. Chapman, Frank Wondersee, Fred Retchless, Henry Trump, Latie Miller, Frank Abney, C. W. Hawkins, George F. Harpste, H. Schock, Glen Terwilleger, S. H. Terwillegar, C. S. Jurais, John Petersen, William Craig, A. B. Allington, E. E. Cyamhfit, S. A. Smith, O. Wilzenburg, J. W. Marples, D. J. Mosher, Frank Wise, William B. Miller, Cyrus Houghton, E. A. Williams, P. P. Whittaker, D. W. Lawson, G. H. Davis, J. W. Hawthorn, Elmer D. Walker, and D. N. Willet, of Blue Springs; Maurice Evans, of Barneston; T. O. Jones, L. C. McPheron, B. J. Martin, Will Humphrey, G. Shoff, H. J. Trauemicht, and R. L. Boswell, of Blue Springs; Arthur Evans, of Barneston; W. E. Garrett, B. F. Garrett, Lewis Cruff, J. B. Bigger, H. H. Leymanster, I. V. Leymaster, H. R. Truss, Joe Hanson, G. C. Rupp, J. A. Davis, O. S. Swedberg, Joseph Hofbaner G. Rekermann, Ira Smith, D. H. Saylor, N. S. Cole, W. I. Worthington, I. H. Otto, Jerome Fye, L. H. Caulkins, S. J. Ryan, Robert C. Meredith, C. E. Bradbury, E. J. Kremer, E. E. Mumford, C. A. Hirans, August Schertz, C. A. Kemper, F. W. Hammond, J. H. Stokesbury, C. R. Medaris, G. W. Moore, E. L. Kempon, E. P. Titman, H. C. Rahmeyer, O. A. Lunguist, Ross Goethe, J. E. Winter, J. M. Springer, G. E. Damonde, R. P. Guigsby, O. G. Wright, J. E. Zebr, J. C. Schrock, and John Hagg, of Aurora; Carl G. Ramesberger, L. C. Albrogge, John Bamesberger, H. C. Bamesberger Sam Troester, J. I. Bamesberger, W. C. Troester, Carl Troester, W. H. Troester, J. A. Casteed, and Carl G. Bamesberger, of Hampton; G. M. White, A. Wilson, E. Lewis and G. W. Fox, of Harvard; Walter Salmon, H. G. Fulton, and William Miller, of Stockham; Clara E. Micke, H. A. McCormick, Lee H. Mickey, Eleazer McCormick, Emma Baker, L. B. Reitz, and Ellamina Reitz, of Osceola; C. C. McCormick and Willard L. McCormick, of Silver Creek; A. F. Jeline and Frank S. Kucera, of Crete; Simon Bovez, Ernst Kemper, W. J. Natehka, E. G. Wolesensky, William Sehnert, John T. Jones, Frank Roland, William McIlnay, J. Widick, Ignac Novsk, Charles C. Front, Woodley Crick, Edwin F. Crick, and John R. Bovey, of Dorchester; Frank Vaura and Frank J. Hanis, of Bruno; Alex. Robb, J. M. Hall, F. A. Hass, E. C. Stillger, Carl E. Anderson, Richard Hageman, N. O. Youngstrom, Finley Walter, Nels Monson, G. F. Wagner, H. Kraft, Sadie A. Nightingale, Olga Hass, C. Charburg, Hugo Stees, Loue Blair, L. Harden, William Pobloth, J. F. Olson, A. J. Olson, Charles Smith, Albert Hanke, Edward Schenneman, B. H. Dahim, William Trimm, Karl Hengen, Fred Harden, Ned Hageman, Horace J. Ort, Charles Hietfeld, Herman Hanke, A. J. Barry, Emil Rexilius, A. Soland, W. Martin, L. W. Hass, August Scheuneman, Albert Hageman, H. H. Williamson, W. Sackett, W. Smith, Magnus Hanron, Oscar Hagstram, C. J. Anderson, H. C. Jordan, John Krueger, August Noerenberg, and Erie Charberg, of Ithaca; John F. Proskovet, Joseph A. Feyan, Charles F. Fujan, and Joseph J. Sousek, of Malmo; Charles Nebenhem, of Memphis; John A. Stuchlik, J. S. Jambor, F. Kellner, A. E. Stucklek, Joseph A. Smitily, Mike Shanderson, Joe Havlovic, Joe W. Sedlacek, A. Snilily, Anton W. Sedlacek, Andreas Havlovin, Andrew J. Havlovec, F. A. Stuchlik, E. T. Nilaz, Frank V. Woita, Joseph J. Ratkovec, Joseph Vanek,

Ferdinand Fujan, James Harlowe, James Rezmcek, Joe W. Koranda, John Hauloric, A. B. Sabata, C. J. Havloric, Louis J. Stadley, Ed. G. Shaudera, Louisa Shandera, Leo Kantar, Charles R. Kubik, Joseph N. Paseka, Frank Eger, jr., Y. Sabata, Frank Rernicok, Wend Kubik, and Vaclar Koranda, of Prague; Leo Kantar and J. J. Bash, of Valparaiso; Olin F. Johnson, C. F. Charling, D. D. Danis, A. C. Knapp, F. F. Smith, W. M. Zinke, and George Landenschlagr, of Wahoo; Charles Woita, Vaclav Hruska, Jacob Woita, W. Polak, Vaclav Kastl, Frank Koranda, Frank V. Woita, John Egr, Joseph V. Mack, Theo C. Pospisel, Joe J. Maly, Frank Pospisel, Emil Maly Frank J. Souset, Vaclar Pospisel, Anton Woita, J. F. Krutky, James Egr, Anton V. Novak, Joseph J. Woita, Joseph Egr, Louis J. Stadky, Joseph N. Paseka, Joseph Tomsicek, and Anton Pospisel, of Weston; W. C. Weber, Allie Hackworth, C. F. Weber, A. J. Weber, A. C. Bennett, F. Eggerling, jr., H. Davis, C. T. Gausman, J. I. Rogers, Fred C. Eggerling, R. H. Dubbe, Carl Wefeb, John Sell, Arthur Sell, F. A. Freeman, Martin Eggerling, P. H. Gerken, O. W. Anderson, A. C. Anderson, Ed Wehrs, and W. H. Ahlschwede, of Milford; George L. Eberspacker, C. F. Eberspacker, G. Eberspacker, W. J. Curtis, L. R. Gake, Jacob Spahn, J. F. Bender, William Bender, Henry Hillman, George Bender, Herman Bohlman, H. F. Ahlschwede, Rudolf Bender, and P. W. Bender, of Seward; Casper Mikkelson and Will Davis, of Utica; D. Jagels, Arthur Jagels, Louis Jagels, William Glasoats, John Schroeder, Ralph Voigt, Walter E. Voigt, M. S. Crockett, C. D. Prith, Roy Perninger, A. W. Wehrly, John Penninger, Martin Rodenberg, Ray Beckey, F. I. Miller, H. H. Jagels, C. C. Fosnot, John H. Emmers, G. Harnud, August Borine, Henry Holtzen, Rev. John Meyer, P. W. Natzke, J. C. Pegette, G. Deering, J. H. Neeyer, Peter Mudler, Emil L. Meyer, Theo. Holtzen, J. F. Poppe, C. H. Meyer, L. E. Henisoth, E. Poppe, John Flathman, G. Groshems, Fred Harmy, August Schuekenberg, H. E. Mueller, H. H. Meyer, H. B. Rossmiller, C. H. Bartels, Theo. Bergt, Albert Bohling, Arthur Holtzen, Conrad Buethe, Ben Ross, John N. Herman, and Carson Doring, of Davenport; Albert Bohling, August Borine, and Louis Jagels, of Deshler; H. D. Cob, of Charleston; Fred Fender, of Lushton; G. M. Jose, of McCool; D. F. Broadwell, W. H. Francis, J. N. Ankeny, John Wallace, W. M. Jose, C. M. Anderson, F. D. Saddoris, H. L. Charlton, George Martin, M. W. Green, Charles S. McNeill, F. Pruitt, George Lunney, and J. A. Reece, of York, all of the fourth congressional district of Nebraska, for repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: Resolution adopted by the supreme board of directors of the Knights of Columbus of Indiana, in State convention assembled, earnestly urging our honored President and other distinguished American delegates to use every effort to procure a fair hearing of the representatives of the Irish nation before the peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NOLAN: Petitions of the Sunset Publishing House and the Northern California Grocers' Association, of San Francisco, Calif., protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition from Marshal Hale and 262 citizens of San Francisco, for the repeal of the luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Service Motor Truck Co. (Wabash, Ind.), John Tiedejen, Broadway Garage, Victor Seely, Parthey Muller Cooler Garage, Cas. D. Faller Decatur Garage, Hughes Garage & Repair Co., Thomas McGlyne, Kootman's Garage, and Globe Garage, all of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging removal of sales tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Earl H. Brooks, New Amsterdam Casualty Co., Chamber of Commerce of State of New York, and J. W. Allen Service Motor Truck Co. (Wabash, Ind.), against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. QUIN: Petition of citizens of Natchez, Adams County, Miss., in behalf of the freedom of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: Petition of Greene County Farm Bureau, Jersey County Farm Bureau, and Cass County Farm Bureau, all of Illinois, favoring repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Hugh Whitlaw and other citizens of Jersey County, Ill., against importation of Argentine corn; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of International Association of Electrical Workers, against employment of present director of Muscle Shoals, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Centenary Methodist Episcopal Church, of Jacksonville; Fred Grant and 34 other citizens, of Timewell, Ill., against repeal of war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Trades and Labor Assembly, Jadisonville, Ill., indorsing Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolution adopted by Lodge No. 602, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, petitioning five years' further Government control of railroads, by G. E. Jennison, president, Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, letter of Miss Frances S. Voegelein, president of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Westwood, Calif., urging retention of the war-time prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Red Bluff Chamber of Commerce, of Red Bluff, Calif., indorsing the soldier-settlement plan; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ROSE: Resolutions adopted by citizens of Blair County, Pa., protesting against the persecution of Jews in Poland and other eastern European countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of 84 residents of Lyndonville, N. Y., and vicinity, urging the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 80 residents of Lyndonville, Medina, and vicinity, urging the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 62 residents of South Lima, N. Y., and vicinity, urging the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition of citizens of the seventeenth congressional district of Illinois, protesting against modification of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of citizens of Plattsburg, N. Y., for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio: Petition of Ohio Valley Retail Shoe Dealers' Association, asking for repeal of luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Toledo Chevrolet Motor Co., Toledo, Ohio, protesting against the continuation of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Ohio Association Volunteer Retired List, Columbus, Ohio, appealing to Congress to favor the passage of the volunteer officers' retirement bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Elm Grove Sunday School of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Van Wert, Ohio, protesting against the restoration of license permitting the sale of beer and wine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Presbyterian Church, both of Ottawa, Ohio, protesting against the repeal or modification of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of post-office clerks, with regard to salaries for special clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VAILE: Petition of the Denver Trades and Labor Assembly, for an appropriation to continue the women in industry service of the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. WASON: Letter of Mr. J. C. Derby, Concord, N. H., advocating the repeal of the luxury tax on jewelry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Haverhill Grange, No. 212, of Haverhill, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Cheshire Grange, No. 131, Keene, N. H., George E. Newman, master; Ethel B. Davis, secretary, urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Luida E. Hutchinson and 32 other members of Antrim Grange, No. 98, of Antrim, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of citizens of Milford, asking the retention of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: Petition signed by 275 citizens of Porter County, Ind., asking enactment of laws to enforce war-time and constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition signed by many residents of the tenth congressional district of Indiana, praying that a tariff be laid upon Argentine corn; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *June 10, 1919.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee that we have lived through the days that have shown that men count something dearer to them than life. We thank Thee that men have been willing to stake their fortunes and their lives upon great ideals. We thank Thee that Thou hast given Thy blessing to those who have consecrated themselves to the higher things. We pray that we may catch the spirit of all the men who have sacrificed and suffered and died, that we, too, may carry on that work, counting not our lives dear unto us, that we may fulfill the divine purpose in us and accomplish God's will in this great Nation. Bless us to-day in the discharge of the duties that are upon us. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. SMOOT and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution.

Be it resolved by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, requested to amend section 2 of the act of Congress approved March 28, 1916, relating to the powers of the board of harbor commissioners of the Territory of Hawaii so as to authorize the said board of harbor commissioners to make toll or tonnage charges on freight passing over or across wharves, docks, quays, bulkheads, and landings in the Territory of Hawaii by changing the word "except" in said section to read "including," so that said section, as amended, will read as set forth in the bill hereto attached and made a part of this resolution and marked "Exhibit A," and so as to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to make certain amendments to the law relating to the board of harbor commissioners; and be it further

Resolved by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That copies of this resolution and of said Exhibit A, all duly certified, be forwarded by the secretary of the Territory of Hawaii to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to the Territorial Delegate to said Congress and to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States.

EXHIBIT A.

An act to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to ratify, approve, and confirm sections 1, 2, and 3 of an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to the board of harbor commissioners of the Territory, as herein amended, and amending the laws relating thereto," approved March 28, 1916.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

SECTION 1. Section 2 of an act entitled "An act to ratify, approve, and confirm sections 1, 2, and 3 of an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to the board of harbor commissioners of the Territory, as herein amended, and amending the laws relating thereto," approved March 28, 1916, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Section 685 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 685. Powers and duties of board: Said board shall have and exercise all the powers and shall perform all the duties which may lawfully be exercised by or under the Territory of Hawaii relative to the control and management of the shores, shore waters, navigable streams, harbors, harbor and water-front improvements, ports, docks, wharves, quays, bulkheads, and landings belonging to or controlled by the Territory, and the shipping using the same, and shall have the authority to use and permit and regulate the use of the wharves, piers, bulkheads, quays, and landings belonging to or controlled by the Territory for receiving or discharging passengers and for loading and landing merchandise, with a right to collect wharfage and demurrage thereon or therefor, and, subject to all applicable provisions of law, to fix and regulate from time to time rates for services rendered in mooring vessels, charges for the use of moorings belonging to or controlled by the Territory, rates or charges for the services of pilots, wharfage or demurrage, rents or charges for warehouses or warehouse space, for office or office space, for storage of freight, goods, wares, and merchandise, for storage space for the use of donkey engines, derricks, or other equipment belonging to the Territory under the control of the board, and to make other charges, including toll or tonnage charges on freight passing over or across wharves, docks, quays, bulkheads, or landings. The board shall likewise have power to appoint and remove clerks, wharfingers and their assistants, pilots and pilot-boat crews, and all such other employees as may be necessary, and to fix their compensation; to make rules and regulations pursuant to this chapter and not inconsistent with law; and generally shall have all powers necessary fully to carry out the provisions of this chapter.

"'All moneys appropriated for harbor improvements, including new construction, reconstruction, repairs, salaries, and operating expenses, shall be expended under the supervision and control of the board, subject to the provisions of this chapter 100. All contracts and agreements authorized by law to be entered into by the board shall be executed on its behalf by its chairman.

"'The board shall prepare and submit annually to the governor a report of its official acts during the preceding calendar year, together with its recommendations as to harbor improvements throughout the Territory.'"

SEC. 2. The Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii may amend or repeal section 685 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, as amended by section 2 of the act of Congress approved March 28, 1916, save and except such portion thereof as relates to the public lands of the Territory of Hawaii.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect upon its approval.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 3, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was finally adopted by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii on April 3, A. D. 1919.

_____, *President of the Senate.*

_____, *Clerk of the Senate.*

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 2, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted in the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on April 2, A. D. 1919.

_____, *Speaker House of Representatives.*

_____, *Clerk House of Representatives.*

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 6.

TERRITORY OF ALASKA, FOURTH SESSION.

To the honorable the Congress of the United States:

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in fourth regular session assembled, do most respectfully and earnestly represent that:

Whereas the salt-herring industry of Alaska is of the greatest importance to the people of the Territory of Alaska as well as to the people of the United States, as this industry has steadily grown from an output of 8,956 barrels in 1915, 18,079 barrels in 1916, and 22,557 barrels in 1917, to 105,394 barrels during the past year; and

Whereas with the ending of the World War it will be impossible for this industry to be sustained without governmental aid to offset the advantage European producers have in the New York market on account of low trans-Atlantic freight rates; and

Whereas the cost of shipping a barrel of salt fish from points in Europe to New York or Philadelphia is but $2 per barrel against the cost of over $6 per barrel for freight on Alaska herring to the same points; and

Whereas the fishing industry of Alaska should be fostered, built up, and expanded:

Therefore we, your memorialists, would respectfully pray that the Congress of the United States pass the necessary legislation, placing an import duty on foreign salt herring of not less than $3 per barrel, as the only hope of the survival of this important industry seems to be through protection of the extent of this freight differential.

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, That copies of this memorial be furnished by the secretary of the Territory of Alaska to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to the Representatives and Senators in Congress from the State of Washington, and to the Delegate to Congress from Alaska; and be it further

Resolved, That the Delegate to Congress from Alaska be, and the same hereby is, urged to give this matter his attention to the end that the necessary relief may be granted.

And for this relief we, your memorialists, will ever pray.

Adopted by the House April 19, 1919.

E. J. WHITE,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

HARRY F. MORTON,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Adopted by the Senate April 25, 1919.

JAMES FRAWLEY,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

T. M. REED,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. CURTIS presented memorials of sundry citizens of Chetopa, Rock, Lyndon, Wichita, Hackney, Wakefield, Luray, Republic, Kansas City, Winfield, Highland, Tonganoxie, Beloit, Chiles, Belleville, Overbrook, Colony, Lincoln, Topeka, and Emporia, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Rone Grange, No. 1812, Patrons of Husbandry, of Haven, Kans., and a petition of Ninnescah Grange, No. 1878, Patrons of Husbandry, of Sylvia, Kans., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Motor Trades Association of Topeka, Kans., and a petition of sundry citizens of Anthony, Kans., praying for the repeal of the so-called "luxury" tax, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of the Rotary Club of Wichita, of the Chamber of Commerce of Salina, of the county commissioners of Wyandotte County, of the Central Labor Union of Hutchinson, of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Wichita, and of sundry citizens of Wichita, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the continuance of the United States Employment Service, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of Local Grange No. 1520, Patrons of Husbandry, of Oswego, Kans, and a petition of Local Grange No. 118, Patrons of Husbandry, of Olathe, Kans., praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 221, Boiler Makers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers of America, of Pittsburg, Kans., and a petition of sundry citizens of Mulberry, Kans., praying for Government ownership of railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Teachers' Association of McPherson, Kans., praying for the establishment of a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have a communication from the secretary of the Arkansas Bankers' Association, incorporating a resolution adopted by that association at its twenty-ninth annual State convention at Little Rock, in favor of the ratification of the league of nations covenant and peace treaty. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Racine, Wis., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Havre, Mont., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Montana, praying for the independence of the Jugo-Slavs and for justice and fair dealing in connection with peace deliberations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHERMAN presented memorials of sundry citizens of Winslow, Monroe, Du Quoin, Peru, La Salle, Ottawa, Browns, and Champaign, all in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WARREN. I present a telegram from C. L. Draper, chairman of the Public Service Commission of Wyoming, relative to control of wire systems, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHEYENNE, WYO., *June 9, 1919.*

Hon. F. E. WARREN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Regarding return of wires to private ownership, commission favors and recommends return June 30, 1919. Willing that present rates established under Federal control remain in effect until commission determines their reasonableness by investigation and hearing, if deemed necessary, for protection of companies. Investigation and hearing can be held in Wyoming in the early future after return of wires.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF WYOMING,
By C. L. DRAPER, *Chairman.*

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of the St. Alouizia Society, of Rock Springs, Wyo., praying for the independence of the Jugo-Slavs and for justice and fair dealing in connection with peace deliberations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Commercial Club of Sheridan, Wyo., remonstrating against the proposed extension of the Yellowstone National Park, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from sundry citizens of Sundance, Wyo., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LODGE presented a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of the State of Massachusetts, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
May 28, 1919.

Ordered, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives hereby expresses its abhorrence of the cruelties now being inflicted upon the Jews in Poland, and urges the Government of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to insure life and liberty to the Jewish inhabitants of the newly created Poland—a country which owes its existence as a free and independent State to the Allies and to the United States, in whose armies the Jewish people have contributed their full share of service and sacrifice—and that it is the hope and expectation of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts that Poland, which has suffered greatly from oppression, will not herself become an oppressor; and be it further

Ordered, That the clerk of the house of representatives be directed to send to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth a copy of this order.

Adopted.

JAMES W. KIMBALL.

A true copy.
Attest:

JAMES W. KIMBALL, *Clerk.*

Mr. LODGE presented a memorial of sundry employees of the Forbes Lithograph Manufacturing Co., of Chelsea, Mass., remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the Labor Council of San Francisco, Calif., praying for the submission of the prohibition amendment to a referendum of the people, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FERNALD presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lewiston, Me., praying for the repeal of the so-called luxury tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

NATIONAL BUDGET SYSTEM.

Mr. KNOX. From the Committee on Rules I report back favorably Senate resolution 58, with an amendment, and I submit a report (No. 12) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I think it will require no discussion. It is self-explanatory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 1, after the word "committee," insert the following: "to be composed of 10 members, 6 to be chosen from the majority party and 4 from the minority party," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That there be appointed a special committee to be composed of 10 members, 6 to be chosen from the majority party and 4 from the minority party of the Senate, to devise a plan for a budget system, and that said committee shall report a plan for a national budget not later than September 1, 1919.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I do not want to offer an objection at this time except to make one observation. I am not entirely familiar with the Senate rules, and I am asking more as a matter of information. I am so much interested in the real results from this session of Congress in the matter of adopting a Federal budget that I feel any action that did not reach the very core of the situation that has the approval of the Senate might retard rather than advance it.

Personally I feel that the appointment of a committee of Senators confined alone to Members of this body can not get very far. It is a subject on which, it seems to me, any commission should include the membership of both Houses as well as representatives of the departmental activities. I can not conceive of a result from the adoption of a resolution which gives to the Senate the responsibility of formulating a budget system when all measures for revenue, as is well known, must originate in the House. Yet we are taking upon ourselves the responsibility of evolving a budget system. I have lived in a budget atmosphere in public life for the last three or four years, and I am very anxious to see Congress prepare and complete a budget act, but the passage of this resolution, I am very much afraid, would not advance it very far.

Mr. POMERENE. It seems to me I have seen something to the effect that the House has taken some action in this behalf. Is the Senator advised as to what they have done?

Mr. EDGE. I know nothing further than the statement in the newspapers that a bill has been introduced in the House, with which I am not familiar.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, this matter has been introduced this morning?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is the report of a committee, and there is a request for unanimous consent for present consideration.

Mr. WARREN. I object.

Mr. KNOX. I hope the Senator will allow me to make a brief statement before he insists on his objection.

Mr. WARREN. I withhold the objection then. I wish to say that I do not object to the resolution with any intention of sidetracking it. I am very anxious to get the consideration of an appropriation bill and I thought perhaps the resolution would lead to a debate of some length.

Mr. KNOX. If it does, I will withdraw it.

Mr. WARREN. Very well, then, I withdraw my objection for the present.

Mr. KNOX. I wish to reply to the Senator from New Jersey. This resolution was introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK]. Before he introduced the resolution he informed the Committee on Rules, of which he is a member, that he had made an effort to secure the consent of the House to a joint committee, but he had made no progress in that direction, because the House desired to proceed, as he was informed, along its own lines. We thought if we could not get the better method—and I agree that would be a better method—we ought to undertake something on our own account.

This is only a special committee, not a permanent committee, and a special committee which will be filled automatically by the committee on committees from the two parties and instructed to make a report in a very brief period. I can see no possible harm that can come to the cause of formulating a proper budget system by this effort, and some good might come from it. It might be possible that after this committee is formed it would secure some sort of cooperation with the House that might eventually lead to joint action by both bodies.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, far be it from me to retard it in any way, but, as I recall, the House did go on record at the last session in passing in the latter part of the session a resolution similar to the type of resolution I briefly referred to. The Senate went on record by passing a similar resolution introduced by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON]. Therefore both Houses at the last session, although not on the same measure, went on record favoring the type of commission which I think absolutely necessary if we are going to produce a final budget measure.

I have no particular objection to the effort that is being made by the Senator from Illinois, as explained by the Senator from Pennsylvania, except that I do feel that we should put it up to the House. I have no knowledge as to how they would receive it. I intended to offer as a substitute for this resolution a resolution embodying the principle of participation by the three agencies, the Senate, the House, and the governmental departments. That, then, could go by unanimous consent to the House, and I can not understand why the House would object to it when they have already gone on record by passing a similar resolution.

Mr. POMERENE. My question was not prompted by any spirit of opposition to the purpose of the resolution; in fact, I favor it very strongly, but I was not quite sure as to what the House had already done in that behalf. It occurred to me that if we knew it might aid us in coming to a conclusion as to what the Senate should do. I hope there will be some legislation on this subject at an early day.

Mr. KENYON. I came in during the discussion. I should like to inquire if there is a request for the immediate consideration of the resolution by the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. KNOX. Yes; I asked for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. KENYON. The matter will lead to some discussion, as indicated by the Senator from New Jersey. The Senator from New Jersey proposes to offer a substitute for the resolution. If he did not do so, I should certainly offer as a substitute my resolution. I think the matter had better go over. I do not make the request from any spirit of hostility, for I am for anything that will bring about a budget system.

Mr. KNOX. I appreciate the attitude of the Senator from Iowa, and as undoubtedly the resolution is likely to lead to discussion I will withdraw the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I introduce a joint resolution relative to the subject just under discussion, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Rules. I should like to have the Committee on Rules consider it, and if a special committee has been constituted by the Committee on Rules for the consideration of this matter, I should like this resolution to be referred to that committee for consideration.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 50) creating a budget system, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Rules.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 1536) to establish and promote civic, social, and health extension education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 1537) referring claim of Fred Hartel and others to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1538) for the relief of J. C. Garrett;

A bill (S. 1539) for the relief of D. C. Darroch; and

A bill (S. 1540) for the relief of George K. Kitchen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1541) to amend section 3929, Revised Statutes, relating to exclusion of fraudulent devices and lottery paraphernalia from the mails;

A bill (S. 1542) to amend section 215, act of March 4, 1909 (Criminal Code), penalizing fraudulent use of the mails;

A bill (S. 1543) to amend section 213, act of March 4, 1909 (Criminal Code), affixing penalties for use of mails in connection with fraudulent devices and lottery paraphernalia; and

A bill (S. 1544) to amend section 4041, Revised Statutes, enabling Postmaster General to forbid payments of postal money orders in connection with the exclusion of fraudulent devices and lottery paraphernalia from the mails; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 1545) for the relief of John Horgan;

A bill (S. 1546) for the relief of Katie Norvall;

A bill (S. 1547) for the relief of George Killeen;

A bill (S. 1548) for the relief of Augusta Reiter; and

A bill (S. 1549) for the relief of Mary Jordan; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1550) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make necessary surveys and provide plans for the construction and maintenance of an irrigation and colonization system in the States of California and Nevada, to be known as the "Tahoe reclamation system," and to provide farms and employment for returned soldiers and sailors, and appropriating funds for the same; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 1551) to amend an act approved March 3, 1891, incorporating the National Conservatory of Music of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 1552) granting a pension to Kate E. Le Velley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 1553) to enable the Government to carry out the recommendations of the committees in Congress and to establish a home or homes for aged and infirm colored people and working girls and to establish an industrial farm and to aid the people who must move from the alleys in the District of Columbia and to provide work for the colored youth during the summer vacation and to provide work for the returning colored soldiers; to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 1554) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant German war relics to the city of Lawrenceburg, Ind.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NUGENT:

A bill (S. 1555) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 1556) to donate war trophies to the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 1557) providing for extra pay for cadet aviators; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1558) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw from the Treasury a certain sum of the permanent fund of the Chippewas of Minnesota, now on deposit therein to their credit; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 1559) granting a pension to Harold A. Salisbury (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 1560) for the relief of James S. Huntington;

A bill (S. 1561) for the relief of Ralph Parsons;

A bill (S. 1562) for the relief of Edward Stewart;

A bill (S. 1563) for the relief of Thomas Huggins;

A bill (S. 1564) for the relief of Adam Culp;

A bill (S. 1565) for the relief of John Dalton; and

A bill (S. 1566) for the relief of Willson Douglass; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 1567) to amend section 4 of the act of June 29, 1906, as amended by the act of May 9, 1918, relative to the naturalization of aliens serving in the forces of the allies during the present war; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 1568) granting an increase of pension to Almon G. Warren; and

A bill (S. 1569) granting an increase of pension to Elbridge L. Orbeton (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 1570) for the relief of V. E. Schermerhorn, E. C. Caley, G. W. Campbell, and Philip Hudspeth; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1571) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended by section 7 of the act entitled "An act to create a Commerce Court and to amend the act entitled 'An act to regulate com-

merce,' approved February 4, 1887, as heretofore amended, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1910; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 1572) granting a pension to Amanda M. Haner;

A bill (S. 1573) granting an increase of pension to Martin Parker;

A bill (S. 1574) granting an increase of pension to Fermon L. Botkin;

A bill (S. 1575) granting an increase of pension to Maria Love;

A bill (S. 1576) granting a pension to Julia McMains;

A bill (S. 1577) granting an increase of pension to Milton S. Harvey;

A bill (S. 1578) granting a pension to John T. Peet;

A bill (S. 1579) granting a pension to Sarah A. Walker;

A bill (S. 1580) granting a pension to Mary A. Hanks;

A bill (S. 1581) granting a pension to Hannah Vandenburg;

A bill (S. 1582) granting a pension to Elvisa Fightner;

A bill (S. 1583) granting a pension to Mary M. Billings;

A bill (S. 1584) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Roach;

A bill (S. 1585) granting a pension to John T. Peet;

A bill (S. 1586) granting a pension to Jennie Y. Brandon;

A bill (S. 1587) granting a pension to Hannah F. Taylor;

A bill (S. 1588) granting a pension to Nancy E. Baskins;

A bill (S. 1589) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Baker;

A bill (S. 1590) granting a pension to Marcia R. Ainsworth;

A bill (S. 1591) granting an increase of pension to Ada J. Bevelle;

A bill (S. 1592) granting a pension to Mary F. Brown;

A bill (S. 1593) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Bratton;

A bill (S. 1594) granting a pension to Sadie Jane Hodges;

A bill (S. 1595) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Hamilton;

A bill (S. 1596) granting a pension to Mary Jane Thomas;

A bill (S. 1597) granting a pension to Mary F. Robinson;

A bill (S. 1598) granting a pension to Isadora Richardson;

A bill (S. 1599) granting a pension to Josephine Mater Roberds;

A bill (S. 1600) granting a pension to Julia Rumbley;

A bill (S. 1601) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Gee;

A bill (S. 1602) granting a pension to Susan J. St. John;

A bill (S. 1603) granting a pension to Emma Ervin;

A bill (S. 1604) granting a pension to Mary Ann Leahey;

A bill (S. 1605) granting a pension to Eliza Jane Mayabb;

A bill (S. 1606) granting a pension to Elizabeth Stover;

A bill (S. 1607) granting a pension to Catherine Stapleton;

A bill (S. 1608) granting a pension to Nancy K. Sadler;

A bill (S. 1609) granting a pension to Mary Ellen Saunders;

A bill (S. 1610) granting a pension to Clara C. Watson;

A bill (S. 1611) granting an increase of pension to Sylvia McDevitt;

A bill (S. 1612) granting an increase of pension to Elvina Kelly;

A bill (S. 1613) granting a pension to Malinda Kiniston;

A bill (S. 1614) granting a pension to Margaret E. Hutchinson;

A bill (S. 1615) granting an increase of pension to Lottie L. Matthews;

A bill (S. 1616) granting an increase of pension to James L. Lamar;

A bill (S. 1617) granting a pension to Mary C. Thompson;

A bill (S. 1618) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Wintermote;

A bill (S. 1619) granting an increase of pension to De Witt C. Callen;

A bill (S. 1620) granting an increase of pension to Henry Piele;

A bill (S. 1621) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Wilson;

A bill (S. 1622) granting a pension to Mary Alcinda Wingert;

A bill (S. 1623) granting an increase of pension to Samantha O. Andrews;

A bill (S. 1624) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. A. J. Park;

A bill (S. 1625) granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Pike;

A bill (S. 1626) granting a pension to Willard O. Bennett (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1627) granting a pension to Cassie Norman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1628) granting a pension to Ada Sloan (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1629) granting an increase of pension to John M. Kennedy (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1630) granting a pension to Henry Lewis Johnson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1631) granting an increase of pension to Daniel E. Winfield (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1632) granting an increase of pension to Morton A. Pratt (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1633) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Waller (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1634) granting an increase of pension to Daniel E. Bush (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1635) granting an increase of pension to William A. Hicks (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1636) granting an increase of pension to H. Mott (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1637) for the relief of Albert H. Campbell; and

A bill (S. 1638) for the relief of Elijah W. Penny (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 1639) to establish the military record of Marshall M. Pool; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FERNALD:

A bill (S. 1640) granting a pension to Melville L. McCorison; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 1641) requiring all public-building bills to be submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury for investigation and report as to whether proposed buildings and sites are needed and the expenditure justified and as to the lowest cost at which buildings found necessary may be erected with economy and efficiency; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1642) to provide for a division of municipal research and reference in the Bureau of the Census, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on the Census.

A bill (S. 1643) for the relief of the heirs of Dr. James Gower, deceased;

A bill (S. 1644) for the relief of Roberdeau Buchanan, administrator de bonis non of McKean Buchanan, deceased;

A bill (S. 1645) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas J. Powell, deceased;

A bill (S. 1646) for the relief of A. H. Rebentish;

A bill (S. 1647) for the relief of Mary E. Ayres;

A bill (S. 1648) for the relief of Wyona Ambrose Dixon;

A bill (S. 1649) for the relief of the estate of Henry Ware, deceased;

A bill (S. 1650) for the relief of the estate of Lemuel Thomas, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) directing the Court of Claims to investigate claims for damages growing out of the riot of United States Negro soldiers at Houston, Tex.; to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENT TO THE DISTRICT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. KENYON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $15,000 for clinical examination, advice, care, and maintenance of children under 6 years of age, under a contract to be made with the Washington Diet Kitchen, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MISS ALICE WOOD—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, as personal explanations have been very much in order in the Senate of late, I rise to a question of personal privilege and will make a short statement in connection with it.

I do not find that I am able at all times to be in attendance upon the Senate during all of the morning hour each day. The demands on my time are sometimes so great that I find that to be impossible. Last Friday I was not able to be in the Senate during the entire morning hour, and I learn from the RECORD of last Friday that during the morning hour of that day, and in my absence, the following resolution was reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and it is hereby, directed to investigate and ascertain the facts relative to the suspension by the board of education of the District of Columbia of Miss Alice Wood, a teacher in the schools of the District, and report the same to the Senate, with its recommendations; and the committee, or any subcommittee conducting such investigation, is authorized to subpœna witnesses, send for persons,

books, and papers, to administer oaths, and take all steps necessary to ascertain the facts, and to employ such stenographic help as may be necessary, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate in conducting such investigation.

That resolution was then, by unanimous consent, taken up for immediate consideration, and, by unanimous consent, was adopted.

I merely rise to say that if I had been here the resolution would not have been taken up for consideration or adopted by unanimous consent. I doubt not that by motion it would have been taken up for consideration, and that upon motion it would have been adopted, but it would not have been done by unanimous consent. I am not content to let the statement of unanimous consent on the part of the Senate remain in the RECORD without a statement from me that I am not in accord with it, and that, if I had been present, unanimous consent would not have been obtained.

The matter involved in the resolution is now in the courts of the District of Columbia, and I think it undignified and improper for the United States Senate to undertake an investigation of it, at least while it is pending in the courts. I have no doubt that all of the facts will come out during the proceedings in the courts, which are now pending.

It has been charged that Miss Wood undertook to give in the public schools of the District the other side of Bolshevism, meaning the attractive side, and I have never seen nor heard any denial of that charge. I have followed the matter pretty closely in the newspapers, and I have never heard of Miss Wood or anyone in her behalf denying that she undertook to give the pupils of her school the other side of Bolshevism, meaning the side that is not regarded favorably by the American people in general; in other words, the attractive side; that Bolshevism is not so bad as it is generally painted.

The school board of the District took cognizance of the matter and investigated it sufficiently to arrive at the conclusion that Miss Wood had done something wrong and that she should be disciplined. It arrived at a conclusion that was satisfactory to the school board, and Miss Wood was suspended for a week. I believe the school board was right in the matter.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. MYERS. I yield, with pleasure.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to ask for the regular order. I notice that the Senator from Montana announced that he desired to speak on a question of personal privilege.

Mr. MYERS. I am; and I waited until all morning business had been transacted.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator think that the statement he is now making is a matter of personal privilege?

Mr. MYERS. Yes, sir; and I desire two or three minutes more to explain my attitude in the matter.

Mr. WARREN. I simply say that I ask for the regular order.

Mr. MYERS. As I have stated, I waited until I thought all of the morning business had been concluded; I purposely so waited, and I ask the privilege of completing my statement. It will take only a few moments. Of course, if not accorded the privilege, I shall sit down.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is not responsible for the call for the regular order. Are there further bills or joint resolutions? If not, concurrent and other resolutions are in order.

NATIONAL PEACE POLICY.

Mr. KNOX. I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I wish to give notice that in the near future I shall address myself to the subject of the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 76) was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States in declaring, pursuant to its exclusive authority under the Constitution, the existence of a state of war between the United States and the Imperial German Government, solemnly affirmed that the Imperial Government has so "committed repeated acts of war against the Government and the people of the United States" that a state of war had been thrust upon them by that Government, and thereupon formally pledged the whole military and national resources of the country "to bring the conflict to a successful termination"; and

Whereas the Senate of the United States, being a coequal part of the treaty-making power of this Government and therefore coequally responsible for any treaty which is concluded and ratified, is deeply concerned over the draft treaty of peace negotiated at Versailles by which it is proposed to end our victorious war, and is gravely impressed by the fact that its provisions appear calculated to force upon us undesirable and far-reaching covenants inimical to our free institutions under the penalty that failing to accept these we shall continue in a state of war, while our cobelligerents shall be at peace and enjoying its blessings; that it is proposed to make us parties to a league of nations under a plan as to which the people of the United States have had neither time to examine and consider nor opportunity to express regarding it a matured and deliberate judgment, whereas the treaty may be easily so drawn as to permit the making of immediate peace, leaving the question of the establishment of a league of nations for later determination; and that the treaty as drawn contains principles, guaranties, and undertakings obliterative of legitimate race and national aspirations, oppressive of weak nations and peoples, and destructive of human progress and liberty: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That it will regard as fully adequate for our national needs and as completely responsive to the duties and obligations we owe to our cobelligerents and to humanity a peace treaty which shall assure to the United States and its people the attainment of those ends for which we entered the war, and that it will look with disfavor upon all treaty provisions going beyond these ends.

2. That since the people of the United States have themselves determined and provided in their Constitution the only ways in which the Constitution may be amended, and since amendment by treaty stipulation is not one of the methods which the people have so prescribed, the treaty-making power of the United States has no authority to make a treaty which in effect amends the Constitution of the United States, and the Senate of the United States can not advise and consent to any treaty provision which would have such effect if enforced.

3. That the Senate advises, in accordance with its constitutional right and duty, that the great paramont, if not sole, duty of the peace conference is quickly to bring all the belligerents a full and complete peace; that to this end, the treaty shall be so drawn as to permit any nation to reserve without prejudice to itself for future separate and full consideration by its people the question of any league of nations; that neither such an article nor the exercise of the rights reserved thereunder, whether at the time of signature, the time of ratification, or at any other time, shall affect the substance of the obligations of Germany and its cobelligerents under the treaty nor the validity of signature and ratification on their behalf; and that any indispensable participation by the United States in matters covered by the league covenant shall, pending the entry of the United States into the league, be accomplished through diplomatic commissions, which shall be created with full power in the premises.

4. That this resolution indicates and gives notice of the limits of the present obligations against the United States in which the Senate of the United States is now prepared to acquiesce by consenting to the ratification of a treaty embodying peace conditions that may be found otherwise acceptable to its judgment, and that the adoption by the peace conference of the foregoing reasonable limitations and positions will facilitate the early acceptance of the treaty of peace by the Senate of the United States, will in no wise interfere with the league of nations as between these countries prepared to ratify the treaty without further consideration, and will afford such a manifestation of real respect for the wishes of a great people as can not fail more firmly to cement the friendship already existing between ourselves and our cobelligerents.

5. That, finally, it shall be the declared policy of our Government, in order to meet fully and fairly our obligations to ourselves and to the world, that the freedom and peace of Europe being again threatened by any power or combination of powers the United States will regard such a situation with grave concern as a menace to its own peace and freedom, will consult with other powers affected with a view to devising means for the removal of such menace, and will, the necessity arising in the future, carry out the same complete accord and cooperation with our chief cobelligerents for the defense of civilization.

WISCONSIN'S RATIFICATION OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I take great pleasure in sending to the Secretary's desk a message which I have just received, and I ask to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

MADISON, WIS., *June 10, 1919.*

Hon. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE,
Washington, D. C.:

Federal suffrage amendment ratified by both houses at 11.30 this morning.

EDWARD F. DITSMAR,
Lieutenant Governor.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KEY PITTMAN.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] on June 5 made a very able address on the league of nations at the Academy of Political Science at Columbia University. I have read the address, and it is very fine, and contains a great deal of information. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MOSES. Who is the author of it?

Mr. SWANSON. The senior Senator from Nevada. It is a discussion of the league of nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. FLETCHER. I suggest that it be not printed in the RECORD but printed as a document.

Mr. SWANSON. It has been the custom to have addresses of Senators printed in the RECORD.

Mr. FLETCHER. Let it be printed in both forms.

Mr. SWANSON. I did not ask that it be printed as a public document.

Mr. FLETCHER. I simply suggest to the Senator that we would get more use out of it as a public document.

Mr. SWANSON. Only four or five hundred copies would be printed as a public document, and if it goes in the RECORD many thousands will be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The address is as follows:

"Mr. Chairman, permit me to express my deep appreciation of the honor you have conferred upon me through your invitation to address this distinguished assemblage. I assure you that I have in mind the proprieties of the occasion and the necessity for brevity. It is such limitations that make the effort more difficult, and especially for one schooled in a body of unlimited and sometimes ungoverned debate.

"The distinguished chairman [Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler], in his statement to the effect that, while he hopes that the covenant of the league of nations will be adopted, he would have written a very much different instrument had he been intrusted with the responsibility, suggests to my mind a very pertinent thought. It is but natural that statesmen should differ not only with regard to the expression of an idea, but as to the plan and procedure involving any revolutionary undertaking. Such was the experience of the framers of our Constitution. Benjamin Franklin, near the close of our Constitutional Convention of 1787, read a statement expressing his views with regard to the adoption of the Constitution. He then said, in part:

"In these sentiments, sir, I agree to this Constitution, with all its faults, if they are such; because I think a general government necessary for us, and there is no form of government but what may be a blessing to the people if well administered; * * * I doubt, too, whether any other convention we can obtain may be able to make a better Constitution. For, when you assemble a number of men to have the advantage of their joint wisdom, you inevitably assemble with those men all their prejudices, their passions, their errors of opinion, their local interests, and their selfish views. From such an assembly can a perfect production be expected?

"This, undoubtedly, expresses the thoughts of many of the framers of the covenant of the league of nations and of the Members of the United States Senate who will be called upon to ratify the treaty that embraces the covenant.

"How much more difficult it must have been to bring about a unanimous agreement between the members of the peace conference composed of many different races, speaking different languages, raised in different environments, and trained in different schools of thought. Even in our own Congress, notwithstanding a grave demand and most serious effort to pass a law for the development of our mineral resources, we have, during a period of four years, found it impossible to draft a bill that would meet with the approval of a sufficient number of United States Senators to insure its enactment. It is remarkable that the peace conference was able to draft any covenant that could meet the unanimous approval of that peculiarly constituted body. There can be little doubt that the covenant in its present form is the most definite and reasonable agreement that can be reached.

"There are three kinds of leagues of nations that have been under consideration by statesmen throughout the world, and very probably by the peace conference. The plans of these leagues of nations differ chiefly in the power that may be exerted to compel compliance with their covenants. They may be designated as the conservative, the radical, and the compromise plans.

"The conservative plan carries with it no power of enforcement other than public sentiment. It means little more than the adoption of our present arbitration treaties by the peace conference. Under this plan, as under our present arbitration treaties, any nation may decline to abitrate without bringing upon it any punishment by other nations. Under the exceptions and reservations included in all such treaties, for instance, that a nation is not required to arbitrate matters affecting its 'honor' or its 'vital interests,' any nation may find an excuse to avoid the purpose of the treaty. In other words, the matter of arbitration is entirely optional with the contracting parties, and either party to the contract may withdraw under these broad exceptions and reservations. While these treaties have accomplished good and have been the means of settling many disputes of minor consequences, they have no binding effect upon any nation which seeks war and in these cases are not only useless but deceptive.

"The radical plan proposes the enforcement of the provisions of the covenant by armaments under the direct control of a league of nations. This plan was favored by many of the French statesmen and probably by the delegates of the French Republic at the peace conference. Under this plan a power would have been created which would have had many of the attributes of government and might have, with much reason, been characterized as a supergovernment.

"The compromise plan, while denying the right to the league to raise armies and control and direct armaments, except with unanimous consent of all of the Governments, does provide for the enforcement of the terms of the covenant through the combined moral, commercial, and economic forces of the Governments that are members of the league. The covenant adopted by the peace conference embodies and exemplifies the compromise plan.

"In view of the wide divergence of opinion, is it not wonderful that any compromise plan could have been agreed upon? And is it not dangerous to again open up the whole matter for discussion, reconsideration, and further action by a peace conference? At the time that the covenant of the league of nations was adopted the consciences of nations, chastened by the horrors of war, were ready to make concessions for peace, but as time goes on these sentiments may be supplanted by the ambitions of the victor.

"Any amendment by the United States Senate would result in a rejection of the treaty by us and compel the reopening of negotiations, unless the other nations involved should ignore the action of the United States and proceed to ratify the treaty in its present form. In that event we would be isolated from our present allies and forced to make a separate peace with our enemies. The so-called right of amendment of the treaty by the United States Senate is a misnomer. The sole authority of the Senate, under the Constitution, is to advise and consent to the adoption of the treaty.

"It may, of course, after rejecting the treaty by amendment, represent to the President of the United States and the other authorized negotiators of treaties that two-thirds of the Senate will approve a treaty in a certain form if entered into by the respective Governments. The act of the Senate in adopting amendments would, nevertheless, have the same effect as the direct rejection of the treaty. It must be apparent, not only to United States Senators but to all well-informed men and women who have given the matter consideration, that the other nations who have suffered more than we have through this war, and who have joined so sincerely with us in arriving at the present treaty, will hardly tolerate further delay by reason of hypocritical objections to matters which must have been most thoroughly and painfully worked out.

"There are, in my opinion, but two questions to be determined by each Senator in reaching a conclusion as to whether he will vote for the approval or the rejection of the treaty, namely, first, is the treaty fair and honorable and does it make for peace in the world; second, is it so injurious or dangerous to the vital interests of our country that, notwithstanding the good it may accomplish for peace, he is not justified in approving it?

"In discussing the potentialities of the covenant of the league of nations, I will devote my argument principally to its powers with relation to our own sovereignty and governmental policies. I presume that all statesmen agree that concerted action of nations is essential to world peace, and that such action must be supported by effective powers. Of course, I do not assume to commit partisan politicians or those political economists who believe, or argue, that the United States can be isolated from the rest of the world. This theory of national isolation is an ancient Chinese doctrine that has not brought to China the progress and prosperity that we seek for our country.

"The conditions existing in the early history of our Government might have given some foundation for an argument for national isolation. We did not then possess the power or influence to be a determining factor in international action and intercourse. We were then desperately using every energy of mind and body to firmly establish and maintain a democracy in the midst of world autocracy, and in the presence of the opposition of jealous and fearful rulers of other Governments and skeptical, timid, and disloyal residents within our own country.

"Revolutionary changes have taken place since those days. The products of our mines, our fields, and our factories have grown beyond the demands of our own people. Our progress and prosperity require that we compete in the markets of the world. We stand as the richest nation on earth. We have advanced and are advancing with greater strides than any other people. Since the World War commenced we have jumped from the position of fourth to that of second place in world shipping. Our citizens are carrying the freedom of their institutions, the energy of their industry, and the skill of their accomplishments to every country where any other free man is permitted to tread. It is our duty to encourage and protect our people in these great undertakings, and this can only be accomplished through the agreement and concerted action of all civilized nations. The covenant of the league of nations is such an agreement.

"The progress, the peace, and the happiness of every nation must inevitably be affected by the conditions existing in other nations. The time has arrived when the intercourse and affairs of nations have become so intimate and intricate, through the remarkable facilities for transportation and communication, that a far greater cooperation is imperative.

"We can not escape the effects of the vital actions of other nations. To the mind of the thoughtful man the recent World War has demonstrated this beyond argument. Who, five years ago, would have imagined that the assassination of an Austrian prince, by a lowly Serbian subject of Austria in a remote section of Europe, could involve our country and practically the whole world in the most disastrous war that has ever cursed humanity? Certainly there is no patriotic, intelligent citizen who believes or would argue that we could have avoided being dragged into this war. Then how can we hope to escape future foreign wars that may be nearer to our country? So, apparently being unable to isolate our Nation from the effects of foreign wars, it is our sacred duty to do everything in our power to eliminate war.

"This beneficent consummation has been sought by our statesmen for many years. They have earnestly attempted through treaties of arbitration to accomplish the determination of rights and the reparation for wrongs through instrumentalities of justice rather than by the force of arms. Numerous treaties have been entered into by us with various nations, and between other nations, providing for the arbitration of disputes that might lead to war. And yet, when this great war was threatened, civilized nations found themselves without authority under any of these treaties to interpose in behalf of the peace of the world. That must never happen again.

"Had the covenant of the league of nations been in force in July, 1914, Austria would not have declared war upon Serbia, and the most brutal, un-Christian, and disastrous catastrophe that the world has ever known would have been spared to humanity.

"Serbia, after making full reply to the Austrian ultimatum and after humbly apologizing and offering every honorable reparation, proposed that—

"In case the Austro-Hungarian Government should not consider itself satisfied with the answer, it is ready, as always, to accept a peaceful solution, either by referring the decision of the question to the international tribunal at The Hague or by leaving it to the great powers who cooperated in the preparation of the explanation given by the Serbian Government on the 17th–31st March, 1909.

"England, France, and Russia, in the interest of world peace, urged Austria to accept Serbia's proposal. Austria, spurred on by Germany, declined, and the rest of the world were powerless even to defer the impending disaster. This conclusively demonstrated the inefficacy in such cases of all of the efforts of the past and the inefficiency of the peace instrumentalities that had been provided.

"Under the provisions of articles 12 and 15 of the covenant of the league of nations Serbia would have proposed to submit the matter to arbitration or to inquiry by the council of the league of nations. Austria would have been compelled to submit either to arbitration under article 13 or an investigation, inquiry, and recommendation by the council or the assembly under article 15, and in any event to desist from 'war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the report by the council.' Serbia would undoubtedly then have taken advantage of that part of article 15 which provides:

"That they—

"Which would include Austria—

"will not go to war with any party to the dispute which complies with the recommendations of the report.

"Serbia would have complied with any recommendation.

"A portion of the penalty provided in article 16 and which would have applied to Austria under article 17 is as follows:

"Should any member of the league resort to war in disregard of its covenants under articles 12, 13, or 15 it shall ipso facto be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other members of the league, which hereby undertakes immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant-breaking State and the prevention of all financial, commercial, or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking State and the nationals of any other State, whether a member of the league or not.

"It shall be the duty of the council in such case to recommend to the several Governments concerned what effective military or naval forces the members of the league shall severally contribute to the armaments of forces to be used to protect the covenants of the league.

"Does anyone doubt that in such circumstances Germany would have desisted from her instigations and Austria would have refrained from war?

"I have taken this concrete case, so fresh in our minds, for the purpose of illustrating my analysis of the potentiality of the covenant of the league of nations in the enforcement of peace. We can not conceive that a more difficult situation threatening the peace of the world could ever arise to test the efficiency of the league.

"The covenant of the league of nations chiefly depends for its effectiveness on that portion of article 16 which I have just quoted, and while there may be those who will scout the influence of the combined moral, commercial, and economic forces of nations, students of history recognize that it is rapidly becoming the dominant power for peace and justice on earth. No nation can stand in the face of the public condemnation and ostracism of the world.

"But the chief attacks made in the United States upon the covenant of the league of nations are not based upon its lack of power to prevent or defer war, but upon the alleged grant to the league of jurisdiction and power to interfere with the vital interests of our Government.

"What are the vital interests that we submit to the league of nations under the covenant? There is not contained in the document a single prohibition or limitation upon our right to defend our own territory or our citizens against attack. Our domestic affairs and our Monroe doctrine are expressly excluded from the jurisdiction of the league. It is granted no control over our Army or our Navy. It is granted no power to fix or determine our armaments, but only the authority to recommend a plan looking to the reduction of armaments in all nations. The adoption or rejection of any proposed plan would be exclusively within the authority of our Congress under the express terms of the covenant. It has no authority other than that expressly conferred upon it by the covenant. It is purely a creature and agent of the contracting Governments. Members of the league are only obligated to submit to arbitration, under article 13, 'disputes as to the interpretation of a treaty, as to any question of international law, as to the existence of any fact which if established would constitute a breach of international obligation, or as to the extent and nature of the reparation to be made for any such breach.' There are no other requirements in the covenant as to arbitration. Such action would only involve the adjudication of the terms of a contract or the measure of damages for a proven wrong. Our Government has long favored such arbitrations. It is committed to the policy. Beyond these questions there is no provision for compulsory arbitration. Have our people such passion for war that they would refuse to submit such disputes to arbitration when their continued existence threatened us with war and endangered the peace of the world?

"If disputes arise that are not subject to arbitration, then the matter shall be submitted under articles 12 and 15 to the league for inquiry, report, and recommendation. What, then, is the result and effect of such submission? If a report is adopted by a unanimous vote, then the recommendations are submitted to the disputants. If both accept, the matter, of course, is settled. If neither accepts the recommendation, then both are free to pursue their own course. If only one of the disputants accepts the recommendations, then the other is only bound to the extent that it shall not go to war.

"If our Nation in any case were adjudged to be in the wrong it would still have the privilege of breaking off all relations. It would still have the right to treat the opposing nation as unfriendly and visit upon it every power of isolation and ostracism that it could command. And let us keep in mind that this adjudication requires the unanimous vote of every member of the league except the representatives of the disputants. It is true that the matter may be referred to the assembly, but in this case it requires a unanimous vote of the assembly, which, of course, includes the members of the council.

"And, again, let it be distinctly remembered that incorporated in the provisions of this article 12, the effects of which I have been analyzing, we find this express exception of jurisdiction and limitation of authority. I quote:

"If the dispute between the parties is claimed by one of them and is found by the council to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the council shall so report and shall make no recommendation as to its settlement.

"This section was the subject of broad discussion and interpretation at the peace conference by those who will constitute the council and the assembly of the league of nations. The Japanese representatives contended that under the construction of such paragraph governments such as the United States, Canada, and Australia could continue to cast upon the Japanese race the alleged stigma of inequality by excluding them from their shores under their immigration laws. The peace conference recognized that the question of immigration is a domestic question, and it therefore refused to adopt the amendment offered by the Japanese representatives in attempting to change the paragraph in this effect.

"We only limit Japanese immigration through a gentleman's agreement with Japan, while Canada and Australia have long had upon their statute books stringent Japanese exclusion acts.

"The protection of our domestic jurisdiction is of vital importance to us. So is the protection of the domestic jurisdiction of Canada and Australia equally vital to those countries. It is but natural that every nation should be jealous of its domestic jurisdiction, and in this we find conclusive assurance against interference by the league with matters within the domestic

jurisdiction of our own Nation. So the maximum restraint upon our sovereignty would be that, upon the unanimous verdict of the world, we would have to refrain from war.

"Should we desire to go to war against the unanimous verdict of the world?

"Could we hope to win a war against the unanimous disapproval of the world?

"Is this so dangerous a covenant that we should be willing to endure militarism rather than submit to it?

"Can we conceive of any plan for peaceful settlement of disputes that so little affects our sovereignty?

"If we, the leader of democracy, the most ardent advocate of peace, and the bitterest opponent of militarism, are unwilling to submit such international disputes, equally with all other civilized nations, to the unanimous verdict of the world, then, indeed, all is hopeless.

"Hardly had these smoke screens, under which pessimistic and hopeless statesmen of the order of national isolation and militarism attacked the covenant of peace, been cleared away by the unalterable construction of the peace conference before these same statesmen had shifted their attack to the effect of the covenant of the league upon our sacred Monroe doctrine. They contend that under article 10 of the covenant, which reads as follows—

"The members of the league undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league—

"the league has usurped our authority to protect the Republics on the American continent to the south from external aggression against the territorial and existing political independence of those countries. They seem to fail to see—at least, they are unwilling to admit—that such declaration of article 10 is but a confirmation of our Monroe doctrine with regard to the Republics of the American continent extended and applied to all the nations of the earth. They, with all of the citizens of our country, should have rejoiced that the principles pronounced by President Monroe on behalf of this country as applying to South and Central America should have been recognized and approved by all of the civilized nations of the world.

"It was the national militaristic attitude of the world that forced our pronouncement of the Monroe doctrine. It was the knowledge that under the old order of things conquests by nations of other races and governments were deemed justifiable in aid of national expansion, glory, and power that made the Monroe doctrine imperative. The Monroe doctrine was the expression of a high principle and was essential to our protection against existing conditions, but it was a terrible burden that constantly grew more threatening. It was not recognized by other governments until the adoption of the covenant of the league of nations as an international principle or doctrine, and its authority was challenged on more than one occasion by powerful nations. It had no support in the world until reenunciated and adopted in the covenant of the league of nations, except the power of our own Government and the determination of our people to go to war in its defense. But that the suspicions and palsying fear of these statesmen might be forever allayed, in article 21 of the revised draft of the covenant it is expressly provided that—

"Nothing in this covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements, such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe doctrine for securing the maintenance of peace.

"The purpose in adding this provision in the revised covenant was that there might be no doubt as to the exclusion of the Monroe doctrine from the effect of the treaty. It is not subject to any other reasonable construction. Yet the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who is leading a solid Republican phalanx in the Senate against 'advising and consenting' to the treaty with the covenant of the league of nations therein, boldly proclaims that the validity of the Monroe doctrine is not recognized or protected by such provision. He says that the Monroe doctrine is not a 'regional understanding.' What difference does it make what the Monroe doctrine is when it is expressly excluded from the effect of the treaty by name? The peace conference has seen fit to decide that the Monroe doctrine is a regional understanding. If Alaska were excluded from the effect of the covenant, it would be immaterial whether it was designated as the 'District of Alaska' or the 'Territory of Alaska.' There might be a difference of opinion as to whether 'District' or 'Territory' better described the political character of Alaska, but there would still remain no doubt as to what was meant by 'Alaska.'

"And again they contend, with apparent seriousness and intensity of argument, that the words 'for securing the maintenance of peace' found at the end of article 21 will enable the league to pass upon whether or not the Monroe doctrine is for 'securing the maintenance of peace.' In other words, they are attempting to convince the people of the United States that, by reason of such words, the league has the jurisdiction and power to hold that the Monroe doctrine is not for the purpose of securing the maintenance of peace, and therefore is not excluded under article 21 from the effect of the treaty. It is apparent from a most casual reading of the article that the Monroe doctrine is set up as an example of the kind of regional understandings that will be excluded from the effect of the treaty. It says plainly and means that other regional understandings for securing the maintenance of peace 'like the Monroe doctrine' shall not be affected by the treaty. The article recognizes that the Monroe doctrine is for securing the maintenance of peace, and it not only expressly excludes the Monroe doctrine from the effect of the treaty but all other regional understandings like the Monroe doctrine. Let the American people read article 21, and I am satisfied that they will consider the arguments of these distinguished Senators as an insult to their intelligence and common sense. It exposes the character of argument to which these bitter opponents of the covenant in their desperation are driven and destroys their influence at home and abroad.

"While there are still some attacks being made with regard to these provisions, in a heated and demagogic manner, the opponents of broader statesmanship are attacking the covenant upon the fundamental theory that it creates a supergovernment and destroys our nationalism. In support of this contention they quote that portion of article 10, which provides—

"In case of any such aggression, or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

"And, again, they refer to that paragraph of article 4, which states—

"The council may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the league or affecting the peace of the world.

"The word 'deal' in this case must be synonymous with 'consider and recommend.' It grants no more authority than the 'power to advise' provided in article 10. There is no provision for the enforcement of this advice or their decision with regard to the matters with which they may deal. The only force provided in the entire covenant and agreed upon is the commercial, financial, and moral blockade provided in article 16. The only physical force considered in the covenant is set forth in article 17, as follows:

"It shall be the duty of the council in such case to recommend to the several governments concerned what effective military or naval forces the members of the league shall severally contribute to the armaments of forces to be used to protect the covenants of the league.

"It does not say recommend to the membership of the league, but 'recommend to the several governments.' In other words, it was intended, and its effect is, that it remains with the Congress of the United States to accept or reject any such recommendations. What, then, becomes of the bold, heated, and impassioned declamation of the opponents of the covenant when they ask the mothers of the country if they wish to place in the power of the league of nations the right to send their boys as soldiers to fight in the far corners of the earth? There is no provision in the covenant that can be tortured into such construction. There is no provision in the covenant that grants the league of nations any jurisdiction or control over our Army or our Navy or our soldiers. No vital act may be done by the league of nations without our vote, because it requires a unanimous vote, except as to matters of disputes in which we are involved, and I have shown that as to those matters no action may be taken that could vitally effect the interests of our Government.

"The supporters of the covenant of the league are ardent in their efforts for a great nationalism, and it is for such reason that they are striving so intensely to maintain the position and influence of the United States among the nations of the world. It would be unfortunate, indeed, if our nationalism were only supported by those few statesmen who arrogate to themselves the only Americanism.

"In my opinion, there can be no great nationalism isolated from internationalism. One of the great purposes of the covenant is the establishment and maintenance of nationalism. It is taking small, subservient races and making independent nations of them. It is making a nation of Poland. It is making a nation of Czechoslovakia. It is making a nation of Jugo-Slovenia. And their nationalism shall be sustained through the united action of the old and established nations of the earth under the covenant of the league of nations. And the adoption of these underlying and dominant principles will establish and maintain the national independence of every subservient race."

DAYLIGHT-SAVING LAW.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask permission to present a letter in the form of a resolution from the Farm Bureaus of Walsh County, N. Dak., respecting the daylight-saving law. I ask that it may be read. It is a brief letter, and I ask that Senators give attention to a suggestion for an amendment covering the large cities.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS,
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Grafton, N. Dak., May 26, 1919.

Senator PORTER J. MCCUMBER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Farm Bureaus of Walsh County, N. Dak., ask you to use your influence toward amending or repealing the so-called daylight-saving law. Farmers here all agree the law places a handicap on them, especially in connection with hired help. In haying, harvest, and threshing the farmers are compelled to work on "old time."

Suggestions received at this office state that a law might be so framed that large cities could use the daylight-saving plan without affecting the whole Nation.

Thanking you for your service in this matter, we are,

Yours, very truly,

WALSH COUNTY FARM BUREAUS,
L. J. HERBISON,
President Eastern Bureau, Grafton, N. Dak.
E. M. RUZICKA,
President Western Bureau, Fordville, N. Dak.

Mr. McCUMBER. I also ask to have inserted in the RECORD a letter from the editor and manager of the Dakota Farmer on the same subject, explaining more in detail the matter which has just been read.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABERDEEN, S. DAK., *June 5, 1919.*

Hon. PORTER J. MCCUMBER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Re daylight saving.

DEAR SIR: After a careful study of the matter I am convinced that the so-called "daylight saving" works greatly to the disadvantage of farmers in "The Dakota Farmer Empire."

I fully realize the great advantages of "daylight saving" to city people and even to many in small towns, and until I had made a careful study of the proposition among farmers I was inclined to believe that their complaints in this connection were not justified, but I have changed my mind.

First, I wish to make it plain that the unsatisfactory labor situation has a great deal of bearing in this connection.

Right now we have here in our territory an illustration of how the present method is working to the disadvantage of our farmers. Labor is very scarce on the farms, and the great majority of the men working on farms insist on quitting on the new time, regardless of when they begin work. As it is generally impossible to begin work in haying, etc., until 8 or 9 o'clock in the morning, when there is any moisture on the grass, this makes a very short day, and apparently is going to have its effect in the amount of hay produced in this section this year.

Farmers who produce milk, cream, etc., for town or city market can not go by the "old time," as has been stated by many who oppose the farmer's opposition to the new time, because they must get their produce to market according to the time in vogue in the town or cities.

There are many other minor reasons, which I will not discuss at this time. On the whole, it appears to me that the farmers generally are being seriously handicapped by "daylight saving," and particularly so in this section, where we are considerably ahead of sun time on account of being so far west of the point where the time changes.

I believe this is a matter worthy of your most serious consideration, and if the matter of the repeal of the present law is brought before Congress I hope it may have your support.

Very truly, yours,

THE DAKOTA FARMER,
W. C. ALLEN,
Editor and Manager.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I give notice that on to-morrow at the conclusion of the routine morning business I shall address the body on the covenant for a league of nations and the Constitution.

THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill 3478, being the general deficiency appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS—SPEECH BY EX-PRESIDENT TAFT.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, during the morning hour, when we were presenting petitions and resolutions, and during that period when it is customary to present for printing in the RECORD speeches of prominent men whom the Senate may consider worthy of such an honor, I presented a short address made by ex-President Taft, delivered on the 7th of this month, dealing with the league of nations, and requested that it be published in the RECORD. To that objection was made by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]. At that time he asked that it be referred to the Committee on Printing. I then withdrew my request and the speech, and announced that I was unwilling for the speech of an ex-President to be swamped in the Committee on Printing, and that I would be forced to read it to the Senate.

I think that this speech is very timely, in view of the resolution which has been introduced this morning by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX]. I may say that it is the first time that I have ever known of an objection being made to the publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of a speech delivered by an ex-President of the United States. I am satisfied that, no matter what view he may express in regard to the covenant of the league of nations, his ability is recognized and that his sincerity is unquestioned. His address will certainly throw more light on this subject than is being shed upon it by a great many speeches that have been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without objection upon possibly another side of the question. I therefore am compelled to read from the New York Times of Sunday, June 8, the following:

TAFT CRITICIZES FOES OF LEAGUE—WARNS REPUBLICAN SENATORS OPPOSING COVENANT OF RESPONSIBILITY OF BLOCKING PEACE—DEFENDS WILSON'S COURSE—LEAGUE IS NOT HIS FAD, AND HE IS NOT TO BLAME FOR DELAY OF TREATY—FINISHES SPEAKING TOUR—STATE LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE URGES EMPIRE STATE SENATORS TO SUPPORT COVENANT.

ALBANY, N. Y., *June 7.*

The 800 delegates attending the State convention of the League to Enforce Peace to-night listened to an address by William Howard Taft, ex-President of the United States and president of the league, and unanimously adopted a resolution ratifying the league of nations covenant and urging the State's representatives in the Senate, JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Jr., and WILLIAM M. CALDER, to support it. The resolution read:

"We, citizens of the State of New York, assembled in open convention in the city of Albany this 7th day of June, 1919, to consider the covenant of the league of nations, believing that the adoption of this covenant in its present form will provide the machinery for composing differences between nations, will promote and firmly establish world order, will make effective the enforcement of the treaty of peace, and will accomplish all this without involving our Nation in any obligations that we should not be ready to assume to lessen the danger of war, hereby

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this convention that we approve and indorse the covenant of the league of nations as proposed and urge that the Senate of the United States promptly ratify it; it is further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH and the Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER and to the Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, United States Senate."

The convention marked the closing of a campaign instituted on May 31, during which Mr. Taft and others who indorse the league of nations covenant have addressed State conventions in 15 States. The big auditorium of Chancellor's Hall in the State Education Building was filled, and many stood throughout the meeting. While speaking, Mr. Taft was frequently cheered.

WARNS BUSINESS COMMUNITY.

In opening his address, Mr. Taft called attention to the fact that "if any substantial amendment is to be made to the treaty submitted by the President, it must go back to the other powers who signed it for their acceptance and approval."

"Upon those who insist that substantial amendments must be made to the treaty," he went on, "will therefore fall the responsibility for the indefinite postponement of peace, which the unconditional ratification of the treaty will at once bring about. It has been proposed to separate the covenant from the treaty and to ratify the treaty thus truncated or dissected, with the idea that peace will follow such action by the Senate.

"The suggestion has been made that peace thus might be reached through a protocol embodying the treaty and leaving the question of the league to further consideration. It should be premised that no one can initiate peace except the President of the United States, who is vested by the Constitution with this power. No one can make a protocol of peace except the President. If, therefore, the President deem it essential that the Senate should act upon the treaty as he submits it, there can be no protocol as long as he maintains that attitude, nor indeed could the protocol be concluded without the consent of Germany.

"In other words, all these propositions are nothing but conditional ratification on the basis of radical amendments, and they

all will postpone indefinitely the coming of peace. Meantime the other great powers, under the terms of the treaty as they are now reported, can ratify the treaty and establish peace with Germany so far as they are concerned. In this way the anomalous condition will be presented of a state of war between Germany and ourselves while peace prevails between Germany and Great Britain, Germany and France, Germany and Italy, and Germany and Japan. This obviously disadvantageous condition for our industries and this delay in the resumption of our trade with Germany should make the business community of the United States scrutinize with care the reasons for substantially amending the covenant or attempting to dissect it out of the treaty."

FOUR GREAT STEPS FORWARD.

Mr. Taft said the creation of the league of nations would mark "four great steps of progress," which he enumerated as follows:

Limitation of armament.

The provision by which members of the league undertake to respect and preserve territorial integrity and political independence of all its members.

The clauses in which provision is made for the settlement of differences between members of the league by arbitration or mediation and a covenant of the nations not to begin war until machinery for settling differences peacefully shall have been tried.

Open diplomacy.

The ex-President answered criticisms of the league covenant in detail. Speaking of the criticism of the clause for the limitation of armaments, he said:

"What is the objection? It is that if we limit our armament we paralyze our Government in its defense of our liberties and our institutions against external aggression, and we expose ourselves naked to our enemies. The objection is entirely without weight. We limit our armament in consideration of the nations of the league limiting theirs. Our limit is adjusted proportionately to theirs, having due regard to the more or less exposed position of each nation, its obligations to the league, and its need for domestic use of armament."

Article 10, "the second great step forward," which provides for mutual preservation of territorial integrity and political independence, he called "the heart of the league."

"It is said," he went on, "that this will involve the United States in wars to protect nations in distant parts of the world in whose welfare we have no interest, and will call for an expenditure of money and the lives of our boys in which we ought not to involve our country. This is not true. The effect of the organization of the league, with the threat against any nation who should violate article 10 and attempt a war of conquest against another nation, will be to restrain that nation and prevent its beginning war."

The third great step forward Mr. Taft found in article 12, providing for mediation and arbitration.

"The same objections," he said, "are made to this step as to that of article 10, that it will involve us in trouble with remote nations, and possibly wars. There is the same answer, namely, that the knowledge of this union of the nations to enforce this obligation of the league will prevent its violation by reckless members."

Open diplomacy, the fourth great step, he said, would mean that the cards were to be "played face up on the table."

Summing up the objections made to the league, he said:

"There is no transfer of sovereignty under this league to the council of the assembly. The council only recommends and proposes and advises. It does not command or direct or order. The chief attacks upon the league rest entirely on the claim that the word 'recommend' means to 'command,' and that the word 'advise' means to 'direct,' and that the word 'propose' means to 'order.' This is an utterly unwarranted and strained construction of the league which every fair-minded man should see.

"The Monroe doctrine is specifically recognized by all nations as a regional understanding in the constitution of the league by a provision that nothing in the league shall affect it. This is the first time in the history of the doctrine that the Monroe doctrine has been recognized by the world as a customary convention. It is a great achievement for us."

PARTISANSHIP OUT OF PLACE.

"This is not a partisan question," said Mr. Taft in conclusion. "We should be for or against the league without respect to whether we are Democrats or Republicans. We should be for or against the league without regard to whether we think it will bring credit to our party or credit to any man. Personal and partisan considerations of this kind are reasons which should have no influence with us in determining an issue so fateful in the world's history and so likely to affect the future welfare of the people of the United States and of all mankind.

"When, therefore, you come to consider the question whether you are in favor of the treaty or not, you should search your hearts and souls and your consciences to see whether you are approaching it in the proper patriotic and humane spirit or whether you are against it because Mr. Wilson is for it and you may fear that he will gain credit for its adoption, or because you may suppose that his party may gain party credit for it. These are small reasons for supporting or opposing the league.

"The question is, Will it do good for this country or mankind? If it will, let us favor it. If it endangers our country or interferes with mankind, let's oppose it, but let's base our action and our view on high and patriotic reasons. When we approach the question of the league of nations from that standpoint, I do not doubt that the great majority of the people of the United States, and the needed majority of the Senators of the United States, will approve this league."

The convention was presided over by William Church Osborn. Other speakers included Herbert H. Houston, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, of New York, and Miss Helen Varick Boswell, president of the Women's Republican Association. In his address Mr. Houston, who is publisher of the World's Work, referred to the recent bomb outrages, and declared that effective means of combating anarchism was to be found in the league of nations.

ARRAIGNS PARTISAN REPUBLICANS.

Mr. Taft reached Albany early to-day and at noon attended a luncheon given by the chamber of commerce. Mr. Taft spoke briefly at the luncheon, saying in part:

"This covenant is not a mere fad of Mr. Wilson. It is demanded by the peoples of France, Great Britain, and Italy. Neither Lloyd-George nor Clemenceau originally advocated it. They were driven to it by two things—one that their constituents demanded it, the other that the treaty of peace, which the terms of the armistice foreshadowed, could not be enforced without it.

"The opponents of the league, however, have aroused protest against the league among business men and partisan Republicans by asserting that Mr. Wilson is seeking personal credit and party advantage in making a league of nations and is sacrificing the interests of this country and delaying peace and prosperity to secure the league. The reasons for delay are now demonstrated to have been acute differences in respect to the terms of peace and not the covenant of the league, which was agreed to long before the treaty.

"Germany is now protesting against signing. When she does sign, as she must, and the President lays before the Senate the treaty, with the league as part of its web and woof, the business men and short-sighted Republicans who have based their opposition on personal or partisan reasons will have a rude awakening. They will find then that the responsibility for further delay of peace and the waiting prosperity will be not on Mr. Wilson, but on those in the Senate, who would amend the treaty by eliminating the league or materially changing its provisions.

"Such amendments would require the President to send back the made-over treaty to Paris for another conference to see whether all the signatories, including Germany, will consent to the new document framed by the Senate. I need hardly point out that this would consume months, during which business would wait, and numbing uncertainty would prevail. Meantime, France, Great Britain, and Italy, who will promptly ratify the treaty, will, under its terms as reported, at once resume or establish normal business with Germany, while for months we shall be embarrassed by the same restrictions in our commerce with her which the continued armistice would impose."

Mayor James R. Watt welcomed the representatives of the league. Gov. Alfred E. Smith and John H. Walker spoke briefly.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just a word in regard to the reference that I requested be made of the speech of ex-President Taft.

Notice has been given to the Senate that all such speeches other than the speeches of Senators or documents from the legislative bodies of States shall be requested to go to the Committee on Printing; and I am going to follow out that policy, which was adopted by the Printing Committee, until the Senate overrules me. I have no feeling at all in the matter, and it would not have made any difference to me who made the speech that the Senator from Nevada asked to have printed in the RECORD. I would have objected just the same.

THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it may be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator state that it will be read textually at some period before he asks for its passage?

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator wishes it read beforehand, of course that will be done.

Mr. KING. As I understand, the purpose of the Senator is to dispense with the reading at all and merely take up the amendments for consideration.

Mr. WARREN. Oh, no; it will all be read.

Mr. KING. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill, and read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, namely:

ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN.

For expenses of the Alien Property Custodian authorized by the act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, including personal and other services and expenses incident to the acquiring and rental of quarters in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence not exceeding $4, traveling expenses, printing and binding, law books, books of reference and periodicals, supplies and equipment, and maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, $90,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, as I recall the appropriation made for this bureau for the year past it was very liberal. I want to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not the expenditure of $90,000 seems to be legitimate and proper, in view of the very large appropriation, as I recall, which was made for this department. I can not conceive of any reason why the bureau should transcend the limits fixed by Congress and expend this large sum.

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that this appropriation was considered exceedingly necessary by the committee in the consideration of it. That institution, as with other war measures, and those created because of the war, has grown beyond the comprehension of the Committee on Appropriations and of the Senate itself, and this is a genuine deficiency to bring us up to the first of the year.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit another inquiry? Is there no limitation whatever upon the discretion of executive officers as to deficiencies which they may create?

Mr. WARREN. We have from time to time in the past included in appropriation bills paragraphs covering that so far as we could; but we must provide—or, at least, it has always been considered that we must—that when the head of a department, a member of the President's Cabinet, certifies that a certain amount must be used in order to meet needed unexpected occurrences and others, it is legitimate for those amounts to be expended, and to take them up here in Congress as deficiencies. Of course, the Congress can allow such amounts or not, as it may deem proper, but a disallowance means to take away that which belongs to the servants of the Government and others who have earned the money for services or furnished commodities for which they should be paid.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think that the policy of permitting departments and bureaus and public officials to expend thousands of dollars, and even hundreds of thousands of dollars, and in the aggregate millions of dollars, each year as a deficit, when they know the limitations placed upon them, is a dangerous one?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I think no one knows it better, and no one is more opposed to it, and no one is more ready at all times to overcome it.

I have before me one of the paragraphs which I have just mentioned. It reads in this way:

No executive department or other Government establishment of the United States shall expend in any one fiscal year any sum in excess of appropriations made by Congress for that fiscal year, or involve the Government in any contract or other obligation for the future payment of money in excess of such appropriations, unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law. Nor shall any department or any officer of the Government accept voluntary service for the Government or employ personal service in excess of that authorized by law, except in cases of sudden emergency involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property.

Other paragraphs follow, for instance, this paragraph:

All appropriations made for contingent expenses or other general purposes, except appropriations made in fulfillment of contract obligations expressly authorized by law, or for objects required or authorized by law, without reference to the amounts annually appropriated therefor, shall, on or before the beginning of each fiscal year, be so apportioned by monthly or other allotments as to prevent expenditures in one portion of the year which may necessitate deficiency or additional appropriations to complete the service of the fiscal year for which said appropriations are made.

But, Mr. President, there never yet has been a Congress, and I presume there never will be, when some matters were not brought in to close some account that was found deficient. Perhaps Congress had not appropriated sufficiently for it. There will continue to be emergencies and there will continue to be amounts brought in for deficiencies. Of course, we have gone away beyond the bounds of anything in the past during the period of preparation for war and now in the closing of the war. All I can say about that is that I hope the Senate will be ready at all times to join us in such legislation as may put a stop to these deficiencies in the future.

Mr. KING. The Senator will admit that many of these appropriations—and I have very hastily examined the bill—exceed the authorization which would be permitted under the statute to which the Senator has just invited attention. The Senator knows that in many of the States, notwithstanding very stringent limitations, it became necessary, because of the constant deficits which were created, to pass penal statutes making it an offense for any public official to expend one dollar in excess of the appropriation made by the State or the municipal government. It seems to me that if these expenditures are continued in violation of the law it may be necessary to enact a very drastic penal statute to prohibit creating these excessive expenditures.

Mr. FLETCHER. I would suggest that while perhaps the expenditures have exceeded the appropriations, they have not exceeded the authorization to make contracts. When the law authorized the making of contracts by the various departments, even though the appropriations were not exceeded, there would still be the requirement that those contracts be met.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it is the universal custom of all the departments, and has been, to spend more money than has been appropriated, and it will never be stopped so long as we pass deficiency bills covering every dollar that they spend over and above the amount which was authorized. I have been here now nearly 17 years, and every year it has been the same identical thing, only it is growing every year more and more; and the younger the bureau or department the greater the expenses which are incurred over and above those which are authorized by law. The way to stop it is for Congress at some time to have backbone enough to say not one dollar of deficiency will be appropriated, and then the heads of the departments and the different bureau chiefs will begin to believe that we mean what we say.

There is not a year passes that this question is not discussed here upon the floor, and we say what we think ought to be done, but we never do it. I think the time has about arrived now when we should say to every department, "Do not spend one dollar more than is authorized by law," and when that time comes there will be hundreds of millions of dollars saved to the taxpayers of the country every year.

Mr. KING. If my colleagues will permit, I give notice now that I shall introduce as an amendment to one of the appropriation bills or some appropriate bill in the near future a provision that will make it a penal offense for departments or bureaus to expend more than has been appropriated for their purposes, and I shall do it within a very few days.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am delighted with this colloquy, because it leads up to what is so much needed, a budget system. Senators can declaim against this practice until they are out of breath, but they will never stop it, because the needs which are largely local and which are therefore represented locally by Senators and Representatives will overcome all the good resolutions on earth just as they have in the past. But with a decent, intelligent budget system, some restriction can be placed upon these expendiures.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I think I am in hearty accord with what has been said. I realize that this abuse has been growing. At the same time I can understand why there was really more necessity for it during the period of the war than perhaps at any other time. I suggest that an amendment similar to that suggested by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] be prepared and made a part of this bill.

Mr. KING. If the Senator from Wyoming will agree not to press the bill to final passage before the end of the day I shall endeavor to prepare one.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Alien Property Custodian," on page 2, after line 12, to insert:

That section 9 of the "Act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. That any person not an enemy or ally of enemy claiming any interest, right, or title in any money or other property which may have been conveyed, transferred, assigned, delivered, or paid to the Alien

Property Custodian hereunder and held by him or by the Treasurer of the United States, or to whom any debt may be owing from an enemy or ally of enemy whose property or any part thereof shall have been conveyed, transferred, assigned, delivered, or paid to the Alien Property Custodian hereunder, and held by him or by the Treasurer of the United States, may file with the said custodian a notice of his claim under oath and in such form and containing such particulars as the said custodian shall require; and the President, if application is made therefor by the claimant, may order the payment, conveyance, transfer, assignment, or delivery to said claimant of the money or other property so held by the Alien Property Custodian or by the Treasurer of the United States or of the interest therein to which the President shall determine said claimant is entitled: *Provided*, That no such order by the President shall bar any person from the prosecution of any suit at law or in equity against the claimant to establish any right, title, or interest which he may have in such money or other property. If the President shall not so order within 60 days after the filing of such application or if the claimant shall have filed the notice as above required and shall have made no application to the President, said claimant may, at any time before the expiration of six months after the end of the war institute a suit in equity in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia or in the district court of the United States for the district in which such claimant resides, or, if a corporation, where it has its principal place of business (to which suit the Alien Property Custodian or the Treasurer of the United States, as the case may be, shall be made a party defendant), to establish the interest, right, title, or debt so claimed, and if suit shall be so instituted then the money or other property of the enemy or ally of enemy, against whom such interest, right, or title is asserted, or debt claimed, shall be retained in the custody of the Alien Property Custodian, or in the Treasury of the United States, as provided in this act, and until any final judgment or decree which shall be entered in favor of the claimant shall be fully satisfied by payment or conveyance, transfer, assignment, or delivery by the defendant or by the Alien Property Custodian or Treasurer of the United States on order of the court, or until final judgment or decree shall be entered against the claimant, or suit otherwise terminated: *Provided, however*, That in respect of all property heretofore determined by the President to have been held for, by, on account of, or on behalf of, or for the benefit of a person who was an enemy or ally of enemy, if the President, after further investigation, shall determine that such person was an enemy or ally of enemy solely by reason of residence in that portion of the territory of any nation associated with the United States in the prosecution of the war which was occupied by the military or naval forces of Germany or Austria-Hungary, or their allies, and that such person is a citizen or subject of such associated nation, then the President, without any application being made therefor, may order the payment, conveyance, transfer, assignment, or delivery of such money or other property held by the Alien Property Custodian, or by the Treasurer of the United States, or of the interest therein to which the President shall determine such person entitled, either to the said enemy or to the person by whom said property was conveyed, transferred, assigned, delivered, or paid over to the Alien Property Custodian. And the receipt of the said enemy or of the person by whom said property was conveyed, transferred, assigned, or delivered to the Alien Property Custodian, shall be a full acquittance and discharge of the Alien Property Custodian or the Treasurer of the United States as the case may be, and of the United States in respect of all claims of all persons heretofore or hereafter claiming any right, title, or interest in said property, or compensation or damages arising from the capture of such property by the President or the Alien Property Custodian: *Provided further, however*, That except as herein provided no such action by the President shall bar any person from the prosecution of any suit at law or in equity to establish any right, title, or interest which he may have therein.

"Except as herein provided, the money or other property conveyed, transferred, assigned, delivered, or paid to the Alien Property Custodian shall not be liable to lien, attachment, garnishment, trustee process, or execution, or subject to any order or decree of any court.

"This section shall not apply, however, to money paid to the Alien Property Custodian under section 10 hereof."

Mr. WARREN. The period should be stricken out and a semicolon inserted after the word "Custodian," in line 15, page 5.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That change will be made.

Mr. KING. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee having this bill in charge what was the reason for placing in the general deficiency bill this legislation with respect to the Alien Property Custodian?

Mr. WARREN. The amendment appears to contain more than is actually asked for or granted by it. It reenacts a great deal of the old legislation. I shall ask the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to explain it, as he has taken particular care of the subject.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Most of this legislation is proposed to be reenacted; it is in the law already. It is just reenacting the section as a part of an appropriation bill, but the vital legislation in reference to the Alien Property Custodian act was passed in this way in this sort of a bill, and that is probably the excuse for bringing it back here for reenactment.

If the Senator will turn to page 3, line 20, I will state that the only change made there is that this language is inserted:

In the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia or.

That is one amendment. The reason for that amendment is that as the law now stands the claimants of this property are many of them persons whose property was taken through mistake and who are American citizens or allied citizens. In most cases the jurisdiction over the claimants is in the city of New York, in the southern district of New York. It was represented to us that that district was very crowded and very far behind in its dockets. This gives the option to the claimant or litigant to sue in the court in his own district, as provided in the act, or to come here and sue in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia. If he comes here—and he can not be forced to come here; he comes of his own will—it gives him an earlier and speedier hearing and it is more convenient to the Government officers.

Mr. POMERENE. It has been said the dockets here in the District of Columbia are so overcrowded that they need two additional judges. Has the Senator any information on that subject?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know about that, but it was represented to us that it would probably take many of these cases two or three years to get a hearing in New York, and that they would probably get a very much speedier hearing if this option were given. But it does not take anything away from anybody. It gives them the option, and it would be more convenient to the Government if they exercised their option.

The next amendment of the section, and the only other amendment, starts in line 13 on page 4, after the word "provided," and continues on down to the end of that page and to and including all of line 6 on page 5, except the words "and the receipt" on that line. That is practically half a page of an amendment. I will not take the time of the Senate to read it, but I will explain in a very few words what it is.

When the original bill was written, it made an alien enemy of a man who resided in alien territory. He did not necessarily have to be a German or an Austrian, or in arms against us, but any citizen of the United States, or any alien citizen who happened to be residing in Germany or those portions of Belgium and France that were occupied by the German Army, became an alien enemy for the purposes of the act. In other words, it gave the Alien Property Custodian power to take possession of his property and hold it, the purpose being to keep the property or the proceeds of the property or the income from the property from going back into enemy territory.

In other words, in the early days of the war it was found that certain large dividends that belonged either to Germans, on the one hand, or to American or French citizens who happened to be in alien territory, were finding their way through neutral countries into the hands of an American citizen in that alien country and possibly were confiscated. At any rate, we did not know what became of it, or whether it would be of value to the enemy, or whether it would be levied on there. The purpose of the act was to stop it, even if it was property belonging to a loyal American citizen, as long as it went to those sources. A noted case was that of Mr. Busch, whose property was taken over entirely. We found that in the enactment of the law this property could be turned back. It gave the right under section 9 to sue to get the property back if they had taken property from an American citizen or made a mistake in taking it; but it also provided that it could be turned back to the proper person with the consent to the enemy. The enemy in that case was not necessarily an enemy of the Government. In the sense of the law, the loyal American citizen residing in Germany or Belgium when his property was taken under the law, became an enemy so far as the act was concerned; and the purpose of this amendment is merely to give the Alien Property Custodian or the President, for whom the Alien Property Custodian is acting, an opportunity, where he finds he has taken property from a citizen of the United States or France or Belgium, to preserve it and keep it or its income out of the hands of the enemy and turn it back to its rightful owner without litigation.

In some cases he can not get consent of the enemy, as described here. For instance, some of this property was on its way, when the act was passed, through the banks of New York, and their correspondent was the Deutscher Bank or some other bank of Germany, and when it was levied on in the New York bank by the Alien Property Custodian, it was levied on in the name of the Deutscher Bank, and there it stands, and he can not get the consent of the Deutscher Bank to turn it back to the loyal subject who happened to be in that enemy territory. The main object is to facilitate settlements in the case of property that belongs to loyal people, either our own citizens or our Allies, without any litigation and without dispute. So the amendment amounts to but very little, although the language of the clause is long. The object is to save lawsuits and save costs and rapidly dispose of the matter.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 17, to insert:

BUREAU OF EFFICIENCY.

For investigating duplication of statistical and other work in the various branches of the Government service, and for maintaining a current index record of such work and disseminating information concerning it to such Government organizations as may be concerned: *Provided*, That not later than June 30, 1919, all books, records, and papers relating to the investigations of duplication of statistical and other work and to the work of the statistical clearing house of the Central Bureau of Planning and Statistics shall be transferred to the Bureau of Efficiency, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Civil Service Commission," on page 8, line 1, before the word "who," to insert "sailors and marines," and in the same line, after the word "qualified," to strike out "if they" and insert "but whose wives," so as to make the clause read:

The unexpended balances on June 30, 1919, of appropriations for additional and temporary employees for the Civil Service Commission made, respectively, in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, and the "First deficiency appropriation act, 1919," are reappropriated and made available under the same conditions for the fiscal year 1920: *Provided*, That the act entitled an "An act to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses," approved March 3, 1919, so far as it relates to preference in employment of honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, be amended to read as follows: "That hereafter in making appointments to clerical and other positions in the executive branch of the Government in the District of Columbia or elsewhere preference shall be given to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, and widows of such, and to the wives of injured soldiers, sailors, and marines who themselves are not qualified but whose wives are qualified to hold such positions."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 2, to insert:

EXECUTIVE.

Office of the President: For additional compensation to one expert stenographer, fiscal year 1920, $500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued, the last item read being as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

SALARIES.

Coroner's office: For payment of the deputy coroner during the absence of the coroner, $110.

Mr. KING. I move to strike out the item found on page 8, lines 21 and 22, being the item just read by the Secretary. As I understand, the coroner and the deputy coroner are provided for by existing law and their salaries are fixed. This seems to be an additional compensation by reason of the absence of one of the employees of the District of Columbia.

Mr. WARREN. I understand from one of the representatives of the District government that that is entirely under the legislation which has been passed heretofore; that in the necessary absence of the principal, the deputy has the amount of salary which he may earn during that time.

Mr. KING. I ask the Senator from Wyoming is that amount subtracted from the compensation provided by law for the principal?

Mr. WARREN. I have here what was stated on that question, which is as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Commissioner, the first estimate is for $95 for the deputy coroner. I understand you have increased that to $110.
Mr. BROWNLOW. Yes, sir; there is a supplemental estimate for $110, which makes the total required $205.
The CHAIRMAN. This is to pay the salary of the deputy during the absence of the coroner?
Mr. BROWNLOW. Yes; in accordance with the provisions of the code.
The CHAIRMAN. This is an actual deficiency?
Mr. BROWNLOW. Yes.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, that does not explain the matter. It is clear that there is no diminution of the amount provided for the principal who absents himself.

Mr. WARREN. I do not understand that the code provides for that. I assume that the duties of the coroner are such that he can not always be present where a coroner is needed, and therefore the necessity of a deputy.

Mr. KING. I understand the law already gives vacations and annual leaves, and that during those periods the officer receives a fixed compensation; and, in addition to that, we are paying him the amount indicated in this item. I think it ought to go out, because it is double compensation.

I will say to the Senator that if he will consent that it may go out, if in conference it becomes apparent that there is a diminution or subtraction of the amount which the coroner obtains, I shall have no objection to it being inserted. I insist on my motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed, the last clause read being as follows:

For maintenance, care, and repair of automobiles, motor cycles, and motor trucks owned by the District of Columbia, that are not otherwise provided for, including such personal services in connection therewith not otherwise authorized, as the commissioners shall in writing specially order, $4,000.

Mr. KING. I move to strike out the paragraph commencing on line 6 and ending on line 11, on page 9.

Mr. JONES of Washington. What is the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah?

Mr. KING. I move to strike out lines 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, on page 9. It has become the fad now for everybody who is an employee of this municipality and of the War Department—particularly the latter—to have automobiles and transportation furnished them to take them to and from their residences, their boarding houses, and their other places of abode. This seems to be largely for the purpose of furnishing automobiles, motorcycles, and so on, for employees of the District of Columbia. I doubt not that there has been a very liberal appropriation made heretofore for these particular matters.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington will state it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Are we considering this appropriation bill under the usual consent that committee amendments are to be first considered?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendments are first to be considered, but nobody has raised the question.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I want to raise that question, because I think if we have that understanding it ought to be followed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then the Senator from Utah will have to defer his motion to strike out.

Mr. KING. I did not understand that the usual rule prevailed in this instance.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was under the subhead "Contingent and miscellaneous expenses," on page 9, after line 11, to strike out:

The appropriation for the establishment of an ice or cold storage plant at the morgue, contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1918, is reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1920, together with the further sum of $3,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public schools," on page 13, after line 18, to insert:

Longevity pay: For longevity pay for director of intermediate instruction, supervising principals, supervisor and assistant supervisor of manual training, principals of normal high and manual-training high schools, the assistant principal (who shall be dean of girls) of the Central High School, principals of grade manual-training schools, heads of departments, director and assistant director of primary instruction, directors and assistant directors of drawing, physical culture, music, domestic science, domestic art, kindergartens, and penmanship, teachers, clerks, librarians and clerks, and librarians, to be paid in strict conformity with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the board of education of the District of Columbia," approved June 20, 1906, as amended by the acts approved May 26, 1908, and May 18, 1910, and June 26, 1912, $72,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee under what circumstances those having control of the schools in this District contracted obligations amounting to $72,000, as indicated in this item, and the additional sum, as indicated by the next paragraph, in excess of the amounts which have been appropriated.

Mr. WARREN. This is to fulfill the law, and I shall ask the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], who is acquainted with the matter, to explain the item.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a number of teachers left the service here last fall. The estimate was not so high as is ordinarily carried in these bills, because it was believed the schools could get along with a lower amount; but in employing teachers to take the places of those who had gone away it was necessary to pay an increased salary. That places the District in this position at this time: The teachers have come back, and, as to the longevity pay to which they are entitled, they will have to wait until next fall for it, unless it is paid to them now. They have already received their checks each month, and many of them have but very little money. We therefore thought it was unfair to require them during all the summer vacation to go without the money that is actually due them as longevity pay.

Mr. KING. What is longevity pay?

Mr. CURTIS. Longevity pay is for length of service. Each year there is so much added to the compensation of a teacher who has taught for a certain length of time, up to five years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 14, after line 10, to insert:

Allowance to principals: For allowance to principals of grade-school buildings for services rendered as such, in addition to their grade salary, to be paid in strict conformity with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the board of education of the District of Columbia," approved June 20, 1906, $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 7, before "1919," to strike out "March 22" and insert "May 30," so as to make the clause read:

Night schools: For teachers and janitors of night schools, including teachers of industrial, commercial, and trade instruction, and teachers and janitors of night schools may also be teachers and janitors of day schools, $12,000: *Provided*, That payment is authorized to all employees who served in the night schools during the period from March 8 to May 30, 1919, inclusive, at the rate of pay they were receiving on March 7, 1919, this payment to be in addition to the nominal sum of $1 which such teachers received for the service rendered.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued down to the end of line 25, on page 15, the last item read being as follows:

METROPOLITAN POLICE.

Miscellaneous: For fuel, $1,300.

For maintenance of motor vehicles, $1,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if that is a deficiency, it is obvious that the department ought to know what the deficiency is. If they are seeking for an appropriation to cover a loss, they ought to know what the loss is. This appropriation is very indefinite. The item makes an appropriation of "$1,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. WARREN. As the Senator knows, it is not in order to change the item now. The item to which he calls attention is in the print of the House text.

Mr. KING. That is true, but it will relieve me of the necessity of calling attention to it later if the Senator will give the explanation now. If not, I shall be compelled to invite attention to it later.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Courts," on page 17, after line 18, to strike out:

Police court: For printing, law books, books of reference, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, $710.70.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Charities and corrections," on page 18, after line 12, to strike out:

Washington asylum and jail: For provisions, fuel, forage, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, $12,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 20, after "1919," to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$20,000," so as to make the clause read:

For maintenance of jail prisoners of the District of Columbia, including the same objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, $20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 5, after "1899," to strike out "$250" and insert "$500," so as to make the clause read:

For deportation of nonresident insane persons, in accordance with the act of Congress "to change the proceedings for admission to the Government Hospital for the Insane in certain cases, and for other purposes," approved January 31, 1899, $500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 21, to insert:

EMERGENCY SHIPPING FUND.

For recruiting, instructing, and training officers, engineers, and crews for American vessels, and for all expenditures incidental thereto, $2,417,186.95.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Emergency Fleet Corporation has expended not only millions and hundreds of millions of dollars, but billions of dollars. I should like to know whether or not the investigations of the committee demonstrate the wisdom of the appropriations, the justice of them, and justify this large deficiency for the limited purposes for which the appropriation is to be used or has been used?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the general appropriation for the Emergency Fleet Corporation is not applicable to this particular line of service. This item represents what it will take to pay the expense of the particular service referred to up to the end of this fiscal year; that is, the end of the present month. As the Senator knows, there have been a large number of vessels at various times completed for the merchant marine and for other service, and there is a lack of sailors and officers educated or trained in the work of manning and navigating the vessels. The consequence is that not coincident with but following the appropriations for the building of ships it was necessary to build up the machinery, the human side of it as well as the other part, in order to put these ships into service. The shortage in this branch was not presented to the House because the officers of the corporation had not the opportunity to complete their calculations as to the enlistment of men in the service and to compute what was necessary to cover this emergency. So the item was left out until it came to the consideration of the Senate committee. If the Senator cares to have a little further information——

Mr. KING. I will be very glad to have it.

Mr. WARREN. I shall read briefly from the hearings. I quote from the testimony of Mr. Henry Howard, director this recruiting service, United States Shipping Board, as follows:

Mr. HOWARD. We have an appropriation in the bill which failed of passage at the last Congress, the deficiency bill, and owing to its failure we curtailed to the utmost in the interim. Our service, I might say, is training and providing personnel for the new ships that the Emergency Fleet Corporation is building, with trained officers, deck and engineer officers, seamen, firemen, cooks, oilers, and the whole personnel.

The CHAIRMAN. And this without any connection with the Navy Department?

Mr. HOWARD. It has nothing to do with the Navy. It is a civilian manning of the ships, and of course the burden has been much greater since the war is over, because we have been not only manning the new ships but the ships that the Navy formerly manned, which they are now turning over to us. We stopped completely our activities immediately after the failure of the passage of that bill, because we ran out of funds, and then it was thought it was such a serious matter and might cause a tie-up of so many ships that Commissioner Stevens took upon himself the responsibility of authorizing the use of some of the funds of the Division of Operations, surplus funds, something that is probably illegal.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any estimates to propose? If so, in what form?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes. The appropriation for the recruiting service of the United States Shipping Board provided $6,250,000 for the training of officers and men for the merchant marine for the year ending June 30, 1919.

The expenditures for the nine months ended March 31, 1919, are as follows:

Operating expenditures	$5,326,615.37
Construction expenditures	425,836.34
Inventories	1,259,942.82
Accounts	154,792.42
Total	7,167,186.95

It is estimated that operating expenses for the months of April, May, and June will amount to $1,500,000, making the total expenditures $8,667,186.95 for the present fiscal year and necessitating a deficiency appropriation of $2,417,186.95 to meet the above expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. By what authority is your board undertaking to create a deficiency of that size without some leave of Congress? I am not inquiring about it with any feeling against it, but the point is that this Government can not be run on a basis of every department spending what it chooses and coming in with it for deficiencies. The whole country is aflame now with the budget system, and we have an association here sending out literature about the budget, saying how much they will raise and how to spend it, and that it is to be divided and apportioned to these deficiencies. Now, where are we going to be at if we have such deficiencies, especially deficiencies of that size?

Mr. HOWARD. A deficiency on the basis that we estimated, if we had run full force, would have been about $4,000,000, which was approved by the last Congress and would have passed but for the filibuster. We had either to stop the thing at a severe damage to the interests of the Government having ships going out without crews to operate them or somebody had to run the risk of doing something a little illegal in the interests of the Government keeping the thing going. Mr. Stevens said that he was willing to assume the responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. This was done by the corporation within the corporation?

Mr. HOWARD. No, sir; it was done by the Shipping Board. The recruiting service is not connected with the Emergency Fleet Corporation. It is responsible directly to the board and is working under appropriations directly.

The CHAIRMAN. It has nothing to do with the fleet department?

Mr. HOWARD. Nothing to do with the fleet proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. I notice on page 15 of the old bill which you have referred to——

Mr. HOWARD. No; page 45, lines 13 to 16.

The CHAIRMAN. Page 15 of the old bill as reported by Senator MARTIN, $3,750,000.

Mr. HOWARD. It is in the sundry civil bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; it is in the sundry civil and also in the proposed deficiency bill.

Mr. HOWARD. Let me read you this letter from the comptroller in the Division of Operations. I wrote to him telling him that I thought it would be necessary for us to appear before the House committee. He replied as follows [reading]:

"I took the matter up through Mr. Soleau with Mr. Shields, the clerk of the committee, who confirmed the original statement that I made to you.

"However, it now transpires that it is quite possible that the sundry civil bill, in which the appropriation was included for your service, may not become a law until after July 1. In this event the portion of the appropriation that was made available prior to June 30 might not become effective. It is therefore suggested that upon your arrival here Thursday you take up with the Senate Committee on Appropriations the proposition of including in a deficiency bill or an urgent deficiency bill now before them the amount of the deficit that will occur in your operations up to June 30 next."

The money has been spent. It has been borrowed, a portion of it, from another fund provided for another purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEW in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of State," on page 21, after line 5, to strike out:

For additional employees in the Department of State, $20,000: *Provided*, That not more than six persons shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding $1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Foreign intercourse," on page 21, line 14, after "1919," to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$100,000"; so as to make the clause read:

United States consulate: For contingent expenses of United States consulates, including the same objects specified under this head in the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 18, after "1919," to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$200,000," so as to make the clause read.

Foreign missions: For contingent expenses of foreign missions, including the same objects specified under this head in the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, $200,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah, if he will be kind enough to answer me, if in one of the former appropriation bills provision was not made for these enlarged expenditures of the State Department owing to the war?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to my colleague that the regular appropriations were made in the Diplomatic appropriation bill for this service; but it now develops in the hearing that the $50,000 allowed by the House was not sufficient for the United States consulates, and that the $100,000 was not enough for foreign missions. The House thought it was, but the hearing before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on the appropriation bill convinced the subcommittee that they required the $100,000 and the $200,000, respectively. I will say that I am not a member of that subcommittee now.

Mr. KING. My recollection is that when we were considering the appropriation bill of last year, the demands of the State Department for the Consular Service were rather large and were responded to by the Senate; and my recollection is that in the appropriation bill for this year the large demands were pretty generally acceded to by the Senate. I am surprised at these large deficits, in view of the very liberal appropriations which were made in the regular appropriation bills for 1918 and for 1919.

Mr. WARREN. I was somewhat surprised myself, and very much disposed to ignore those calls, but inasmuch as a thorough examination developed that they have followed since the time we appropriated, and have been increasing instead of decreasing, it seems to me that to cut this out now, or to cut out part of it, means that we shall have it in the next bill; and it was the intention of the subcommittee to cover this and put an end to this matter of coming in with these deficiencies. Of course, as the Senator knows, one of the ways to avoid these deficiencies hereafter is, if we can ascertain what absolutely must be expended, to give them that money and close the account.

I have here some letters that have come up to me from the Secretary of State; and if the Senator wishes them read, they were such as to convince the subcommittee handling the bill that those amounts ought to go in.

Mr. KING. I will not ask the Senator to put them in the RECORD or to read them; but if he can answer this one question it will be satisfactory to me: Are these increased amounts for the services of additional employees in the department or for additional consular agents abroad?

Mr. WARREN. No; nothing of that kind. So far as the employees are concerned, it means that they would have to be furloughed immediately, and that they have already rendered a part of this service. As to these other matters, as the Senator knows, the business of the State Department is largely with foreign countries, and is done by telegraphing and cabling, because the other countries nearby all communicate with each other by wire, and this country would be at a great disadvantage in every way if it did not adopt the same system; and, as the Senator knows, the expense of transmitting messages by wire his greatly increased, and that has largely entered into this contingency.

One of these items is for the relief and protection of American seamen. That means that where an American seaman is cast away somewhere and is picked up and taken care of, under the law, we have to cover the expense. The Senator would not, of course, like to leave accounts of that kind open.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, I was not alluding to that item at all. I was alluding to the item on line 14, page 21, where $100,000 has been allowed for contingent expenses of United States consulates.

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. KING. Then, on line 18, $200,000 has been allowed for foreign missions.

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. KING. That does not refer to the question of shipwrecked sailors.

Mr. WARREN. No.

Mr. KING. I was not challenging attention to the item last mentioned by the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. But in these contingent funds, what I have said about the wire and other expenses as well applies—that they have been greater than was expected when the appropriations were made.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I should like to ask what the term "foreign missions" comprehends. If the members of the committee have had that item explained to them perhaps it would be wise for us to understand what the term "foreign missions" covers. Are they special missions sent to foreign countries or are they standing foreign missions?

Mr. WARREN. As the Senator knows, we have embassies, legations, and agencies; and the terms that they may apply there are not, of course, part of the expense in any way. Does the Senator desire the reading of the letters?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I did not mean to take the time of the Senate or to annoy the Senator. I wondered whether the term "foreign missions," as used here, included something more than the embassies and legations. Does it include special missions that are appointed to visit a country to undertake a special line of negotiation? For instance, we notice by the newspaper dispatches that during the peace conference at Paris all the countries, ourselves included, have been sending missions to Poland, missions to Roumania, to Czechoslovakia, and to Serbia. We have a mission now, I think, in Constantinople. They are appointed by the President to fill a temporary need, and I was wondering whether they were covered under this language.

Mr. WARREN. May I read to the Senator the original appropriation which this follows? The title is:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, FOREIGN MISSIONS.

To enable the President to provide, at the public expense, all such stationery, blanks, records, and other books, seals, presses, flags, and signs as he shall think necessary for the several embassies and legations in the transaction of their business, and also for rent, repairs, postage, telegrams, furniture, typewriters, including exchange of same, messenger service, compensation of kavasses, guards, dragomans, and porters, including compensation of interpreters, and the compensation of dispatch agents at London, New York, San Francisco, and New Orleans, and for traveling and miscellaneous expenses of embassies and legations, and for printing in the Department of State, and for loss on bills of exchange to and from embassies and legations, and payment in advance of subscriptions for newspapers (foreign and domestic) under this appropriation is hereby authorized.

It is a separation of money that is expended by the Department of State and, of course, includes the embassies and legations, which seems to take in those agencies in addition. Of course, I will say to the Senator the language is not the language of the committee. It is the language that is presented by the Department of State and indorsed by the House, and comes to us in that form.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; but you see, Mr. President, the significant thing is that the item is doubled, and I was wondering if one of the reasons for doubling it was the existence of these special foreign missions during the last six months, as contrasted with the permanent foreign missions. In listening to the reading of that statute, I imagine that it is confined largely to taking care of the contingent expenses of permanent foreign missions; but the paragraph does not read that way. It reads:

For contingent expenses of foreign missions, including the same objects specified under this head in the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919.

Mr. WARREN. Which I have just read.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; but it includes that and anything else under the term "foreign missions." Of course, some day the bill must be paid for the temporary foreign missions which we have now, I imagine, all over Europe during the progress of these peace negotiations, and I am merely endeavoring to ascertain whether those are being handled under an entirely separate account of which we have not had a view or whether, step by step, we are appropriating for them under this item.

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that the members of the committee had before them at the last session an estimate of $5,000,000 for this foreign service, which they ignored.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask if a similar estimate has been sent to the committee at this session?

Mr. WARREN. We have not seen it yet. It may be on the House side. We have not received it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Did the State Department indicate to the committee at all in the course of the hearings, or the committee's examination of these items, how the expenses of our foreign missions of a special or temporary character are now being met?

Mr. WARREN. We had Mr. Carr before us and, so far as he is concerned, he alluded to these matters. Of course, he wanted more than the amount granted.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have no doubt of that.

Mr. WARREN. He wanted somewhat more than that, but it was finally concluded that he could work through until the first of the month with these appropriations. As I have said, quite the larger amount of this is owing to the increased cost of various matters. For instance, in their telegraph bill I remember just one item. I have forgotten how long a space of time it covered, but it was a matter of over $1,000,000 for cabling.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not criticizing the amount of money appropriated in this item. I was trying to locate exactly where it goes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 22, after the words "Philippine Islands," to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$60,000," so as to make the clause read:

For relief and protection of American seamen in foreign countries and in the Panama Canal Zone, and shipwrecked American seamen in the Territory of Alaska, in the Hawaiian Islands, Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands, $60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Treasury Department," on page 22, after line 1, to strike out:

OFFICE OF CHIEF CLERK AND SUPERINTENDENT.

Arlington Building and Annex: For equipment of the Arlington Building and Annex, including rugs and carpets, awnings, window shades and carriers, window ventilators, and bottle water coolers, $15,000, to continue available during the fiscal year 1920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 7, to strike out:

Treasury Department Annex, Pennsylvania Avenue and Madison Place: For equipment of the building, including rugs and carpets, awnings, window shades, window ventilators, and bottle water coolers, $3,000, to continue available during the fiscal year 1920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 12, to strike out:

Treasury Department Annex, Fourteenth and B Streets NW.: For the following employees for care and maintenance of the building during the fiscal year 1920, at annual rates of compensation as follows: Carpenter, $1,200; plumber, $1,200; plumber's helper, $1,000; electrician, $1,200; wireman, $900; 3 mechanics, at $900 each; captain of the watch, $1,400; 2 lieutenants of the watch, at $900 each; 31 watchmen, at $720 each; janitor, $1,200; assistant janitor, $1,000; head of char force, $660; 2 assistant heads of char force, at $480 each; 120 charwomen, at $240 each; 12 male laborers, at $660 each; 4 female laborers, at $660 each; in all, $76,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 23, to strike out:

For heating, electric current, electrical equipment, ice, removal of trash, repairs, equipment, and miscellaneous expenses, fiscal year 1920, $33,548.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 3, to strike out:

Darby Building: For heating, electric current, electrical equipment, ice, and miscellaneous items, fiscal year 1920, $6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses," on page 23, after line 19, to strike out:

For rent of the Navy Annex Building on New York Avenue near Eighteenth Street NW., fiscal year 1920, $40,000; and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to accept from the Secretary of the Navy the long-term lease entered into by the Secretary of the Navy with the owners of the building known as the Navy Annex, located on New York Avenue near Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 7, to strike out:

OFFICE OF THE TREASURER.

For amount required to increase the compensation of 26 expert counters, provided in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, from $720 to $900 each, $4,680.

National currency (reimbursable): For the following employees from July 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, inclusive, at annual rates of compensation as follows:

Assistant tellers—1 $2,200, 1 $2,000; clerks—4 of class 4, 4 of class 3, 4 of class 2; expert counters—20 at $1,100 each, 30 at $900 each; 3 messengers at $840 each; messenger boy, $480; in all, $75,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Health Service," on page 27, after line 18, to insert:

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to acquire and complete immediately the hospital at Broadview, Cook County, Ill., authorized and appropriated for by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanitarium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines," approved March 3, 1919 (Public act No. 326, 65th Cong.).

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would like to inquire of the Senator having charge of the bill what hearings, if any, were had regarding the propriety of purchasing this hospital, or rather the necessity for its purchase by an amendment to this bill. My reason for asking the question is that I have understood the Secretary of the Treasury and the Bureau of Health have been confronted with a great many conditions that were not at all satisfactory in regard to the hospital and that to take the unfinished building over, especially in its present condition, would be to saddle a very considerable burden upon the Treasury which it ought not to bear. In other words, the reason for the failure of the Secretary of the Treasury to act under the bill which we passed last February or early in March was not due to a lack of desire to secure these quarters, but to the terms which were imposed upon the Government by accepting the building in its present condition.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, there is a rather long story connected with the matter, but the committee had the Secretary of the Treasury before its subcommittee, and he testified, I will not say at great length but at considerable length, and not exactly along the line of what has been stated, but rather that he had not had the time to give this hospital, which under the bill required his approval, the attention it required; that it had come to him as he was just starting out on a campaign for the victory loan; that just before he went away he had asked for certain papers to take with him; that he asked the War Department to state why the contract which had been signed by those officers of the Army failed to receive the O. K. of the Secretary, and he also asked for information from the Public Health Service; that he learned from the Secretary of War that the War Department had ceased to function in the matter, because all these hospitals were to go over to the Public Health Service; that the Surgeon General of the Health Service and his senior assistants had examined this property and that the reports were somewhat conflicting; that he had one report that it had been unanimously approved and another that it was three to two, and stated that the three to two was the latest report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend for a moment. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 120) to repeal chapter 154 of the act of the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, being the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, or marine cable or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I realize the importance of concluding the appropriation bill, and I ask unanimous consent temporarily to lay aside the unfinished business. In connection with that, however, I give notice that I expect to go on with it just as soon as the appropriation bill is completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Wyoming will proceed.

Mr. WARREN. I will state to the Senator from Colorado that half an hour or an hour after the Secretary had left us he returned to say that he was mistaken or had overlooked the fact that there had been a late meeting of the Health Service officials with the Surgeon General and others who had later examined the property and who had approved it unanimously.

Mr. THOMAS. That is perfectly satisfactory to me. I do not care to have any further explanation.

Mr. KING. I should like to make an inquiry. I understand the Secretary of the Treasury has discretion for the completion of that building.

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. KING. Why should he be directed to immediately proceed with the construction of it? The Secretary of the Treasury, empowered and authorized, as he is, to construct the building, certainly would not abuse the discretion which is placed upon him. If the building is necessary, I see no reason why there should be such a direction. I see no reason why he should be directed to proceed immediately.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield in order that I may make a brief statement? This whole subject matter was fully investigated by a committee of the Senate during the last session, and a provision was reported in a bill which passed the Senate unanimously after the subject was discussed for almost an entire day. That provision required the Secretary to acquire the Speedway site and building. In conference, however, a modified provision was adopted which directed the Secretary to take over this project subject to a general proviso authorizing him to reject any project specified in the act if he found it was to the interest of the Government to do so. The emergency nature of this hospital project is admitted.

According to the evidence before the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and according to the investigations of three authorities in the War Department on different occasions, this is the best hospital project that has ever been submitted to the Government during the war. It is both the cheapest per bed and the best. In addition to that, it is a modern, up-to-date, fireproof hospital and the only one that is available.

Conditions in the Chicago district where this hospital is located make it imperative that this question should be promptly determined. Every authority that has investigated it, and it has been investigated over and over again, has reported not only favorably but urged its adoption.

The act was passed March 3, last. Several months have gone by and the service has suffered by reason of failure to determine this question. The Secretary of the Treasury has been a very busy man and has not finally disposed of the matter.

There was in the War Department at one time opposition to the project, but the opposition, to say the least of it, is not justified. The Secretary of the Treasury indicated at one time that he felt that Congress should have legislated emphatically rather than to have given him discretion. He has made no objection to the proposition. He at one time suggested that perhaps Congress should legislate affirmatively and that he felt, under the discretion vested in him, that it is his duty to make an independent and thorough investigation, and that investigation has not been completed.

Considering the emergency nature of the subject, the number of times it has been investigated, the conclusive evidence establishing it to be for the best interest of the Government and of the service, I express the hope that the provision will be adopted speedily.

Mr WARREN. On line 23, page 47, the word "sanatarium" is quoted from the law, but it should be "sanatorium."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TRAMMELL in the chair). Without objection, that amendment to the amendment of the committee will be made.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 2, to insert:

The last paragraph of section 6 of the "Act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines," approved March 3, 1919, is hereby amended to read as follows: The sum of $1,500,000 is hereby authorized to be held as an emergency fund for the purchase of land and the erection thereon of buildings or for the purchase of land and buildings, and the remodeling thereof, suitable for hospital and sanatoria purposes, which the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to select and locate for the uses of the United States Public Health Service, if in his judgment the emergency requires it.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 14, to insert:

BONDS OF CREW OF UNITED STATES SHIP "SAN DIEGO."

Any Liberty loan bonds belonging to an officer or member of the crew of the United States ship *San Diego*, and which were in possession of the owner on board said vessel on the 19th day of July, 1918, when such vessel was sunk off the coast of Long Island, N. Y., and which shall be shown to have been at that time lost beyond recovery, are hereby declared to have been wholly destroyed, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to issue duplicates of such bonds in conformity with the provisions of the Revised Statutes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "War Department," subhead "Contingent expenses," on page 29, after line 2, to insert:

For purchase of professional and scientific books, law books, including their exchange, and so forth, including the same objects specified under this head in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, $252,258.14.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 10, to strike out:

For rent of buildings in the District of Columbia for the use of the War Department, $1,978.72.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ordnance Department," on page 29, line 23, after the word "been," to strike out "agreed upon by the War Department and the claimants" and insert "determined by the Secretary of War," so as to make the clause read:

For the payment of the claims for damage to and loss of private property occasioned by the explosions and fire at the plant of T. A. Gillespie Co., at Morgan, N. J., which have been determined by the Secretary of War, and in amounts not exceeding those which are enumerated and scheduled in House document No. 1735, parts 2 and 3, of the Sixty-fifth Congress, third session, $852,106.49.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 2, to insert:

For the payment of the claims for damage to and loss of private property occasioned by the explosions and fire at the plant of the T. A. Gillespie Co., at Morgan, N. J., which have been determined by the Secretary of War from claims submitted by the sufferers and in amounts not exceeding those which are enumerated and scheduled in the final report of the Secretary of War under date of May 31, 1919, in Senate Document No. —, Sixty-sixth Congress, first session, and shown therein as schedules "A," "B," "C," "D," and "I," $463,392.08.

Mr. WARREN. I move to fill the blank after "numbered," in line 10, by inserting "31."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 12, to insert:

The disbursing authority in paying amounts appropriated herein, or amounts heretofore or hereafter appropriated by Congress for the payment of claims for damage to and loss of private property occasioned by the explosions and fire at the plant of the T. A. Gillespie Co., at Morgan, N. J., is hereby directed to make such reductions as is found necessary by any errors or omissions on submission of further evidence.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers," on page 32, line 8, after the word "hospital," to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$3,000," so as to make the clause read:

For hospital, $3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 10, after the words "In all," to strike out "$24,000" and insert "$25,000," so as to make the clause read:

In all, $25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 11, after the word "household," to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$26,000," so as to make the clause read:

Western Branch, Leavenworth, Kans.: For household, $26,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 12, to insert:

For current expenses, $2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 14, after the word "hospital," to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$6,000," so as to make the clause read:

For hospital, $6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 15, after the words "in all," to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$34,000," so as to make the clause read:

In all, $34,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 19, after the word "hospital," to strike out "$8,000" and insert "$9,000," so as to make the clause read:

For hospital, $9,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 20, after the words "in all," to strike out "$22,000" and insert "$23,000," so as to make the clause read:

In all, $23,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 14, after the word "Soldiers," to strike out "$128,558.62" and insert "$134,558.62," so as to make the clause read:

In all, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, $134,558.62: *Provided*, That no part of the foregoing appropriations shall be expended for any purpose at any branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers that maintains or permits to be maintained on its premises a bar, canteen, or other place where beer, wine, or other intoxicating liquors are sold.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "State, War, and Navy Department Buildings," at the top of page 34, to strike out:

Temporary office buildings: For employees during the fiscal year 1920 at annual rates of compensation as follows, for the maintenance and protection of the temporary office buildings known as War Trade Building, between B and C Streets and Twentieth and Twenty-first Streets NW.; Food Administration Building No. 1, between Eighteenth and Nineteenth Streets and C and D Streets NW.; Food Administration Building No. 2, between New York Avenue and D Street and Nineteenth and Twentieth Streets NW.; Council of National Defense Building, on Eighteenth Street between C and D Streets NW.; Fuel Administration Buildings Nos. 1 and 2, bounded by Virginia Avenue, Eighteenth and C Streets NW.; Fuel Administration Building No. 3, on D Street,

between Twentieth and Twenty-first Streets NW.; H. L. Pettus Building, on Nineteenth Street, between Virginia Avenue and D Street NW.; Archie Butt Building, 1725 New York Avenue NW.; and Corcoran Courts Building, on New York Avenue, between Seventeenth and Eighteenth Streets NW.: Assistant superintendent, $2,000; principal clerk, $2,000; clerks—1 of class 3, 1 of class 2, 3 of class 1; 2 messengers, at $840 each; chief electrician, $1,600; electricians—1 $1,400, 4 at $1,200 each; foreman, $1,600; carpenters—1 $1,400, 5 at $1,200 each; plumbers—1 $1,400, 3 at $1,200 each; steam fitter, $1,400; sign writer, $1,400; painters—3 at $1,200 each, 1 $1,000; 8 general mechanics at $1,000 each; assistant engineers—1 $1,400, 3 at $1,200 each; 18 firemen at $840 each; 11 coal passers at $700 each; guards—captain $1,600, 3 lieutenants at $1,080 each, 18 sergeants at $900 each, 167 privates at $780 each; fire marshal, $1,200; foreman of laborers, $1,000; assistant foremen of laborers—2 at $840 each, 9 at $720 each; 84 laborers at $660 each; 6 attendants at $480 each; laborers and charwomen, $97,020; in all, $394,520.

For fuel, lights, repairs, ground rent, miscellaneous items, and printing, fiscal year 1920, $102,798.75: *Provided*, That the care, maintenance, and protection of the above buildings shall be under the supervision and control of the superintendent of the State, War, and Navy Department Buildings.

State, War, and Navy Building: For an assistant to the superintendent, fiscal year 1920, $3,600.

Potomac Park Office Buildings: For the following additional employees for the maintenance and protection of the buildings during the fiscal year 1920, at annual rates of compensation as follows: Foreman, $1,400; 2 assistant foremen, at $960 each; 9 assistant foremen or forewomen, at $780 each; laborers and charwomen, $184,140; in all, $194,480.

For cleaning material and supplies, fiscal year 1920, $19,308.

Mall office buildings: For the following additional employees for the maintenance and protection of the buildings during the fiscal year 1920, at annual rates of compensation as follows: Foreman, $1,400; 2 assistant foremen, at $960 each; 14 assistant foremen or forewomen, at $780 each; laborers and charwomen, $118,140; in all, $132,380.

For cleaning material and supplies, fiscal year 1920, $11,814.

Temporary office building (Eighteenth Street and Virginia Avenue NW.): For the following additional employees for the maintenance and protection of the buildings during the fiscal year 1920, at annual rates of compensation as follows: Assistant foreman or forewoman, $780; laborers and charwomen, $9,900; in all, $10,680.

For cleaning materials and supplies, fiscal year 1920, $1,068.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the chairman of the committee that this morning I had my attention called to this provision striking out all of pages 34 and 35 and down to and including line 20, on page 36. I sincerely hope that the amendment of the committee will be disagreed to, and for this reason: I find after a careful inquiry as to the buildings provided for here that they contain an area of 1,193,901 square feet, and if we do not provide for these temporary buildings they can not be occupied. The Public Buildings Committee have already decided that these temporary buildings are not going to be removed as long as we are leasing buildings in the District of Columbia. Therefore we will have to not only use every square foot of space in these buildings as they are used to-day, but we are going to make the employees who are already there use less space and move other departments or employees of our Government into these same buildings.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. The committee realized that this or a similar appropriation must be made; but these are appropriations for 1920, and my conception of the proper way to handle it—and I hoped that the Senate might agree to it—would be to incorporate it in the urgent deficiency bill or the sundry civil bill, which will come in time to cover this matter. There is no intention on the part of the committee of withholding the proper sum for this purpose, but the committee believed the other is the better way, and certainly we did not have the knowledge which the Senator from Utah has now given us about a survey of the buildings. We found that there had been changes continuously, and that a week or two later consultation on the part of the House and Senate would develop its great value and we would be able to put it in better form than it is here. There is no objection at all to making these appropriations in the proper way and at the proper time. If this is the proper time, there is no objection.

Mr. SMOOT. I think it is the proper time, and for the reason that it ought to be made in a deficiency bill rather than in the sundry civil bill, because it rightly belonged in the legislative bill, but for reasons that we thought good at that time they were not put in, because we thought these temporary buildings were going to be taken away. But that plan, Mr. President, I think I can say with positiveness, will not be followed.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask a question of the Senator?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. Will there not be sufficient space in these temporary buildings to justify our surrendering a good many of the leases?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that within the next day or two we will have a complete survey of every building there is in the District of Columbia owned by the Government. We are going to ascertain the exact space per square foot in every one of those buildings and have a diagram showing where they are located, and showing the number of employees in every one of those buildings.

Let me call the attention of the Senate to the fact that there are bureaus in this Government to-day that have 487 square feet for every employee, while all that is necessary or all that is claimed by anyone as necessary is 65 square feet.

Mr. POMERENE. May I inquire what bureaus they are?

Mr. SMOOT. I want to make a complete report with reference to that at a later time, but I will say now one is the Food or Fuel Administration. I am going to lay the whole survey before the Senate just as quickly as we can get it completed, and that will be within a very short time.

Outside of one or two of the bureaus and departments of this Government, every one of them has more space than is absolutely necessary, and we are going to see if many of the leases can be canceled, but we want to cancel every lease in the District of Columbia and we want to see all the employees of the Government housed in buildings owned by the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator's survey reveal the number of people who are employed in the various buildings and in the various bureaus? For instance, take the Food Department. Will it show how many are employed in that department?

Mr. SMOOT. It will show how many were employed on the 1st day of May. Of course, we can not bring it further down than that, but it will show the number of persons in every building, no matter what department, working on the 1st day of May, and the area in square feet which they are occupying in those buildings.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it the Senator's personal work?

Mr. SMOOT. No; it is not my personal work, but I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that I will guarantee that it is right before I report it to the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad the Senator is undertaking it, and I hope it will soon come into the Senate.

Mr. POMERENE. I hope the survey will go further, and show how many hours some of these employees are at work.

Mr. SMOOT. That is a very good suggestion, although we have no authority to do that, I will say to the Senator. My opinion is that it would be a splendid thing not only for the employees but for the Government. Since I made the statement to one or two newspaper boys, with no idea of having it published, that I thought we ought to see that there are at least one-third of all the employees of the Government discharged and that the other two-thirds would do their work better without the one-third who would be discharged, I have received hundreds of letters from employees of the Government in which they say "the statement is without question correct, and if they would only give us the work to do"—and the letters generally come from the older employees—"we would see that the work was done and could be done just as well, if not better, with one-third of the employees discharged who are now in the employment of the Government."

Mr. POMERENE. I desire to say in connection with what has been said by the Senator from Utah that just the other day I learned of one of the bureaus or departments in which additional employees were being moved while those who were there at the time did not have enough to occupy them half of the time.

Mr. WARREN. As I have already stated, Mr. President, the committee has expected in due course of time to make this provision. My colleagues on the committee will agree with me that technically it is in no sense a deficiency.

Mr. SMOOT. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. Secondly, in no sense should we take it up in a deficiency bill as a matter of example for the future. I understand the circumstances. My honored colleague, with others, has made this survey which I dare say will be another evidence of his thoroughness of work. I am perfectly willing at this time to allow these 1920 matters to go in, knowing as I do that they must be correct with this additional testimony, but I must beg my colleague to try with me to prevent these things in the first place from being deficiencies, and, second, not to undertake to have deficiencies for something that has not yet occurred or for time that has not yet elapsed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Naval Establishment," subhead "Bureau of Construction and Repair," on page 39, line 8, after the words "sum of," to strike out "$900,000" and insert "$1,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

The limitation specified in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919 on expenditures for draftsmen and other technical services from the appropriation "Construction and repair of vessels" is increased by the sum of $1,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under subhead "Public buildings," on page 40, after line 1, to insert:

Capitol Buildings: For work at the Capitol and for general repairs thereof, including cleaning and repairing works of art, flags for the east and west fronts of the center of the Capitol and for Senate and House Office Buildings; flagstaffs, halyards, and tackle; wages of mechanics and laborers; purchase, maintenance, and driving of motor-propelled, passenger-carrying office vehicles; and not exceeding $100 for the purchase of technical and necessary reference books and city directory, $5,000; to be available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 10, to insert:

Maltby Building: For an additional amount to convert the building known as the Maltby Building into suitable condition for office purposes, said work and expenditures hereunder to be under the supervision and direction of the Superintendent of the United States Capitol Buildings and Grounds, to be available until expended, $4,400.

Mr. WARREN. On line 15 the word "Buildings" should be in the singular.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that change will be made.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the chairman of the committee tell us what is proposed to be done with the Maltby Building?

Mr. WARREN. It is now being used for a Government purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is occupied by the Vocational Board?

Mr. WARREN. Yes. The Superintendent of Buildings, Mr. Elliott Woods, appeared before the committee with reference to that matter. It appears he was instructed to prepare it for a certain number, I think 200, and he says he is now required to make additional repairs in order to make it ready for four or five hundred additional employees. I think the building, whatever may become of it, will be useful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 16, to insert:

Courthouse, District of Columbia: For reconstruction and furnishing of the courthouse, District of Columbia, including material and labor, and for each and every item incident thereto, to be expended under the direction of the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds, to be available until expended, $57,000, one-half to be paid out of the Treasury and one-half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 11, to insert:

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL.

For support, clothing, and treatment in St. Elizabeths Hospital of the insane from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, inmates of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, persons charged with or convicted of crimes against the United States who are insane, all persons who have become insane since their entry into the military and naval service of the United States, civilians in the quartermaster's service of the Army, persons transferred from the Canal Zone, who have been admitted to the hospital and who are indigent, including purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent, purchasing agent, and general hospital business, not exceeding $1,500; not to exceed $45,240 for adjustment of compensation of employees, $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 9, to insert:

BUREAU OF EDUCATION.

Relief of sufferers in Alaska: To enable the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion and under his direction, with the advice and cooperation of the Public Health Service, to combat the influenza in Alaska and to afford relief to the indigent natives thereof, including expenses already incurred for this purpose, $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "United States Courts," on page 43, after line 6, to insert:

For salary of the additional district judge for the northern district of Texas, at the rate of $7,500 per annum from March 14 to June 30, 1919, $2,229.17.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Post Office Department," subhead "Contingent expenses," on page 46, line 25, after the date "1918, to strike out "$5,500" and insert "$6,934.67," so as to make the clause read:

For amount required during the fiscal year 1919 to meet the increased cost of envelopes in accordance with the adjustment made by the Postmaster General under section 4 of the Post Office appropriation act approved July 2, 1918, $6,934.67.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Postal Service," subhead "Office of the Third Assistant Postmaster General," on page 48, line 24, after the date "1919," to strike out "$474,500" and insert "$691,493.45," so as to make the clause read:

For 1919, $691,493.45.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Commerce," on page 50, after line 8, to strike out:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

Field expenses: For surveys and necessary resurveys of the Atlantic and Gulf coasts of the United States, including the coasts of outlying islands under the jurisdiction of the United States, $7,500.

For surveys and necessary resurveys of coasts on the Pacific Ocean under the jurisdiction of the United States, $7,500.

Office expenses: For the purchase of new instruments, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, $24,000, to continue available during the fiscal year 1920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, under subhead "Bureau of Fisheries," on page 51, after line 3, to strike out:

For an additional amount for the purchase or construction of a wooden power lighter for use at the Pribilof Islands, and for equipment thereof, $7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under subhead "Miscellaneous," on page 51, after line 14, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of Labor, during the remainder of the fiscal year 1919, to maintain the present organization established under appropriations contained in the sundry civil appropriation act approved July 1, 1918, for the furnishing of information and the rendering of assistance to wage earners throughout the United States during the present emergency, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, per diem in lieu of subsistence at not exceeding $4, traveling expenses, rental, and maintenance of quarters in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, heat and light, telegraph and telephone service, supplies and equipment, and printing and binding, $272,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 10, after the word "binding," to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$26,393.11," so as to make the clause read:

To enable the Secretary of Labor, during the remainder of the fiscal year 1919, to carry on the work of mediation and conciliation in labor disputes, including personal services and rent in the District of Columbia and in the field, per diem in lieu of subsistence not to exceed $4, traveling expenses, law books, books of reference, periodicals, newspapers, supplies and equipment, contingent and miscellaneous expenses, and printing and binding, $26,393.11.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Housing for war needs," page 52, line 24, after the words "sum of," to strike out "$40,000,000" and insert "$32,500,000 and all other sums," and, on page 53, line 4, after the word "act," to insert:

Provided, That all revenues on hand June 30, 1919, and all revenues derived thereafter from the exercise of the authority contained in the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to provide housing for war needs," approved May 16, 1918, as amended by the deficiency appropriation act approved June 4, 1918, including revenues from rentals, the operation of properties, the disposal of properties, the repayments of loans, and the interest on loans, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. And the proper authority shall submit to Congress detailed estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for each fiscal year thereafter so long as the said act remains in effect, for personal services and all other expenses required in the District of Columbia and elsewhere to provide for the care, rental, maintenance, and operation of properties as authorized by law.

So as to make the clause read:

The sum of $32,500,000 and all other sums of the unexpended balance of the appropriations heretofore made for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to provide housing for war needs," approved May 16, 1918, shall be covered into the Treasury immediately upon the passage of this act: *Provided*, That all revenues on hand June 30, 1919, and all revenues derived thereafter from the exercise of the authority contained in the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to provide housing for war needs," approved May 16, 1918, as amended by the deficiency appropriation act approved June 4, 1918, including revenues from rentals, the operation of properties, the disposal of properties, the repayments of loans, and the interest on loans, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. And the proper authority shall submit to Congress detailed estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for each fiscal year thereafter so long as the said act remains in effect, for personal services and all other expenses required in the District of Columbia and elsewhere to provide for the care, rental, maintenance, and operation of properties as authorized by law.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the chairman of the committee explain this item of $32,500,000 for housing on account of war needs after the war is over?

Mr. WARREN. This is not an appropriation. It is going to put money back into the Treasury. It was determined to turn back $40,000,000, but on evidence before the committee it seemed there was not $40,000,000, and consequently we put it at $32,500,000, or whatever it may be, because they might refuse to turn back any of a stated sum of exactly $40,000,000 when they had but $32,500,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. What has become of the difference between the $32,500,000 and the $40,000,000?

Mr. WARREN. They say that there was a mistake made in the information which the House had.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Legislative," on page 54, after line 5, to strike out:

Legislative drafting service: For salaries and expenses of maintenance of the legislative drafting service as authorized by section 1303 of the "Revenue act of 1918," the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1919 is reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1920, together with the further sum of $20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, after line 11, to insert:

SENATE.

For compensation of officers, clerks, messengers, and others:

For assistance to Senators who are not chairmen of committees, as follows:

Five clerks, at $2,000 each per annum, from March 4 to June 30, 1919; five assistant clerks, at $1,200 each per annum, from March 4 to June 30, 1919; five messengers, at $1,200 each per annum, from March 4 to June 30, 1919, to be paid from the appropriation for assistance to Senators provided for the fiscal year 1919.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, after line 22, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay from the appropriation for 1919 for compensation of officers, clerks, assistant clerks, and messengers to Senators not chairmen of committees, to wit:

John J. McAllister, jr., for services rendered as clerk to Hon. GEORGE H. MOSES, Senator from the State of New Hampshire, from November 6, 1918, to November 21, 1918, at the rate of $2,000 per annum and additional compensation at the rate of $120 per annum;

J. Rutledge McGhee, for services rendered as clerk to Hon. W. P. Pollock, Senator from the State of South Carolina, from November 6, 1918, to December 1, 1918, at the rate of $2,000 per annum and additional compensation at the rate of $120 per annum;

Cornelia W. Morton, for services rendered as clerk to Hon. CHARLES L. MCNARY, from November 6, 1918, to December 9, 1918, at the rate of $2,000 per annum and additional compensation at the rate of $120 per annum;

Aline Thompson, for services rendered as assistant clerk to Hon. CHARLES L. MCNARY, from November 6, 1918, to December 9, 1918, at the rate of $1,200 per annum and additional compensation at the rate of $120 per annum; and

Helen K. Kiefer, for services rendered as messenger to Hon. CHARLES L. MCNARY, from November 6, 1918, to December 9, 1918, at the rate of $1,200 per annum and additional compensation at the rate of $120 per annum.

To pay Susan Shoemaker for services rendered as additional clerk to Hon. CHARLES L. MCNARY, from November 6, 1918, to December 9, 1918, $113.33.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question. There are certain provisions on pages 54, 55, and 56 with reference to the pay of Senators' clerks. There were some new clerks who were authorized at the last session and some additional increases.

Mr. WARREN. Those are all covered in a lump-sum appropriation further on.

Mr. POMERENE. So that the entire situation is met by this bill?

Mr. WARREN. Yes; it is.

Mr. POMERENE. Very well.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 56, after line 3, to insert:

To reimburse the official reporters of the proceedings and debates of the Senate for clerical expenses actually and necessarily incurred from July 1, 1918, to May 31, 1919, $5,475.52.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, after line 7, to insert:

For maintaining, exchanging, and equipping motor vehicles for carrying the mails, and for official use of the offices of the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, $1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, after line 11, to insert:

To pay Dennis M. Kerr for extra and expert services rendered to the Committee on Pensions during the third session of the Sixty-fifth Congress as assistant clerk to said committee, by detail from the Bureau of Pensions, $1,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, after line 15, to insert:

For the Capitol: For repairs, improvements, equipment, and supplies for Senate kitchens and restaurants, Capitol Building and Senate Office Building, including personal and other services, to be expended by the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds, under the supervision of the Committee on Rules, United States Senate, $4,500, to be available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, after line 22, to insert:

The balance of the appropriation made in the sundry civil act approved March 4, 1911, "To provide suitable transportation for freight and other purposes in the subway leading from the Capitol to the Senate and House Office Buildings," is hereby made available for the improvement and maintenance of the subway transportation system in the Senate subway.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, after line 4, to insert:

The unexpended balance of the appropriation for refrigerating apparatus for the Senate and House wings of the Capitol and Senate and House Office Buildings, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, including the cooling of the air supplied to the Senate Chamber and the Hall of the House, completion of the ice-water plants in the Senate and House Office Buildings, for labor, materials, and personal services, made in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1912, is hereby made available, to provide at all times an equable temperature and a sufficient supply of pure fresh air for the Senate Chamber, together with the additional sum of $42,000 for said purposes, including labor, materials, and personal services, which is hereby appropriated, to be available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations as to the appropriations on pages 56 and 57. Are the appropriations under which the bathrooms are carried, in the Senate Office Building, embraced in those items? What does the appropriation for that purpose come under?

Mr. WARREN. They are not embraced in those appropriations. I am not able to tell the Senator under what sum they are supported. I think the mere act of opening them requires no expense. I understand they were opened before the close of the last session of Congress. I only have that information as a passer-by. I know nothing whatever of the circumstances.

Mr. KENYON. It was heralded in the newspapers, Mr. President, that the first act of the Republicans coming into power was to open marble bathrooms in the Senate Office Building. Upon inquiry I found that that was done by the Democrats through their Committee on Rules before its membership was changed. So, in order to keep the record straight, I hope it may be known that the "unwashed Democracy," and not the Republicans, opened the marble bathrooms.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I want to plead guilty to the proposition which the Senator from Iowa has just stated about opening these bathrooms, and I want to give the condition.

In the first place, the "unwashed Democracy" did not build these marble bathrooms which were modeled after the days of Cæsar, but they were built by the Senator's side of the Chamber. However, being built and being in the building and not being used, the bathrooms being locked up, and considering the crowded condition of boarding houses and places where the clerks at the Capitol had to live, they found it difficult to get access to bathrooms. Therefore the committee opened them to the extent of having somebody turn on the water and furnish the clerks with towels. So I am sure that the "unwashed Democracy" was taken care of in a very proper way.

Mr. KENYON. That is good, if that is actually what happened.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is really the case.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator say now that the clerks are permitted to go into those luxurious marble bathrooms and have their baths? If so, I am going to withhold my opposition.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know what has happened during the last few weeks because I have never been in those marble bathrooms. I understand they are magnificent. But having been built magnificently there is no reason why they should be shut up. You might as well turn on the spigot for a clerk in a magnificent palace, if it is there, as if you had a hydrant out in the yard.

Mr. KENYON. I agree with the Senator, but I want to ask a question. Can the clerks go to these bathrooms? Have they the privileges of these baths?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand that is the fact. It was so when they were opened by the Rules Committee under the Democrats.

Mr. KENYON. I thought the Democratic Party was entitled to be congratulated on closing those bathrooms at the time they came into power. I am sorry that they erred.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me ask the Senator is not his objection to these baths the fact that a Senator may possibly use one of them; that he is perfectly satisfied provided the populace in general could use these baths, so long as Senators should be excluded from them? Is that the Senator's position?

Mr. KENYON. No; my position is that public money should not be expended for bathing Senators any more than for clothing them or giving them cigars or shaving them.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not know but what the Senator is correct; but we strain sometimes at that sort of a gnat and at the same time we swallow a great many expensive camels without a single protest.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 57, after line 18, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay from the appropriation for clerks and messengers to committees for the fiscal year 1919, to Don C. Clayton, for services rendered as clerk to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department, from October 25 to 27, 1918, both inclusive, at the rate of $2,220 per annum and additional compensation at the rate of $120 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 58, to insert:

For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate, including compensation to stenographers to committees, at such rate as may be fixed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, but not exceeding $1 per printed page, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, after line 5, to insert:

That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to transfer without charge to the Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate such motor equipment as is suitable to the needs of the Senate, and which is no longer required for the use of the War Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, after line 10, to insert:

For fuel, oil, cotton waste, and advertising, exclusive of labor, $500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, after line 12, to insert:

For purchase of furniture for refitting 10 rooms in the Senate terrace for occupancy by Senate committees and Senators, fiscal years 1919 and 1920, $20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, after line 16, to insert:

Senate Office Building: Toward the construction of the fireproof building for committee rooms and offices for the United States Senate, provided for in the sundry civil act approved April 28, 1904, fiscal years 1919 and 1920, $2,500, said sum to be expended by the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds under the supervision of the Committee on Rules, United States Senate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I want to propound a query to the Senator having charge of this bill, which I have asked on one or two similar occasions, regarding the Senate Office Building. This provision appropriates $2,500 toward the construction of a fireproof building for committee rooms and offices for the Senate, and so forth. That building is uncompleted. I think the Senate took possession of it something like 12 or 13 years ago. The steps, for example, leading from the street to the doorway at the lower end of the building constitute one of the few uncompleted portions of the structure. I have never been able to understand why that building was not completed. It has been once or twice said that there is a provision in the original bill, or somewhere in the statutes, which keeps the present manager of the building in control until it is completed. Whether that be true or not, it is a singular circumstance that the building itself remains in an uncompleted state. There should be some rational explanation of the facts. This is an inquiry to which I have never received a satisfactory reply.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] has been on the Committee on Appropriations for a great many years. He is perhaps as familiar as is any Member of this body with the history not only of that building but of many others which have been erected in the interval and which have been fully completed, and he may perhaps be able to give us some information.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I take it that the Senator's inquiry is mainly directed to the wooden staircase down near the northwestern corner of the building.

Mr. THOMAS. I mention that as the most striking feature of the uncompleted part of the building; but what is true of that is also true of a number of other entrances.

Mr. WARREN. Would the Senator mention some of the more important ones?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, the exit from the wing farthest from this building at the lower end is incomplete. There are two exits there, and they are both practically barred up. Then there is one to the court, which I think is on the first floor, possibly upon the second floor; but there are a number of little matters which ought not to cost very much and which I think ought to be completed.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, there was some hesitation about the stairways. The stairway most used, the one directly opposite the Capitol Building, was found to be very dangerous in winter. Men have been blown off there, and several Senators have received quite severe bruises. It has been necessary at times, as the Senator knows, to put up a false wooden stairway. At one time there was objection to finishing the entrance at the northwestern corner by those Senators who occupy the part of the building nearest those northwest steps. I understand, unless there is some objection offered, that the Superintendent of the Capitol expects to have in the sundry civil bill certain sums to cover that and other improvements which may be made from time to time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator why it is necessary to have a separate office as superintendent of that building? Why can not the Superintendent of the Capitol Building also look after the very small duties that are incumbent upon the superintendent of that building?

Mr. WARREN. As the Senator from Tennessee knows, there is but one Superintendent of the Capitol Building—Mr. Elliott Woods.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is my understanding. How does it happen that the superintendent of that building—whose name is Werner, I believe, a good German name, of course—is kept as the superintendent of the building?

Mr. WARREN. I think the Senator from Tennessee will agree that there should be some responsible person there to see that the employees are at their stations and that the building is properly cleaned and cared for.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why can not Mr. Woods have that done? He has ample time, and, as I understand, Mr. Werner is kept there simply as superintendent of the uncompleted building. That is a fiction, of course.

Mr. WARREN. So far as Elliott Woods is concerned, I might say to the Senator that Elliott Woods does not have time to attend to those duties which we have imposed on him. He was the architect as well as the superintendent of these structures. He is the architect of the courthouse used by the appelate court, and he is the architect in charge now of the old courthouse building.

Mr. McKELLAR. But why should he have charge of any buildings except just this one?

Mr. WARREN. He does have charge of them all. You may call Mr. Werner a superintendent or foreman or chief of employees, but he is a subordinate.

Mr. McKELLAR. My understanding is that he is an independent superintendent——

Mr. WARREN. Not at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. That he is kept on as the superintendent of an incomplete building.

Mr. WARREN. The fact that there are certain portions of the building not completed has nothing to do with his duties. He would be there just the same if the building was entirely completed.

Mr. McKELLAR. It would make no difference, then, so far as he is concerned?

Mr. WARREN. I think it would be exactly the same.

Mr. McKELLAR. What is the superintendent of that building paid?

Mr. WARREN. I am not certain; I should have to look it up; but it is not a large sum.

Mr. McKELLAR. This $2,500 is a small sum, relatively speaking, but what is it to be used for?

Mr. WARREN. It is desired to divide up a number of rooms for the accommodation of the Senate and Senators, and in other cases to make suites. It has been found necessary to make entrances from one suite of rooms into another or into one of the larger rooms; and there is now an order, for instance, to move the stationery rooms from the Capitol Building to the Office Building, which would require the buying of some new shelves and adding to the old ones and otherwise properly fitting up the quarters.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is there any other appropriation out of which that is ordinarily done?

Mr. WARREN. I know of none.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is the only appropriation?

Mr. WARREN. I think so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Government Printing Office," on page 61, line 19, before the name "Joseph De Fontes," to insert "and"; in line 20, before the word "messengers," to strike out "and Charles C. Allen"; and in line 22, after the words "in all," to strike out "$2,800" and insert "$2,100," so as to make the clause read:

To pay Samuel Robinson, William Madden, and Joseph De Fontes, messengers on night duty during the Sixty-fifth Congress, third session, for extra services, $700 each; in all $2,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 64, to insert:

JUDGMENTS, COURT OF CLAIMS.

For payment of the judgments rendered by the Court of Claims and reported to Congress during the present session in Senate Document No. 12, namely:

Under the War Department, $5,618.36;
Under the Navy Department, $5,039.18;
Under the Interior Department, $123.78;
Under the Post Office Department, $208,694.94;
In all, $219,476.26.

None of the judgments contained herein shall be paid until the right of appeal shall have expired.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, after line 22, to insert:

AUDITED CLAIMS.

SEC. 4. That for the payment of the following claims certified to be due by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874, and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1916 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884, as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 18, reported to Congress at its present session, there is appropriated as follows:

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

For collecting the revenue from customs, $3.84.
For freight, transportation, etc., Public Health Service, $60.57.
For field investigations of public health, $377.69.
For collecting the income tax, $67.50.
For miscellaneous expenses, Internal Revenue Service, $85.77.
For refunding internal-revenue collections, $10.
For refunding taxes illegally collected, $163,177.50.
For redemption of stamps, $1,756.92.
For payment of judgments against internal-revenue officers, $127,730.01.
For allowance or drawback, internal revenue, $49.66.
For Coast Guard, $4.52.
For operating supplies for public buildings, $15.61.
For furniture and repairs of same for public buildings, $2.85.
For repairs and preservation of public buildings, $103.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

For pay, etc., of the Army, $2,510.76.
For extra-duty pay to enlisted men as clerks, etc., at Army division and department headquarters, $833.25.
For supplies, services, and transportation, Quartermaster Corps, $184.80.
For transportation of the Army and its supplies, $1,186.20.
For barracks and quarters, $325.
For medical and hospital department, $50.
For disposition of remains of officers, soldiers, and civil employees, $4.76.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE NAVY DEPARTMENT.

For pay, Marine Corps, $486.64.
For ordnance and ordnance stores, Bureau of Ordnance, $8.93.
For pay of the Navy, $366.44.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

For contingent expenses, Department of the Interior, 1918, $4,130.86.
For contingent expenses, Department of the Interior, $9.
For library, Department of the Interior, 1917, 74 cents.
For Capitol Building and repairs, 1917 and 1918, $1,772.92.
For education of natives of Alaska, 1917 and 1918, $3,240.01.
For restoration of lands in forest reserves, $28.25.
For surveying the public lands, $3.33.
For investigating mine accidents, $80.91.
For books and publications, Bureau of Mines, $38.38.
For fees of examining surgeons, pensions, $8.
For suppressing liquor traffic among Indians, 1918, $13.27.
For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1918, $15,492.73.
For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1917, $220.62.
For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 80 cents.
For telegraphing and telephoning, Indian Service, 1918, $59.41.
For Indian school and agency buildings, $130.50.
For Indian school, Fort Mojave, Ariz., repairs and improvements, 1918, $63.80.
For irrigation, Colorado River Reservation, Ariz. (reimbursable), $873.43.
For water supply, Papago Indian villages, Arizona, 1918, $17.76.
For support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, $28.
For Indian school, Kickapoo Reservation, Kans., repairs and improvements, 1918, $127.42.
For Indian school, Lawrence, Kans., repairs and improvements, 1918, $16.44.
For support of Indians of Klamath Agency, Oreg., 1918, $3.20.
For Indian school, Carlisle, Pa., $308.83.
For Indian school, Carlisle, Pa., heating plant, $3.50.
For support of Sioux of different tribes, subsistence and civilization, South Dakota, $37.
For Indian school, Pierre, S. Dak., boilers and stack, 1919, 35 cents.
For Indian school, Hayward, Wis., repairs and improvements, 1918, $7.50.
For Indian school, Tomah, Wis., 1918, $50.
For Indian school, Tomah, Wis., repairs and improvements, 1918, $69.34.
For Indian school, Shoshone Reservation, Wyo., repairs and improvements, 1918, $31.33.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE STATE AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS.

For salaries and expenses, War Trade Board, 1918, $38.38.
For transportation of diplomatic and consular officers, 1917, $1,507.71.
For contingent expenses, foreign missions, 1917, $15,970.75.
For salaries, Consular Service, $634.32.
For contingent expenses, United States consulates, $529.69.
For contingent expenses, United States consulates, 1918, $13,146.72.
For relief and protection of American seamen, 1918, $3,549.81.
For International Bureau of Weights and Measures, $2,521.01.
For miscellaneous expenses, Supreme Court, District of Columbia, 1919, $1,157.74.
For general expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry, 81 cents.
For general expenses, Bureau of Plant Industry, 65 cents.
For enforcement of the food and drugs act, 60 cents.
For general expenses, Bureau of Entomology, 67 cents.
For general expenses, Bureau of Biological Survey, 23 cents.
For general expenses, Bureau of Biological Survey, 1918, $260.34.
For general expenses, Bureau of Crop Estimates, 71 cents.
For general expenses, States Relations Service, $2.20.
For agricultural experiment station, Alaska, receipts from sale of products, $36.91.
For general expenses, Office of Public Roads and Rural Engineering, 49 cents.
For general expenses, Office of Markets and Rural Organization, $1.15.
For general expenses, enforcement of the insecticide act, $225.43.
For enforcement of wireless communication laws, 1918, 35 cents.
For investigation of railway materials, Bureau of Standards, $28.97.
For equipment, Bureau of Standards, $80.
For general expenses, Lighthouse Service, $174.37.
For protecting seal and salmon fisheries of Alaska, 1917, $299.13.
For expenses of regulating immigration, $235.82.
For contingent expenses, Department of Commerce and Labor, 20 cents.
For salaries, fees, and expenses of marshals, United States courts, 1918, $642.96.
For salaries, fees, and expenses of marshals, United States courts, $19.70.
For salaries and expenses of district attorneys, United States courts, 1918, $1,975.31.
For fees of clerks, United States courts, 1918, $3,280.63.
For fees of commissioners, United States courts, 1918, $908.60.
For fees of commissioners, United States courts, 1917, $49.55.
For fees of commissioners, United States courts, $125.70.
For fees of jurors, United States courts, 1918, $43.50.
For fees of jurors, United States courts, $3.
For fees of witnesses, United States courts, $12.60.
For miscellaneous expenses, United States courts, $25.
For support of prisoners, United States courts, 1918, $2,950.22.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

For indemnities, domestic mail, $48.88.
For shipment of supplies, $3.17.
For freight on stamped paper and mail bags, 36 cents.
For railway post-office car service, $432.69.
For compensation to postmasters, $46.24.
For clerks, first and second class post offices, $50.
For city delivery, incidental expenses, $12.75.
For railway mail service, salaries, $6.06.
For watchmen, messengers, and laborers in post offices, $5.81.
For rural delivery service, $520.97.
Total, audited claims, section 4, $377,838.71.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, line 15, to change the number of the section from 4 to 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 14, to change the number of the section from 5 to 6, and in line 24, after the word "communicating," to insert "to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or," so as to make the clause read:

SEC. 6. That hereafter no part of the money appropriated by this or any other act shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers and employees of the United States from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, line 14, to change the number of the section from 6 to 7.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to come in as a new section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 8. That no limitation contained in section 7 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920 shall deprive mechanics, laborers, and workmen employed at the arsenals or navy yards of the $240 increase provided therein by reason of their having received during the fiscal years 1919 or 1920 an increase at a rate in excess of $200 per annum, unless such increase amounts in the aggregate for the fiscal years 1919 or 1920, respectively, to over $200.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I shall have to make a point of order against that amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I hope the Senator will reserve the point of order.

Mr. WARREN. I shall reserve the point of order for the present.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, during the fiscal year 1918 Congress provided for an increase in the compensation of Government employees of from 5 to 10 per cent, depending upon the salary received. For the fiscal year 1919 this was replaced by a lump-sum bonus of $120 per annum. The result was that the compensation of some of those who were getting the benefit of the 5 and 10 per cent increase was in fact reduced. Then, for the year ending June 30, 1920, we have provided a bonus of $240, but there was a limitation attached to the effect that if during the year 1919 or 1920 any employee shall have received an increase of salary at the rate of $200 he shall not have the benefit of the $240 bonus. The language in that respect is substantially the same as when we made provision for the $120 bonus. The effect of that is illustrated by what actually happened in some of the navy yards of the country. On the 1st of July, 1918, the employees received a basic increase in pay of 8 cents a day. Then, I think about the 1st of November, they received an increase——

Mr. KING. Does the Senator mean 8 cents an hour or 8 cents a day?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think it was a per diem increase. Then, about the 1st of November they received an increase of 56 cents, making a total increase of 64 cents. As a matter of fact, the actual increase which they received during that year on account of these increases amounted, I think, to $137 and some cents, or under $200; but if they had received this increase for each day in the year it would have amounted to $200.32, or 32 cents more than the $200, and therefore they could not get the benefit of the $240 bonus. In other words, according to the holding of the department, if they received an increase at the rate of $200 a year, although during the year they actually received only an increase of from $50 to $75, they are not entitled to the benefit of the $240 bonus.

The effect of my amendment is simply to provide that if the aggregate increase in the year does not exceed $200, then the employee shall get the advantage of the $240 bonus. I think that was really the intention of Congress when this legislation was passed. A provision similar to my amendment was inserted in the last legislative appropriation bill, but went out in conference. Then, at the close of the last session of Congress we put it on the deficiency bill as the committee reported it; but the deficiency bill did not pass. I think it is a simple matter of justice to some of the employees in the navy yards and in the arsenals. They are the only ones who are affected by it.

It was suggested in the committee, and has since been suggested outside, that they may get the benefit of the $240 increase by stopping work, by quitting their jobs after they had obtained an increase up to, say, $180. That may be true; but they will not do it.

The language of the law applies to Government clerks just the same as it does to employees in the navy yards and arsenals, but we have not heard of Government clerks quitting in order to get the benefit of the bonus, inasmuch as if they would continue to the end of the year they would not get the benefit of it because of increased salary. So that I do not think there is any force in that suggestion. It seems to me that this is simply an act of justice to employees in the navy yards and the arsenals. I understand that, as a matter of fact, in all of those places, except one or two, the employees have been given the benefit of the bonus, but on account of the construction placed upon the provision by some one a discrimination has been worked against some of the employees.

Mr. KING. When would this become operative?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It would become operative on the 1st of July.

Mr. KING. As I understand, the bonus is not paid monthly, but is paid at the end of the year, so that——

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think it is paid monthly.

Mr. WARREN. It is paid monthly.

Mr. KING. I was not advised of that fact.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think it is, but I may be mistaken.

Mr. KING. Of course, if it is not paid until the end of the year, then there would be no necessity for any legislation, assuming the conditions which the Senator suggests to be correct, until a year from now.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think the bonus is paid in monthly installments. The $240 begins to be paid from the beginning of the fiscal year.

Mr. KING. Can the Senator find any reason why heretofore in conference a provision similar to that which he has just offered to this bill was eliminated from the bill?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; I was not on the conference, and I do not know what the special reasons were.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think that this is new legislation that ought to be considered as an independent bill, rather than being attached as a rider to a general appropriation bill?

Mr. JONES of Washington. There is no question that the point of order is good. It is legislation on an appropriation bill, but the law which it is intended to change will begin to operate on the 1st of July, and if we do not get the legislation through now it will be too late, for even if we secured it in the future I am sure it would not be made retroactive; so that this is the time, it seems to me, for us to take care of it.

That is all I can say. I hope the Senator in charge of the bill will feel justified in not insisting upon the point of order. I know that the subcommittee reported against it and that the full committee did not put it on. I think it was not put on, however, because they did not fully understand the circumstances. I know the embarrassing position in which it places the chairman of the committee, and probably, if he should not make the point of order, other amendments might be offered; but I hope that he will feel justified in not insisting upon it in this instance.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I think I ought to say before renewing the point of order, on which I certainly shall insist, that we have two classes of employees in the Government. One class receives statutory salaries, paid on an annual basis, on a scale which has prevailed for the last 30 or 40 years, namely, clerk of class 1, $1,200; clerk of class 2, $1,400; clerk of class 3, $1,600; clerk of class 4, $1,800. It has been found necessary, or has seemed wise, during the rise in prices incident to war times to increase this basic pay, and consequently, after a great deal of study on the part of the House, and later on the part of the committee of the Senate, there was approximately $120 per annum added for the fiscal year 1918 to the pay of all clerks receiving up to and including a certain amount. As I recall, the original increase was 10 per cent to those who were not receiving in excess of $1,200 a year and 5 per cent to those receiving more than $1,200 a year but not more than $1,800 a year, amounting to practically $120. The 1919 provision was a bonus of $120 to all clerks receiving not more than $2,500 per annum. This year we again took up the matter and undertook to provide for that class of employees by granting a bonus of $240 a year, or $20 a month, for the fiscal year 1920.

We have another class of employees, namely, those working under commissions and in the various bureaus that were organized during the war, which make their own prices, fix their own salaries, taking my clerks and the clerks of other Senators away from us by offering them great advances in pay. Requests are coming in now from these various bureaus and commissions to give their employees the benefit of the $240 bonus, where they in some cases receive anywhere from 25 to 50 per cent more compensation than the statutory-roll employees receive. I have here a suggested amendment covering, with one exception, all the employees of the Government that are not included on the statutory roll.

So, Mr. President, I feel it necessary to make the point of order, which is that the amendment proposes to add a new item of appropriation which has not been estimated for by any department; that it has not been proposed by a standing committee, but has been refused by the subcommittee and refused by the full committee; and that it is new legislation on an appropriation bill. I make that point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts in the chair). The Chair sustains the point of order under Rule XVI.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, it is necessary for me at 3 o'clock to attend a meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs. Before I go I wish to ask unanimous consent to present an amendment to the pending bill, that it lie upon the table until it can be reached in regular order, and I ask that I may be notified when that comes about.

Mr. McKELLAR. The bill is about to be passed.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let me ask the chairman of the committee what is the status of the bill?

Mr. WARREN. It is now open to amendment, the committee amendments having been completed.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Very well. I offer the amendment now. I did not realize that the reading of the bill had been completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. That the accounting officers of the Treasury be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to reopen and adjust the claims of the State of New York for which appropriation was made by the act of Congress approved February 27, 1906, on the basis of the claims of Pennsylvania and Delaware, with the same force and effect as though appropriations therefor had not been made and accepted by said State.

Mr. KING. I do not know what that amendment is or the scope or extent of it. If the Senator will submit a word or two in explanation, I am sure it will be gratifying to Senators other than myself.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This matter is one which has been pending for some time, in one form or another, before the Congress. It seems that in the settlement of claims made by several of the States arising out of advances of money made to the Federal Government in the War of 1812, two different theories have been used by the Auditor for the Treasury Department. It seems that in the settlement of one set of claims, under a certain ruling of the Auditor for the Treasury Department, the claim of the State of New York was settled and payment was made to the State. I think that was approximately in the year 1906. A short time after that the Auditor for the Treasury Department changed his ruling, which involved a considerable change in the method of computing the original claims. Two

of the States—and they were the only two remaining at that time—had their claims audited under this new ruling of the auditor. Those two States were Pennsylvania and Delaware.

The State of New York, according to my information, is the only State which can possibly request legislation of this sort. The State of New York has believed, and its State administration has upon occasion asserted its belief, that its claim should be settled upon the same basis as the claims of other States, and the same method of computation used in arriving at the settlement. This amendment is to authorize the Auditor for the Treasury Department to reopen and readjust the claim of the State of New York upon the same principles and the same theories as has been done with other States.

Mr. POMERENE. What is the amount of this claim?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not know that I can give the Senator an accurate estimate of the difference which might be paid to the State under a reopened and readjusted claim. My information is that it could not exceed $100,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, do I understand that these are claims of the hoary age of more than 100 years?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They would seem to be of about that age. As a matter of fact, they were not settled until 1906, and they have not been settled upon an equitable basis as between the States, and the State of New York merely asks that it be treated like the others.

Mr. KING. Do the claims arise out of the appropriation by the Federal Government of property belonging to individuals, or out of advances made by the States to the Federal Government during the War of 1812?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Advances made by the States; and I may assure the Senator that interest does not run to date.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator know why there has been such a long delay in the settlement of claims of this character? It seems to me the statute of limitations ought to be successfully pleaded, or at least the laches of the State, in a claim that is more than $100,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I could not tell the Senator. I was not here during that century. I know they were settled in 1906.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, perhaps I can enlighten the Senator on that point. In these days of red tape it takes about 100 years for any claim to be considered; and even then, in nine cases out of ten, it is considered unfavorably.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The States pressed for the settlement of the claims for many, many years; and the Auditor or Comptroller of the Treasury Department apparently got mixed up in his method of computation, and the one State left to suffer under that method of computation was the poor State of New York.

Mr. KING. It seems to me that States that failed to press their claims for so long a time ought not to receive any consideration. Unquestionably this is new legislation; but I shall leave it to the chairman of the committee, exercising that wise discretion which he exhibits on all occasions, to insist upon the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 64, after line 11, it is proposed to insert the following:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Walston H. Brown, sole surviving partner of the firm of Brown, Howard & Co., the sum of $65,792.53, and to the Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co. the sum of $26,400.30, these being the amounts severally found due the said Walston H. Brown & Co. and the Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co. by the Court of Claims and transmitted to Congress on the 7th day of February, 1914.

Mr. MOSES obtained the floor.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Hampshire will excuse me just a moment, I know the claim. The bill has passed each House of Congress at one session or another, but never both Houses during the same session. Of course it is a claim, and under the rules could not be put in an appropriation bill. It can be offered by unanimous consent, of course. The chairman does not feel that on an offer of this kind it is necessary to object, but will let the Senate consider the matter as it thinks best.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. That the second paragraph of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes," be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"The provisions of this section shall not apply to the following: Employees paid from the postal revenues and sums which may be advanced from the Treasury to meet deficiencies in the postal revenues; employees of the Panama Canal on the Canal Zone; employees of the Alaskan Engineering Commission in Alaska; employees paid from lump-sum appropriations in bureaus, divisions, commissions, or any other governmental agencies or employments created by law since January 1, 1916, except the civilian employees of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and of the office of the Alien Property Custodian; employees whose duties require only a portion of their time, except charwomen, who shall be included; employees whose services are utilized for brief periods at intervals; persons employed by or through corporations, firms, or individuals acting for or on behalf of or as agents of the United States or any department or independent establishment of the Government of the United States in connection with construction work or the operation of plants; employees who receive a part of their pay from any outside sources under cooperative arrangements with the Government of the United States or the District of Columbia; employees who serve voluntarily or receive only a nominal compensation; and employees who may be provided with special allowances because of their service in foreign countries. The provisions of this section shall not apply to employees of the railroads, express companies, telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems taken over by the United States, and nothing contained herein shall be deemed a recognition of the employees of such railroads, express companies, telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems as employees of the United States."

SEC. 2. That the additional compensation provided for in said section 7 of said act as amended shall be paid to the civil employees of the office of the Alien Property Custodian at the full rate provided in said section from and after the 30th day of June, 1918, and so much as may be necessary to pay said additional compensation to said employees from said 30th day of June, 1918, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I make the point of order against the amendment. It is legislation of several kinds. It never has been estimated for. It has not been presented by any standing committee. It is legislation which appropriates large amounts of money in addition to what has been estimated by the department.

Mr. McKELLAR. Unquestionably, Mr. President, the amendment is subject to a point of order. The purpose of it is just to put all the employees on the same basis so far as bonuses are concerned. It is subject to a point of order, without doubt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if I may be pardoned, I think it ought to be stated, emphasizing what the Senator from Wyoming has said, that the employees who are receiving compensation under statutory provisions which fixed their compensation years ago, and there has been no particular augmentation in their salaries for many, many years, ought not to be put in the same class as the employees in these new bureaus and these new agencies where they have received compensation higher than the statutory compensation. I think it would be manifestly unjust to put them in the same class.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I was out of the Chamber when the Senate passed on the amendment providing for the appropriation of $2,400,000 to pay a deficit in the so-called recruiting service. Perhaps it is too late to give it further consideration. I am not prepared to move a reconsideration, because I have not sufficient facts; but I do want to point out to the Senate at this time the statement of Mr. Howard, representing that bureau, as far as I can analyze it, in which he says, on page 93, that the class now consists of 825 sailors or men being taught the work of the merchant-marine sailor. There are 825 men in the class, and there is a deficit of $2,400,000.

While I appreciate that this does not include all the things that would come under consideration, just that one thought would mean that those men are costing the Goverment approximately $3,000 each for their education. It seems to me it might be better for us to consider paying some type of bonus or subsidy to get men to prepare themselves for the merchant-marine service, if my analysis of this very brief statement is correct.

In addition to the deficit of $2,400,000, it is admitted here that an appropriation of $6,250,000 has already been expended for the same purpose. I do not know how many men have been turned out. This service has only been in operation for nine months, and I presume it is a four or five months' course, so I assume there has not been a very large class turned out, and it does seem to me a very unusual and expensive appropriation for a very necessary service.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I have been detained from the Chamber, and have had no opportunity to pay the attention to the bill that I ought to have paid. I am a member

of the Committee on Appropriations, but failed to receive the notice that was sent me at the time the committee had it under investigation; but it was no fault either of the clerk or of the chairman of the committee that I did not receive the notice, for it was sent to my apartments instead of to my office, and was not handed to me in time for me to know anything about it.

I see on page 58, line 13, the following:

For purchase of furniture for refitting 10 rooms in the Senate terrace for occupancy by Senate committees and Senators, fiscal years 1919 and 1920, $20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

I wish to add an amendment to that, and I do not think it ought to meet any opposition from any Member of the Senate. The body is very nearly equally divided.

I have an infirmity, well known to my friends, that prevents me from reaching the Senate Chamber from my office in the Senate Office Building, on a call of the yeas and nays, in time to respond. We all know how much time we are compelled to spend in our Senate Office Building rooms, or in our private rooms, when we have no chairmanship of a committee that carries with it a room in the Capitol. I think it is better, not only for this hour but for the coming hour, that those rooms that are to be occupied by individual Senators should be equally divided between the minority and the majority of the Senate at the time, leaving the present rule untouched as to the disposition of these rooms; for we often find, aside from the mere question of seniority, that Senators, no matter what may be their infirmities or necessities, have no chance, no opportunity, to secure a room near the Senate Chamber.

I have been turned out from a room that has been occupied for a long time by the minority of the Senate, and I am not complaining. It was occupied by Senator Bacon the whole time he was here, and before him other Democrats had occupied it. It was assigned to me. It was very inconvenient in a way, having to go through the Document Room of the Senate in order to get to it, and when the Senate is not in session I have to carry more keys than the Secretary of the Treasury in order to get into your own room. Yet that was assigned to me, never having been assigned before to anybody as far as the record shows and my knowledge goes; but that was one of the rooms which the Democrats, in order of seniority, had to take if they got any. It was selected by my friend Senator OVERMAN, of North Carolina, who is entitled to one of these rooms.

I see, in walking through the corridors, the chairmen of great committees who have rooms half as big as this, who still have private rooms near the Senate Chamber, very convenient, very necessary to men who can not get to their offices and back in time for a roll call. Now, it seems to me that we might at least put in this bill a provision that when those rooms are fixed up they shall go to the minority and to the majority in equal proportions.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether these rooms are now occupied.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. They are not. They are being fitted up for occupancy. They used to be occupied, for I remember that in my days in the House I found that Senator Blackburn was down there, Senator OVERMAN himself was there, Senator SMOOT was there, and many of the older Senators now here; and I take this public occasion to thank the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] for his great kindness in permitting me to occupy the room for the business that I had to transact during the sessions of the Senate.

Now, Mr. President, I move——

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I greatly sympathize with what the Senator has just said; but I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that, under the rules, of course, the Committee on Rules has the disposition of the rooms. If this provision is allowed to pass as it is and the minority Members of this body call the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] to the matter, I have not any doubt but that satisfactory arrangements will be made. I say this simply because if it becomes a provision of law those rooms will virtually have to be separated from all the other rooms hereafter, and it may work a hardship for either side that may be in the majority; but I do believe that if the Senator will call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Rules to the fact that these rooms are to be fitted up he will take a special interest in it and will do what is absolutely just.

I really hope the Senator will not offer an amendment on the subject to this bill, because it will hereafter apply to the rooms, no matter what may come or what changes may be made.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I always receive with great attention any suggestion made to me by the Senator from Utah. I have reason to feel that way about it, and it appeals to me; but I want a Senate resolution, then, if possible. I do not want to put it in a crystallized law. That is a suggestion that strikes me favorably; but I should be glad if we could get a Senate resolution through this body saying that that shall be done. If it is done, either by Senate resolution or by law, my service in this body not being as long as that of other men, and not wanting to put myself forward as a claimant for any favor to which a man of older service is entitled, I would not feel like appealing even to the Senator from Pennsylvania to take me out of the rule; but I would concede that any Senator had the right above me, no matter whether I could get over here or not or whether I had one leg or two. But that does not matter. There ought to be a fair division of these rooms, no matter who is in the majority; and any Senator who has a great committee, and a suite of two or three rooms in connection with it, ought, as a matter of common right and justice to other Senators, to surrender any private room he happens to have in the Capitol Building and use one of the rooms attached to his great committee for his private use. It seems to me that suggestion would appeal as a matter of propriety to Senators, without any action upon the part of the Senate to enforce it, even if it were inclined to do so.

In answer to the suggestion of the Senator from Utah, I see the propriety and the force of it, and I will not offer the amendment that I had intended to offer; but I give notice that I will introduce a resolution to that effect, and I hope to have not only the concurrence of the Committee on Appropriations but the concurrence of the sense of fairness upon the part of Senators to have it pass in a resolution that the Senate afterwards can control at its pleasure.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, word has just been received from the department by the chairman of the committee of a correction that should be made on line 13, page 49. It seems that in the House text here the appropriation is made for the year 1919, when it should be 1918. I ask unanimous consent to reconsider and insert "1918" in place of "1919" at that point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What page is that?

Mr. WARREN. Page 49, line 13.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What is the amendment proposed to the House text?

Mr. WARREN. To erase "1919" and put in "1918."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 49, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "1919" and to insert in lieu thereof "1918."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee why this deficiency was not discovered prior to this time, so that in the last deficiency appropriation bill it could have been added?

Mr. WARREN. There was a long document here on the subject; but oftentimes things of that kind occur. In fact, I presume this bill has some matters in it relating to the year 1916. The adjudication of the accounts sometimes develops something of this nature at a later time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, during the reading of the bill I invited the attention of the chairman of the committee to a provision found on page 9, containing an appropriation of $4,000 for the District of Columbia. I should like to ask the chairman or some member of the committee to make an explanation respecting that item.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, when the deficiency bill was up before, the District Commissioners asked for an item of $7,500 to cover that deficiency. That bill failed to pass, and the commissioners reduced expenses as far as they could; but they now have an actual deficiency of $4,000, and they have simply asked for the actual amount needed to meet that deficiency. I might state to the Senator that in order to meet the expenses they have taken $4,000 out of the street and walks fund, which I think they had a right to do; but, of course, it should be replaced, and I hope the Senator will not object to the item.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not any instructions have been given or any measure has been recommended to curtail, if not the extravagance of the officials of the city, at least their predilection to exceed the amounts appropriated and their predilection to come in and secure additional appropriations?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator asked that question. The District Commissioners are not the only ones who are guilty of filing estimates far below the amount required for the year, and coming in at the end of the year with large deficiency estimates. I hope the chairman of the committee will serve notice upon the heads of the various departments that they must put in the original estimates what they need and that the next time a deficiency bill comes up, unless they have asked for what they really need in the regular estimates, their request for a deficiency appropriation will be disallowed. I am going to ask the chairman either to give that

notice or to indorse what I have said on the subject. I have charge of two bills, and the departments which send in the estimates for those two bills are going to be notified by me that they must send in for the regular appropriation bills estimates of the amounts they will actually need.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit an inquiry? Is it not the fact, however, that they do send in what they conceive to be required for the operation of their bureau or department for the year, but they become lax and extravagant and, by reason of their extravagance and their laxity and the failure to observe the proper methods and the proper administration and executive methods, exceed the amount which has been appropriated?

Mr. CURTIS. My experience on the Appropriations Committee leads me to believe that the statement by the Senator is partly true; but they go further. I think some of the heads estimate for less amounts than they know they will need, because they want to cut down in the original appropriation bill the amount given to their department to make a good showing, knowing that the last two or three months of the fiscal year they can come in with a deficit and show that there is really that much needed and that there will be an appropriation made to cover it. I think that is an additional reason for sending in an estimate for an amount less than they know will really be needed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further amendments, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE CONTROL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 120) to repeal chapter 154 of the act of the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, being the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

Mr. CURTIS. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to me a moment, that I may ask to have read a telegram explaining the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa on behalf of the committee.

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., *June 9, 1919.*

Hon. CHARLES CURTIS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Owing to the crisis existing in affairs of telephone companies throughout the Nation, resulting principally from increase in wage scales, this commission favors the immediate return of wire systems to their owners and that local exchange rates inaugurated by the Government continue the legal rates for a period of at least 90 days, thereby giving State commissions time to investigate and authorize fair rates for said service, which by reason of its character is purely intrastate service.

JOHN M. KINKEL, *Chairman.*

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I merely desire to finish in a very brief way the suggestion I was making last night when the bill was temporarily laid aside.

I explained as fully as I thought necessary the purposes and the effect of the bill now before the Senate, together with the amendment which has been proposed by the committee. I think it is due to the Postmaster General to incorporate in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter which I received from him on the day following the order, which the newspapers of the country construed as an order releasing the wire systems from Federal control. I do not criticize the newspapers, because I think their mistake was due largely to a heading put upon the announcement in the office of the Postmaster General; but I have this letter from him upon this subject, and I read it because I think it is desirable to remove a false impression which may exist throughout the country upon the subject. The letter is addressed to me and reads as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., June 6, 1919.

Hon. ALBERT B. CUMMINS,
Chairman Committee on Interstate Commerce,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: An order issued by me yesterday relative to the operation of the telegraph and telephone systems has been construed by some as actual return of the properties to the owners. No such action has been taken by me, nor is any contemplated. This order simply dissolves the operating board appointed by me under date of December 13, 1918, and directs that the systems be again operated by the regular operating officials under Government supervision. Responsibility of the Government to these systems in no wise ceases. It being evident that these properties are to be returned in the very near future, it was necessary for the Postmaster General to take steps immediately to set up the regular operating organization of the companies so that when the properties are turned back it can be done without confusion or interruption to the service, which was the purpose of the order. This order in no wise affects the legislation pending before your committee or before the Congress. It will enable the companies to begin steps immediately to prepare the data and collect their information to be submitted to the State commissions for the rate cases, which will probably be taken up immediately after the period of Government control ends.

I am attaching copies of the order and statement made by me at the time same was issued.

Sincerely, yours, A. S. BURLESON.

I read this simply to indicate that there was no purpose on the part of the Postmaster General to anticipate or prevent the legislation which was pending before our committee and before Congress.

In addressing myself to the subject yesterday I referred to the order of December 13, 1918, Bulletin No. 22, which increased the toll charges in the companies throughout the country, and I also referred to a statement that had been furnished to me by the Postmaster General giving the names of the several companies whose exchange rates had been either increased or approved by the Postmaster General. I thought I requested that these papers should be printed as a part of my remarks yesterday, but I find that I omitted it, and I now ask that the statements and order be printed as a part of my observations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Original order.]

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE SERVICE—BULLETIN NO. 22.

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
ORDER NO. 2495. *Washington, December 13, 1918.*

There are many counties and districts in which a free toll service is granted the subscriber within such county or district, the exchange rates presumably having been made with a view to such free toll service. This order shall not be construed as requiring a discontinuance of these privileges pending a study and revision of these exchange rates.

Nothing in this order establishing toll rates shall be construed as changing rates made without reference to mileage now established for service within a certain county or other area when such rates are not in excess of 10 cents, but no further rates of this character shall be established without specific approval of the Postmaster General.

In competitive situations where the earning value of a property under Federal control would be unfavorably affected by the establishment of rates and charges herein ordered, an exception may be made by filing with the Postmaster General a statement to that effect with a proposal of modification from ordered rates and such modifications may go into effect unless vetoed or otherwise ordered by the Postmaster General within 30 days, and during such 30 days existing rates may be continued.

I. CLASSIFICATION OF TOLL TELEPHONE SERVICE.

The following classes of telephone toll message service shall be established effective at 12.01 a. m., January 21, 1919.

1. Station-to-station messages.—This service shall be defined by the following conditions:

(a) Orders for station-to-station service shall specify the telephone station called, either by telephone number or by the name of the subscriber of the called station.

(b) Under this classification orders will not be accepted to establish communication between particular persons.

(c) The measurement of the duration of a station-to-station message for purposes of the application of rates shall begin at the moment when telephonic communication is established between the called and the calling stations. The term "station" for the purpose of this clause is defined to include a private branch exchange switchboard operator, in those cases where private branch exchange systems are involved in station-to-station service.

(d) Station-to-station service may be operated as a number service, in which case the called station may be designated only by number, through A and B switchboards or through tandem operators, etc.; or it may be operated through toll switchboards, and technically known as an "AY" service, depending on the local circumstances as to operating conditions, plant conditions, and the circumstances as to directory distribution and areas; and the more economical method will be employed in each case. The choice of method of operating station-to-station service will be determined solely as an operating arrangement, not in any way affecting rates or service, except that where the number method is employed it is required that orders be accepted stating only the telephone number of the called station.

(e) The charges for station-to-station messages shall not be "reversed," i. e., collected at the called station.

2. Person-to-person calls: This service shall be defined by the following conditions:

(a) Orders will be accepted to establish communication between specified persons.

(b) The measurement of the duration of a person-to-person message for the purpose of the application of rates shall begin at the moment when communication begins with or between the particular person or persons specified in the order; provided that certain report charges will be made under the conditions specified in the clause next below, where communication may not be established.

(c) Orders for person-to-person service are accepted only under the condition that a limited charge (to be known as "Report charge") will be made in the following cases where it is impossible to establish communication between particular persons:

(1) When the order is to establish communication with a particular person in a given city, telephone address unknown, and the particular person can not be secured within one hour (exclusive of any time during which "no circuits" or other cause prevent communication of the order to the distant city or exchange or its completion).

(2) When the designated person called refuses to talk.

(3) When the report is returned that the designated person called is "out" or "out and will return at (specified time)" or "out and time

of return unknown," "is absent from the city," and similar reports advising the calling subscriber of the facts ascertained when failure to complete the order is due solely to the circumstances of the called person or to fault in describing the location of the called person, and when all of the work preliminary to establishing communication with the called person is done.

(4) When communication between the designated persons can not be established because the designated person at the calling station is absent at the calling station; provided that no charge shall be made in such cases where the delay, if any, in establishing connection is greater than one hour.

(5) When the designated person at the calling station refuses to talk when the facilities for communication have been established.

3. Appointment calls: Appointment calls are person-to-person calls, the order for which provides that communication is to be arranged for to take place at a specified time.

4. Messenger calls: Messenger calls are person-to-person calls requiring the use of a messenger to secure attendance of a designated person at one of the public pay stations at the distant point.

5. Collect calls: Collect calls are person-to-person calls, the charges for which are "reversed," i. e., to be collected from the subscriber of the distant station at which the call is to be completed.

II. STANDARD TOLL RATES FOR STATION-TO-STATION MESSAGES.

Effective 12.01 a. m., January 21, 1919, the following initial period rates are made standard throughout the United States for station-to-station toll messages where the distance between the exchanges or toll points does not exceed 40 miles by direct air-line measurement:

For distances more than—	But not more than—	Initial rate is—
0 miles	6 miles	$0.05
6 "	12 "	.10
12 "	18 "	.15
18 "	24 "	.20
24 "	32 "	.25
32 "	40 "	.30

The following initial period rates are made standard for station-to-station toll messages for all distances in excess of 40 miles by direct air-line measurement:

For distances more than—	But not more than—	Initial rate is—
40 miles	48 miles	$0.35
48 "	56 "	.40

For each additional 8 miles or fraction thereof, 5 cents additional.

For the purpose of applying standard rates where the direct air line distance between points is in excess of 40 miles, distance shall be determined as the air line distance between the centers of blocks 7 miles square, within which the points of communication are located, and where the distance is in excess of 350 miles by the air line distance between centers of sections 35 miles square.

The block and section scaling system for purposes of measuring toll rate distance between points more than 40 miles distant by direct measurement, shall consist of a grid containing sections 35 miles square, each section subdivided into 25 blocks 7 miles square, so placed on a polyconic projection of a Government survey map of the United States that section lines coincide with a line drawn approximately north and south through the center of the United States and with a line at right angles thereto passing through the northwestern point of the international boundary line in the Strait of Georgia.

III. STANDARD TOLL RATES FOR OTHER CLASSES OF TOLL CALLS.

Effective 12.01 a. m., January 21, 1919, the following toll message rates are established for person-to-person calls, appointment calls, and messenger calls:

1. The initial period rates for person-to-person calls shall be approximately 25 per cent in addition to the station-to-station rates between the same points in accordance with the schedule of computed rates for person to person, appointment, and messenger toll calls attached hereto and hereby made a part of this order; but no person-to-person rate shall be less than 20 cents.

2. In those cases where person-to-person calls are not completed and a report is made or the conditions are such as described in paragraph I, 2 (c), of this order, a report charge shall be made of approximately one-fourth the initial rate for station-to-station messages between the same points in accordance with the schedule of computed rates for person to person, appointment, and messenger toll calls attached hereto and hereby made a part of this order; but no report charge shall be less than 10 cents for any one call nor more than $2.

3. The rates for appointment calls shall be approximately 50 per cent in addition to the rates for station-to-station messages between the same points in accordance with the schedule of computed rates for person to person, appointment, and messenger toll call hereto attached and hereby made a part of this order; but in the case of any appointment call order, where the distant station is reached, whether the appointment be made or not, the report charge applicable in case of person-to-person calls between the same points shall be made. No appointment calls shall be accepted where the station-to-station rate is less than 15 cents.

4. The rates for messenger calls shall be the same as applied to appointment calls between the same points, plus any charges that may be required for the service of messengers. No messenger calls shall be accepted where the station-to-station rate is less than 15 cents.

IV. STANDARD TOLL NIGHT RATES.

Effective 12.01 a. m., January 21, 1919, the following reductions shall be made in the rates and charges for station-to-station messages only between the hours of 8.30 p. m. and 4.30 a. m.

1. Between the hours of 8.30 p. m. and 12 midnight the night rates for station-to-station messages shall be approximately 50 per cent less than the regular day rates in accordance with the schedule of computed night rates attached hereto and hereby made a part of this order, but no night rate shall be less than 25 cents.

2. Between the hours of 12 midnight and 4.30 a. m. the night rates shall be approximately 75 per cent less than the established day rates in accordance with the schedule of computed night rates attached hereto and hereby made a part of this order, but no night rate shall be less than 25 cents.

3. For the purpose of applying night rates, the time of day at the point at which a station-to-station message originates shall be used.

4. Day rates only shall be employed between the hours of 4.30 a. m. and 8.30 p. m.

V. STANDARD INITIAL PERIODS, OVERTIME PERIODS, AND OVERTIME RATES.

Effective 12.01 a. m., January 21, 1919, the following initial periods, overtime periods, and overtime rates are made standard in connection with all toll calls and messages made at standard initial toll rates:

1. Standard initial period and overtime period:

Where the initial rate is—	The initial period is—	The overtime period is—
$0.05	5 minutes	5 minutes
.10	5 "	3 "
.15	5 "	2 "
.20	5 "	2 "
.25	5 "	1 "
.30	3 "	1 "
.35	3 "	1 "
All other rates	3 "	1 "

Where person-to-person calls are accepted at the above initial rates the initial period is three minutes and overtime period is one minute.

2. Standard overtime rates are as follows:

Where the initial rate is—	The overtime rate is—
$0.05	$0.05
.10	.05
.15	.05
.20	.05
.25	.05
.30	.10
.35	.10
and thereafter approximately one-third of the initial rate, and in no case more than one-third of the initial rate, in accordance with the Table of Computed Overtime Charges hereto attached and hereby made a part of this order.	

A. S. BURLESON,
Postmaster General.

Schedule of computed overtime charges.

Where the initial rate is—	The initial period is—	The overtime rate is—	The computed charges are for—						
			4 mins.	5 mins.	6 mins.	7 mins.	8 mins.	9 mins.	10 mins.
$0.05	5 minutes	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10
.10	5 "	.05	.10	.10	.15	.15	.15	.20	.20
.15	5 "	.05	.15	.15	.20	.20	.25	.25	.30
1.20	5 "	.05	.20	.20	.25	.25	.30	.30	.35
1.25	5 "	.05	.25	.25	.30	.35	.40	.45	.50
.30	3 "	.10	.40	.50	.60	.70	.80	.90	1.00
.35	3 "	.10	.45	.55	.65	.75	.85	.95	1.05
.40	3 "	.10	.50	.60	.70	.80	.90	1.00	1.10
.45	3 "	.15	.60	.75	.90	1.05	1.20	1.35	1.50
.50	3 "	.15	.65	.80	.95	1.10	1.25	1.40	1.55
.55	3 "	.15	.70	.85	1.00	1.15	1.30	1.45	1.60
.60	3 "	.20	.80	1.00	1.20	1.40	1.60	1.80	2.00
.65	3 "	.20	.85	1.05	1.25	1.45	1.65	1.85	2.05
.70	3 "	.20	.90	1.10	1.30	1.50	1.70	1.90	2.10
.75	3 "	.25	1.00	1.25	1.50	1.75	2.00	2.25	2.50
.80	3 "	.25	1.05	1.30	1.55	1.80	2.05	2.30	2.55
.85	3 "	.25	1.10	1.35	1.60	1.85	2.10	2.35	2.60
.90	3 "	.30	1.20	1.50	1.80	2.10	2.40	2.70	3.00
.95	3 "	.30	1.25	1.55	1.85	2.15	2.45	2.75	3.05
1.00	3 "	.30	1.30	1.60	1.90	2.20	2.50	2.80	3.10
and thereafter increasing in 5-cent steps.	and thereafter 3 minutes for all rates.	and thereafter one-third the initial rate to the nearest multiple of 5 cents, but not more than one-third the initial rate.	and thereafter in accordance with the above-applied system of computation for each higher rate and for each additional overtime period or fraction thereof.						

† Where person-to-person calls are accepted at these rates, the initial period is three minutes and the overtime period is one minute.

Schedule of computed rates for person to person—Appointment and messenger toll calls.

When the station-to-station day rate is—	The completed person-to-person rate is—	The completed appointment and messenger rate is—	The report charge is—
$0.05	Not quoted.	Not quoted.	Not quoted.
.10	Not quoted.	Not quoted.	Not quoted.
.15	$0.20	$0.25	$0.10
.20	.25	.30	.10
.25	.30	.35	.10
.30	.40	.45	.10

Schedule of computed rates for person to person, etc.—Continued.

When the station-to-station day rate is—	The completed person-to-person rate is—	The completed appointment and messenger rate is—	The report charge is—
$0.35	$0.45	$0.50	$0.10
.40	.50	.60	.10
.45	.55	.65	.15
.50	.60	.75	.15
.55	.65	.80	.15
.60	.75	.90	.15
.65	.80	.95	.20
.70	.85	1.05	.20
.75	.90	1.10	.20
.80	1.00	1.20	.20
.85	1.05	1.25	.25
.90	1.10	1.35	.25
.95	1.15	1.40	.25
1.00	1.25	1.50	.25
1.05	1.30	1.55	.30
1.10	1.35	1.65	.30
1.15	1.40	1.70	.30
1.20	1.50	1.80	.30
1.25	1.55	1.85	.35
1.30	1.60	1.95	.35
1.35	1.65	2.00	.35
1.40	1.75	2.10	.35
1.45	1.80	2.15	.40
1.50	1.85	2.25	.40
1.55	1.90	2.30	.40
1.60	2.00	2.40	.40
1.65	2.05	2.45	.45
1.70	2.10	2.55	.45
1.75	2.15	2.60	.45
1.80	2.25	2.70	.45
1.85	2.30	2.75	.50
1.90	2.35	2.85	.50
1.95	2.40	2.90	.50
2.00	2.50	3.00	.50
and thereafter increasing in 5-cent steps.	and thereafter 25 per cent in addition to the station-to-station day rate. When the station-to-station day rate is not evenly divisible by 4, 25 per cent in addition to the station-to-station day rate, computed to the next lower multiple of 5 cents.	and thereafter 50 per cent in addition to the station-to-station day rate. When the station-to-station day rate is not evenly divisible by 2, 50 per cent in addition to the station-to-station day rate, computed to the next lower multiple of 5 cents.	and thereafter one-fourth the station-to-station day rate. When the station-to-station day rate is not evenly divisible by 4, one-fourth the station-to-station day rate computed to the next higher multiple of 5 cents, but no report charge will exceed $2.00.

Schedule of computed night rates for station-to-station toll messages.

When the day rate is—	The rate between 8.30 p. m. and 12 midnight is—	The rate between 12 midnight and 4.30 a. m. is—
$0.05	Day rate.	Day rate.
.10	" "	" "
.15	" "	" "
.20	" "	" "
.25	" "	" "
.30	$0.25	$0.25
.35	.25	.25
.40	.25	.25
.45	.25	.25
.50	.25	.25
.55	.30	.25
.60	.30	.25
.65	.35	.25
.70	.35	.25
.75	.40	.25
.80	.40	.25
.85	.45	.25
.90	.45	.25
.95	.50	.25
1.00	.50	.25
1.05	.55	.30
1.10	.55	.30
1.15	.60	.30
1.20	.60	.30
1.25	.65	.35
1.30	.65	.35
1.35	.70	.35
1.40	.70	.35
1.45	.75	.40
1.50	.75	.40
1.55	.80	.40
1.60	.80	.40
1.65	.85	.45
1.70	.85	.45
1.75	.90	.45
1.80	.90	.45
1.85	.95	.50
1.90	.95	.50
1.95	1.00	.50
2.00	1.00	.50
and thereafter increasing in 5-cent steps.	and thereafter one-half the day rate. When the day rate is not evenly divisible by 2, one-half the day rate, computed to the next higher multiple of 5 cents.	and thereafter one-fourth the day rate. When the day rate is not evenly divisible by 4, one-fourth the day rate, computed to the next higher multiple of 5 cents.

INDEPENDENT COMPANIES HAVING RATE INCREASES.

Alabama: Greenville Telephone Co., Greenville (App. 4–11–19), Class B. Mutual Telephone Co., Beatrice (App. 10–4–18), Class D, not heard from.

Arkansas: Citizens' Telephone Co., Paris (App. 1–7–19), Class C. Siloam Springs Tel. Co. (App. PmG. 4–19–19), Class —.

California: Corona Home Tel. & Tel. Co., Corona (App. 5–16–19), Class —. Home Telephone Co., Covina (App. 5–16–19), Class C. Oxnard Home Telephone Co. (App. 4–24–19). Pomona Valley Telephone & Telegraph Union, Pomona (App. 5–16–19). Santa Paula Home Telephone Co. (App. 4–11–19), Class —. Sierra Madre Tel. & Tel. Co. (App. 5–16–19), Class D, under Federal control. Union Home Tel. & Tel. Co., Long Beach (App. 1–24–19).

Georgia: Brookiet Telephone Co., Statesboro (App. 1–10–19), Class —. Fruit Belt Telephone Co., Fort Valley (App. 12–31–18), Class C. Hawkinsville Telephone Co. (App. 4–12–19), Class —. Winfield Telephone Co., Winfield (App. 3–31–19), Class D, under Federal control.

Illinois: Abingdon Home Telephone Co. (App. 4–11–19), Class C. Byron Telephone Co. (App. 3–17–19), Class C. Christian County Telephone Co. (App. 9–30–18), Class B. Jerseyville Telephone Co., Jerseyville (App. 3–18–19), Class C. Kewanee Home Telephone Co. (App. 3–31–19), Class B. Lebanon Telephone Exchange (App. 1–6–19), Class D, license. Martinsville Telephone Co. (App. 4–19–19), Class C. National Telephone & Electric Co. (App. 1–10–19), Class C. Lexington Home Telephone Co. (App. 4–12–19), Class —. Williamsville Telephone Co. (App. 11–20–18), Class —.

Indiana: Connersville Telephone Co. (App. 4–19–19), Class C. Flora Telephone Co. (App. 3–18–19), Class C. Home Telephone & Telegrapn Co. (App. 2–20–19 and 4–24–19), Class A.

Iowa: Afton Mutual Telephone Co. (App. 12–21–18), Class —. Albia Home Telephone Co. (App. 4–11–19), Class C. Baxter Telephone Co. (App. 9–20–18), Class D, license. Cantril Telephone Exchange (App. 1–10–19), Class —. Crawford County Telephone Co., Denison (App. 12–21–18), Class C. Delaware County Telephone Co., Manchester (App. 1–4–19), Class C. Eddyville Telephone Co. (App. 4–11–19), Class D, license. Farmers' Mutual Telephone Co., Fontanelle (App. 12–21–18), Class —. Farragut Public Service Co. (App. 12–21–18), Class D, license. Fort Dodge Telephone Co. (App. 12–21–18), Class B. Gilbert Telephone Co. (App. 12–21–18), Class D, license. Hartley Telephone Exchange (App. 12–21–18), Class D, license. Henry County Telephone Co., New London (App. 4–16–19), Class C. Hurmence Telephone Co., New Hampton (App. 12–21–18), Class C. Interior Telephone Co., Grinnell (App. 12–21–18), Class C. Interstate Telephone Co., Dyersville (App. 12–21–18), Class B. Marengo Telephone Co. (App. 12–21–18), Class —. McCallsburg Telephone Co. (App. 4–19–19), Class —. Moravia Telephone Co. (App. 12–21–18), Class D, license. New Sharon Public Utility Co. (App. 4–11–19), Class C. Pleasant Plain Telephone Co. (App. 12–21–18), Class —. Plymouth County Telephone Co., Lemars (App. 12–21–18), Class C. Sanborn Telephone Exchange (App. 3–31–19), Class D, under Federal control. Storey County Independent Telephone Co. (App. 12–21–18), Class C. Sutherland Telephone Co. (App. 12–21–18), Class D, under Federal control. Tingley Telephone Co. (App. 12–21–18), Class D, license. Union Dale Telephone Co., Riverside (App. 12–21–18), Class —. Washington Telephone Co. (App. 1–21–19), Class C. Wesley Telephone Exchange (App. 12–21–18), Class —. Woodbury County Tel. Co., Sergeant Bluffs (App. 4–11–19), Class —.

Kansas: Altoona Telephone Co. (App. 4–12–19), Class —. Arma Central Telephone Co. (App. 4–12–19), Class D, license. Coffey County Telephone Co., Waverly (App. 3–17–19), Class —. Crawford Tel. & Tel. Co., Cherokee (App. 4–12–19), Class C. Geneseo Telephone Co., Geneseo (App. 10–5–18), Class D, license. Kansas Telephone Co., Lawrence (App. 4–12–19), Class B. Richmond Home Telephone Co. (App. 1–3–19), Class B. Tescott Telephone Co. (App. 1–6–19), Class D, license. Victor Telephone Co., Hunter (App. 5–1–19), Class —. Baldwin Telephone Co. (App. 5–16–19), Class D, license.

Kentucky: Auburn Home Telephone Co. (App. 4–19–19), Class D, license. Central Home Tel. & Tel.: Cynthiana Tel. Co. (App. 4–17–19), Class C; Bowling Green Home Tel. Co. (App. 4–17–19), Class C. Other Class C companies: Mayfield Home Tel. Co. (App. 12–28–18), Class C. Grayson County Telephone Co., Leitchfield (App. 12–21–18), Class —. Henderson Telephone & Telegraph Co. (App. 4–19–19), Class C. La Rue Home Telephone Co., Hodgenville (App. 4–19–19), Class C. Louisville Home Telephone Co. (App. 4–19–19), Class A.

Maine: Poland Telephone Co., S. Poland (App. 1–10–19), Class —. Stockton Springs Telephone Co. (App. 4–14–19), Class —.

Michigan: Citizens Telephone Co., Grand Rapids (App. 3–31–19), Class A. Grand Ledge Telephone Co. (App. 4–12–19), Class C. Union Telephone Co., Alma (App. 5–16–19), Class A.

Minnesota: Granite Falls Telephone Co. (App. 9–18–18), Class C. Greenfield Farmers' Telephone Co., Kellogg (App. 9–27–18), Class —. Home Telephone Co., Grand Meadow (App. 9–18–18), Class —. McLeod County Telephone Co. (App. 4–19–19), Class C. Tri-State Telephone & Telegraph Co. (App. 3–31–19 & 4–24–19), Class A.

Mississippi: Smith County Telephone Co., Raleigh (App. 11–8–18), Class D, license.

Missouri: Appleton City Telephone Exchange (App. 12–16–18), Class D, license. Cass County Telephone Co. (App. 9–21–18), Class C. Golden City Telephone Co. (App. 4–12–19), Class D, license. Home Telephone Co., Joplin (App. 12–11–18), Class A. Kearney Telephone Co. (App. 9–27–18), Class C. Missouri Union Telephone Co. (App. 1–29–19), Class C.

Nebraska: Union Telephone Co., Wauso (App. 11–27–18), Class C.

New Hampshire: Weare Telephone Co. (App. 10–1–18), Class D, license.

New York: Alexandria Bay Telephone Co. (App. 3–22–19), Class D, license. Chestertown Telephone Co. (App. 3–22–19), Class D, license. Friendship Telephone Co. (App. 3–22–19), Class —. Grand Island Telephone Co. (App. 3–22–19), Class —. Hamlin Rural Telephone Co. (App. 3–22–19), Class —. Lewis & Hall Telephone Co., Manlius (App. 12–21–18), Class D, license. Newport Telephone Co., Inc. (App. 3–31–19), Class D, license. Mayville Telephone Co. (App. 10–8–18), Class D, license. Rochester Telephone Co. (App. 4–12–19), Class A. Seneca-Gorham Telephone Co. (App. 2–8–19), Class C. Sherburne Telephone Co. (App. 3–22–19), Class D, license. Thousand Island Telephone Co., Clayton (App. 3–31–19), Class D, license. Union Telephone Co., Syracuse (App. 4–12–19), Class C. Waterville Telephone Co. (App. 4–12–19), Class —. Western Sullivan Tel. & Tel. Co. (App. 3–22–19), Class —.

North Carolina: Cardenas Telephone Co., Walthall (App. 10–10–18), Class D, license. Elkin Telephone Exchange & Horton Tel. Co. (App. 10–18–18), Class —. Iredell Telephone Co. (App. 4–12–19), Class —.

Ohio: Ada Telephone Exchange (App. 10–1–18), Class C. Archbold Telephone Co. (App. 10–21–18), Class —. Ashtabula Telephone Service Co. (App. 10–1–18), Class B. Athens County Home Telephone Co. (App. 5–8–19), Class C. Bellevue Home Telephone Co., Columbus (App. 12–21–18), Class C, Sub. to #. Bergholz Telephone Co. (App. 10–4–18), Class C. Bucyrus Telephone Co. (App. 1–7–19), Class C. Burton Telephone Co. (App. 2–8–19), Class —. Elyria Southern Tel. & Toll Co. (App. 4–12–19), Class D, license. Garrettsville Telephone Co. (App. 12–21–18), Class —. Harrison & Jefferson Telephone Co., Cadiz (App. 4–11–19), Class C. Lima Tel. & Tel. Co. (App. 4–24–19), Class B. Local Telephone Co., Bellevue (App. 12–21–18), Class B.# Metamora Telephone Co. (App. 9–30–19), Class D, under Fed. control. Mount Vernon Telephone Co. (App. 10–1–18), Class B. Ohio State Telephone Co. (App. 12–13–18), Class A. Paulding Home Telephone Co. (App. 9–27–19), Class C. Marion County Telephone Co. (App. 12–21–18), Class B. Williams County Telephone Co. (App. 1–22 & 4–12–19), Class B.

Oklahoma: Mountain Park Telephone Co. (App. 1–14–19), Class D, under Fed. control. Mulhall Telephone Exchange (App. 12–21–18), Class D, under Fed. control.

Oregon: Home Independent Telephone Co. (App. 4–12–19), Class B.

Pennsylvania: Bethel & Mt. Aetna Tel. & Tel. Co. (App. 10–17–18), Class C. Denver & Ephrata Tel. & Tel. Co. (App. 1–14–19), Class C. York Tel. & Tel. Co. (App. 4–19–19), Class B.

South Dakota: Dakota Central Telephone Co. (App. 1–10 & 3–31–19), Class A. Moody County Tel. Co. (App. 3–31–19, Class C.

Tennessee: Dyer Home Telephone Co. (App. 1–14–19), Class —. Rutledge Telephone Co. (App. 1–6–19), Class D, license. Weakley County Telephone Co., Martin (App. 12–21–18), Class —.

Texas: Batesville Telephone Co., Batesville (App. 12–21–18), Class D, license. Bellevue Telephone Co. (App. 9–30–18), Class D, license. Bluff Dale Telephone Co. (App. 4–12–19), Class D, license. Cameron County Telephone Co. (App. 1–10–19), Class —. De Leon Telephone Co. (App. 2–28–19), Class D, license. Franklin Telephone Exchange (App. 4–12–19), Class D, license. Georgetown Telephone Co. (App. 4–11–19), Class —. Grapevine Telephone Co. (App. 12–28–18), Class D, license. Ore City Telephone Co. (App. 9–23–18), Class —. Quitman Telephone Exchange (App. 10–22–18), Class —. Rio Vista Telephone Co. (App. 9–27–18), Class —. Texas Long Distance Telephone Co. (App. 2–20 & 3–18 & 3–31–19), Class B. Texas Telephone Co. (App. 4–24–19), Class A. Whitney Independent Telephone Co. (App. 4–19–19), Class —.

Virginia: Petersburg Telephone Co. (App. 4–24–19), Class B. Franklin County Telephone Co. (App. 5–2–19), Class D, license.

Washington: Puget Sound Telephone Co. (App. 12–13–18), Class A. Washington Coast Utilities (App. 4–12–19), Class —. White Bluffs & Columbia River Tel. Co. (App. 5–16–19), Class D, license.

Wisconsin: Crystal Lake Rural Tel. Co. (App. 4–19–19), Class —. Eagle River Telephone Co. (App. 4–12–19), Class D, under Federal control. Markeson Telephone Co. (App. 4–12–19), Class —. Oakfield Telephone Co. (App. 3–31–19), Class D, license.

BELL SYSTEM COMPANIES GRANTED RATE INCREASES.

Alabama: Southern Bell Tel. & Tel. Co., Anniston, 4–19–19.

Arizona: Mountain States Tel. & Tel. Co., Tucson & Phoenix, 10–7–18.

Arkansas: Southwestern Bell Tel. Co.: Camden (App. 11–15–18); Pine Bluffs (App. 12–13–18); Osceola (App. 1–10–19).

Colorado: Mountain States Tel. & Tel. Co., Denver (App. 2–19–19).

California: Home Tel. & Tel. Co. of Pasadena (App. 4–14–19). Ontario & Upland Tel. Co. (App. 4–14–19). Sacramento Valley Tel. Co. (App. 4–14–19).

Delaware: Delaware & Atlantic Tel. & Tel. Co. (App. 4–24–19). Diamond State Tel. Co. (App. 4–24–19).

Georgia: Southern Bell Tel. & Tel. Co., Atlanta (App. 4–2–19).

Illinois: Central Union Telephone Co.: Lewiston (1–10–19); Onarga, Oquawka (3–22–19); Forrest (4–24–19); Gilman, Harristown, Hersher, Momence (2–20–19); Vandalia (3–22–19).

Iowa: Independent Telephone Co. of Council Bluffs (App. 12–13–18). Iowa Telephone Co., Des Moines, Runnells, & other (App. 12–13–18).

Kentucky: Christian Todd Telephone Co., Hopkinsville, Cumberland City (App. 1–25–19). Citizens Telephone Co. (App. 10–21–18). Cumberland Tel. & Tel. Co., Millersburg, Paducah, Louisville (4–19–19).

Maine: Moosehead Tel. & Tel. Co., Dover (App. 2–20–19).

Maryland: Chesapeake & Potomac Tele. Co. (App. 4–14–19).

Michigan: Michigan State Telephone Co., Detroit (12–4–18).

Minnesota: Northwestern Telephone Exchange, Hawley (App. 10–29–18).

Mississippi: Cumberland Tele. & Tele. Co., Lucedale and Holly Springs (App. 4–19–19).

Missouri: Boonville Telephone Co. (App. 4–19–19). Buffum Telephone Co., Eolia, Clarksville, Elsberry, Bowling Green, Louisiana (4–19–19). Missouri Central Telephone Co., Fulton (App. 4–19–19). Southwestern Bell Tele. Co., Aurora (12–21–19); Kirksville (2–20–19).

New York: Allegany County Telephone Co. (Wellsville, Singlehouse, Pa., Rushford, other), App. 3–22–19. Cattaraugus Union Telephone (App. 3–22–19). Cayuga & Southern Telephone Co. (App. 3–22–19). New York Telephon Co., P. B. X. Yonkers, Mt. Vernon, other (4–19–19); Springville (App. 3–22–19). Otsego & Delaware Telephone Co. (3–22–19). Wayne Telephone Co. (App. 3–22–19).

North Carolina: Asheville Tele. & Tele. Co., Asheville, Biltmore (1–25–19).

Ohio: Central Union Tele. Co., New Castle, Vandalia (1–10–19); Springfield (3–22–19); Atwater, Lancaster, Winchester, other (5–8–19). Cincinnati & Suburban Bell Telephone Co. (10–21–18), Amelia, etc. (10–8–18).

Oklahoma: Southwestern Bell Tele. & Tele. Co., Tulsa, Oklahoma City (9–28–18).

Oregon: Home Tele. & Tele. Co. of Southern Oregon, Medford, Rogue River, other (4–14–19). Pacific Tele. & Tele. Co. (11–15–18).

Pennsylvania: Bell Telephone Co. of Penn. (4–24–19).

Tennessee: Cumberland Tele. & Tele. Co. (App. 4–19–19), Bolivar, Jackson, other. Gainesboro Telephone Co., Cookeville, Carrollton, Ga. (3–18–19).

Vermont: Franklin County Telephone Co., East Fairfield, St. Albans (2–20–19).

Washington: Home Tele. & Tele. Co. of Spokane (4–14–19). Pacific Tele. & Tele. Co. (3–1–19).

New England: Southern New England Tele. Co., New Haven, Waterbury, Manchester, other (12–21–18).

ADDITIONAL COMPANIES GRANTED RATE INCREASES.

California: Interstate Telegraph Co., Bishop (App. 5–31–19), Class B. Oxnard Home Telephone Co. (App. 6–2–19), Class —. Pacific Tele. & Tele. Co., Woodlake (App. 6–2–19), Class A Bell. Southwestern Home Tele. Co., Redlands (App. 5–31–19), Class —. Whittier Home Tele. & Tele. Co. (App. 6–2–19), Class C.

Florida: Southern Bell Tele. & Tele. Co., Jacksonville (App. 5–31–19), Bell.

Illinois: Kinloch-Bloomington Telephone Co., Bloomington (App. 5–31–19), Class B. Wabash Valley Telephone Co., Paris (App. 5–31–19), Class B.

Indiana: Citizens Independent Tele. Co., Terre Haute (App. 5–31–19), Class B. Garrett Telephone Co. (App. 5–31–19), Class —. Logansport Home Tele. Co. (App. 6–2–19), Class B.

Iowa: Ackley Telephone Co. (App. 5–31–19). Boone County Telephone Co., Boone (App. 5–31–19), Bell, Class B. Iowa Tele. Co., Ankeny, Davenport (App. 6–2–19), Bell. Mills County Telephone Co., Malvern (App. 5–31–19), Bell, Class C. Oskaloosa Home Telephone Co., Oskaloosa (App. 5–31–19), Bell, Class B. Western Electric Telephone System, Mason City (App. 6–2–19), Bell, Class A.

Kansas: Consolidated Telephone Co., Northwestern Kans. (App. 5–31–19), Class C. United Telephone Co., northwestern Kans. (App. 5–31–19), Bell.

Kentucky: Cumberland Tele. & Tele. Co., La Grange-Middlesboro (App. 5–31–19), Bell; Henderson (App. 5–31–19), Bell.

Maine: Aroostook Tel. & Tel. Co., Aroostook County (App. 5–31–19), Class B, Bell. Maine Telephone & Telegraph Co. (App. 5–31–19), Class B, Bell. Moosehead Tel. & Tel. Co. (App. 5–31–19), Class C, Bell. Swan Island Tel. Co. (App. 5–31–19), toll rates, Class —.

Massachusetts: Heath Telephone Co., Shelburne Falls (App. 5–31–19), Class C.

Minnesota: Tri-State Tel. & Telg. Co., Albert Lea (App. 5–31–19), Class A; Faribault (App. 6–2–19). Zenith Telephone Co., Duluth and Carlton (App. 5–31–19), Bell.

New Hampshire: Carroll County Telephone Co. (App. 5–31–19), Class —. Coos Telephone Co., Coos County (App. 5–31–19), Class B, Bell. White Mountain Tel. & Tel. Co. (App. 5–31–19), Class B, Bell.

New York: Rochester Telephone Corporation (App. 5–31–19), Class A.

Ohio: Central Union Tel. Co., P. B. X. & inter-comm. rates (App. 5–31–19), Bell. Central Union Tel. Co., Trimble, Springfield (App. 5–31–19), Bell. Highland County Tel. Co. (Cent. Union & Hillsboro Tel. Cos.) (App. 6–2–19), Class —. Peoples Telephone Co., Forest, Mt. Blanchard (App. ———), Class C. Warren & Niles Tel. Co., Warren and Phalanx (App. 6–2–19), Class B.

Pennsylvania: Mutual Telephone Co., Erie (App. 6–2–19).

Rhode Island: Westerly Automatic Tel. Co. (App. 6–2–19), Class C.

South Dakota: Dakota Central Telephone Co., Aberdeen (App. 6–2–19), Class A. South Dakota State Tel. Co., Sioux Falls (App. 6–2–19), Class C.

Tennessee: Cumberland Tel. & Tel. Co., Memphis (App. 5–31–19), Bell.

Texas: Denison Telephone Co., Denison (App. 5–31–19), Class —. Electra Telephone Co., Electra (App. 5–31–19), Class —. Grayson Telephone Co., Sherman (App. 5–31–19), Class —. McKinney Telephone Co., McKinney (App. 5–31–19), Class C, Bell. North Texas Telephone Co., Whitesboro and Pilot Point (App. 5–31–19), Class —. Union Telephone Co., Plano (App. 5–31–19), Class —.

Vermont: Franklin County Telephone Co. (App. 5–31–19), Bell, Class C.

Virginia: Clifton Forge Mutual Telephone Co. (App. 5–31–19), Class C. Harrisonburg Mutual Telephone Co., Harrisonburg, etc. (App. 5–31–19), Class C. Home Telephone Co., Smithfield (App. 5–31–19), Class —. Scottsville Telephone Co., Charlottesville (App. 6–2–19), Class —. Waynesboro Mutual Tel. Co. (App. 5–31–19), Class —.

Washington: Citizens Independent Telephone Co., Port Townsend (App. 6–2–19), Class C. Home Telephone Co., Castle Rock (App. 6–2–19), Class —.

Wisconsin: La Crosse Telephone Co. (App. 5–21–19), Class B. Portage Telephone Co. (App. 5–21–19), Class C.

Mr. CUMMINS. I need say nothing further than that. The amendment which is now pending is an amendment which proposes to continue in force the rate increases promulgated by the Postmaster General for a period of 90 days after the passage of the act, and I again add my judgment is that it is but fair to the telegraph companies and fair to the public.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President——

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON. Before the Senator from Iowa takes his seat I should like to ask him a question with respect to the language of the bill. It is to be noticed that by the first section chapter 154 is expressly repealed. In a subsequent section, section 3, it is provided—

> That the first proviso of said joint resolution prescribing the just compensation to be paid for and on account of said acts shall continue in full force and effect until such just compensation shall be fully paid and adjusted to and with the owners of said systems, lines, and property, in the manner and according to the terms and conditions therein set forth.

I wondered if the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] had given thought to that apparent incongruity in the language of the bill repealing the entire chapter, and then in a subsequent section reenacting the proviso and declaring that it shall remain in force.

Mr. CUMMINS. Before the Senator from Minnesota answers, permit me to express my own opinion about it. I do not think that the reservation to which the Senator from Arkansas has referred is really needed in the bill. I think the right of the telephone companies to claim and to obtain just compensation for the use of their properties while under Federal control is necessarily reserved.

Mr. ROBINSON. I agree with the Senator. I do not think Congress could take it away from them even if it attempted to do so.

Mr. CUMMINS. It could not do so without violating the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. ROBINSON. It occurred to me that to repeal the entire chapter and then provide that a proviso, without reenacting the language of it, should remain in effect is a doubtful procedure.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Minnesota will speak for himself in a moment, but I assume it was intended to give reassurance to the owners of these companies that there was no thought or purpose of taking away from them their right to just compensation for the use of their property.

Mr. ROBINSON. Of course Congress could not do that even if it attempted to do it, but it might, by repealing the language, modify the manner in which the compensation should be arrived at. I simply call the attention of the Senator to it.

Mr. CUMMINS. If I may be permitted, I will conclude my remarks upon the subject and yield the floor, hoping that we may secure a vote on the amendment soon, and give the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] an opportunity to answer the question which has been propounded by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. KING. Before the Senator from Iowa takes his seat, I should like to ask a few questions.

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. During the hearings on the bill offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] was it disclosed what, if any, reason existed for taking over the telegraph and telephone systems at any time or at the time when they were taken over?

Mr. CUMMINS. That question was asked more than one of the witnesses, and there were many who appeared before the committee. There was no witness able to answer it. There was no witness able to assign any reason whatsoever for the taking over of these properties. But I regard that as a question that is long past, and I did not debate it because I do not think it is material.

Mr. KING. I concede, of course, if the Senator will pardon me a moment, that it is not material to the passage of this bill, and perhaps is not pertinent, and yet believing, as I always have believed, that there was no necessity whatever for taking over the telegraph and telephone systems, and that it was a mistake to do it, I was rather curious to ascertain whether there was any justification before the committee for the action of the executive department.

Mr. CUMMINS. I thought it was a mistake at the time and I still think it was a mistake. I have never been able to discover any reason whatever for taking over either the telegraph or the telephone systems of the country, whatever may be said with regard to the cable.

Mr. KING. Another question, if the Senator will permit me: Was there any evidence showing that any effort had been made to adjust the claims, if the claims had been preferred, of the telegraph and telephone systems for damages resulting from the taking over?

Mr. CUMMINS. There has been a continuous effort. The Postmaster General has entered into contracts with, I think, about 35 companies, which fixed the compensation those companies are to receive for the use of their properties. The remainder of the companies are entirely at sea. There has been no adjustment or arrangement with regard to their compensation, and they will be compelled, I assume, to seek compensation in the manner provided for in the original resolution.

Mr. KING. One further question. Was there any evidence which would enable the committee to determine with any degree of accuracy the amount of loss that the Government will sustain by reason of having taken over the telegraph and telephone systems?

Mr. CUMMINS. There was some evidence upon that point, but I do not recall the aggregate amount. Representatives of several companies stated the amount the Government would lose under the contract which had been made with their companies.

Mr. KELLOGG. If the Senator will permit me, I can give the figures.

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KELLOGG. The loss of the Government to the American Telegraph & Telephone Co. was estimated to be about $9,000,000.

Mr. KING. That is the operating expense?

Mr. KELLOGG. The Government's loss will be $9,000,000. That is, the Government has agreed to pay to the American Telegraph & Telephone Co. as compensation a sum exceeding the income by $9,000,000. So the Government's loss is $9,000,000. For the 35 companies which have made contracts with the Postmaster General the loss is estimated at about $600,000. The balance of the companies have no contracts, and there is no way of telling what the Government's loss will be. They have claims against the Government for compensation, but they have not been adjusted.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, when the Senator speaks of losses which the Government sustained, the Senator does not include within the term "losses" claims for damages which the respective companies will assert against us for having dispossessed them of their property?

Mr. KELLOGG. The American Telegraph & Telephone Co. probably has no claim for damages, because it entered into a contract with the Government similar to the railroad contract, whereby the Government agreed to pay the American Telegraph & Telephone Co. a sum as compensation for the use of the wires. The 35 companies which have made contracts with the Government are in the same position. The other 10,000 to 50,000 companies taken over by the Government have made no adjustment, and we have no knowledge as to what their claims for damages will be.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit me to ask the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Iowa, whether there was anything before the committee to indicate that any superior service had been rendered by reason of the Government having taken possession of the systems or, upon the contrary, did the evidence tend to show a deterioration in the service and a lack of morale upon the part of the employees?

Mr. CUMMINS. It is quite safe to say that all the representatives of the companies who were before the committee asserted that the service rendered before the Government took possession was quite as good as the service rendered afterwards. I do not think, however, that any witness put particular emphasis upon any deterioration in the service, although some of them spoke about the disorganization which necessarily occurs in a transition of that character.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if I may refer to the question asked by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] a moment ago, I agree with him, legally speaking, that there was no necessity for making the reservation in the pending bill with regard to compensation. I believe, however, it was wise to insert it, because it would relieve the minds of some who might not be familiar with the legal liability of the Government.

I desire to say just a word with reference to the history of the joint resolution approved July 16, 1918, under which the Government assumed control of the wire systems of the country. At the time the joint resolution was presented the majority of the committee were first of the opinion that there ought to be full hearings. Later, when it was called to the attention of the committee that we were not taking over the wires but simply authorizing the President to take them over when it might seem to be desirable in his judgment, it was decided not to have hearings of any length, and the only witness who appeared before us was one of the officials of the Western Union Telegraph Co.

It was claimed on the outside that there was a certain present necessity in that there were rumors that there were going to be certain labor troubles. I think I am in entire accord with the facts when I say that the threatened labor troubles were inconsequential.

We were approaching the close of the session and it was thought there might be a military necessity for the taking over of these wires, possibly during the recess of Congress. I was satisfied at the time that there was no necessity whatsoever for the taking over of any of the wire systems; and, if I am properly informed, I do not believe that during the prosecution of the war any necessity developed. I do know that originally it was thought that there might be a reason for the taking over of the telegraph wires. It was said that there might possibly be a necessity for taking over the telephone trunk lines, but not the local companies. I think a very great mistake was made when it was attempted to take over these wire systems, and particularly the telephone systems. I think no good came of it, and much harm.

There were from 40,000 to 50,000 of these smaller telephone companies. There is no evidence whatsoever that the Government was not just as well served prior to the taking over of the wires as they were served after they were taken over, and it has served to some extent, I think, to destroy the morale of the companies. But that, perhaps, is past history.

The President has suggested the turning back of these wires. I understand that the Postmaster General concurs in that suggestion. I think it is wise that they be turned back, and the more quickly they can be turned back the better for all parties concerned. The only matter that gave us very much concern, and I perhaps am expressing my own view rather than that of the members of the committee, was as to what should be done with respect to a continuation of the rates which had been prescribed by the Federal Government. They were increased generally speaking about 20 per cent. It appeared in the testi-

mony before the committee on the part of the Postal Telegraph Co. that if their wires were turned back they would immediately reduce their rates to those of the prewar period. That being so, I felt that there was no particular reason why the Western Union Telegraph Co. could not decrease its rates in the same way, because they are conducting the largest part of the telegraph business.

But when it came to the telephone systems we were confronted with a different question. There were probably forty or fifty thousand of these local companies. Many of them were organized not for purposes of profit but as local companies for the convenience of the subscribers. They did not care whether they made any money out of their system or not. What they wanted was the service. In nearly all, if not all, of the States there are local bodies that can fix the rates, either in the form of public utilities commissions controlled by the State or by municipal bodies or by contracts between the companies and the subscribers. Of course it would take some little time to adjust these rates. Necessarily the committee could not fix a rate or suggest a rate that could apply to all of the various companies in the 48 States, and so it was thought wise that the present Government rates, wherever they have been announced, should be continued for a period of 90 days unless the State, municipal, or other local authorities should change the rates at an earlier date. In my judgment, in every State there will be plenty of time to change these rates if they are not right, within the 90 days.

Further than that, it seemed to us that there was a good deal of doubt as to whether or not if we said nothing upon this subject in the pending legislation the present Government rates would continue. That is a legal proposition fraught with a good deal of difficulty, and we thought, looking at it from the financial standpoint of the companies, it would be better to render certain a thing which was uncertain. It appeared before our committee that in most of the States there would not be very much difficulty, it was thought, in the changing of the rates to make them reasonable if they are not reasonable.

I have before me a letter from the Bell Telephone Co., called the American Telegraph & Telephone Co., and the United States Independent Telephone Association, suggesting a period of one year; but my guess is that if these rates were continued for a year they would take a year to adjust them, and if we gave them two years they would probably take two years.

They know what their property accounts are, they know what their increased expenses are, and certainly they will have no difficulty in going before the proper State or local authorities and naming a schedule of rates. This can be adopted temporarily by these different organizations if they are not quite certain as to exactly what they should be, and later on they can take further testimony if necessary. I feel that the committee has been very reasonable in fixing a 90-day period within which they can adjust the question of rates.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I desire to address a question to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. Can the Senator tell me about claims for damages accruing during the period of Government ownership? Will the companies be in a position to plead that they were Government agencies and therefore secure immunity from suits?

Mr. CUMMINS. Unfortunately, Mr. President, the original act made no provision for bringing suit against the Government. The committee believed that it was not wise to enter upon that subject at this time. Personally my opinion is that if all the systems were under Federal control or in the possession of the Government no suit would lie against the companies which theretofore had operated them, and that any suit arising out of the operation by the Government would be brought against the Government, and under our law it would necessarily be brought in the Court of Claims.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have an amendment prepared prohibiting the companies from pleading in suits for damages the fact that they had been Government agencies, but if the chairman of the committee does not think it wise to go into this matter at present I shall not press the amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think there is a general law which confers jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims in such cases.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield for a moment? The chairman of the committee is familiar with the last proviso of the act approved July 16, 1918, which reads as follows:

Provided further, That nothing in this act shall be construed to amend, repeal, impair, or affect existing laws or powers of the States in relation to taxation or the lawful police regulations of the several States, except wherein such laws, powers, or regulations may affect the transmission of Government communications, or the issue of stocks and bonds by such system or systems.

I do not know what the effect of that provision is, but it was evidently intended to preserve these rights.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think it was intended really to preserve in the States the power or authority of regulation over such rates. But the Supreme Court of the United States, as you will remember, a week ago yesterday declared that notwithstanding that provision in the law the Postmaster General had the full and complete authority to make rates, not only interstate rates but State rates as well.

I am inclined to think that would not cover the case of a suit, and anyone who has suffered damage of that kind will have to seek his remedy against the United States precisely as every other citizen seeks a remedy when the Government has wronged him.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Was this matter brought before the committee during its hearings?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not remember that it was; I can not recall, but I am inclined to think it was not.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it the opinion of the Senator that it is not within the power of Congress to provide that these companies may be made responsible in damages by suits of the character indicated?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not think you can make the companies which formerly operated the properties responsible for torts committed by the Government; but it is possible to provide—this is a first impression—that suits may be brought against these companies in the various jurisdictions, and that any sums paid out by reason of damages recovered could be reckoned as a part of the cost of operation, and in that way the Government be made responsible for the damages.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I desire to say that it seems clear that after the Government took possession of this property any resulting damages growing out of the possession of the property lie against the Government and not against the owners of the property. If the Government were to take the Senator's automobile for a war emergency, and the man who was driving the car ran over somebody and injured him, the Senator would not be liable because it was his car, but the Government would be liable because it was its act. Of course, those causes that arose before the Government took possession still exist against these companies—there is no question about that—but as to anything that arose during Government control and operation these companies have nothing to do with.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But suppose it is provided that any judgment shall be charged to the operating expenses of the systems during the period of Government control and shall be taken out of the receipts during governmental control?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But you can not divorce the Government from the right, as it ultimately has to pay. Of course, that would only be making the Government pay because the Government gets the receipts and then pays its lease for the system. If you did that, you might take away the right of the Government to defend itself, and you might have actions lying against the Government that were unjust.

Besides that, I doubt very much whether a clause of that kind would be constitutional. Even if we pass the bill making these companies liable for the unlawful acts of the Government during its operation, and judgment was rendered, would that not be taking private property without due compensation? It would be making an individual pay for an act which the Government or somebody else committed. It seems to me that clearly it is within the scope of the constitutional inhibition against taking private property without just compensation; and even if we put a clause of that kind into the bill, I do not believe it would pass the courts.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Alabama will not misunderstand me. In the way he has just stated it, it would undoubtedly be unconstitutional; but when the Government comes to pay the compensation due to these various companies during Federal control it must, if it adopts the plan of net income, allow them damages, for they are part of the operating expenses. If a private citizen recovers from a company for damages during that period and it is permitted to charge the judgment into operating expenses, the Government would have to pay it only once, and it would be entirely fair, althought it is open to the objection that the Senator has suggested in regard to the Government having an opportunity to defend. It would have no opportunity to defend against a claim of that kind.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It seems to me that as to damages for wrong done to individuals during Government control, if there is a just case against the Government during that time, the individual citizen ought to have his opportunity. I am rather inclined to think that the general statutes in reference to the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims are broad enough to cover cases of that kind now; but possibly they are not. If they are

not, the jurisdiction ought to be broadened in the Court of Claims, so that the citizen who is injured by the Government during the period of control might have his day in court. It seems to me that is the only place a case would lie.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does the Senator not realize that it would be a great hardship to have citizens of this country go into the Court of Claims to press their various suits for damages?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Most of those cases would fall within the jurisdiction of district courts. The district courts have concurrent jurisdiction with the Court of Claims up to $10,000, and where the case involved not more than $10,000 I do not know that any great hardship would be incurred.

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire to suggest to the Senator from Texas that, in my judgment, Congress will be compelled to pass subsequent legislation with regard to adjusting the claims of these companies against the Government for use during Federal control. I do not believe it is possible either to make contracts with respect to all of them, nor do I think it is fair to require all of them to come to Washington to sue in the Court of Claims. I think the Senator will have abundant opportunity to present the views that he has just stated at a subsequent time. I think that time will surely come.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate I shall ask that the amendment which I had in mind be read in order that it may be incorporated in the RECORD. I trust opportunity will offer hereafter for the consideration of the question I have presented.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add after the last proviso in section 1 the following:

And provided further, That actions on claims for loss and damage on account of the acts or omissions of the agents and employees engaged in the operation of such systems accruing during the period of control of the same under the joint resolution approved July 16, 1918, may be maintained in courts of competent jurisdiction, and in any such action no defense shall be made thereto that any such telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems was an instrumentality or agency of the Federal Government, and any judgment therein rendered shall be charged to the operating expenses of such systems during such period of governmental control, and compensation made therefor as provided in such joint resolution: *Provided,* That no process, mesne or final, shall be levied against the property of any such system or systems to satisfy any such judgment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the substitute amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President——

Mr. CUMMINS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CUMMINS. The vote just taken was upon the committee amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was upon the committee amendment.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I rise to occupy the attention of the Senate for a few moments only. The main fact to which I desire to call attention is the futility of Government operation, as evidenced by our recent experience. Those of us who prophesied evil, weakness, inefficiency, and incompetency when these lines were taken over have had our prophecies fulfilled, not because of those who took them over or those who have operated them, but because of the inevitable weakness of any system of Government operation or Government ownership.

The President in his letter recently published made this statement:

The telegraph and telephone lines will, of course, be returned to their owners as soon as the retransfer can be effected without administrative confusion.

Why "of course"? That was not the intention when they were taken over, because when the legislation was enacted by virtue of which they were taken over there was no intention, either implied or expressed, that they should ever be returned to their owners. The President uses the term "of course" because of the conditions that have resulted by reason of Government operation. "Of course" because of incompetency; "of course" because of inefficiency; "of course" because of increased cost; "of course" because of inadequate revenue; "of course" because of general discontent on the part of those who use these systems throughout the country; "of course" because of a nation-wide strike; "of course" because of utter demoralization from one end of the land to the other; "of course" they are to be returned to their owners and their managers.

When these lines were taken over there was no justification for taking them, but at that time it was the expressed intention of those who testified to retain control for all future time. Mr. Burleson, the Postmaster General, testified before the House committee in this fashion:

Mr. ESCH. And do you agree with the other Secretaries that this resolution is primarily a war necessity?

Postmaster General BURLESON. Undoubtedly the necessity for action now grows out of the exigencies of the war; but if the same efficient management and direction is given the telegraph and telephone that has been given the Postal Service, the probability is that they never will be returned to private control.

I may say, in passing, that the great trouble about the telegraph and telephone service is that the same kind of management has been given to them that has characterized the management of the Post Office Department; but that is only aside from the purpose of my argument. Mr. Burleson makes the statement:

If the same efficient management and direction is given the telegraph and telephone that has been given the Postal Service, the probability is that they never will be returned to private control.

Then he adds this significant statement:

But if Government control was a failure they would undoubtedly be returned.

Mr. President, they are being returned, and therefore the statement justifies and explains itself, for if Government operation had been a success, according to his own language, the lines would have been permanently operated by the Government; but, inasmuch as Government operation has been a failure, according to his own language, they are because of that fact to be returned to their private owners. I think it quite important at this time that that admission should be called to the attention of the country.

At the time when the lines were taken over there were but three witnesses examined before the House committee—Postmaster General Burleson, Secretary Baker, and Secretary Daniels. At that time Mr. Baker said:

If I had my way about it there would not be any limitation of time put in. That is the position I would have taken on the subject of railroad legislation.

Thereby expressing his belief not only in Government operation but in Government ownership.

And Secretary Daniels said:

If you wish my view, I would say it ought to last forever.

So that the only three persons who testified before the House committee when these lines were about to be taken over were three members of the President's Cabinet, all of whom gave testimony to the effect that they believed in Government operation and Government ownership, leaving the irresistible inference that the lines which were to be turned over by virtue of the act then under consideration would be retained for the purpose of Government operation.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana if he thinks that these three members of the Cabinet, after the experience we have had, are of the same opinion still?

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, unfortunately I am not in intimate contact and have no intimate relationship with the members of the Cabinet, but I infer from the language used by the Postmaster General that he is more than satisfied with his experience, and that he is quite willing at this time to turn these lines back to their owners, because he said:

But if Government control was a failure, they would undoubtedly be returned.

Inasmuch as they are being returned, we are left to the conclusion inevitably that the Postmaster General regards his administration as a failure, and in that I think the entire country is willing to concur.

Mr. President, the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], whom I do not now see in his seat, asked various questions as to the justification for taking over the lines at that time. I will read from the testimony of Mr. Reynolds, which is very brief, on that point. Mr. Reynolds, who is the general manager of the Postal Telegraph Co., testified as follows:

Senator KELLOGG. So far as the telegraph lines are concerned, do you know of any war necessity at all for taking them over?

Mr. REYNOLDS. There was no emergency at that time that justified taking them over for the national security.

Senator POINDEXTER. What date were they taken over?

Mr. REYNOLDS. August 1, 1918.

Senator KELLOGG. Has there ever been any necessity for taking them over?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Not to my knowledge.

Senator KELLOGG. You are familiar with their operations?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; I am familiar with the operations of the Postal Telegraph Co.; and there was nothing, as far as I know, to justify taking over the lines.

Senator KELLOGG. They have been operated since by the same employees?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Exactly.

Senator KELLOGG. And the cables are the same?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Senator POINDEXTER. At what time were the cables taken over?

Mr. REYNOLDS. On November 16—five days after the signing of the armistice—on an order dated November 2, which had not been announced.

But that is aside from the purpose of these remarks.

Mr. Carlton, the manager of the Western Union, had this to say as to the justification for the lines being taken over:

Senator TOWNSEND. Has the Government adopted any policy for enlarging the plant, different from what you had?

Mr. CARLTON. No, sir.

Senator TOWNSEND. Has it attempted any other policy?

Mr. CARLTON. No, sir; not that I know of.

Senator TOWNSEND. Have the wires served the interests of the country as a war property better than they were serving it prior to the taking over?

Mr. CARLTON. Well, I was mystified when I appeared before this committee a year ago as to why the wires were taken over; to-day I am in the same fog of mystery.

Senator TOWNSEND. Was it urged upon you at the time that the Government could use these lines for war purposes better than you were using them?

Mr. CARLTON. No; because they were used after the Postmaster General took them over precisely as they were used before.

Senator TOWNSEND. Do you know whether it was the Postmaster General's purpose in taking these lines over to serve the country better as a war agency?

Mr. CARLTON. I have not the remotest idea.

Senator TOWNSEND. Has he ever expressed that to you?

Mr. CARLTON. No; he never has, and I have always been very careful not to ask him.

Senator TOWNSEND. In your opinion, were the lines taken over as a war emergency or as a peace proposition, with the idea of reorganizing them differently from what they were organized?

Mr. CARLTON. Well, you ask my opinion?

Senator TOWNSEND. Yes.

Mr. CARLTON. My opinion is that an opportunity was seized to take over the wire companies in order to carry out a program of Government ownership.

So it is exceedingly gratifying to those of us who have always opposed the policy of Government ownership to know that it has been a failure in this regard. I do not mean, Senators, that I am glad to have any part of our Government activities fail, because, as one who upholds the Government, I am glad to see whatever the Government undertakes or any policy upon which it embarks a success; but inasmuch as there was no justification for taking these lines over, save that they should be seized to carry out a prearranged policy and in order to give Mr. Burleson an opportunity to exploit his ideas of Government ownership, I have no regret to express at the failure which has resulted.

I am very glad that the telegraph and telephone lines are to be turned back to their owners, and I believe that the measure which we are about to pass is the very best that can be enacted under existing circumstances and under present conditions. I trust that out of it all will come a lesson to the American people that we should not at any time undertake the operation, much less the ownership, of these public utilities by the Government. If we learn that lesson, so that the next generation can not be induced to touch this question, I think the great cost it has occasioned will not have been expended in vain.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, on the second day of the present session, feeling, as I did, that the telegraph and telephone systems should be restored to their owners, I introduced a joint resolution, which was referred to the appropriate committee, asking for the repeal of the existing law. I am very much pleased that the chairman of the committee and the committee have acted with such promptitude in reporting the bill offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG]. I shall be doubly gratified when this bill is enacted into law and these instrumentalities are returned to their owners. I ask that the joint resolution which I then introduced, and to which I have just referred, be printed as a part of my remarks. I do not ask that it be read.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 9) relating to the transfer of control of the telegraph, telephone, marine cable, and radio systems was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas pursuant to a joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President, in time of war, to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, the President of the United States, by proclamation dated July 22, 1918, took possession and assumed control and supervision of each and every telegraph and telephone system, and every part thereof, within the jurisdiction of the United States, including all equipment thereof and appurtenances thereto, and all materials and supplies; and also by said proclamation directed that said supervision, possession, control, and operation of said telegraph and telephone systems should be exercised by and through the Postmaster General of the United States; and

Whereas whatever reasons called for the passage of said resolution and for said action taken thereunder by said President of the United States no longer exist: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the authority conferred by said resolution be, and the same is hereby, revoked and withdrawn and said resolution is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. That the Postmaster General of the United States be, and he is hereby, directed to relinquish the supervision, possession, and control of each and every telegraph and telephone system, together with all appurtenances thereto and all materials connected therewith, so taken over, under and by virtue of said resolution and said proclamation issued pursuant thereto, and to restore the same forthwith to the owners and holders thereof: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to impair or in anywise abridge the right of the owner or owners of any of said systems or property affected by said proclamation to recover just compensation for any and all damages and injuries sustained by reason of said supervision, possession, control, or operation upon the part of the President of the United States and the Postmaster General.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CUMMINS, the title was amended so as to read: "A bill to repeal the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war and to provide just compensation therefor,' approved July 16, 1918, and for other purposes."

REGULATION OF RAILROAD RATES.

Mr. CUMMINS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 6, being Senate bill 641.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 641) to amend section 10 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce with amendments.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to restore to the Interstate Commerce Commission its full and complete authority over the railway rate structure of the United States. I think most of the Members of the Senate who are here now were here at the last session when I explained it at some length, and I do not want to take up the time of Senators to do a useless thing; but I may remark that when we passed the act of March 21, 1918, prescribing the compensation which should be paid to the railways, we adopted a rather comprehensive code for Federal control. I say of the pending bill, as I did about the bill that has just passed, that I have no desire to enter into a controversy with regard to the wisdom of the legislation which we then passed. While I was fully in sympathy with the desire and purpose of the administration in taking over the railways for Government operation during the war, there were many parts of that bill which prescribed the terms of control to which I was very much opposed, and this was one of those parts. I believed then that it was not necessary to withdraw from the Interstate Commerce Commission its jurisdiction over the rates which would govern the transportation of traffic; but the Senate and the Congress decided otherwise, and I have no comment or criticism to make with regard to its decision at that time.

The war, however, is now over, and I think it is the desire of every person, the Railroad Administration included, that the jurisdiction which the commission formerly had should be restored. I am led to make that remark not from any communication which I have had with the officers of the administration, but I am led to make it because it has become the policy of the Railroad Administration to refer these matters largely to the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Railroad Administration has discovered the impossibility of dealing with railroad rates in a way just to the public, just to the shipper, and just to the Government itself.

The bill does nothing more than put the President of the United States and the Director General in the stead of the railway companies so far as initiating rates is concerned, and, when the rates have been initiated by the President or by the Director General, the Interstate Commerce Commission has the same authority over them for suspension, for revision, and for other investigation that it formerly had over the railway companies when they initiated the rates and filed their tariffs with the commission.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, would it disturb the Senator if I interrupted him?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Will the passage of this bill be used as an excuse or pretext—and I do not use those words offensively—by the Director General and those now operating the railroads to justify any expenditures made by them or any failure upon their part, or any maladministration upon their part; that is to say

will they contend that the passage of this bill hampers them, precludes the carrying out of the economies and wise and just policies which they have in view and which they were about to put into operation and would have put into operation except for the passage of this measure?

Mr. CUMMINS. I can not answer that question definitely, because I have had no communication with the Railroad Administration that will warrant me in answering it. I have had a very brief discussion of the matter with the Director General, and all that he asked me with regard to the bill was whether the bill interfered with the authority of the President or the Director General to control intrastate rates. I replied to him that in my judgment it did not have any such effect; that it was confined to the restoration of the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission over rates which affected interstate commerce and applied to no other rates. Whether he ought to have replied to me suggesting either his friendliness toward the bill or his opposition to the bill, I will not say. It is sufficient, however, to say that he made no objection at that time or at any other time, so far as I know.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. KING. I am in sympathy with this bill. I feel that we ought to reinstate the Interstate Commerce Commission in the position that it formerly occupied, and give it the powers which the interstate commerce act conferred upon it, and that that ought to be done at the earliest possible moment. As the Senator from Iowa was speaking the thought occurred to me that it might be possible that the passage of this bill now would be regarded as premature, in view of the fact that there is legislation pending to restore the railroads to private ownership and control at an early date; and the thought suggested itself in my mind that, in view of the great expense that has been incurred in governmental operation, and the great loss of revenue, if this bill were passed and those deficits continued and the lack of proper administration continued, those in charge of the railroads might attempt to lay the blame for future losses and deficits upon this legislation.

In making this statement, I do not mean to condemn in any way the present Director General or his predecessor. I think perhaps they have performed the very onerous duties resting upon them as ably as any man could have done; but the system is wrong. The governmental attempt to operate and control railroads is wrong. It will be a failure; it will involve expense and extravagance, I do not care who is in control of it.

Mr. CUMMINS. I believe the fear of the Senator from Utah is unfounded, and I think he will recognize that no harm can come from this course upon a moment's reflection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

Mr. CUMMINS. If the Senator will just pardon me until I answer the Senator from Utah, then I will yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

The President and the Director General have the power to initiate rates, to file tariffs with the Interstate Commerce Commission under the act which I propose; and if they desire to lessen the deficit or to increase the rates in order to diminish the loss to which the Government is daily subject, they are at perfect liberty to do so; and I assume that the Interstate Commerce Commission would not prevent the execution of those rates if that body believed an increase to be necessary in order that the revenues may measure up more nearly to the expenses. The Director General, with whom I am upon the most friendly personal terms, knows that this bill is pending, and he has not directly or indirectly conveyed to me any objection to it.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this bill as amended is very objectionable and ought not to pass in its present form. It is subject to a far more serious objection than the Senator from Utah has stated. The Supreme Court has lately decided, in the Dakota case—a railroad and telephone case—that under the legislation existing now, under our war legislation, the Railroad Administration has as full control over intrastate rates as over interstate rates.

I want to call the Senator's attention to the very queer phraseology of this amendment. It simply, ex industria, restores the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission as to interstate rates, but leaves the State rates, the intrastate rates, at the mercy of the present Railroad Administration.

Let me read the language:

That during the period of Federal control the right to initiate or change rates, fares, charges, classifications, regulations, and practices, exercised by the carriers now under Federal control, prior to the 29th day of December, 1917, shall hereafter be exercised by the President, or by the Director General of Railroads, but such right as to interstate commerce shall be exercised under all the limitations and conditions which were imposed upon said right by the act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887, as amended.

In other words, it restores to the Interstate Commerce Commission the full control of interstate rates, but it leaves intrastate rates absolutely under the control of the Railroad Administration by an amendment in italics which you have put into the bill here.

Mr. CUMMINS. I know that.

Mr. NELSON. Why, I ask, should you relieve interstate rates and then put State rates at the mercy of the Railroad Administration? Why should you not relieve the States as well as the Federal Government? Why should you not relieve intrastate rates as well as Federal rates from the onus of this railroad legislation? Why make this discrimination? Why leave a State, as to State rates, at the mercy of the Railroad Administration and relieve it as to interstate rates?

Mr. CUMMINS. I hope the Senator from Minnesota will consider the matter somewhat calmly and dispassionately——

Mr. NELSON. I always consider it calmly.

Mr. CUMMINS. And not involve us all in a passion upon not so immaterial a question but a question that really ought to be considered with a good deal of care.

Mr. NELSON. Does the Senator deny—if he will allow me the question, Mr. President—that it leaves intrastate rates under the control of the Railroad Administration as now existing?

Mr. CUMMINS. Of course I do not.

Mr. NELSON. No. All your bill accomplishes is to relieve the Railroad Administration from control over interstate rates.

Mr. CUMMINS. Which gives the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over 90 per cent of all the traffic of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. And it never has had jurisdiction over intrastate rates.

Mr. NELSON. I am anxious to have the States retain the control that they have exercised heretofore over the State rates; and I do not know why we should make any distinction and favor these interstate rates instead of our local State rates. Why leave the States in the lurch? Why leave them in purgatory and take the others out of it?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota had been as patient as he usually is and had not yielded to the impulses which very rarely control him, I would have reached that part of the bill and attempted to explain it. I have been rather fiercely denounced before the Senator has even heard an explanation of the reasons which seemed sufficient to the committee.

The Senator will observe that the amendment is one which was not in the original bill. It was proposed in the committee and was adopted by the unanimous vote of the committee. It can not be assumed that the members of the committee have any malicious designs upon the power or the authority of the several States; and the Senator from Minnesota, it seems to me, ought to have assumed that there was some reason which at least seemed sufficient to the committee.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator will allow me, why would it not have been easy to put into this bill a provision that the Railroad Administration shall have no more control over intrastate than over interstate rates?

Mr. CUMMINS. It would have been perfectly easy, so far as a matter of words is concerned; but if, in the judgment of the committee, the Federal Railroad Administration, during what I hope will be a short period of control, ought to have control over intrastate rates, the Senator may find in that the reason for the action of the committee.

Now, if the Senator will allow me to explain for just a moment what the situation really is, I am sure that it will relieve us from the imputation that we have done an inconsiderate and an unpremeditated thing.

The railroads are in the hands of the Federal Government. Just when they will pass out of the hands of the Federal Government into other instrumentalities I do not know. No man dares predict just when that will happen. The Interstate Commerce Commission is a function of the Federal Government. When we were considering the bill originally it was simply a question as to whether the function of passing upon rates or initiating rates or suspending rates, which unquestionably belonged to the power which was intended to operate the property, should be reserved to the Interstate Commerce Commission, which was acting for the Federal Government, or whether it should be exercised by the Director General, who was also acting for the Federal Government. To transfer to one branch of the Federal Government the right to revise or suspend rates which have been initiated or published by another branch of the Federal Government is a very different thing from restoring to the several States their power over intrastate commerce. It must be remembered that this bill stands upon its necessity as a

war measure; and I have so often heard the Senator from Minnesota uphold the power of the Federal Government in executing the designs of the war that I am sure he will be in sympathy with me. It is the first time that I have ever heard from him the suggestion that while this act remains as a war measure, the power of the Federal Government should be subordinated to the power of the States.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. Granting that it is a war measure, why do you keep up a war measure against the States and not against the Interstate Commerce Commission? Why should you perpetuate it? Does not the Senator know that the railroads are aiming to have the Interstate Commerce Commission get control of intrastate traffic; that Justice Hughes, in his decision in the Minnesota rate cases, squinted in that direction and intimated that Congress had the power to do that; and by leaving, as you do in this bill, this remnant of control in the Railroad Administration, you leave an entering wedge for them to carry out this policy of the railroads?

Mr. CUMMINS. On the contrary, Mr. President, this distinction which we make here, if preserved, will accomplish a different object. I am just as much opposed to the attempt to take away from the State authorities their constitutional right to regulate intrastate commerce as the Senator from Minnesota can possibly be; but so long as the Government of the United States is in operation of these properties—and I hope that will not be long—it is illogical, it is indefensible, from my standpoint, to compel the Government of the United States in its operation of the properties to submit to the State authority other than was prescribed in the original act.

I think there is a vast distinction between the cooperation of the Director General with the Interstate Commerce Commission and the subordination of the Director General to the rates which have been established in the various States. If the Senator from Minnesota desires to test the sentiment of the Senate with regard to that question, I shall be very glad to have him do it. I confess I have very much sympathy with him; but it disorders the system which has been established. It makes it impossible at this time to proceed in a way that will enable the Railroad Administration to earn the revenue which it is absolutely necessary for it to earn if we are not to be involved in a loss that will be appalling to the American people.

Last year in Government operation we suffered a loss of $240,000,000. During the first four months of this year we have suffered a loss of $250,000,000; and if the rates which have been made by the Director General are to be reduced in the various 48 States of the Union without any possibility of cooperation, without any possibility of relating these rates to each other as they should be related, our loss at the end of the present year may reach $750,000,000.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. That argument amounts simply to this—that it will make the States victims of the loss. Now, where does the bill leave you if it passes? It leaves, as a matter of fact, two tribunals for the adjustment of railroad rates. The interstate rates will be regulated, under your bill, by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The intrastate rates, rates within a State, will be still controlled by the Railroad Administration. As to the argument which the Senator advances that we are running the railroad system at a loss, we are falling behind, does the Senator seek to imply by that that we should make up these losses by holding the 48 States under a separate control, and leave them at the mercy of the Railroad Administration?

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator know whether the State rates are higher or lower than the interstate rates?

Mr. NELSON. They were lower before the Railroad Administration got hold of it, but after they got hold of it they got to be higher.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think that is true.

Mr. NELSON. I know it is true.

Mr. CUMMINS. They were lower, but they are not now higher. The same changes that the Director General has made—I will not enter upon a discussion of the necessity or wisdom of those changes—in interstate business he has made in intrastate business. The intrastate rates have not been raised above the interstate rates.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CUMMINS. And the State of North Dakota recently passed a statute which reduced the rates, I think, by one-half, and reduced them in such a way that no person who is familiar with the situation would for a single moment enter upon a justification of the reduction.

Mr. NELSON. No; but, Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me——

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. I will give the Senator a different case from that. We had in Minnesota a 2-cent passenger rate existing and acquiesced in by the railroads for several years. The new Railroad Administration came in and increased it to 3 cents a mile, and for a while, as the Senator knows, if he took a sleeping car, it was increased a little more than that; but at all events it increased it, and kept it at 3 cents a mile instead of 2 cents a mile under our State legislation and State administration; and the increases made in transportation rates on freight were even greater than that, even a greater proportion. I know of some cases where the Railroad Administration increased local rates in the State of Minnesota to the extent of 200 per cent, and they destroyed a great many little wholesale stores that we had in the State—absolutely ruined them. Where they had established wholesale grocery stores and wholesale fruit stores under State administration, and where the railroads had given them rates, they were utterly ruined and driven out of business.

Mr. CUMMINS. I know of cases where interstate rates have been increased 700 per cent, so the instance suggested by the Senator from Minnesota is not peculiar to the State rates.

Mr. NELSON. But, Mr. President—perhaps I am interrupting the Senator——

Mr. CUMMINS. Not at all.

Mr. NELSON. But here is one question: Why can we not in this bill relieve the State rates from the incubus or burden of this Railway Administration just as well as we relieve the interstate rates?

Mr. CUMMINS. I should like very much to do that if it can be safely done; but I am treating the United States as the operator of this property. I know of no stancher defender of the jurisdiction and power of the United States than the Senator from Minnesota. I desire to end that possession at the earliest possible moment; but so long as the United States is in possession of the property and is operating it and is responsible for its revenues as well as its expenses, it must have some of the privileges of an owner and operator of such property.

Suppose we were to pass such a bill as is suggested by the Senator from Minnesota and every State should reduce the rates to the point where they were before the Railroad Administration assumed control. We would have a 2-cent fare in Minnesota, in Iowa, in Nebraska, I think in both of the Dakotas, and we would have a 3 or a 3½ cent rate for all through business. Does the Senator from Minnesota think that is a desirable situation?

Mr. NELSON. No; but, Mr. President, the Senator assumes in that case that the Interstate Commerce Commission will make no changes in rates. He proposes to divest the Railroad Administration of the power of making rates and confer it upon the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Senator assumes in his very statement that the Interstate Commerce Commission will retain the present rate of 3½ cents.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think rates will have to be very much increased all over the country. I am sorry to say that. No one regrets to say it more than I do.

Mr. NELSON. Well, whether they are increased or not, I want a fair deal. I do not want the States discriminated against. I do not want their rates to be left under the Railroad Administration and the rates of the other roads left immune.

Mr. CUMMINS. No more do I; and when the transportation comes to be furnished by private companies, as I hope will be the case before very long, then the Senator will find me as earnest a defender of the rights of the several States in adjusting the regulations and in fixing the rates upon intrastate traffic as he can possibly be; but I see a vast difference between the submission of a private corporation to the authority of the several States, so far as rates are concerned, and the submission of the Government of the United States to the several States. If I am wrong about that, if there is no difference between the two cases, then, of course, the conclusion of the Senator from Minnesota inevitably follows.

Just a moment with regard to any hope of decreasing rates; and that, of course, is what the Senator from Minnesota desires, and it is a perfectly natural desire. He wants to see all the States reduce the rates to the point at which they stood prior to the war or prior to our entrance upon this great undertaking. As I said a moment ago——

Mr. NELSON rose.

Mr. CUMMINS. Just a moment, and I will yield gladly. I want the Senator to have in mind just what is happening. As I said a moment ago, in the year 1918, notwithstanding the fact

that the Government increased the rates about the middle of the year 25 per cent upon an average, many of them, however, being increased vastly more than that and some of them less, notwithstanding the fact that the railroads of this country earned in the year 1918 $800,000,000 more than they earned in the year 1917, which was the best year the railroads ever experienced in all of their history, we lost $240,000,000 in the operation. In the first four months of this year, notwithstanding additional increases, no great or general increases but some additional increases, by reason of the diminished traffic and the enhanced expenses of operation, we lost, as I said before, nearly $250,000,000.

Unless a miracle happens during the year, our total loss at the end of the year can not be fairly estimated at less than $600,000,000 or $650,000,000.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

Mr. CUMMINS. In just a moment. Somehow we must bring the expenses of the railroads and the revenues of the railroads into closer relation with each other. If we do not we are all lost in hopeless bankruptcy. We will not only have imposed upon the United States a vast debt, but we will have so impaired our transportation facilities that they will not answer the demands of commerce. I must yield to the Senator from Minnesota first.

Mr. NELSON. It is perhaps a little late, but the Senator from Iowa intimated awhile ago that it is my great zeal to have the State rates reduced to the old basis. That is not my chief interest. My chief interest is to preserve the rights of the States to control rates within their own borders. I am more anxious about that.

The Senator has told us how many millions we have run behind. Will the Senator explain how those losses occurred? I understand the Railroad Administration have added to the force of employees upward of 60,000 men.

Mr. CUMMINS. I know. I can tell the Senator——

Mr. NELSON. Permit me to ask the Senator if he does not think he ought to draw a lesson from what was stated so eloquently by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] about this telegraph bill, to show the result of Government control and operation? For a few months they have had control of the telegraph and telephone lines and they have run them into the ground. With that lesson before you, why do you not aim to take the railroads out of the Railroad Administration as soon as possible and put them back into private hands the same as you have the telegraph and telephone companies?

Mr. CUMMINS. I wish to assure my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, there is no man in this assembly or in the United States or in the world who is so anxious to return these properties to private operation as I am. But if we were at this moment to pass a bill such as the telegraph bill, there is not a railroad in the United States, possibly save two or three, that would not be in the hands of a receiver within 30 days. We might just as well face the situation. There is no glamor about it. If the railroads were returned to their owners at this moment with the rates which now prevail and with the cost of maintenance and operation which now exists—I may be overdrawing it a little—there are not one-half of the railroads in the country that could earn interest upon their bonds.

No man ought to talk, as has been suggested in other circles, lightly about returning these properties to their owners until we have effective and substantial and helpful legislation that will enable them to continue to furnish to the people of the country the transportation which our commerce demands.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I desire to add this suggestion to what the Senator from Iowa has already said: I am in hearty accord with what the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] has said with respect to getting the rate-making power out of the hands of the Director General's office, but I think a study of this question will convince him, as it has myself and some others, that it is necessary that we have some perhaps general legislation bearing on the subject. Suffice it to say that it was sufficient for me to consent to the report of this bill in its present form because I realize that one of the very strong reasons why the rate-making power, so far as interstate commerce is concerned, should be returned to the Interstate Commerce Commission, is not that the Director General's office had increased the rates, but that they had increased them inequitably, because they attempted to formulate a committee or a commission which was operating independently of the Interstate Commerce Commission. They made certain changes in classification. The word was given to the country that there was an increase of 25 per cent, but when you took into consideration the changes in classification, it meant, for instance, so far as rough grain was concerned in the Middle West, an increase of from 50 to 60 per cent. It appeared before our committee that in certain classes of freight from New Orleans there was an increase of 240 per cent. One of the members of the committee stated that in his own State he had information that there were increases of 500 per cent. I want, if I can, to get just as much as possible of this rate-making power taken away from the Director General's office and restore it to the Interstate Commerce Commission, a body that has been built up, that has existed and worked for 30 years, and take it out of the hands of some of the incompetents who are down there in the Director General's office.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, it is evident we will not be able to conclude the consideration of the pending bill to-day. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, June 11, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *June 10, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our heavenly Father, let Thy holy influence find its way into our waiting hearts, that our legislative acts this day may be in consonance with Thy holy will and make for American citizenship among our people and for righteousness in the midst of a world of sorrow and grief; and Thine shall be the praise through Him who taught us love and good will to all mankind. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN A MEMBER.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana, Representative elect JAMES O'CONNOR, who was elected on June 5 from the first congressional district of Louisiana in succession to Gen. Albert Estopinal, lately deceased, is present in the Chamber and prepared to take the oath, with the consent of the House. His credentials have not arrived. Under the laws of the State of Louisiana the same can not be issued until June 16, and naturally can not reach Washington for two or three days thereafter. Inasmuch as Mr. O'CONNOR had no opposition, either in the primaries or in the general election, and there is no question as to his right to sit in this body, I ask unanimous consent, in conformity with many previous precedents, that the requirement in regard to credentials be waived in this case and that the oath be now administered to him.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent that his colleague, Mr. O'CONNOR, be allowed to take the oath of office without the credentials being presented. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I understand there is no question about Mr. O'CONNOR's election or in regard to the regularity of his election, and there is no question but that in due time his credentials will arrive. Therefore I shall not object.

Mr. DUPRÉ. In regard to the latter statement I will say that there is no question about the fact that his credentials will in due time arrive, and in regard to the preceding suggestion I will say, if I may, that I think the gentleman from Wyoming would be very glad to have the condition apply to his own case—that there is absolutely no question about the fact that he was duly elected and received—oh, I do not know how many thousands of votes; I think there were 18 scattered throughout the district.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana will step forward and take the oath of office.

Mr. O'CONNOR, accompanied by Mr. DUPRÉ, appeared before the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2480) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 1213. To amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918; to the Committee on Education.

VICTOR L. BERGER.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate back to the amending stage the proceedings by which the House passed House resolution No. 6, providing for the appointment of a committee to report on the right of Mr. Berger to a seat in the House.

I will state, Mr. Speaker, that I do this for the reason that, owing to an error on the part of the Clerk in copying the name from the certificate sent by the governor of Wisconsin, the name was printed on the roll as "Victor Berger," instead of "Victor L. Berger," which is the right name.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to vacate back to the amending stage the proceedings had on the resolution relative to Mr. Berger.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, while I think all this performance is superfluous after it is done, yet I think this will not do any harm, and therefore I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DALLINGER moves to amend House resolution No. 6, on page 1, line 2, after the word "Victor," by inserting the initial letter "L.;" and on line 8, after the word "Victor," inserting the initial letter "L."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The same amendment will be applied to the title, unless there is objection. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

PERMISSION TO A COMMITTEE TO SIT DURING THE SESSION.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads to sit during the sessions of the House.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and subcommittees thereof have leave to sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a communication from Chicago inclosing some statistics that were gathered there by some members of the Chicago Post Office Clerks' Union on the question of postal wages and working conditions, and I ask unanimous consent that these may be incorporated in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD for the purpose suggested. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think most of us received that pamphlet. What does the gentleman expect to accomplish by inserting it in the RECORD?

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Nothing more than to have it incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the future record and for the guidance of some of the Members in case they may desire to consult it.

Mr. BLACK. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, we have a commission now that is investigating that whole question, and I have no doubt but that that commission will go into all of the facts stated in the pamphlet that the gentleman has received. I have received a copy of that pamphlet. It is a very interesting one, but I will have to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2480) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill and asks that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I reserve all points of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri reserves all points of order on the conference report. Is there objection to the statement being read in lieu of the report?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the House conferees.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2480) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, having met after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 14, 15, 17, 28, 36, 37, 38, and 46.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, and 48, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter covered in amendment 6 and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"That the amounts of $42,500 appropriated by the Indian appropriation act approved March 2, 1917 (39 Stat. L., p. 975), and $5,000 appropriated by the Indian appropriation act approved May 25, 1918 (Public No. 159), in all $47,500, for the construction of two bridges over the Little Colorado and Canyon Diablo Rivers, near the Leupp Indian Agency, Ariz., are hereby reappropriated for the same purposes as provided in said acts, reimbursable as provided in said acts, and to remain a charge and lien upon the lands and funds of the Navajo Tribe of Indians until paid."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Strike out the matter covered by amendment No. 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion and under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to cause to be issued to the Gospel Missionary Union, which has engaged in mission work among the Navajo Indians since 1896, a patent in fee, for mission purposes only, for that particular tract of land on the Western Navajo Reservation, in Arizona, not exceeding 160 acres in area, which it has continuously used and occupied for mission purposes from a date prior to the Executive order of January 8, 1900, withdrawing from sale and settlement the lands which now constitute the said reservation; said patent in fee shall be issued on a legal description of the land so used: *Provided*, That if said land shall cease to be used for mission purposes the same shall revert to the Navajo Tribe of Indians"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: The House recedes with an amendment: Strike out "$2,000" and insert "$1,000" in lieu thereof; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter contained in amendment 34 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided further*, That from the sums heretofore appropriated for said Pottawatomie Indians the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay to Erik O. Morstad, of Leona, Wis., in person and in full satisfaction for services rendered, the sum of $2,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment numbered 35 insert the following: "For the purchase of subsistence supplies in relieving cases of actual distress and suffering among those needy St. Croix Indians of Wisconsin whose cases are referred to in report of January 30, 1915, transmitted by the Secretary of the Interior to the House of Representatives March 3, 1915, pursuant to the provisions of the act of Congress of August 1, 1914 (38 Stats. L., pp. 582-605), and printed as House Document No. 1663, Sixty-third Congress, third session, $1,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by Senate amendment numbered 39 insert: "For the construction of a road from the village of Odanah in the Bad River Reservation to the south line of said reservation, $20,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, said sum to be reimbursable from any funds now or hereafter placed in the Treasury to the credit of the Indians on the Bad River Reservation, to remain a charge and lien upon the funds of said Indians until paid: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the construction of said road: *Provided further*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be expended until the Secretary of the Interior shall have obtained from the proper authorities of the State of Wisconsin satisfactory guaranties of the payment by the said State of at least one-half the cost of the construction of said road"; and the Senate agree to the same.

HOMER P. SNYDER,
P. P. CAMPBELL,
C. D. CARTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

CHARLES CURTIS,
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE,
HENRY F. ASHURST,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The bill as passed by the Senate increased gratuity appropriations over the amount allowed by the House by $216,335.05. This Senate increase was decreased in conference by $177,000, leaving, as carried in this report, a net increase over appropriations as originally made by the House of $39,335.05.

On amendment No. 1: The House provision was restored.

On amendment No. 2: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment, which inserts the words "roads and."

On amendment No. 3: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment which limits the payment of a per diem in lieu of subsistence to the time when the employee is away from home or designated headquarters.

On amendments Nos. 4 and 5: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment which changes the limitation from three years to one year from and after March 5, 1919.

On amendment No. 6: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment with an amendment which cites the additional appropriation of $5,000 for the construction of these bridges.

On amendment No. 7: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment which appropriates $167.75 to reimburse Yuma County, Ariz.

On amendment No. 8: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment which appropriates $300 to pay for a team of horses which had been commandeered by the department and drowned while in the service of the department.

On amendment No. 9: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment with an amendment providing that the lands granted shall revert to the Navajo Indians if not used for missionary purposes.

On amendment No. 10: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment with an amendment reducing the amount appropriated to $1,000.

On amendment No. 11: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment increasing the appropriation of $3,500 to construct a cottage destroyed by fire since the bill passed the House.

On amendment No. 12: Your conferees receded on account of the very limited fire protection at this school.

On amendment No. 13: Your conferees receded on this amendment, appropriating $100,000 of the tribal funds of the Chippewa Indians, it having been demonstrated that this sum was absolutely necessary to care for old, indigent Indians on the Chippewa Reservation.

On amendment No. 14: The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 15: The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 16: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment, making this appropriation available until expended, because it is advantageous to the Government to allow a longer time than a single fiscal year in which to construct irrigation works, this being an appropriation to complete the work.

On amendment No. 17: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment for the reason that all the funds available for the construction of this irrigation system are now exhausted.

On amendment No. 18: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment, which restores the House language, except that lands patented to Indians are made nontaxable, and, second, that all mineral rights are reserved to the tribe instead of to individual allottees.

On amendment No. 19: Your conferees accepted this amendment, believing that the sum of $676 was justly due Vincent County, N. Dak., for the care of three insane Indians.

On amendment No. 20: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment increasing this appropriation by $5,000, because this additional money was needed to facilitate the leasing of additional oil and gas lands.

On amendment No. 21: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment increasing this appropriation by $20,000 at the earnest solicitation of the full-blood Indians of the Osage Tribe, whose children are educated in this school.

On amendment No. 22: Your conferees accepted this amendment because there is a disagreement between the Indians themselves as to the advisability of the appointment of an attorney.

On amendment No. 23: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment increasing this appropriation by $5,000 because of the large increase in gas production on the Osage Reservation.

On amendment No. 24: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment in order to permit the payment of necessary expenses which have already been incurred.

On amendment No. 25: This corrects a clerical error.

On amendment No. 26: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment, favorable action on this claim having been previously taken by the House.

On amendment No. 27: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment which appropriates the sum of $367.30 out of tribal funds to pay George D. Rogers for services as tribal attorney.

On amendment No. 28: The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 29: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment which increases this appropriation by $2,000 to cover necessary expenses incurred since May 1, 1919.

On amendment No. 30: Corrects a total.

On amendment No. 31: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment, increasing this appropriation of $3,000, which is $2,000 less than the estimate.

On amendment No. 32: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment which provides for reimbursing land owners for damages in the manner usually provided under reclamation projects.

On amendment No. 33: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment which reduces the per capita payment from $50 to $40.

On amendment No. 34: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment with an amendment reducing the amount to be paid to Eric O. Morsted from $5,000 to $2,000, and providing that said sum shall be paid to him in person and in full satisfaction for services rendered.

On amendment No. 35: This amendment authorizes the appropriation of $1,000 relieving cases of actual distress and suffering among the needy of St. Croix Indians of Wisconsin.

On amendment No. 36: The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 37: The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 38: The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 39: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment with an amendment making it clear that the sum provided for the construction of a road on the Bad River Indians' Reservation in Wisconsin shall be reimbursed to the United States.

On amendment No. 40: This amendment validates the relinquishment of John Stone of certain lands in the State of Wisconsin.

On amendment No. 41: This amendment permits the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse the Treasurer of the United States, from Indian funds, for expenditures made from moneys accruing from reimbursable appropriations.

On amendment No. 42: Change in total only.

On amendment No. 43: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment, because upon further investigation it was found that the amount appropriated was insufficient to supply feed for 15,000 head of cattle.

On amendment No. 44: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment in order to permit the cattle belonging to the Hickory Indians to be sold and to be replaced with sheep.

On amendment No. 45: This amendment was also accepted for the same purpose of amendment 44.

On amendment No. 46: The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 47: Adds a new section number.

On amendment No. 48: Changes a section number.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. SNYDER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

RAILROAD DEFICIENCY.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the deficiency appropriation for railroads (H. R. 5312), and pending that motion I will ask the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] if we can agree on time for general debate.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. What does the gentleman suggest? I agreed with the gentleman this morning that we would have one hour on a side. That is satisfactory to me unless the gentleman has changed his mind.

Mr. GOOD. I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be limited to two hours, one hour to be controlled by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and one by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate be limited to two hours, one hour to be controlled by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and one hour by himself. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, will that take care of my 10 minutes?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will say to the gentleman frankly that I am satisfied I will not be able to take care of him in the hour, because I have received requests that make it impossible to do so; but I am satisfied that under the five-minute rule the gentleman will have ample opportunity, and there will be no disposition to cut the gentleman off.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion of Mr. GOOD was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5312) to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for carrying out the act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918, with Mr. ANDERSON in the chair.

Mr. ANDERSON took the chair amid applause.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 5312, which the Clerk will report.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for carrying out the act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918, there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $750,000,000, which shall be in addition to the appropriation of $500,000,000 made in section 6 of said act, and shall be subject in all respects to the same authority for, and restriction of, expenditure as the said $500,000,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, in the last Congress a bill passed the House carrying an appropriation of $750,000,000 to supply a deficiency in the Railroad Administration. That bill failed of final enactment, and the Director General of Railroads has made another estimate for this service, to supply the deficiencies in the operation of the railroads during the year 1918 and for anticipated deficiencies in 1919 of $1,200,000,000. The committee has reported out the bill carrying $750,000,000. In making this report the committee does not say that $750,000,000 will be all that will be required to pay the deficit of last year and the deficit for the balance of the year 1919, but it does say that it is sufficient to permit the Railroad Administration to pay all of its obligations that are outstanding at the present time, both to the railroad companies for the standard return and to pay the equipment companies for the balances due for equipment it has purchased. The committee is satisfied that the entire amount carried by this bill is required. It may, and not unlikely will, be necessary to make additional appropriations for this service.

But it is the opinion of the committee that additional requirements are so indefinite and uncertain that the appropriation therefor may well await future action by Congress when the needs for additional funds are more clearly apparent. So much depends upon the extent to which the railroads are able to finance themselves and upon operations for the remainder of the year.

The sum recommended in the bill, however, will meet the situation until the latter part of the calendar year, when the Railroad Administration will be in a much better position to state what further amount the Government will be called upon to appropriate to fulfill the provisions of the Federal-control act.

The Army appropriation act of August 29, 1916, carried a provision giving the President the power in time of war to take over and operate the railroads and inland waterways of the United States. Pursuant to that act, on the 26th day of December, 1917, the President by a proclamation took over all the railroads of the United States. Subsequently and on March 21, 1919, Congress enacted a law providing for the Government control and operation of the railroads and appropriated $500,000,000 as a revolving fund for their operation. Since that time, therefore, the President of the United States, both by the provisions of the Army appropriation act and the provisions of the railroad-control act of March 21, 1918, has been operating practically all the railroads in the United States, the mileage of the railroads under actual control and operation aggregating 239,893 miles, or more than 98 per cent of the total mileage of the railroads in the United States.

This appropriation does not involve in the slightest degree the question of whether or not it was necessary or advisable for the President at that time to take control and operation of the railroads. We are brought face to face now with a condition and not a theory. The President did exercise that power, and thereafter Congress enacted a law continuing Federal control and providing how the roads should be operated. That law provided a basis for determining the amount of the standard return or rental the railroads would be entitled to and provided a plan for the maintenance and equipment of all the railroads under Federal control by the Railroad Administration.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. The law that the Congress passed authorized the President to make contracts within the average amount of the earnings for three years prior to the taking over of the roads, but it did not compel him to make contracts absorbing the entire amount earned on the average during those three years. Can the gentleman tell us what proportion of the entire earnings the Government is obligated to pay under these contracts?

Mr. GOOD. If I understand the gentleman's question the Government in the first place is obligated to pay under these rental contracts $940,669,104.57 annually so long as under Federal control. Some of the railroads have not executed the rental contract, and there may be some change, but the change will increase the total and will not diminish it.

Mr. MADDEN. What was the total average earnings for the three years? Was it $961,000,000 or $931,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. The average return for the three years was something less than $940,000,000, but the act provided that in special instances, where, for instance, a part of a road had been constructed subsequent to 1915 or 1916, and was not in operation during the entire three prewar years, a special allowance could be made to such roads, and there have been special allowances made to cover just such contingencies.

Mr. MADDEN. My understanding of the law is, without being clear as to its exact language, that it was not within the power of the President of the United States to make contracts beyond the amount the earnings averaged for the period of three years, but that he could make contracts within that limit and for as much less than that as it is possible for him to make it.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman is right in assuming that the law provides a method for determining this standard return. It provides that rental should be paid to the railroads by the Railroad Administration, based upon the average that each road earned during the three prewar years—the years 1915, 1916, and 1917. That law also contains this provision:

"If the President shall find that the condition of any carrier was during all or a substantial portion of the period of three years ended June 30, 1917, because of nonoperation, receivership, or where recent expenditures for additions or improvements or equipment were not fully reflected in the operating railway income of said three years or a substantial portion thereof, or

because of any undeveloped or abnormal conditions, so exceptional as to make the basis of earning hereinabove provided for plainly inequitable as a fair measure of just compensation, then the President may make with the carrier such agreement for such amount as just compensation as under the circumstances of the particular case he shall find just."

If, therefore, a road was not operating all its lines that the Government took over in pursuance of this law during all of the three prewar years, or if during the three prewar years had doubled-tracked the systems or made additions and betterments that radically changed its condition and earning power, these matters which resulted in increased earnings should be taken into consideration, and to a considerable extent claims have already been allowed for such additional investment, and this allowance is provided for in the law and also in the contracts.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Have the contracts that the Railroad Administrator made with various railroads for compensation under the law been submitted to the gentleman's committee?

Mr. GOOD. The form of the contracts has been, and will be found in the hearings, but the contracts for the separate roads were not submitted and were not asked for.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman advise the House whether any contract was made with any railroad for less than the three years' average referred to by the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. GOOD. I do not know of any contract, and our attention was not called to any contract, with any railroad company where the amount of the standard return was less than the average operating income for the three prewar years.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman will remember that that was the maximum, and it was said that undoubtedly the President or the Director General of Railroads would make contracts for less than the average provided for in the law. What I am trying to get at is whether there was any one instance where a contract was made for less than the standard return.

Mr. GOOD. The committee did not go into that and I am not advised as to the facts. Possibly some railroads receive less than the average operating income for the three prewar years, but I do not think so.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is advised that the aggregate amount of the contracts is more than the amount of the standard earnings.

Mr. GOOD. I am not sure that I understand the gentleman. The operating income of the railroads would not amount to $940,000,000. That is, the income after the payment of all operating expenses and taxes does not amount to $940,000,000 during the year, but it failed by $236,000,000 in 1918.

Mr. MADDEN. That is, $236,000,000 last year; but I am talking about the contracts that the Government entered into to pay the railroads the standard returns, and whether these contracts are not more in the aggregate than the three years' average earnings?

Mr. GOOD. They are more than the standard returns. Claims in addition to the standard returns amounting to $3,709,887.09 have been allowed and there are like claims still pending, aggregating $26,285,606.51.

We must consider that when the roads were taken over a little different condition prevailed than at present. We were at war. Aside from that, during 1917 there had been an advance in wages of the labor employed by the railroad companies of about 12½ per cent. The Interstate Commerce Commission had not increased the rates of the railroad companies to meet the increased compensation granted the employees. They had begun to feel the increasing cost of operation and maintenance.

Congestion, especially in the eastern lines, had practically tied up some of the great railroads. A labor crisis was threatening, and there were a great many things of this kind that I have no doubt actuated the President in taking over the roads at that time. Whether or not all these things combined justify the taking over the roads I do not care at this time to express an opinion. As I stated before, we are face to face with the fact that the roads were taken over; they have been operated for a year and a half, and that for the first year there has been an admitted deficit of $236,000,000 in the operation of the roads and for the first four months of this year an admitted deficit of $250,000,000. That these sums will be increased anyone familiar with the situation must admit.

I am satisfied that these deficits do not begin to measure the full amount of the deficit that will actually come to the Government by reason of the operation of the roads.

In the first place, the Government appropriated $500,000,000. It had to borrow that amount of money, and the Railroad Administration has been using it for practically all of 1918. If we add to the deficit the amount of interest on that amount of money, we would increase the deficit at once by about $25,000,000.

Then, too, the Government for years to come will be paying losses and damages for personal-injury claims. The Government will have settlement to make with regard to the equipment that was purchased for the railroads. Some of the roads refuse to accept the equipment allotted to them. It must be remembered that when the President took over the railroads he took over the complete operation of the railroads. He took the property of the railroad companies in use for transportation purposes. He operated these roads just as if he owned them. He employed the labor, made the improvements, paid the taxes, kept up the betterments and the maintenance of the roads, and paid such judgments and claims as originated in the operation.

The Government stands to lose a substantial amount on the $100,000,000 which it has advanced to the various roads and for the payment of which it holds certain supplies and material. With some of the weaker roads the supplies and material held for the repayment of the amount which such roads owe the Railroad Administration is not sufficient to guarantee the obligation. Unquestionably claims will be made against the Railroad Administration for damage because of deferred maintenance. While, on the whole, the statement made by the Director General would indicate the roads have been maintained in accordance with the contract requirements, yet unquestionably many roads will claim that their properties have not been maintained on the standard of the general average, and will make claims for damage on this account.

No one who has given any study to this subject doubts the fact that hundreds of short-line railroads have substantial claims that must somehow be paid, and that that payment must come out of the Treasury of the United States. It is indeed to be regretted that the short-line railroads of the country have not been treated more fairly so far as Government control and operation is concerned. Since the roads were taken over on the 28th of December, 1917, this class of roads has never known what its real status was unless they have been recently advised. At first they were all taken under Federal control and remained under Federal control and operation for several months, when the President released a large number of them. From the beginning of Federal control freight and traffic that would naturally have gone to these roads has been diverted to other channels, whether under Government control and operation or not. They have suffered an irreparable loss; but to some extent, sometime, this loss must be paid if the Government is to deal fairly and honorably with the owners of this class of property.

It is to be hoped that the Director General will in the future give consideration to the just claims of this class of roads, and that when the Director General again asks Congress for additional appropriations he will be able to show that not only the rental due the trunk-line railroads has been paid, but that substantial progress has been made in a fair and just settlement with the short-line railroads.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman has called attention to $236,000,000 it lost last year and $250,000,000 in the first four months of this year, and $25,000,000 interest that has not been charged up against that, and possibly other things, but he has not said anything about the $100,000,000 in excess of passenger service and increased freight rates which the roads received and which would be a loss to the American people. Why not add that?

Mr. GOOD. That is true; there were increases in freight and passenger rates which were in effect about six months of the year. That increase in rates resulted in a total increase in operating revenue of about $560,000,000. If it had been applied for the entire year it would have resulted in an increase of about $950,000,000 or $1,000,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. It would be $1,100,000,000.

Mr. GOOD. No; it would not be that amount, because the gentleman will note that during the first four months of the year there is always a falling off, in freight traffic especially. The decrease in freight traffic for the first three or four months of a year as compared with the months of August, September, October, and November is very marked, and I think if the rates had been in effect for the entire year it would have produced in the neighborhood of $950,000,000 or $1,000,000,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I agree entirely with my colleague that the amount of debts stated by the Director General is not the whole amount of deficit. There is another matter which I think ought to be mentioned. It has been stated, and I think possibly in the hearings, although I am not sure of that, but by railroad experts, who ought to know about the matter, that the condition of equipment and ways of railroads has been permitted to run down; that it is not as good as it was when the roads were taken over. If so, that would represent another item that would eventually have to be made up, would it not?

Mr. GOOD. I am aware that such claims have been made, and some loss may result from deferred maintenance, but I do not believe there is very much, if anything, in that claim. If the gentleman will turn to page 47 of the hearings, he will find that during the three prewar years the railroads themselves invested in maintenance of ways and structures $403,501,408. That was the average for the prewar years, whereas for 1918 the Railroad Administration paid $653,869,469, or an increase of $250,000,000, in maintenance of ways and structures. So, too, we find the same condition in regard to the maintenance of equipment. The average for the three prewar years was $563,978,613, whereas the Director General expended last year in maintenance of equipment $1,108,030,396. In other words, there was paid for maintenance of equipment $544,051,783 more in 1918 than the amount paid for a like purpose for the average of the test period. That maintenance, of course, was composed of labor and material that was purchased at higher price than like articles were purchased at during the test period; but, after full credit is given for increased costs, it seems to me that the Director General has, so far as maintenance of ways and structures and maintenance of equipment are concerned, expended enough money at least to keep them up to the standard required in the contract.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is aware that prices of most articles of maintenance have practically doubled and wages have greatly increased, but aside from that matter I suppose that anyone who has been traveling over the railroads to any great extent, observing the condition of the roadbeds and equipment, would agree with the statement that it had not been fully kept up.

Mr. GOOD. I can not say how efficiently or wisely the money has been expended. I only state from the money standpoint that the amount expended was sufficient for maintenance of the roads as provided for in the contract, even considering the increase in the cost of materials and labor.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. Of course, we know that the Government had to take charge of railroads under the war powers, and that in the emergency we had to depend upon the railroad people to operate the roads. Some people claim that the railroad people were afraid of Government ownership, and in order to provide against that they made the service as unpopular and as expensive as possible. Has the gentleman any opinion about that that he would care to express?

Mr. GOOD. The committee attempted to find out whether or not there was any truth in the reports that the railroads were being administered in a way to discourage the idea of public ownership; that is, whether or not the men left in official charge were fulfilling their duty patriotically and faithfully in executing this law.

It was the opinion of Mr. Hines that while under private control, as well as under Government operation, there is always a loss of property by theft, and inefficiency on the part of some officials, yet the loss in this respect was no greater than under private operation, so far as the management by officials was concerned; that the officials are attempting to get as much for the money expended under Federal control as did the officials under private operation.

The Director General did not state anything with regard to the efficiency of labor in that respect.

Mr. MADDEN. Did the Director General of Railroads say anything to the committee about the fact that they have more than 200,000 more men in the employ of the railroads doing less work than they had before the Government took them over?

Mr. GOOD. The committee inquired what the situation was in regard to the number of men employed by the railroad companies during the prewar period, as compared with 1918 or 1919. The Director General was not able to furnish us with an analysis that would make the comparison, and there were some very good reasons for it. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in 1917—I think it was in October—Congress enacted the Adamson law, which decreased the hours of service of railway employees from 10 hours per day to 8 hours per day. Therefore it was his contention that in making a comparison it should be in hours of service rather than in days of service. His attention was called to the fact that when that law was pending before Congress it was claimed that if the eight-hour day was adopted a man would perform in 8 hours as much labor or service as he had been accustomed to perform in 10 hours; but the statement of the Director General is that in so far as hours of service are concerned there is about the same number as formerly—a slight increase. If, however, we take days of service, while I think the gentleman's figures are a little large, yet I imagine there are about 140,000 or 150,000 more men employed on the railroads of the United States than during any of the prewar years.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It appears from the remarkable statement of the gentleman that the longer we keep these roads the more they run in debt, and the larger will be the debt incurred against the United States. I would like to inquire whether anything developed in the testimony to show that the debt will increase instead of decrease in the future?

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman means deficit in operation?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. I will say first to the gentleman it all depends upon the volume of business done by the railroads, and the indications are that the volume of business will greatly increase during the remainder of this year. Traffic movement can be seen from the operating income of the roads. The average operation income for the three-year prewar period—that is, the income after we deduct operating expenses and taxes—by month was about $77,000,000 per month; during the month of February the average for the three prewar years was only $47,000,000, but during the month of October the operating income reached the figure of $95,000,000. So while there has been some loss, a great loss so far this year, that should have been expected. The great loss during the first four months of this year, looking at it broadly, ought not to be made good during the remaining seven months. A study of the situation, I think, will convince anyone that during the first quarter of any year the railroads rarely, if ever, receive enough money to pay their operating expenses and allow them anything to speak of as a return on investment, but with an increase of business for the latter part of the year the loss, if any, during the first quarter is made up, and they are generally able to make their earnings and pay a fair return.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Can the gentleman tell the House what percentage of mile-tons of commodities are moved by the railroads now, as compared with the three-year prewar period?

Mr. GOOD. My recollection is that when you measure the traffic in ton-miles for the first four months of this year with the first four months of 1918 there is a falling off of about 14 per cent, but, strange to say, when you compare the ton-miles of freight moved for the first four months of this year with the average of the first four months of the prewar period it is practically the same, so that there is nothing very abnormal in the movement of freight at the present time, as compared with the average for the first four months of the prewar period. It is about normal. The passenger business is more than normal.

Mr. MADDEN. So that with the normal tonnage carried, as compared with the three prewar years, the railroads are still employing, according to the gentleman, more than 150,000 more men?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; but we must remember they are only working 8 hours a day, while the men then worked 10 hours a day.

Mr. JEFFERIS rose.

Mr. GOOD. I shall yield to the gentleman, and then I must decline to yield for a while.

Mr. JEFFERIS. Can the gentleman give some information as to the increase in wages the employees have received since, say, 1917?

Mr. GOOD. The increase, on the average, of wages paid employees of railroad companies during the time they have been under the control and operation of the Railroad Administration amounts approximately to 52 per cent, and that does not include 12½ per cent that was granted to the employees during the latter part of 1917. If we add the increase in wages of employees of railroad companies received during the latter part of 1917 with the wage increase allowed by the Director General we have a total increase in wages of about 65 per cent since the latter part of 1917.

Mr. JEFFERIS. And was that brought about by the action of the Railroad Administration?

Mr. GOOD. The 52 per cent was made by the Railroad Administration, but the 12½ per cent was made before the roads were taken over.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman has stated that the average increase was about 65 per cent in the wages of railroad employees.

Mr. GOOD. Since 1917.

Mr. SNYDER. Well, I just wanted to observe that it is no greater rate of increase than has taken place in almost every line of industry in this country.

Mr. GOOD. I will say in answer to the gentleman that Judge Gary has stated that since 1913 the increase in the labor cost of making a ton of steel is 128 per cent.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The total deficit for the Railroad Administration for the years 1918–19 seems to be $1,250,000,000. What I would like to know is this: Does that whole amount mean a loss to the Treasury or is some of this advances and loans and improvements that the railroads will have to pay back; and if so, how much is the total loss and how much will the railroads be under obligation to pay back into the Treasury of the United States? Has the gentleman those figures?

Mr. GOOD. The Railroad Administration hopes to pay back into the Treasury of the United States all the money that has been appropriated for 1918 operation and which may hereafter be appropriated for its operation except $236,000,000 loss for 1918 and $250,000,000 loss so far this year, less certain losses for inland waterways and some allowances for equipment and things of that kind. In other words, it recognizes an actual loss so far of $486,000,000. Now, I do not want to be discourteous, but I do want to try to give a picture of the situation presented, and I shall appreciate it if I may proceed for a few minutes without interruption.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. FESS. I would like to have a little light on the very thing the gentleman has been suggesting, where Mr. Hines says that $1,214,000,000 of the $1,700,000,000 should be paid back to the Government by the railroads, and he also states of that sum $486,000,000 represents the loss which I take from what the gentleman says should be written off. What is the meaning of that statement?

Mr. GOOD. The meaning is this: He is dealing with hundreds of railroad companies. He is loaning money, for instance, to the New York, New Haven & Hartford amounting to $43,000,000. He is advancing money to all railroad companies practically for additions and betterments. He advanced for additions and betterments for 1918 about $352,000,000 and proposes to advance for like purposes for 1919 $253,000,000.

That is for additions and betterments. He is dealing with a hundred different railroads or more, and taking it all in all he figures that all of these loans he has made and proposes to make and all the amounts invested in various railroad properties in additions and betterments and the like will eventually be returned to the Government. There will be some additional losses, but he thinks it is speculative what those losses will be. He does not think they will be large, and I hope he is right in this regard.

After the railroads were taken over the Director General, as I have stated, increased the wages of employees to the extent of about 52 per cent on the average. The total amount of the increase of wages amounts to $852,000,000 during 1918. The increase in freight and passenger rates equaled about 25 per cent. That increase was only applicable for six months, or approximately six months, of the year. It brought in, in round figures, $560,000,000. The increase in the cost of material that went into the maintenance of the roads and maintenance of equipment averaged, according to the statement of the Director General, from 20 to 35 per cent. So in striking a balance with regard to the operation, without taking into account some of the things that I have alluded to as being elements of possible loss, he finds that the loss in operation last year was $236,000,000. I think it was rather remarkable that while we were face to face with a deficit last year of more than $20,000,000 per month in the operation of the roads the then Director General should, because of a slight demand from certain quarters, eliminate one of the large items of receipts. The Director General by an order had directed that one-half of 1 cent per mile should be collected as additional Pullman fares. That order was in effect only about six months, and yet it brought in $26,000,000. And by the cancellation of that order the Government loses about $50,000,000 annually that it would otherwise have received.

If you will look at the table on page 47 of the hearings, and also at the table on page 96 of the hearings, I think it will give you a pretty good picture of the Railroad Administration and of the operating revenue and operating expenses that are involved in these tremendous transactions.

The law providing for Federal operation of the railroads also provides that the President shall have power to take over the inland waterways.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman goes to that subject will he answer a question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. Under the additions and betterments, including equipments, the amounts expended by the Government are reimbursable, as I understand.

Mr. GOOD. The expenditures for additions and betterments and equipment are reimbursable.

Mr. ESCH. Now, then, the Government has ordered 100,000 freight cars and, I think, 3,000 locomotives, making a total cost of between $300,000,000 and $400,000,000. They are allocated to several railroad systems at the price which they cost the Government, which is the war price. Railroad systems are refusing to take the cars and locomotives allocated to the several systems. What will be the result? Will the Government get back the amount it costs the Government or will the railroads only have to pay the amount which the cars and locomotives would cost, for instance, in peace times?

Mr. GOOD. I thank the gentleman for calling my attention to that item. I intended to refer to it. Unquestionably the Railroad Administration committed a very grave error when it ordered all of this equipment. It ordered 100,000 freight cars and 2,900 locomotives. I do not say this equipment was not needed by the railroads. But the then Director General ordered this equipment without consulting the various railroads to which the cars and locomotives will be allotted. Now some of the roads are refusing to accept it. It is evident now, as we look at it, the country being at war, certain additional equipment for the railroads, taken as a whole, being necessary for their operation, if the railroad officials had been consulted at the time, the roads might have agreed as to the amount of equipment each road should take, and the equipment needed could have been purchased without loss, but for some reason or other an order was given to the equipment companies to build 100,000 cars and something over 2,900 locomotives. The total contract was for $402,000,000, but the contract provides for scaling down in the cost if, in the building of the cars and locomotives, it should be found there could be some saving. Now, they find by adjustments that they can save about $40,000,000 on those contracts. So the net amount which the Government is obligated to pay is about $363,000,000 for this equipment. This equipment is being allocated to the several railroad companies.

Forty-eight per cent of it has already been allocated and accepted. But, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] points out, a great many of the railroads are objecting for one cause or another. One railroad objects because they claim that the equipment is not suitable to their line of railroad, another that they did not need the equipment that has been allocated to them, and still another objects that the amount of equipment is greatly in excess of the needs of the roads, and still others object as to cost. But in all cases the contract provides where they accept the equipment—and my recollection is that the law also makes similar provision—that the question of price shall not be an element upon which a loss can be predicated. But the Government stands to lose something on this equipment. We have a whole lot of equipment, and the former chairman of the committee, now director of finance, is at work trying to get the railroads of the country to agree to take this equipment, and is attempting to have them, in conjunction with some banks, organize an equipment trust in order that these railroads may take the equipment and that the Government of the United States may receive the money which it actually needs to pay for this equipment.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Will the gentleman yield in that connection?

Mr. GOOD. I am afraid I can not. How much time have I used, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used 39 minutes.

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. I wanted to ask in that connection whether this statement is true or not: I have heard or read that the standard coal car on the Pennsylvania Road is a 70-ton car, and that under this order they allocated to the Pennsylvania Road a car of 55-ton capacity, so that if the Pennsylvania takes those cars and pays for them it will be a continuing loss to the road during the entire life of the car, of approximately 20 years? Is there a foundation for that statement?

Mr. GOOD. So far as the Pennsylvania Railroad is concerned—and my recollection may be faulty—I think if the

gentleman will turn to the table with regard to the allocations he will find that the Pennsylvania Road has accepted its allotment, and of course if it has accepted its allotment there can be no loss from that road.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. But it would be a loss to the road and to the public through the use of an unsuitable car.

Mr. GOOD. There would be no loss to the Government, and what I have been considering in this whole matter is not so much in regard to any loss that might be suffered by an individual railroad company as the loss that must be paid out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for two or three questions?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. OLNEY. Could not the deficiency in the passenger traffic during the war be explained or excused partly, perhaps, by the fact that the railroads were obliged to carry men engaged in the military and naval service for 1 cent a mile during the war?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; I imagine some of the loss could be attributed to that.

Mr. OLNEY. There were hundreds of thousands of soldiers and sailors traveling back and forth.

Mr. GOOD. Yes. They traveled at a reduced rate. Also, I think we should take into consideration the fact that the traffic movement of troops did not cost on an average of what it costs to move other passengers as a general rule. The trains being heavy and being filled to full capacity made it possible for the roads to operate at a very low unit cost. Just what that loss would be I am not prepared to state.

Mr. OLNEY. Would the chairman of the committee consider this as a subsidy bill—in the nature of a subsidy or a gratuity to the railroads—to compensate them for deficiencies?

Mr. GOOD. The Director General did not present it in that light. So far as I am concerned, I feel that this bill is necessary in order to maintain the credit of the United States. We owe the railroad companies for last year's operations about $441,000,000 on their standard returns. The railroad companies owe the United States $352,553,455 for additions and betterments. Now, if the railroad companies could pay, we would only have to provide for last year's operations approximately $89,000,000.

Mr. OLNEY. And if this bill is passed it is an entering wedge against Government ownership, is it not?

Mr. GOOD. I do not think there will need to be any further entering wedge as against Government ownership. I believe when the people come to consider that last year, when they paid their freight bills, they were paying only about 90 per cent of what it cost the Government of the United States to carry the freight, and that out of the Treasury of the United States had to be paid the remaining 10 per cent, and if those who have been making shipments during the first four months of this year realize that if they paid the full cost to the Government of the service that the Government rendered in the way of moving freight they would have had to add 25 per cent more to their freight bills, at least that class of people will never favor Government ownership of railroads. [Applause.]

Mr. OLNEY. I am rather inclined against Government ownership of railroads but strongly favor Federal supervision.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that while this loss under Government control is large—and I believe that it will amount for 1918 to more than $325,000,000, and I do not doubt but what this year's operations will amount to the same—and that if we send the roads back at the end of the year we will have to pay at some time or other more than $650,000,000 as a loss chargeable to Government operation of the railroads—I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that, so far as I am personally concerned, if that will settle the loss it will also settle probably for all time to come the question of public ownership of $17,000,000,000 of property covering 260,000 miles of railroads. It is a big sum to lose, but may it not be, after all, money pretty well spent, especially if it kills the Government-ownership bug? [Applause.]

Mr. OLNEY. I agree with you.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just one other question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. FESS. It has cost more to operate the railroads than they are getting.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. FESS. What is your solution for running the roads when they are turned back to their owners?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that if I had my way about it and if we were to continue in Government operation for another year instead of only about six months I would ask to have adopted as an amendment to this bill a provision that would require the Director General of Railroads to so arrange and plan the affairs of their operation that the operating revenues would pay the operating expenses and the rentals due the railroad companies, so that these losses would not have to be financed out of the Treasury of the United States.

But the Director General discussed that at length. He thinks it would be unwise now to increase rates. He says he can not effect any greater economy either in the reduction of the number of men employed or in the reduction of wages and salaries, and that the only way the operating of these roads can be made to meet the operating expenses, plus the rentals and the taxes, is to increase the rates, and he says that that would disturb matters very materially and that at the present time it would be unwise.

Mr. FESS. Is it not a plain, common-sense proposition that you will have to increase the rates or reduce the expense? One or the other has got to be done.

Mr. GOOD. Personally I am inclined to think that even under private operation a great many of the roads, perhaps a third or more, so far as mileage is concerned, can not exist under private operation even at the present rate if the present high scale of wages and high cost of materials and supplies are to be maintained.

Mr. FESS. May I ask one other question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Was there ever danger of bankruptcy in the railway business until the Government took over the railroads?

Mr. GOOD. Well, I will say to the gentleman that things were looking pretty blue about the time the roads were taken over. There was considerable disturbance, I think, at that time.

Mr. ESCH. In 1914, I think, 30 per cent of the railroad mileage was in the hands of receivers.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. We are to understand that coincident with the return of railroads to private ownership we must expect another increase of freight or passenger rates?

Mr. GOOD. That was the belief of Mr. Hines, the Director General of Railroads, and I think the country is to be congratulated in having so able a man as Mr. Hines as Director General of Railroads. I do not believe that a better man could be found anywhere for this very important position, and it is his opinion, supported by the conditions that have confronted him, that when the roads are turned back there will necessarily have to be an increase in the rates, in order that the roads can pay their operating expenses and anything like a fair return to the stockholders.

Mr. MILLER. Just one other question. Then, if I understand the gentleman's statement correctly, the net result will be that the freight rates will have been less under Government ownership than they will be under private ownership when the roads are returned to the private owners?

Mr. GOOD. Freight rates would have to be 10 per cent more in Federal control than they have been to make good the loss of $486,000,000 in operation. If his plan is carried out, there will have to be some additions to the present rates. But I want to say to the gentleman there are railroad executives who claim that if their roads were turned back to them they could operate them under the present rates and pay the present rates of wages and make money. Certainly many roads can not do this.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Is it not a fact that railroads which were operated at a profit immediately before being taken over by the Government were operated at a loss immediately following, under conditions practically the same, except the change in control?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that the committee did not go into the operation of any particular road. I am not informed as to that; and during the very brief time allotted to us for hearings we were compelled simply to get a picture of the Federal operation and of the obligations of the Government to the railroads, and have not analyzed at all the obligation of any particular road, except that of the New York, New Haven & Hartford and the Boston & Maine.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Is it not a fact that during the months in which there has been such a falling off in traffic compared with like months under private ownership the operating expenses were much smaller proportionately under private ownership than under Government ownership?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, yes; the operating expenses were increased over $1,000,000,000. There is no question about that. But, of

course, the gentleman must remember that the wages were increased very materially, and about that time there came also an increase in the cost of materials.

Mr. HAUGEN. Much has been said about the deficiency and about the 200,000 additional employees added to the pay rolls. Is it not possible, by returning the roads to private ownership and by increasing their efficiency, that it may not be necessary to increase the freight charges, and that the charges may be reduced?

Mr. GOOD. I think unquestionably men do not perform the efficient service when they are working for the Government that they perform when they are working for corporations and individuals and when their opportunity for advancement depends on their record for efficiency. I think you will get a great deal more for your money when you operate under private ownership, and one of the reasons for this big deficit most certainly is Government operation. It is because of inefficiency of employees, for no matter who was Director General, or how efficient he was, he was bound to have a larger cost under Government control and operation. Now, I will have to decline to yield further.

Mr. HAUGEN. Just one more question.

Mr. GOOD. I will have to decline to yield now, until I can complete my remarks. Then, if I have any time, I will answer any other questions; but there are some matters that I think I ought to bring to the attention of the committee, and I know I will not have time to conclude what I should say to give you a picture of this matter. Pretty wide latitude will be given under the five-minute rule, so that all these matters can be thrashed out then.

Now, take the inland waterways, for instance. Under this provision of law the President was authorized to operate boats on the inland waterways, and we have an investment in inland waterways for last year, for equipment, of $2,646,686, and it is estimated that the improvements for 1919 will amount to $11,700,000. The deficit in operation of inland waterways last year was $1,143,358. The operating revenue of the inland waterways for last year was only $932,000, while the operating expense was $2,068,000. For every dollar the Government received to handle freight on inland waterways the Government had to pay out $2.25 to transport that freight.

Now, it is only fair to say, however, that this is an experiment, that the whole system was not in operation, and it is the opinion of the Director General that they ought to go ahead with this program and complete the purchase of ships and barges and the other equipment necessary for operation on the Warrior and Mississippi Rivers, on the Cape Cod Canal, and on the New York State Barge Canal until the end of Federal control.

It is the estimate of the Director General that if the operations of the inland waterways is a success there need not be very much loss in this equipment; but if it is not a success the whole investment of about $15,000,000 will result in additional loss to the Government. The Director General regards this as a practical experiment. It may lead to increased use of water transportation and it may result in ending expenditures for improving rivers and inland waterways.

Now, as I stated a few minutes ago, it is claimed by the Director General that we owe the railroads for 1918 $441,000,000. That is the balance due on rental. But the railroad companies owe the Railroad Administration $352,000,000. The only difficulty is that the railroads can not pay and the Government is required to pay. That amount involves a loan that was made to the New York, New Haven & Hartford, and in the estimates for this year there is an amount of $20,000,000 to be loaned to the Boston & Maine. But in arriving at the amount of $352,000,000 that the railroads owe the Railroad Administration for last year's operation, I desire to call the attention of the committee to this, that this sum is made up of a long list of items that the Railroad Administration has advanced to the various railroads for additions and betterments, and I think the Railroad Administration will be able to reduce that amount very materially. Of the $352,000,000 which has been advanced, I find, taking the roads now where advances of more than $10,000,000 have been made, the Railroad Administration has advanced to the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe $15,217,000, and I want to say that if the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. can not finance its obligations to that extent for additions and betterments, then there are few financial institutions in the country that can be financed without Government appropriations.

Take the Chicago & North Western Railway Co., whose earnings on its capital stock, after paying all taxes and operating expenses, are more than $11 per share. I find it was proposed in 1918 to loan to the Chicago & North Western Railway Co. $14,000,000. Take the Illinois Central, again, a railroad that is absolutely sound financially. And yet in the $352,000,000 which we have advanced to the railroads for 1918 is $14,363,000 loaned to the Illinois Central.

Take the New York Central Railroad Co. For 1918 it was proposed to have the Government continue to carry them for additions and betterments for 1918 to the extent of $32,000,000. I undertake to say that it is not necessary for the Government to carry these large sums for these strong railroad companies, and I take issue with any man who claims that it is absolutely necessary for Congress to appropriate now $1,200,000,000 in order that the Government in turn shall loan millions upon millions of dollars to these strong railroads that can go and borrow the money just as well as the Government can borrow the money. The Government must not monopolize the money market.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman from South Carolina yield me five minutes?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. GOOD. I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the Government during these payments is called upon to do unusual things. We are asked here to appropriate $1,200,000,000, and in determining what amount we shall appropriate I say to you we must have some regard for the Treasury of the United States.

I have here the daily statement of the United States Treasury for June 6, 1919. I find by that statement that there was a net balance on hand of $1,702,000,000, but that item refers to another item in which the Secretary states that against that there is outstanding to the credit of disbursing officers and agents $1,759,178,000. If all of the outstanding amounts in the hands of the disbursing officers had been paid on that date, there would have been no balance in the Treasury, but there would have been a deficit of $46,249,666.60.

Oh, gentlemen say that we will have a large amount coming in within a few days; that a billion and a half will be received in income taxes. I call attention to the fact that on June 9 we had outstanding in Treasury certificates of indebtedness to the banks of the United States $5,229,000,000. We have collected from the fifth liberty loan $2,996,000,000, leaving to come in from the fifth liberty loan a balance of only $1,536,699,858.

After all of the fifth liberty loan is received and the proceeds thereof used to retire outstanding certificates of indebtedness, there will be outstanding and owing the banks of the United States, in the form of certificates of indebtedness, $3,692,000,000, and we have coming in on June 15 a billion and a half with which to pay the banks $3,692,000,000.

Now, when the committee reported out this amount it was in full realization that the War Finance Corporation, that has already advanced the Railroad Administration and various railroads about $200,000,000, would still be in existence with $700,000,000 assets and able at all times to help the railroad companies and the Railroad Administration.

We must keep in mind the Treasury of the United States. Having these things in mind, realizing that this Congress will be in session until snow flies, it is the deliberate judgment of your committee that we could well afford now to appropriate for the immediate necessities of the Railroad Administration, leaving until some later date the supplying of such additional sums as the actual circumstances may require, when we will have a more complete understanding in regard to the operation of the railroads and the actual needs of the Railroad Administration. I have no doubt that the patriotism of the membership of this House will always rise to the necessities and see to it that the credit of the United States is maintained at all hazards. [Applause.] And when the time comes, as I have no doubt it will come, within the next few months, when an additional appropriation will be necessary, the committee and Congress will respond to the actual needs. For the present it is the judgment of your committee that $750,000,000 can not be expended by the Railroad Administration within the next three or four months, unless there is waste and extravagance in its expenditure. Therefore I feel under all considerations Congress can not afford at this time to appropriate $1,200,000,000, and that the amount carried by the bill—$750,000,000—will amply take care of present needs. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, while I agree with much that has been said by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] I can not agree with his concluding statement that the Railway Administration at this time does not need more than $750,000,000, and that Congress can not appropriate a larger sum without inviting waste and extravagance on the part of the Railway Administration.

I recall to your minds that in the closing days of the last Congress the Appropriations Committee unanimously reported a deficiency bill appropriating $750,000,000 to care for the immediate necessities of the Railway Administration. This House unanimously passed that bill. Since that time the reports for the first four months of the year show a deficit of $250,000,000, so that without appropriating a dollar for working capital the Railway Administration needs $1,000,000,000. By our failure to appropriate this amount at this time the administration will be unable to pay what it owes to the railroads, and the railroads will in turn be unable to pay their past due obligations. This statement, I think, should be made so that the country will not be misled into the belief that by this appropriation we are properly caring for the financial needs of the Railway Administration. I know that we are not, that we are seriously embarrassing the Railway Administration, and that within the next 30 or 60 days this Congress will be forced to appropriate additional money to provide for their necessities.

Some gentlemen have indulged in criticism of the Government for ever having taken possession of the railroads. Personally I am opposed to the Government owning and operating the railroads of this country. I know, however, that the railroads were taken over not in time of peace but in time of war, and that it was absolutely necessary to take charge of them to successfully prosecute the war. Let me recall to you the conditions existing in 1917. The Congress had on August 29, 1916, unanimously authorized the President in an emergency to take charge of the railroads. We entered the war in April, 1917. We knew that every other nation engaged in the war had found it necessary to take charge of its railroads. Notwithstanding this, the President did not exercise the power vested in him until December, 1917. The railroads then were in a very embarrassing situation. There was great congestion of the railroad lines at every port on the Atlantic seaboard, and for miles and miles the tracks were blocked with freight cars. The railroads were being forced to pay increased prices for materials and supplies. They had already granted an increased wage to some of their employees. They had not been allowed any increase in freight rates, and their financial situation was deplorable. They found themselves unable to borrow money except at excessive rates of interest, because the Government was in the market, having floated during 1917 $6,000,000,000 worth of Liberty bonds. They knew that further issues would be floated in 1918. They were traveling the road to bankruptcy. In addition to this, the railroad employees demanded a substantial increase in wages, basing their demands upon the increased cost of living, threatening in case their demands were refused to inaugurate a nation-wide strike on January 1. To save the situation and to continue in full operation this end of our line of communication, there was nothing for the President to do but take charge of the railroads. You may differ with me as to the wisdom of his course, but the fact remains that he did take charge of them, and that is the essential fact in the consideration of the pending measure.

Now, some gentlemen who admit the necessity for taking over the railroads criticize the Railroad Administration once they were taken over, and the financial statement considered at this time furnishes the basis for this criticism. Therefore let us consider this statement. The Railroad Administration was originally granted $500,000,000. They now ask for $1,200,000,000, making a total of $1,700,000,000. This money has been spent and will be spent in the following manner:

Total amount of investment which can not immediately be paid by the railroads	$774, 473, 174
Investment in waterways in 1918	2, 641, 886
Investment in waterways in 1919	11, 700, 000
Grand total investment	788, 815, 060
Total deficit	486, 184, 940
Working capital	425, 000, 000
	1, 700, 000, 000

Of the total amount appropriated, $486,000,000 represents the loss to the taxpayers. The rest of the appropriation is, in the opinion of the Director General and the Director of Finance, secured and will be returned whenever the railroads are returned to their owners, and the amount advanced by the Government will then be returned to the Treasury. In the opinion of the Director General, the loss from moneys advanced will be infinitesimal.

Taking this statement, let us in fairness to the Railway Administration consider the circumstances under which the deficit was incurred. Of the total $486,000,000, the loss in 1918 was $236,000,000. As I stated a few minutes ago, when we took charge of the railroads we inherited from the private owners a threatened strike of railroad employees. To avert this disaster the Director General agreed with the employees to submit to a commission the question of what wage increase, if any, should be granted and agreed that any increase granted should be made retroactive, taking effect as of January 1. That commission was composed of the Hon. Franklin K. Lane, Interstate Commerce Commissioner McChord, Judge Harry Covington, and Mr. Wilcox, formerly chairman of the Public Service Commission of New York. In May they announced their decision, indicating that the cost of living had advanced more than railroad wages, and recommended a substantial increase in wages. The Director General states that the average increase of wages of employees amounts to 52 per cent. This average includes the increase of wages of some employees subsequently made, but the important fact is that the substantial increase in wages resulting from the decision of this board operated from January 1 and there was no increase in freight and passenger rates until July 1.

Now, entirely apart from this wage question, the railroads in 1917 were confronted with one of the severest winters ever witnessed in this country. It handicapped them in their operations. Again, the draft took from them some of their efficient employees for military service, while many of their old and trained employees were taken to operate the railroad system constructed in France. At the same time the shipping industries and munition plants, paying higher wages, were taking from the railroads some of their most efficient operatives. Thus it will be seen they operated under great difficulties. Having received the increased revenue for only 6 months, and having paid the increased wage for 12 months, they naturally incurred a deficit of $236,000,000.

Now, as to the deficit of $250,000,000 which was incurred during the first four months of this year. Up to the signing of the armistice the organization of the railroads was geared up to full capacity. They were prepared for the continuance of the extraordinary demands made upon them during the war. With the signing of the armistice there was an immediate reduction in the transportation of war supplies. It was not until January, however, that the volume of business began to show such a great decrease. In addition to the loss of war supplies there were many plants in the country which had been engaged in the manufacture of munitions and which had not yet been transformed for the production of what I may call "peace commodities."

Then there was coal. Coal constitutes about one-third of the freight transported by the railroads of this country. Before the signing of the armistice, encouraged, doubtless, by the appeals of the Fuel Administration, the people had stored supplies of coal, both for industrial and domestic purposes. With the signing of the armistice the people naturally refrained from placing any orders except those that were urgent, because they anticipated a reduction in the price of coal. Again, unlike the winter of 1918, this year we had one of the mildest winters of my recollection, and coal was not in such great demand. As a result there was a decrease of 14 per cent in the volume of business handled by the railroads, and this decrease in the volume of business is responsible for the deficit of $250,000,000.

Now, I think you will agree with me that it makes no difference whether the railroads had been operated under private ownership or by the Railway Administration this deficit could not have been avoided. In proof of that it should be stated that, while the Railway Administration was nominally in control of the railroads during the first four months of 1918, as a matter of fact they did not interfere with the operation of the roads by the private owners, and during this four months, without taking any increased wage into consideration, the railroads under private ownership lost $105,000,000. At the end of that time the Railway Administration took charge, and with the exception of two or three railroads they appointed to manage the railroads the same officials who had operated these roads under private ownership. So that as a matter of fact any criticism of the Railway Administration on the ground of inefficiency is a criticism of the railroad officials who owned and operated the railroads prior to governmental control.

Now, with reference to the wage question. There has been much criticism of the administration on this score. I want to call your attention to the fact referred to by Mr. Hines, that while the average increase of wages of railroad employees was 52 per cent, Judge Gary of the Steel Corporation, states the increase in the labor cost in the production of steel has increased 128 per cent. You and I know that there has been an equally large increase in the wages paid to the employees engaged in the shipbuilding industries, munition plants, and even upon the farms of the Nation. Now, in all seriousness, could we expect railroad employees, in view of the increased cost of living, to be satisfied with the wage they were receiving? Is it not apparent to all of us that if the increase had not been granted every efficient employee would have gone into other

fields of endeavor? It is peculiar but nevertheless true, that we expect more of certain classes of employees and of certain industries. Why I recall that when the increase of rates was announced we all howled, but as a matter of fact everything the Government touched during the war increased even more than did the railroad rates. We increased the postal rates 50 per cent, and there was but mild complaint. By fixing a price, we increased the price of coal, of flour, and of many other commodities more than passenger and freight rates were increased, and yet no increase has aroused as much criticism as has the increase of railroad rates.

Now, this brings me to a discussion of whether or not there should be an increase of rates to cover the deficit. I am satisfied that the Director General, Mr. Hines, is too optimistic in hoping that from now until the end of the year he can break even. He expresses the hope that the great crops now in sight and a general improvement of business will so increase the volume of freight as to enable them to escape incurring any further deficit. But I know that the crops will not begin to move for several months; that June, July, and August are lean months in the railroad world, and I am satisfied we are going to have an additional deficit for these months. But I am in accord with him in the belief that it would be unwise at this time to increase the rates. He advances this reason, that any increase of rates based upon the deficit of the four months of this year, which was due to the extraordinary situation incident to the readjustment of business conditions, would be a much greater increase than would be justified under normal conditions, and thus be exceedingly unfair to shippers. He further argues, and with great force, that railroad rates are basic and that any increase at this time would increase the price of all commodities and thus increase the cost of living to the masses of the people. His opinion is that no increase should be granted until normal conditions have been reached and there is an opportunity to intelligently decide what increase, if any, is necessary.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. What security have we that we will ever be able to recover the amount that we have advanced to the roads in bank accounts?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I do not know exactly to what the gentleman refers. If he has reference to the two items in the financial statement, the loans to the New York, New Haven & Hartford and the Boston & Maine railroads, he will find in the hearings a list of the securities which are offered, and which, in the opinion of the Director of Finance, will be ample security in case these loans are made. As to other moneys advanced to the railroads, the Government will in every instance be able to protect itself, either by deductions from standard returns, by materials and supplies, or by other security.

Reference has been made to the advances made by the Railroad Administration for the purchase of equipment. The amount asked for additions and betterments for the year 1919, to be paid for by the Railroad Administration, is $253,000,000. The balance of the additions and betterments is to be paid by the railroads themselves. Of the $253,000,000, $245,000,000 is for equipment which has already been ordered, so that there is really but $8,000,000 for additions and betterments over and above the amount due for equipment. As to the immediate necessity for money for this purpose, I call your attention to the fact that the hearings, on page 128, show 100,000 cars ordered, delivery to be completed by October 1. Fifty-two thousand of them have already been delivered. One thousand nine hundred and thirty locomotives have been ordered, deliveries to be completed by December 1; of these 1,257 have been delivered. Now, the gentleman from Iowa is of the opinion that as some of these locomotives and cars are not to be delivered immediately the money is not needed.

The fact is, however, that they are not paid for when delivered, but payments are made as the work progresses, the amount of payment being based upon percentage of completion, and my information is that some equipment due for delivery in May has not been delivered because payments have not been made. As a further instance of how badly the Railway Administration is in need of money at this time, let me state the situation as to the compensation due the railroads. We owed the railroads $78,000,000 a month, which for five months would be practically $400,000,000. We paid them on this account during the first two months $56,000,000. We gave certificates of indebtedness of $186,000.000, making a total of $242,000,000 paid, and leaving a balance due on this score of $158,000,000.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I am sorry that I can not do so because I will have to give way to others. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] criticized the administration for having ordered equipment which the railroads do not now desire to accept on the ground that they do not need it. The gentleman forgets, however, that this equipment was ordered during the war. The same criticism he makes of the Railroad Administration he might make of the War Department for having placed orders for machine guns, rifles, and ammunition which we do not now need. Unfortunately, we could not know that the war would end on November 11, but if the Railway Administration had failed to place orders for sufficient equipment, and the war had continued, and because of the shortage of equipment the railroads were unable to handle the situation, the gentleman from Illinois would have been one of the first to criticize the Railway Administration for failure to order this equipment.

Now, the same gentlemen say the railroads should not be made to take this equipment. The railroads in 1917 faced bankruptcy. The Government took them over. It guaranteed them compensation during the time they were in the hands of the Railroad Administration, and the railways of this country received a benefit that other public-service corporations did not receive. Street car companies and other corporations have been forced to go out and with great difficulty attempt to finance themselves. They never received the aid of the Government, while the railroads have been running on a guaranty. Now they come in and say they do not want the equipment. They want the Government to take it and at the end of Government control sell the equipment to them for little or nothing. But the Railroad Administration does not agree with this policy, and they are allocating the equipment to the various railroads, but they are not awarding cars and locomotives that are not suited to the roads, notwithstanding statements which have been made to that effect.

Now, with reference to the ability of the railroads to finance themselves at this time. The gentleman who has just preceded me said they ought to go out in the market and borrow. You know off-handed, to a man not accustomed to borrowing hundreds of millions of dollars, that certainly sounded reasonable to me. I have never represented a railroad or tried to borrow a billion or a million dollars, and I have to take the word of the gentlemen in charge of the matter. I have great confidence in the Director of Finance, and his statement is that the railroads are not able to finance themselves. They could finance themselves in some few instances in the case of the more prosperous roads, but using his language, "taking them by and large," they can not well finance themselves for long-term loans, except at an exorbitant rate of interest.

Now, what is the province of the Railway Administration? Why, if the Georgia Central Railroad, for instance, goes to New York to borrow money and agrees to pay 8 per cent for a period of 10 years, a man might say, "That is purely a business matter concerning only the Georgia Central Railroad and the bankers." But the fact is that if the Georgia Central Railroad pays the National City Bank of New York 8 per cent, that boosts the interest rate to every borrower, and everybody who wants to borrow money has to pay an increased rate.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. What interest rates do they pay to the Government of the United States on what we appropriate?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Six per cent on all advances to them.

Mr. MADDEN. On a great part of it no interest is paid, but on these loans it is.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Interest is paid on all money advanced on account of the railroads. But returning to my statement, the Railway Administration will not approve a loan to a railroad which seeks to borrow money and pay interest at the rate of 8 per cent, because when it pays 8 per cent interest it thereby means a loss finally either to the Treasury or to the taxpayer, because that amount of money will be accounted for in arriving at its net earnings. The more interest you pay out the less the net revenues are, and the less the net revenues the greater the deficit; and the greater the deficit the more money you have to appropriate or the more money the shipper will finally have to pay in an increase of rates. Therefore, whenever a loan is made at an exorbitant rate, the Director of Finance, exercising the power vested in him, will not approve it, and frequently the War Finance Corporation steps in, and in order to prevent the railroads from being charged excessive interest rates by the banks of the country will lend to them, charging 6 per cent interest if the security is good, and thus they stabilize the market.

Now, boiling down the situation, I care not how you discuss it, it goes back to this: This House was satisfied last February that $750,000,000 was necessary to enable the Railway Adminis-

tration to meet its obligations. Now we are $250,000,000 additional in the hole. In addition to that, the railways ask for $225,000,000 for working capital. You ought to know, and the country ought to know, that we are not going to give them that $250,000,000 to pay this deficit, and we are not going to give them a dollar to use as working capital. Well, some man will say, "Even if that be true, and you do not give them that, they will get along without it." They can get along only because they will not pay their debts. The effect of that will be that they can not economically run the railroads of the country. As business men, you and I know that if you have the cash on hand when you go to buy supplies you can get those supplies in the market at a lower price than you can when you go to buy supplies and the man from whom you try to buy them knows you can not pay cash; that you can only give him certificates of indebtedness, as the Railway Administration is doing to-day. They have out $186,000,000 certificates of indebtedness. Those certificates are drawing interest at 5 per cent, and when they could not negotiate them we had to guarantee them 1 per cent additional.

If they had the cash they could pay their bills, and the supplies could be bought for lower prices, and the business of the railroads could be run more economically than it can be run when they have no working capital on hand. Now, think of it! It costs $360,000,000 a month to operate the railroads of this country. They ask for $425,000,000 for working capital. That includes $140,000,000 in the hands of conductors and agents. Take the $140,000,000 from the $425,000,000 which they ask, and it leaves them asking for $285,000,000, or less than the cost of operating the roads for a single month, to use as working capital.

Mr. MADDEN. And they carry a certain amount in the hands of local treasurers.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That takes into account every cent they have. If the gentleman will look at page 24 of the hearings he will see a detailed statement of the figures I have just given, showing that a sum less than the cost of operating the railroads for a month would be in the hands of the railroads if you gave them what they asked; and we are not doing that. They have $202,000,000 net excess of current assets over current liabilities, and ask for $223,000,000, which would make $425,000,000 for working capital.

Well, you say, what is going to be the result? The result will be that the Railway Administration is not going to be able to pay the railroads, and the railroads will be unable to pay their debts. Gentlemen say, "Oh, the War Finance Corporation will be able to take care of them."

They may, and they may not. That is their statement to the committee. They say they have to stabilize the Liberty bond market. The War Finance Corporation has on hand at this time, according to its statement, $35,000,000, and it has available $150,000,000. Now, with that $150,000,000 and the $35,000,000 they have to stabilize the bond market; if the banks try to hold up the railroads and make them pay a greatly increased rate of interest, as I have described to you, then they have to step in and stabilize that market.

Then the last Congress passed an act to stimulate exports, an act the purpose of which was to enable us to go into foreign markets, and by making advances to the exporters, stimulate trade at the conclusion of the war. By that act we placed upon the War Finance Corporation the duty of making these advances, and they have to make them out of this $150,000,000 and that cash on hand of $35,000,000, and yet you expect the War Finance Corporation to advance all of this money for the railroads. It can not be done. Gentlemen say, "Why, if we do not give it to them, they will just have to do it." But the War Finance Corporation will not be able to do it and also attend to its proper function of stabilizing the Liberty bond market, this railroad security market, and advance the money for the stimulation of exports.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. How much time have I, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I regret that I have not time to yield. I wish to finish my statement.

Mr. MADDEN. Will it trouble the gentleman if I ask how much of the original——

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I am sorry that I can not yield to the gentleman from Illinois, because I have refused to yield to my friend from Michigan.

Now, the gentleman from Iowa urges as an excuse for not reporting a larger appropriation the fact that the Treasury has not to-day sufficient cash available to take care of a larger appropriation. Well, as a matter of fact, the Treasury statement that he read proved that every argument used against a greater appropriation is equally true as to the $750,000,000 appropriation which he advocates. The truth is that any appropriation you might make for the Railway Administration, whether it be $750,000,000 as he advocates or $1,200,000,000 that the Railway Administration requests, it will be met just as will be the appropriations you hereafter make for the Army, Navy, and all other purposes. In a few days the income and excess-profit taxes will be coming into the Treasury. Whenever the Treasury finds itself without sufficient funds they will issue certificates of indebtedness. The gentleman from Iowa argues that instead of the Treasury taking care of the needs of the Railway Administration, that it should be forced to appeal to the War Finance Corporation. Well, the War Finance Corporation, if it attempts to take care of the needs, will have to sell bonds, which will amount to the same thing as the Treasury issuing certificates of indebtedness, because the War Finance Corporation is only an agency of the Government.

Now, I take this position: The party in power has, through this committee, refused to appropriate more than $750,000,000, when the Railway Administration has proved that it will require $1,200,000,000 to take care of its immediate necessities. The result is that the Railway Administration is going to be seriously handicapped in its effort to economically administer the railroads of this country. I know that the party in power has taken this position in an effort to establish a record for economy, but I know that it is false economy. I know that the failure to provide sufficient working capital will make it impossible for the railroads to be operated as economically as if they were placed in a position to pay their bills. I know, furthermore, that the thought, the time, and the energy that could be devoted to the economical administration of the business of the railroads will have to be devoted to an effort to tide over the financial situation confronting them by reason of the failure to provide sufficient funds to take care of their immediate needs. I know that the failure to provide sufficient funds will seriously embarrass the industries of this country who have either furnished or are under contract to furnish equipment to the railroads, and I think the country should know that this is the true situation; and I am satisfied that within the next three months the business interests of this country will demand of the party in power that they do what they to-day are failing to do, namely, appropriate sufficient funds to take care of the needs of the railroads of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I have no other request for time.

Mr. BLANTON. May I have that?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, by reason of the fact that the legislative body in the other end of the Capitol has placed a rider on the deficiency appropriation bill I take it that it would be apropos to read the following document:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 9, 1919.*

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
United States Representative, City.

DEAR SIR: Answering, as requested, in detail your specific inquiries, will state:

My name is Charles H. Burroughs; live at 221 B Street NE.; am now one of the auditors in the United States Shipping Board, employed in room 1046, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

First, I would like to state that in answering your inquiries I am not volunteering information; that I am dependent upon my position for a livelihood, and hope that you will not cause me to lose my position with the Government.

You are correct in stating that formerly I was Chief of Transportation and Revolving Fund Section of the United States Employment Service. I voluntarily left such position.

Relative to your inquiry concerning record of travel vouchers of Special Representative Luther C. Steward for the months of July, August, September, October, November, and December, 1918, wherein Mr. Steward claimed and there was allowed to him for travel expense: For July, $134.45; for August, $127.25; for September, $87.50; for October, $113.25; for November, $120.50; and for December, 1918, $127.50, per vouchers numbered, respectively, 197, 2450, 6248, 9656, 14331, and 18495. I am familiar with such departmental matters. Numerous parties connected with the service were furnished with transportation books containing printed requests and stubs in same, and such parties would present such requests, filled out by them, to the railroads and get transportation, and their books, with the stubs, were supposed to be returned to the department. The claim of Mr. Steward was in addition to such transportation furnished by the railroad. Thousands of dollars were absolutely wasted in this way. I doubt whether one-third of these books were ever returned and filed with the department. It can not be shown that it was necessary for Mr. Steward to make these trips. He was receiving in the neighborhood of $3,500 or more from the Government and at the same time drew about $2,750 from the Employees Union, and for a time at least his wife worked in the Munition Building at about $1,100. If this service is properly audited it will be found that thousands of vouchers were issued in irregular and unnecessary transportation, and it will also be found that there were numerous details made from stations merely to enable parties to draw their $4 per diem in addition to their salaries and travel transportation. It was wholly unnecessary for Mr. Hibbard and Mr. Harry H. Stone to take that expensive trip to France. Mr. Harry S. Parks

took many unnecessary trips at great expense. Relative to the transportation voucher and three Pullman tickets issued to Miss Jeannette Densmore, sister of the director general, from New York to Atlantic City on July 4, 1918, and the return by Miss Densmore from Atlantic City to New York on July 7, 1918, will state that is only one of hundreds of such trips such agents took on the expense of the Government. In my opinion, the business management of the whole department was rotten. Answering your inquiry, will state that, in my judgment, had Congress allowed the proposed $10,000,000 appropriation requested in February that at least two-thirds of same would have been wasted. It would be a waste of public money for Congress to allow this United States Employment Service any more appropriations until the whole service has been properly audited and investigated and reorganized on proper business lines. It has been continually stated that much has been done and is being done for the returning soldier. Reports of this work are padded and is mostly propaganda, as I do not believe that returning soldiers have received any benefit from the great bulk of the enormous expenditures wasted by this service. I was absolutely disgusted with the system and practice.

Answering your inquiry, I believe that you can depend upon Mr. J. Stuart Brand, of 1477 Newton Street NW., and Mr. J. E. Leemon, now employed by the Federal income tax, to tell what they know about this service.

If the department is properly investigated, Congress will be astounded at the revelation awaiting accounting.

Very sincerely, yours,

CHARLES H. BURROUGHS.

P. S.—If you can get him to do so, Mr. Lynn could give you some very valuable information.

I want to state that I believe that this Congress will protect this auditor of the Government in giving this information, not voluntarily, but given at the request of one of the representatives of the people in this Congress, who asked him the specific questions which he answered. If an attempt is made in injure this Government employee, or if an attempt is made to make this auditor lose his position by reason of the information given, I for one hope that this Congress will see to it that he does not lose his position with the Government by having done his duty as he sees it.

Now, I want to read another document, inasmuch as I say on an appropriation bill, when this House refused to do it, the body at the other end of the Capitol has seen fit, according to its usual custom, to place a rider on the bill and send it back here, where we will have little opportunity to resist such action:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 9, 1919.*

MY DEAR MR. BLANTON: While I am willing to tell a congressional committee what I know concerning the waste of public money in the United States Employment Service, I would prefer for you not to make my name public, as I am dependent upon employment for a living.

With regard to your inquiry, will state that it is my firm belief that it would be almost impossible for any person not a member of some union to obtain desirable employment through this service, as that is almost one of the first questions asked, "Are you a member of the union, and, if not, are you willing to join the Employees' Union?" I do hope that Congress will not give this service another dollar until it has been properly investigated. I will go before any committee, if my evidence is necessary, to assist the administration in cleaning up this department.

Very truly,

_____.

This letter is signed by this employee, with address given in this city; but I will not disclose it, as I was requested to keep it confidential; but I am authorized to give the name and address to a committee.

Now, I want to say that if this Congress knew just how much money this particular employment service had spent in my district alone in propaganda through the newspapers and by telegrams sent to every chamber of commerce and to every newspaper in my district within the last four months you would be astounded at the useless waste of money by any department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say that I have introduced in this Congress a resolution appointing Charles W. Roberts, an expert auditor, to audit the finances of this United States Employment Service. If you appoint Mr. Roberts, not at a tremendous salary, but at $400 a month, I will guarantee that within four months he will produce evidence as it exists, and I will guarantee that the evidence will astound you when he brings it before Congress.

I know of auditing that he did that helped to cause 12 felony indictments to be brought against a county judge in the district over which I presided for eight years as circuit judge. A culprit is now a fugitive from justice in South America, where he has been several years. I should like to see the Congress give an opportunity to this man, in whom I have complete confidence, and I know he would make an honest audit of the department's finances and advise us what became of this five and one-half million dollars which we have permitted by our action to be expended under blanket appropriations.

I hope the committee that has charge of this resolution will take immediate action by reporting and passing it, and let us have an auditing of these accounts before we appropriate another dollar for this service. I am willing to go as far as any man in this House to inaugurate and provide a proper United States Employment Service, available alike for every laborer, but we can not do it in unrestricted blanket appropriations and riders on appropriation bills.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired, and the Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for carrying out the act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918, there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $750,000,000, which shall be in addition to the appropriation of $500,000,000 made in section 6 of said act, and shall be subject in all respects to the same authority for, and restriction of, expenditure as the said $500,000,000.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It is not my intention to detain the House long—I could not if I would, except by unanimous consent.

In March last, shortly before the adjournment, the House of Representatives passed a bill in substance similar to this bill, after much investigation, upon the request of the Director General of Railroads, on regular estimates. Seven hundred and fifty million dollars was what he desired at that time. The bill failed in the Senate. This is the 10th of June. Congress was called into extra session on the 19th day of May last. What might have happened if we had been called together on the 10th of March I do not know. That water has run over the dam. We came together on the 19th of May. I am not here to criticize at this time what happened during this war. The war is not legally over. I do not know when it will be legally over, for I do not know when the treaty of peace may be ratified, if it is ratified by the Senate of the United States. I do know that we have been notified by the President that the railroads will be turned back on the 1st of January next to their owners, and whatever happens, that will require a settlement of accounts as between the United States, represented by the Director of Railroads, and the respective railroads. Some of the railroads will have claims coming to Congress of the United States when most of us are with the angels. I refer now to the short-line railroads. I shall not enter into that part of the discussion, but it ought to be possible between now and the 1st of January next, or a short time thereafter, to settle with the first-class railroads.

I was on the subcommittee on deficiencies that made that investigation of which I speak and reported the bill in the last Congress. Mr. Sherley at that time was the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and the chairman of the subcommittee on deficiencies. Because that bill failed the Railroad Administration, the railroads, and to a considerable extent, incidentally, the people of the country, the business people, the producing people, the consuming people, were put to considerable trouble. The result was that the Director of Railroads devised a new form of certificate, a copy of which you will find in the back part of the hearings which were held at this session before this committee, being in general a statement that the Government owed this railroad so much and that railroad so much, issuing to them a certificate without date for payment, that certificate bearing 5 per cent interest, so that the railroads were able to go to the bankers, or to the Finance Corporation—and my recollection is from the evidence they went to both—and borrowed the money with the certificate as collateral. Most of the money that was borrowed by the railroads was money owing to them by the Government, which the Government did not have the money to pay. Therefore these certificates were devised.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. I am not going to undertake a long explanation, for it would take five hours to do it, if I had the knowledge and the ability to do it. Congress met in extra session. The Director General of Railroads appeared before the Congress, and there were extensive hearings. From those hearings I want to read very briefly a statement which caused me to assent to the present bill and which will explain why I favored the appropriation that was passed by the Democratic House in March last but failed in the Democratic Senate. The chairman of the committee, Mr. GOOD, asked Mr. Hines the following question:

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hines, when you estimated for $750,000,000 for the deficit for 1918, to take care of contracts with the railroad companies and to pay them their return and to pay for the equipment, of course, that was with the full knowledge that Congress would adjourn on the 4th of March and would not meet again until next December,

unless sooner convened by the President. What condition would you have been in if the appropriation had been made and there had been no session of Congress until next December—you would have been able to conduct the roads in an efficient way, would you not?

To that question Mr. Hines replied as follows:

Mr. HINES. I think that if there had been no session of Congress prior to December as things have turned out and this deficit had developed, even larger than I had in mind—

And a deficit much larger than he had in mind did develop—

we would have been very greatly hampered in carrying on the situation the latter part of this year. We would have been decidedly embarrassed in doing so.

Mr. Chairman, I admit that there was a larger deficit in the first quarter of the year than he estimated for, when the former bill was passed early in March. Everyone understands that the first quarter of the year, passing in the winter under all of the conditions in the country, is the lean quarter for railway earnings, because there is less transportation and less business for the railroads. In the remainder of the year, especially in the last half of the year, the receipts greatly increase. The crops are moved and from all accounts, thank God, we may expect bountiful crops this year. So that the $750,000,000 will not be expended immediately. The earnings of the railroads themselves will be subject to expenditure, coming as they will in the latter half of June, in increased amount, in July, in August, September, and October, and we have every reason to believe that the business will be at least equal to what it was in 1917, and in 1917 the receipts almost doubled in those months over the receipts for the first quarter of that year. Those earnings will be available for the use of the Director General.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] said that we will be here until the snow flies. Yes, we will; and until the snow melts, next spring. I will say to the Director General, a gentleman in whom I have great confidence from a business standpoint, that he will get the money. I agree with all of the compliments that have been paid to him. He will have a chance, if necessary, to appear before us again. If the earnings of the railways, when the crops begin to move, double, he will not need any great additional appropriation, if he needs any. Let us wait and see.

Is that a sound policy to pursue? I think it is. While the war is not legally over, it is for ordinary purposes. Our boys are coming back, and the railroads are to be turned back on the 1st of January. We are to take an account of stock; and all war measures for wholesale or retail expenditure, except to meet the obligations of Uncle Sam, ought to cease. My God! we do not want any more cantonments built; we do not want any more enormous expenditures made in time of peace which were necessary in time of war. We do not want anything done except what is necessary to square accounts and pay what we owe, including care for our soldiers and their dependents. If we have not the money to pay Uncle Sam's debts, we will borrow it or raise it by taxation.

The appropriation of $750,000,000 failing in March compelled the Director General to arrange for obtaining that amount of money on credit, which was legally done, and this bill, when enacted, will protect the credit that was given. The Director General cooperated with the railways, the banks, and with the War Finance Corporation in the premises. In my judgment, all this was legally and successfully accomplished, and this appropriation will close the transaction.

Mr. Chairman, so far as I know, the War Finance Corporation has stabilized the value of Uncle Sam's bonds on the market in large degree.

Uncle Sam is the only stockholder in this corporation. Capital, $500,000,000; $350,000,000 of this has been utilized, and there is still $150,000,000 available. The corporation has about $40,000,000 to its credit. All this appears from the hearings.

Mr. MADDEN. And if my colleague will allow me, they have the power to issue $4,000,000,000 worth of securities?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly; they have got that power. Now, then, let me tell you another reason, among many others, why I do not want anything further done that would aid, further than the law now does, the Finance Corporation. I should say, "You have done very good work, but now you have power to do what I want you to do, and possibly you are proceeding to get ready to do it."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois be allowed to conclude his remarks.

Mr. CANNON. I think I can get through in a very short time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois be permitted to conclude his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON. The Finance Corporation under the original act goes out of business, except to close up affairs. It can not make any further obligations six months after the treaty of peace is signed. There was an amendment passed to that act that enabled the Finance Corporation to finance corporations or to act as banker to make arrangements to encourage exports from the United States anywhere in the world. Now, I picked up a newspaper the other day—I have forgotten, but I think it was the New York Times or some other paper—and there was a statement that New York capitalists were very seriously considering the proposition, with their own money, forming their own corporation, to do exactly that thing. Now, whether it is a wise thing to do or not, I do not know, but if you will turn to page 283 of the hearings—let me read from the statement of Mr. McLean, who seems to be a most intelligent gentleman, who is a director on that board:

Mr. MCLEAN. Yes; where we could do so within the spirit of the law. There is one other thing, Mr. Chairman, that you have not referred to, and that is the amendment to the act by which we were authorized to try and stimulate exports from this country. Up to the present time we have not made any actual loans under that amendment, but our managing director is now in Europe for the purpose of looking into that situation and meeting representatives of the governments which will probably become our customers, in order to see what can be done to carry out that provision of the act.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not made any loans for that purpose?

Mr. MCLEAN. We have not.

Mr. BYRNES. Under the act you go out of business six months after the treaty of peace is signed?

Mr. MCLEAN. As to all of the ordinary business of the corporation, except the export business, as I understand it; we would cease doing new business six months after the declaration of peace as promulgated by the President.

Mr. BYRNES. If that is so, who is going to collect these loans?

Mr. MCLEAN. That limitation is only for the purpose of restricting new business. We would, of course, remain in existence——

Mr. BYRNES (interposing). You would remain in existence longer than six months after the treaty of peace was signed, but thereafter you would make no loans?

Mr. MCLEAN. No; except under this new provision to stimulate exports, because I believe under that act we can proceed for 12 months after the signing of the peace treaty.

Now, I announced what I believed was a sound policy in my first 5 minutes or my first 10 minutes. I do not want the Finance Corporation, I do not want any other commission in existence authorized by the Government, to act for the Government and obligate Uncle Sam for any new projects. [Applause.] Let us get back to the normal. Now, the Finance Corporation has the power to advance money to the railroads, has the power to make loans, and it has made loans on these certificates. I do not want to weaken that power, because that is dealing with what Uncle Sam is bound to deal with and bound to pay. I do not want any new obligations. Therefore, as we meet every day substantially from now for months to come, I want to wait and see, and it will not take a great while if they need more money to pass another act giving the Railway Administration more money, and for that reason I voted for the $750,000,000 appropriation. I did not quite understand my friend from Georgia, whom I greatly appreciate and——

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman means the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CANNON. I will not say I beg Georgia's pardon [laughter]; it was a slip of the tongue, for I have very high respect for him, for his character, and great ability; but he says he will not submit an amendment to increase this $750,000,000 to a billion dollars, although he thinks a billion dollars is needed. And while I am neither glad nor sorry because he does not submit it, I think he aimed to lay a foundation for an "I told you so" in the event we have to appropriate $200,000,000 or $400,000,000 for that purpose. But, after all, I have no objection to his not offering that amendment. I do not believe the committee would agree to it. Certainly not if they agree with me, and I have made such a statement of facts after consideration as will enable them to see that the reasons that have been advanced by the gentleman from Iowa, the chairman of the committee, are such as we had better pass the bill as it is reported.

Gentlemen, may I say in conclusion, not particularly referring to this bill more than to other pending bills, do you know that the Government of the United States owes $900,000,000 for insurance that has been issued for our boys who crossed over while in Uncle Sam's military service, and the income, amounting to $200,000,000, cuts it to $700,000,000? Do you know that we have got to pass a pension bill before snow flies that will give the one-legged and one-armed boys who served adequate pensions? God knows how much, and we will all vote for such legislation. Two hundred and twenty million dollars a year in pensions for wars which have passed, and then this $900,000,000 to be paid in 20 annual installments to the people who are entitled to receive it under the terms of these insurance policies that have already been adjusted; and with compensation allowed under other sections of the war-risk insurance act it is estimated by the Treasury officials that our

annual appropriations to meet these obligations must be nearly $150,000,000 for the next 20 years. How much will be added by deaths of insured men and how much by new pension legislation God only knows. Now, all kinds of things are floating about in the country. I understand there is one proposition to give every soldier $5,000 cash instead of expending $5,000 to buy swamp land and build a $4,000 house on it and amortize it for 40 years. Well, as between the two I would rather give the $5,000 in cash. [Laughter.] I believe it would be a saving to the Treasury, and it would let them do with it what they pleased. Well, that is another proposition modified here and there; propagandas are running. My God! it seems to me if every citizen and every man in the United States—and that would include the women, too—would be as anxious and as industrious in laboring manually, aided by brains—you can not do much labor unless you have got some brains to direct it; the mule and the horse can; the lower order of animal life does not need much brain, but the human family needs brains—I say if the brains that are now being used in the United States by men and women seeking to organize all kinds of societies to do something for the soldiers that the soldiers do not want done, if all this effort could be used in production, making something of value for the human family and the United States and the world, it would solve many of the problems much more rapidly than we are liable to solve them.

You ask if I have a speech about it. No; I have not. But I have thought about it a good deal. If I had my way there would be no necessity for my making such a speech, because we would trim ship and sail on without taking on new burdens that would not return a profit.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I would like to know whether the testimony or evidence showed at any place whether the railroads were operating at a profit or loss when the United States took them over?

Mr. CANNON. The railroads were not making a profit, I understand. We did not go into that to any great extent, because we were dealing with the present, and have only the past, prior to the taking over of the railroads here and there, for comparison. My understanding is, I will say to the gentleman, that the railroads were not in a happy condition.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman refers to 1914, one year after the Underwood bill took effect, does he not?

Mr. CANNON. I thought the gentleman referred to 1917.

Mr. FESS. That ought to be an explanation of the railroad situation.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, yes; that is one explanation of it. After all, that water is over the dam. We think you Democrats are responsible for it, and I think they whisper sometimes and say, "No, no; you Republicans are responsible for it." But that is past. The people who gave the Democratic Party power, partial power by which they could lock the wheels in 1910, and full power in 1912, followed by legislation, and full power for six years and two or three months, have produced a condition that they claim they are not responsible for, and that we may claim, when we get into campaigns that you are responsible for, but which the country does not care three whoops about our quarreling now, because the country wants to know what legislation we write upon the statute books that will give all the people an opportunity to run and glorify, every tub standing on its own bottom. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I supported this measure at the last session and stated at the time that I felt it was necessary in order that the railroads could pay their indebtedness, that we were under contract to pay to these railroads a certain amount of money, and that the Government should keep its contract. I shall vote for this measure for the same reason. I do wish, however, to call the attention of this committee to some of the items that are causing embarrassment in the Railroad Administration now and will continue to cause embarrassment to it as long as the present administration of railroad affairs continues.

Pretty soon after the railroads were taken over by the Director General of the Railroads, by some process never as yet entirely explained an order was made requiring all the railroads taken over by the Government to take a certain number of cars—freight cars, box cars, flat cars, coal cars, of whatever description—and locomotives. These cars were manufactured at very great expense, some at the institutions already established to manufacture cars; some in institutions that were created for the purpose of manufacturing them. When they were completed, a portion of them—many of them not as yet completed—an allocation was made among the different railroads throughout the country, without regard to whether they needed these cars or not, without regard to whether they could handle these cars on their transportation systems or not. As a result, about one-half of the railroads to which these allocations were made absolutely refused to take these cars, and they still refuse to take them. What the result of this is going to be no one can foretell.

Now, if the railroads do not need them and it would materially embarrass them to take these cars, it would be an absolute wrong to force the cars upon them. That is one situation. If the Government has no way of disposing of these cars according to their allocation, the result will be that they are going to have them on their hands, those that have been manufactured and those to be manufactured under contracts that are binding; and they will have to be sold, as all Government property is sold, at a greatly reduced price, which will cause a still greater deficit, if you please, to the United States and this Railroad Administration.

I know it has been suggested here by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], if I understood him right, that this allocation of cars was made by virtue of the budgets submitted by the different railroads in the early part of 1918. That is denied by the railroads that are refusing to take these cars. And in order that you may know the attitude of some of the railroads on this proposition I desire to call attention to what the Lehigh Valley Railroad Co. has to say on this subject:

During the year the United States Railroad Administration notified this company that there had been allocated to it 3,300 new cars, consisting of 1,000 box cars, 1,300 coal cars, 500 low-side gondolas, and 500 drop-bottom gondolas, costing approximately $9,647,600, for which this company was expected to pay. Your board promptly protested against any such action, and, after argument, the administration canceled its allocation of 1,000 box cars, but insisted that the company take the 2,300 coal and gondola cars. A further protest was thereupon made and the administration notified that the company would not accept the equipment.

This company's freight equipment consists of 42,988 cars, 98 per cent of which are steel or steel underframe, and in excellent condition. It has a larger equipment for its gross business and per mile of road, with one exception (as to per mile of road), than any railroad in the eastern territory. During the year 1917, when it did the largest business in its history, both as to revenue and tonnage, its freight-car hire showed a substantial credit balance; in other words, there was no shortage of cars at the mines located on its line and all local requirements were filled with fewer cars than it actually owned. No additional equipment was asked for in the 1918 budget made up by the administration officials, as none was required.

Paragraph (f) of section 8 of its contract provides that the Director General shall not acquire any equipment at the expense or on the credit of the company in excess of what, in his judgment, is necessary to provide for the traffic requirements of the road. Your board claims that this judgment must be based on facts and not on theories, and the facts clearly show that the company is fully equipped and has a large excess over the amount necessary to handle its traffic.

In this the Lehigh Valley Railroad Co. is corroborated by Mr. Sherley, now of the Railroad Administration, whose testimony before the Appropriations Committee discloses that the budget submitted by the railroads in 1918 did not show or make any estimates for equipment needs.

The amount of the allocation to this road alone amounted to very nearly $9,500,000. To many of these roads that absolutely refused to take these cars, as shown by the report of the director himself, it amounted to as high as $20,000,000. So you can see this item alone has created a very great embarrassment to the administration, also to the United States Government, and will continue so to do. And you may depend upon it that this will be an addditional deficit in the reports of this administration that are yet to come. There is another thing that I think the people ought to know.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. There is another item to which I wish to call your attention, and I think the people of the country should be apprised of it. Under the guise of equipment and betterment not only have these new cars been bought and attempted to be forced upon these different railroads, but the Federal Railroad Administration has undertaken to build new extensions of railroads where they were absolutely not needed for the purposes of war, and where they could not possibly have been completed within two or three or four years of time.

Not only were they diverting capital for the purpose of doing this thing but they were also using labor that should have been employed in other places when labor was so badly needed. I have in mind a case where, on a railroad that has been operating for more than 75 years, they undertook within three months before the armistice was signed the building of a cut-off 8 miles long, and the only purpose it could possibly serve was to shorten

the line between the point of its start and the point of its finish about one-half a mile by eliminating a curve or two, which could not possibly have saved more than one minute of time, and possibly reduce the danger incident to a curve, as all curves are conducive to danger.

Now, that thing, as I say, was commenced a few months before the armistice was signed. It could not be completed within two years. Yet a lot of things of that kind involved an expenditure of hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars. Therefore I say that millions of dollars that now go to make up this deficit, which will be a constant and growing and increasing deficit for 20 years, are traceable to inefficient and unbusinesslike action alone. We will not know what this deficit will be for years to come. When present Members of Congress are no longer here, there will still be coming up, by reason of this railroad operation, damage claims of various characters that will add to the deficit. So I say that in considering whether or not this Railroad Administration has been efficiently managed, some of these items that are now shown to exist by the report itself speak volumes in language a great deal stronger than I could speak, showing the absolute inefficiency of the Railroad Administration.

The assertion, if you please, that these railroads have been inefficiently managed is supported by the further fact that there are some railroads in this country that were not taken over by the United States which have been efficiently managed.

Many of these the owners sought to have taken over, but were refused, and yet, notwithstanding the fact that they had to pay the same increase of wages and had to pay the same increased cost of materials for their upkeep, they were operated at a profit. That is the most conclusive evidence, if you please, that there is and was inefficiency in the management of these railroads that were taken over.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman state the names of those railroads?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I can state the name of one of them. I can not give its technical corporate name, but the president is Mr. J. N. TINCHER, of Kansas, a Member of this House.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. How large a road is that?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It is not a very large one. It is about 10 miles long. If they could operate that railroad 10 miles long at a profit under the circumstances—and the profitable operation of a road that long is ordinarily deemed an impossible thing—what ought you to do when you have a workable, practicable system of great railroads running through rich territories such as those which the roads controlled by the Railroad Administration ran through?

It might have been necessary as a war measure to take the railroads over for the time being; be that as it may; but I think that the operation of the railroads by the Government has furnished to the public and to the world the best possible argument as to the absolute fallacy of ever attempting to make Government control and Government ownership one of the fixed features of this Government of ours. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the items which go to make up this appropriation have been so very thoroughly discussed that there is little further that I can say. But after a very careful reading of the hearings, there are some few observations which I wish to submit to the committee. These hearings cover about 358 pages, and I want to take occasion to compliment the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for the very able and thorough manner in which he conducted the examination and developed the facts. [Applause.]

Now, gentlemen, in the last analysis, what are the facts with reference to the Railroad Administration and the necessity of this appropriation? In the beginning of 1918—or, to be exact, on December 28, 1917—the United States Government took over the operation of the railroads of the country. At that time there was no dissenting voice; no one criticized the action of the Government in taking them over. On the contrary, Congress, on both sides of this Chamber and in the other branch, gave the President the authority to take the railroads over during the war, because everyone recognized that it was necessary to take them over for war purposes. It was clearly a war necessity, not only for the prompt handling of transportation, transporting our soldiers quickly to the various camps and to the various ports, but in the quick transportation of supplies and the munitions of war that were necessary to carry on the war. We all know, also, that at that time many of the railroads, owing to abnormal conditions, were facing bankruptcy. Had they not been taken over, owing to these conditions, including the loss of efficiency, due to many of their efficient employees entering the military service and many others leaving the railroad service for the purpose of accepting more lucrative employment in other industries, and the extraordinary increase in the cost of materials and supplies, many of these railroads would have gone into the hands of receivers, and that would have created a financial crisis which would have been disastrous and possibly fatal to the winning of the war. So, I say, the railroads were taken over at that time, with the approval of Republicans as well as Democrats, and when they were taken over the Government assumed certain obligations with which we are faced to-day, and which it is necessary for the Government to meet.

Now, what are those obligations? In the first place, it has been stated that we are faced with two deficits—one of about $236,000,000, occurring in 1918, and the other of $250,000,000, a deficit which was incurred during the first four months of the present year, making a total of $486,000,000, which must be charged off to the account of profit and loss. This is a clear loss to the Government and must be considered as one of the expenses of the war. In addition to that, the Director General of Railroads states that there is due as an obligation on the part of this Government for additions and betterments, including equipment, the sum of $775,000,000.

And I may say that that statement is made up not only of additions, betterments, and equipments but also of over $40,000,000, as was explained by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], by way of a loan made to the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, about $20,000,000 to the Boston & Maine, and about $100,000,000 advanced by the Director General to enable the railroads to meet their current liabilities.

In addition to that, the Railroad Administration now has a working capital of about $202,000,000; but that is not a present available asset, for the reason that it is stated that from $140,000,000 to $170,000,000 is now in the hands of conductors and agents over the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

By unanimous consent the time of Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee was extended five minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, if you add these three figures together you get the sum of $1,422,596,252 in exact figures. Congress has heretofore appropriated the sum of $500,000,000, leaving a balance of $922,596,252, which is needed to fully meet these obligations. And that does not take into consideration the sum of about $14,000,000 which the Director General asks for inland waterways.

Now, what is the situation? The Director General states that the United States Government is obligated to industries over this country in the sum of $775,000,000; and in a hearing in the United States Senate in the last session on a similar bill he stated that $700,000,000 of that amount should be paid by the last of May.

This bill carries $750,000,000, or over $100,000,000 less than the amount which the Director General states is absolutely necessary to take care of the deficit and meet these obligations of the Government and maintain the present working capital, the greater part of which can not be applied to these obligations because it is not available, as I have explained.

Now, there is no use in juggling with figures. This is the situation which confronts us. We should meet it fairly and squarely. There is no reason or justice in withholding these sums for materials delivered and materials now under way, and for which the United States Government promised and obligated itself to pay when the orders were given. They have got to be paid. Why not accept the situation frankly as it is and discharge the obligation of the United States, and then take proper steps for reimbursement by the railroads.

Gentlemen have criticized the Railroad Administration for undertaking to give orders for so many box cars and so many locomotives, but these gentlemen are now talking in peace times. When these orders were given, these gentlemen would not have offered any criticism of the Railroad Administration for giving these orders, because they were necessary in order to take care of the business during the war. If it had been known that the war was coming to an end at so early a date, these orders would not have been given. One can with as good grace complain because the end of the war found the Government with an immense amount of ammunition on hand.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JUUL. The gentleman is making a very interesting statement. I would like to have him tell us what part of the original $500,000,000 and of the $750,000,000 now sought to be appro-

priated does the gentleman think will ever be recovered into the United States Treasury?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. All of it, it is expected, will be recovered, except the deficiency of $486,000,000, which, as I have stated, is a clear loss. This money is advanced to the railroads with the expectation and understanding that it will be returned, and the Director General states that it is in his opinion well secured.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I want to ask the gentleman whether that amount that we have advanced to the railroads is in addition to the rentals which have accrued? Have we paid for the rental of the railroads in addition to advancing these amounts?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; this sum to which I have referred is to take care of what is due for additions, betterments, and equipments.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Perhaps I did not make myself clear. We have made certain betterments and additions. Have we credited the rentals on that account or have we paid the rentals and made those advances in addition?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. In some cases, as I recall the hearings, it has been done. In other cases it has not been done. The amount heretofore appropriated was placed in a pool from which all expenses were paid.

Mr. JUUL. Does the United States Government pay the railroads in cash for the transportation of its soldiers and materials?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It does. In order to tide over the situation caused by the failure to appropriate the $750,000,000, on account of the filibuster at the other end of the Capitol in March, they collected from the War Department $100,000,000 due for the transportation of soldiers and supplies, and something like $10,000,000 from the Navy Department. Now, I have only a few minutes. Why should we appropriate this sum of $775,000,000 now, rather than wait a few months, as suggested by the gentleman from Iowa, before paying this just obligation? The Director General answers that question and answers it specifically, and I am going to read to this committee exactly what the Director General says upon that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

By unanimous consent the time of Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee was extended five minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mind you, this answer was given in response to the question which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] read a moment ago, and the reasons given by the Director General are in addition to the reasons that we ought not to submit the industries of this country to the injustice of delay in payment for materials and supplies furnished, and for which the United States stands primarily responsible. They will thus be prevented from meeting their obligations. And if there is any such loss or delay I wish the business interests to know just who is responsible therefor.

Now, what does the Director General say?

> But, going back to your specific question, I do not think there is any doubt, in the light of things as they have developed, that if we had secured the $750,000,000 appropriation on the 4th of March and Congress had not met and could not have dealt with that matter any further until December, we would have been very greatly embarrassed and hampered in clearing up this situation. The way it would have shown itself principally would have been in the holding back of the efforts which we want to make to get the railroad companies to refinance what they owe the Government. That whole thing has been in a state of suspense, first, from one cause and then from another. During the year 1918 it was the war and the Government's financing, in the early part of this year it was the forthcoming Government loan and also our extreme shortage of cash, and then it was the failure of the appropriation.
>
> If we get an appropriation which enables us to clean up in full and enables the corporations to pay off all the temporary loans they have had to make to pay their interest and dividends, we then will be in a position to begin to put the pressure on the corporations to refinance and reimburse the Government. But if we had had a $750,000,000 appropriation on March 4 and then there had been the developments, as they have taken place, and no further appropriation had been forthcoming until December or January, we would have been in a position where we would not have any leverage to exercise, because we would not have been able to pay, and under the contract our principal leverage is to say to the corporations that we will not pay them what we owe them until they take reasonable steps to reimburse the Government. If we are in the position, through shortage of cash, that we can not pay them anyhow, that does not amount to very much leverage; and it gives them an excellent excuse for not doing anything effective in the way of reimbursing the Government. I have, perhaps, strayed far from your question, Mr. Chairman, but I am so impressed with the value to the Government of making available a special fund to clean this up, and then putting us on solid ground, and then to make the corporations come across and reimburse the Government. Undoubtedly we would have suffered from an inability to do that on the hypothesis of your question of getting $750,000,000 on the 4th of March and there being no relief before next December.

Yet, gentlemen, we are in the act here of failing to appropriate by over $100,000,000 the amount which the Director General says is necessary in order to enable him to force these corporations to come across and reimburse this Government. Gentlemen speak of their earnest desire for an early return of the railroads. I want to see the time come quickly when our Treasury may be relieved of the responsibility of guaranteeing their debts incurred for additions and betterments. I want the railroads to be made to finance themselves, and therefore I believe this sum, which must be appropriated sooner or later, should be appropriated now, so as to enable the Director General to compel the railroads to take over their own financing. By your failure to do so, you are delaying the time when this will be done and are thus creating a still further charge upon the Treasury. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] says that very shortly, within two or three months, it will be necessary for him to come back and ask for another appropriation to take care of this situation. I submit, gentlemen, that in view of the fact, admitted on the floor of this House, that within the next two or three months it will be necessary to come here and ask for an additional appropriation, we ought not to put ourselves in the attitude of trying to fool either ourselves or the public.

I am as heartily in favor of economy as anyone. I have been so throughout my service in Congress. I will go as far as anyone in the effort to cut down expenses, but we must not hamper this service or put our Government in the attitude of failing to take care of its obligations. If this money must be appropriated, as the gentleman from Iowa admits, we should not, merely because we do not wish to be put in the attitude of appropriating a larger sum than was carried in the bill passed in March by a Democratic House, evade our plain duty. If we delay for two or three months, as the gentleman suggests, then we postpone the time when the railroads will be made to take care of themselves, which is poor business and poor economy. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a very interesting topic, one in which I think the whole people of the United States is very much interested and is looking forward to action by the Congress to relieve them from the onerous burden placed upon them during the war to the extent that it is possible to find relief.

What is the situation with respect to the railroad proposition? A year ago we appropriated $500,000,000. If the railroad companies were compelled to pay interest on that for the two years they will have it, it would amount to $40,000,000. No interest has been charged, but it is to be counted in the loss, for the Government of the United States pays interest on the money it borrows and which it appropriates.

Now, we are appropriating $750,000,000 and it is altogether likely that the railroad companies will have this money for at least a year, and the interest charged on that at 4 per cent will amount to $30,000,000. Then we have lost $236,000,000 in 1918 and $250,000,000 for the first four months of 1919. And if they keep the railroads for two years from the time the Government took control they will have collected $2,200,000,000 in excess freight and passenger rates. That would make a grand total of $4,006,000,000.

The Director General says we are going to get $775,000,000 back, but we are not going to get back anything they collected as excess passenger and freight money. What part of that is included in the $775,000,000 I do not know, neither does the Director General. But if we assume that he knows what he is talking about, and we do get $775,000,000 back, we will still have lost as the result of Government ownership $3,231,000,000 to be charged to the extravagance and waste of Government operation.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. And Director General Hines admits himself that there is a loss of $486,000,000 that we will never get back.

Mr. MADDEN. That is the total loss that he is ready to admit. I am going to add the difference between $3,231,000,000 and $486,000,000, the amount I think the people ought to know about.

You say the railroads were bankrupt in 1914 and that the Government had to take them over when it did. It may be that they were bankrupt—I do not know—but what made them bankrupt? There was never a period of greater prosperity than in 1913 when the Democrats took control of this Government. Everybody will admit that, even the Democrats.

But you passed the Underwood bill immediately after you came into power, and you began an era of reckless, wasteful extravagance in the expenditure of public money the like of which was never seen before. You opened the ports of America by the Underwood bill and admitted goods made in all parts of the world. They took possession of the markets of America.

The mills were idle and men were thrown out of employment. You reduced the value of the farmers' products everywhere. You put Canada in competition with the American farmer in all the cereal products and compelled him to compete in free markets while Canada prevented America from reciprocal privileges.

That is not all; to meet the extravagant waste that you had entered upon you levied a tax of $120,000,000 against the American people and called it a war tax. It was in a time of peace, but you called it a war tax. We were not in war. The President of the United States said we were at peace with all the world, and even in 1915 and away up to the fall of 1916 the President said we were at peace, and he went before the American people for reelection on the ground that he had kept us out of war. And in the face of all this you levied a tax in 1914 of $120,000,000, calling it a war tax, to meet your wasteful expenditure. Why, you made it impossible for the mills to run, for men to work, for the farmer to sell his goods anywhere at a decent price. There was not anything for the railroads to carry, because you had made it impossible for business to move.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman said a moment ago, and I expect him to discuss it, that the railroads were most prosperous in 1913, 1914, and 1915.

Mr. MADDEN. I said the country was the most prosperous in 1913 that it had ever been at any time in history.

Mr. RAYBURN. And statistics also show that in those two years of Democratic administration the railroads were more prosperous than they had ever been in any year before.

Mr. MADDEN. You could not help their being prosperous. [Applause on the Republican side.] The Democrats had nothing to do with that. The war did it.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. The war erected a tariff wall around this country.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course. You could not bring goods in.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am very glad to hear the gentleman admit that there was one period of prosperity for which the Republican Party was not responsible. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. Whether it was responsible or not, the Democratic Party certainly was not responsible. The only thing they have ever been responsible for was the bankruptcy of the country when they were in power. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. No. Then, later on the Railroad Administration purchased all kinds of equipment at war prices, without consultation with the railroad companies themselves, and they are charging that up to the railroad expenses. It may be that they needed this equipment, but the Railroad Administration bought the kind of equipment that the railroad companies protested against buying, and now they propose to cancel a part of their losses, their obligations against the railroads by charging them for the equipment they did not want and never wanted at prices that only Mr. McAdoo and John Skelton Williams, who was the financial manager of the Railroad Administration, could justify. Nobody else in the world could justify the prices. I say that the reckless waste of money by the Railroad Administration under Mr. McAdoo and Mr. Williams no man living can justify, and loss on this account was inevitable. But why should the people of the United States continue to pay? We must maintain the railroads while we control them and operate them——

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I have not the time. The sooner we can unload them back into the hands of men who are interested in their economic management the better it will be for the railroads and the better for the American people. [Applause on Republican side.] We are not merely making a loss of $486,000,000—remember that; we are making a loss of anywhere from $3,250,000,000 to $4,000,000,000 in two years of Government control, and that is more by $1,000,000,000 than it ever cost to run the Government for the same period of time when it was being managed by the Republican Party. Get the credit you want out of the operation of the railroads, if you can get credit for the kind of management you have given the railroads, but assume the responsibility for the extravagance and waste and inefficiency, as you must, when all the facts are presented to the American people. [Applause on Republican side.]

Mr. MAGEE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent at this time to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, the questions involved have been so ably and completely covered by the distinguished chairman of the committee that I desire to take the time of the House only to make a single observation. I am not in favor of making an appropriation at this time in excess of the $750,000,000 provided in this bill. I am well aware that this amount does not satisfy the Democratic administration. We get deficiencies here all the time, but I feel that if we were so disposed we could not begin to provide the amount of money that they would spend if they could get hold of it.

So far as the obligations of the Government are concerned, everyone concedes that they must be fully met. There is no question about that; but the point is that at this time no one, not even the Director General nor anybody else in the administration, can tell what will finally be the aggregate of the obligations of the Government in respect to taking over the railroads.

There are some facts that I want to get clearly in your mind, because they can not be disputed. They are contained in the record of the hearings, and I would advise every Member in this House to get a copy thereof and read the same diligently. It will interest you and pay you. It will be a revelation to you, in my judgment, of inefficiency and extravagant administration of public affairs.

It is conceded that the Railroad Administration had a deficit in 1918 of $236,000,000. It is conceded that in 1918 they increased wages $852,000,000. In other words, they increased the wages $616,000,000 more than the deficit in 1918. These increases in wages are entirely independent of the increases in wages which resulted by reason of the passage of what is known as the Adamson bill in September, 1916. What did they do to meet the situation which they created? If they had not increased wages, there would have been a surplus last year in operation of over $600,000,000. If they had increased wages only 26 per cent instead of 52 per cent, there still would have been a surplus of about $190,000,000.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE. I have not very much time. If I can get additional time, I will be very glad to yield to the gentleman. I am merely stating facts in the record which the Director General gave. I yield for a question.

Mr. BLACK. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if it is his contention that the wage increase ought not to have been made?

Mr. MAGEE. I am not formulating the policy of the administration. I am giving my views, and I shall say something upon that proposition later. How did they meet the situation?

They raised freight and passenger rates substantially 25 per cent. They went into effect in June, 1918. They were in effect last year substantially 6 months and 20 days. The Director General said that from the increase in freight and passenger rates the Government obtained $560,000,000. That increase in rates on the basis of a whole year would produce about $1,000,000,000. Now, a 7 per cent additional increase in rates, based upon the increase of a billion dollars a year, as stated by the Director General, would take care of a deficit of more than $250,000,000, an amount in excess of the deficit of 1918.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 10 minutes. I may not take all of that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BARKLEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman make that observation he started out to make in the beginning of his five minutes a while ago?

Mr. MAGEE. If the gentleman will be patient I think that he will get the observation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAGEE. I am sure he will. For the first four months of this year they say they have a deficit of $250,000,000. Now, what do they propose to do to meet the existing situation? Nothing—absolutely drifting. That is the proposition of the Railroad Administration; that is the proposition of the Democratic Party here, simply to drift.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE. Now, unless some provision is made—I will yield for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. While we are drifting, will the gentleman please drift back and answer the question of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MAGEE. The gentleman will get that question answered if he will have a little patience. I did not suppose that I was

going to get so deeply under your epidermis that I would no more than get my remarks started when I would have some interruption from that side of the aisle.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield for a fair question? I assume the gentleman's solution of the whole matter would be an increase of freight rates. The gentleman knows, and he has stated so in reference to 1918, or does not the gentleman know that an increase of freight rates would necessarily increase the cost of living, and I want to ask the gentleman if he favors an increase of the cost of living at this particular time?

Mr. MAGEE. I am going to come to that proposition. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KREIDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE. I understand just exactly what the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee says. They do not want to meet their obligations and responsibilities of administration, because they have a camouflaged excuse. If there is anything in the world that can increase the cost of living to any greater extent than the policy of the Democratic Party in the last three or four years, I would like to have you tell me what it is, and I will have it framed and put on exhibition. [Applause on the Republican side.] If you read these hearings from beginning to end, you will not find a single suggestion of economy. You can not point out one; you have not a suggestion to make; you are absolutely drifting; and that is the only policy you have.

I was surprised to learn in reading these hearings that the salary of the Director General is fixed at $25,000 a year, while they have five regional directors with a salary fixed at $50,000 each per year and two more regional directors with a salary of $40,000 each. That is an illustration of Democratic economy.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAGEE. Let me state this observation, and then I will answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Then go ahead.

Mr. MAGEE. We have a situation here that we should meet like men. As suggested by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], you should meet your full responsibility. You have the choice of doing one of three things—reduce wages, increase rates about 10 per cent, or make provision for a large governmental loss. This suggestion should also include efficiency in operation and economy in operation, which have been so sadly lacking to date.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. What is the gentleman's——

Mr. MAGEE. Everybody knows——

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman state his choice?

Mr. MAGEE (continuing). There is a pending deficit for 1919 of $250,000,000, and nobody can tell what it will amount to by the end of the year, but if I were to make an estimate I would say not less than $500,000,000.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE. Now, I would like to say to the gentleman from South Carolina, and I wish he would listen to this——

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will.

Mr. MAGEE. The administration had the courage to increase wages in 1918 to such an extent as to turn a handsome surplus into a large deficit. Why has not the Railroad Administration the moral courage at this time to practice efficiency and economy and to increase rates sufficiently to meet the pending and continuing operating deficit?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Has the gentleman the moral courage to state his own views, whether rates ought to have been increased then and wages reduced?

Mr. MAGEE. If the gentleman can not understand what my views are from what I have said, it would be impossible for me to present any proposition to the gentleman which he could understand. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I would like to ask the gentleman—the gentleman has stood there and criticized the Director General first for raising wages—would he have refused to raise them? The gentleman has criticized him for not increasing the rates. Would the gentleman raise the rates? Does the gentleman favor raising the rates?

Mr. MAGEE. In answer to the gentleman's question, I desire to say this: The Director General—not the present one but his predecessor—or I will say the Railroad Administration——

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MAGEE (continuing). Having raised wages to the extent to which they did raise them, they are bound by reason of that act—that, apparently, being their fixed policy—to meet their responsibilities to the Government by devising ways and means to offset the increased costs of operation.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Then, you were opposed to raising the wages, were you?

Mr. MAGEE. You can draw your own conclusion.

Mr. KRIEDER. Will the gentleman from New York yield to me a minute?

Mr. MAGEE. Yes.

Mr. KREIDER. Is it not a fact that the Railroad Administration advanced the wages about $800,000,000 and collected from the people of the country $1,500,000,000 with which to pay them, but failed to do it, having squandered the balance in inefficient management, and that we are called upon to tax the people to pay the deficit which was caused by inefficient management? That is the truth of the matter. You can talk about increasing the wages all you please. You collected from the people twice as much as was needed to pay the increase in wages, and now you want an appropriation in order to make good. [Applause.]

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to make this point: That we have reached the time—and I also appeal to my colleagues across the aisle—when, in view of the facts and circumstances, in view of a deficiency of $250,000,000 in the first four months of the year, in view of the probability that the Government will continue to operate the roads for the rest of the year—and possibly, if there should not be an agreement, or such a bill passed as the President may approve, perhaps longer—we should meet the situation squarely like men and not camouflage it by saying if the Railroad Administration increases the rates 5 or 7 per cent, such action will increase the cost of living; not camouflage the situation by saying that the railroad receipts during the latter part of the year will be greater and sufficient to meet the deficit, because those months will cover the grain-moving period. I say, that such an argument as that is simply "passing the buck" to the taxpayers of the country. That is all it means. I ask you now in all fairness and in all seriousness, to meet this situation and do your duty to the Government by taking such action as will save the Government from a loss of $500,000,000 in the operation of the railroads for the year 1919. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. You are in power, why do you not do it?

Mr. MAGEE. The gentleman must know that the Railroad Administration is under Democratic control. I am satisfied that by efficiency and economy in operation, and by a very moderate increase in rates the pending and continuing operating deficit can be fully met. We should adopt this policy of affirmative action instead of the existing policy of drifting and save to the Government hundreds of millions of dollars. [Applause.]

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last eight words.

If I understood correctly the attitude of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], the gist of his remarks was that, while he believed this appropriation was some $250,000,000 smaller than it ought to be, he would not offer an amendment to increase it to the sum which he thinks and attempted to demonstrate should be provided.

It is a rather pathetic and pitiful situation, gentlemen of the committee, that the Chief Executive, in whom, after all, the control of these roads was placed by the Congress, with that functionary abroad seeking to defend the 14 points and various other important matters now engaging the attention of civilization, that he should not find, particularly upon the Appropriations Committee, a champion with sufficient courage to offer an amendment to a bill to help ward off a pending deficit, but who will come in and argue with all the fervor and strength that he possesses—and the genial gentleman has a full supply of those qualities—will come in and argue and protest, and yet announce, after all, that he will not attempt to offer an amendment to provide the sum which he thinks is necessary.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I prefer not to yield, because I do not intend to ask for additional time.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I would like to know if the gentleman would vote for it?

Mr. WALSH. No; I would not vote for it, because I agree with the chairman of the committee it is not necessary at this time. I say if it is necessary in the operation of any Government facility to ward off a financial panic or prevent business disaster throughout this country, I am ready to vote to decrease the wages of any Government-operating facility at any time.

Why, the railroad employees have based their demands not upon what their service is worth but upon what they can get the administration and its officials to yield to their demands. The idea of paying flagmen throughout this country $31 a week to wave a flag at the railroad crossings when trains are passing!

Who ever heard of a flagman—and they are mostly men of advanced years—who could perform service worth wages at that rate? The basis of the wages fixed in many instances has not been the worth of the service performed. It has been simply what the employees have demanded, and their demands have been met in most instances without any modification.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Here they think it is something to be afraid of to say the Government should not hesitate to reduce wages. I submit, gentlemen, that our allegiance is to the Government first, and if it is necessary in order to preserve our Government in all its operations, and to give efficient service, and to save the country from financial panic or disaster, and, furthermore, to preserve the Treasury of the United States, we ought not to hesitate to say that we will advocate a reduction and a revision in the wage scale of publicly operated and managed utilities.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman from Texas, because my irrepressible friend would ask the question of somebody else, I know.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the wage to be paid to the flagman any more out of proportion than the $180 per month we now pay to the conductor for six days a week service, when he has an auditor to go along with him and take up the tickets?

Mr. WALSH. Well, I submit, gentlemen, that many of these wages and wage scales that have been adopted by the Railroad Administration are excessive, and I doubt not but what if we had another Lane commission, perhaps a commission that was free from any other connection with Government operations, we might see in their recommendations some plan whereby some of these rates and wages would be reduced. I simply repeat that our duty first is to the people of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 10 words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this performance is so strictly in harmony with other performances that I have been witnessing now since the beginning of this session and which I witnessed back before the last session wound up that it seems utterly imposible that I am convinced that no bill of any kind or of whatever nature may be introduced into this House without gentlemen going over their same old song of criticism of the President being in Versailles, their same old song in regard to the cost of things increasing since the Democrats came into power, in regard to the increased importations, and the lowering of prices of everything produced, especially by the farmers in this country.

When I listened to the humorous "bunk" of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] a little while ago I thought I was hearing a Fourth of July address at some wild forks of the road full of errors and fallacies, to which no one ought ever be condemned to listen. [Laughter.] The gentleman started out with the statement that up to 1914 this country was going to the bow wows and that farmers' products were being reduced in price because of importations under the Underwood bill. The gentleman knows that after the Democrats came into power—from the very day they came into power—farmers were obtaining the highest prices they had ever realized up to that time for their products, and the gentleman knows that to-day the farmers are receiving more for their products than they ever did before in the history of the world.

Then another gentleman [Mr. WALSH] says we ought to reduce the wages of the workingmen while still higher enhancing the prices of the things he must buy and consume. He may be bold, but I do not believe he will go before his constituents on that platform. The gentleman [Mr. WALSH] knows that to-day the laborer is paying more for his bread, paying more for his meat, paying more for his house rent, paying more for everything he buys than ever before, and yet he says he would have the nerve—yes, arbitrarily by the Government—to reduce the workingman's wages. He would not dare have his party go before the country on that kind of a platform. If he did it himself, he would be in a party by himself.

The truth is, I have listened with a great deal of irritation to continued Republican attack and misrepresentation, and with a great deal of patience to Democrats, though not with entire approval of the fact that the Democrats on this side of the aisle have almost always confined their remarks to measures directly before the House. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They have failed to reply to the assertions and denunciations that are constant and continuous on the other side of the House.

My friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] said that the Railroad Administration had cost this Government $4,000,000,000. I think he gave about $1,000,000,000 as the amount the deficit would be and $3,000,000,000 for increased freight. The gentleman knows that the dollar to-day in the prices of all commodities throughout all the world does not buy more than what 50 cents used to buy a few years ago. Freight rates have been increased 25 per cent. That is all the gentleman can truthfully state. Is that a real increase in the cost of carriage in comparison with the value of the commodities carried or when we consider the real fall in value of the dollar? Not at all. The man who pays 25 per cent more freight is not paying more in proportion to the wages paid, in proportion to the cost of material. He really is not paying as much.

Not only so, Mr. Chairman, but the merits of every measure that comes before the Congress are lost sight of in the universal attempt to make political capital by gentlemen on that side. One gentleman arose in a perfect furore a moment ago and made a tirade just generally of charges, that all the increased railroad rates were from inefficiency, without stating one fact to bear him out. It does seem to me that the time has come when Members of Congress, who are sent here to serve the best interests of the people, ought to direct their attention somewhat to the measures coming before the House. There is one body of men in this Capitol that ought to be termed "The Unlimited Ten-hour, Twelve-hour, Fourteen-hour Talkfest Union." It is one union that does not want any eight-hour day.

And all the time and every time they talk it is for the purpose of making an attack on the administration. The President was attacked, first, because he went to Europe, and, second, because when he went there he did not forestall all the action of the council by telling what he was going to do. And since he has been there he has been attacked every morning because he did not send word before breakfast what he did the day before. These gentlemen, if they had been present when God Almighty was trying to evolve order out of chaos, would have called upon Him every morning to state what He did the day before. [Laughter and applause.] They never would have waited six days until He had completed creation. They would have demanded at least a daily report.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I will yield to the gentleman for a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas be given one minute more. I want to ask him a question.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I will ask that it be made five minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY] be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Pending that, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. KNUTSON. I would like to ask my friend from Texas if he considers this proposed constitution of the league of nations an "open covenant openly arrived at"?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I will answer the gentleman in this way, that no power under the sun could tell what that council necessarily must encounter in readjusting the map of the world, and gentlemen like the one who asked me that question know full well that the council can not tell to-day what their conclusions to-morrow will be. [Laughter on the Republican side.] And gentlemen on the Republican side know full well that if they were debating a question on this floor, unless they were content to tie their hands and unless they were determined on a policy regardless of right and justice, they could not tell what the action of the Republican Party would be. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] And furthermore, the gentleman knows to-day that the members of his party do not now know whether they intend to make it a party policy to oppose the league of nations. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] And furthermore, they know that while they desire to attack anything that Woodrow Wilson does, they dare not put their condemnation upon the league of nations now. [Applause on Democratic side.]

Now, the other day—that is, in the closing hours of the Sixty-fifth Congress—your leader on the floor here [Mr. MANN], fearing that the party would take a political position of that kind,

made a five-minute speech on the league of nations, which ought to have been a warning to you. He said we were asking and seeking nothing from that council of nations except a league of peace. He said that if our representatives secured that we would be justified in our war; but if we did not get that our whole fight would have been in vain. Yet over there your leaders are attacking the league of nations in the morning before breakfast and attacking it at noon and attacking it in the afternoon before supper; yes, attacking it because it did not mention the Monroe doctrine and attacking it because it does mention the Monroe doctrine; attacking it because it was not definite and then attacking it because it was definite; attacking because it parted with the sovereignty of the nations and then attacking it because it accomplishes nothing. There is nothing in the category of crimes that will not be laid at the door of the league of nations, and yet the Republicans as a party do not dare come out and denounce it. And your conscience keeper has advised you to take no stand upon it until you shall caucus or confer about it.

Mr. REAVIS. I agree with the gentleman that our remarks should be confined to the bill under discussion, and I want to ask him this question regarding that measure——

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Which measure? [Laughter.] If the gentleman wants to ask me a question with regard to the league of nations, fire away.

Mr. REAVIS. No; with regard——

Mr. HARDY of Texas. If the gentleman wants to ask me a question with regard to this bill, I hope he will be very careful. I may not be able to answer it. Go ahead.

Mr. REAVIS. I only presume to ask the gentleman a question regarding the bill now before the House, because he stated that he thought all remarks should be confined to the bill under discussion.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Oh, no; I stated that I was going outside of the RECORD to follow some of the gentlemen on that side who never touched the bill.

Mr. REAVIS. Without regard to that, that is not particularly pertinent to the question——

Mr. HARDY of Texas. When the gentleman asks his question, if I can not answer it I will simply say so.

Mr. REAVIS. As a matter of good business judgment, if the Railroad Administration, by the increase of wages, a voluntary action on their part, increased the expenses of the business to such an extent that it would show a deficit, should they not likewise increase the rates so as adequately to take care of the obligations which they voluntarily incurred?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I think I will take the time to answer that question, although it is a question which the last speaker on your side persistently and continuously refused to answer. I think the Director General gave perhaps the most consistent, intelligent, and appropriate answer to the gentleman's question. His answer has been read here by Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. He stated that we were going through a period, as it were, of reconstruction, and that in his belief the volume of business would increase enough to avoid a deficit. He said that June, July, and August were lean months, and if they raised rates to make them profitable now they would be too high when the heavy freight months came, and before raising rates and possibly fixing an excessive rate on the people he wanted to have it demonstrated as to whether or not his judgment was right. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] will correct me if I have not correctly stated this. If I remember aright, that was substantially the statement of Director General Hines. The gentleman from South Carolina in his clear and strong statement to this House on this bill said that at first he thought the director was mistaken, and thought they ought to raise rates now, but that upon full consideration he was convinced that the Director General's policy of continuing the existing rates for the present was wise. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I will not ask for further time.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, every time a Member on the Republican side of the House makes mention of the fact of the absence of the President in Europe there is resentment expressed by some Member on the Democratic side. This is some five or six months after the President left these shores, and not often has the fact of his absence been mentioned save in connection with inconvenience in legislation occasioned by his absence. If the Democratic members of this committee will recall, the criticism that was centered against the President going abroad did not originate among Republicans, but it came more largely from the Democratic press than from the Republican press up to the time of his going. That sentiment was largely shared by the Democrats in this Chamber, as expressed in the cloakroom and private conversations. The Republican side took the position that if criticism would prevent his going, it would and should be offered. If it would not prevent his going, there would be no criticism by the Republicans as a party. This policy has been strictly adhered to within this Chamber. I am interested to know why, every time mention is made of the President's absence, in connection with our legislation when we are bending our energies to pass the supply bills before the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1919, there should be such a feeling of unrest, especially in the light of criticism from the Democratic press prior to the President's going. I think the Democratic Members here either do not know, or else they have forgotten, or else they have no respect for the past, as to their attitude on the President being away from this Capital even though he did not go out of the country. Evidently the Democratic Members do not recall the action of the Forty-first Congress, first session, April 3, 1876. The record of the action of that Democratic Congress will be found on page 2156 of volume 4, part 3, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Let me read the resolution passed by a Democratic Congress under suspension of the rules that required two-thirds majority, and that did not receive one dissenting vote on the Democratic or Republican side. This is the resolution:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to inform this House, if in his opinion it is not incompatible with the public interest, whether, since the 4th day of March, 1869, any executive offices, acts, or duties, and if any what, have been performed at a distance from the seat of government established by law, and for how long a period at any one time, and in what part of the United States; also whether any public necessity existed for such performance, and if so of what character; and how far the performance of such executive offices, acts, or duties at such distance from the seat of government established by law was in compliance with the act of Congress of the 16th day of July, 1790.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What Congress was it that passed that resolution?

Mr. FESS. The Forty-first.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman does not claim the Forty-first Congress was a Democratic Congress?

Mr. FESS. It was the Congress presided over by Speaker Randall.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Forty-fourth Congress was the first Democratic Congress after the war.

Mr. FESS. Then it was the Forty-fourth. [Laughter.] I am delighted to have this explosion of enthusiasm on behalf of the ex-Speaker, whose statements I always regard as accurate. That Congress was presided over by Samuel J. Randall, whatever the number of the Congress, and the date was April 3, 1876.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

By unanimous consent the time of Mr. FESS was extended five minutes.

Mr. FESS. I accept the correction of ex-Speaker CLARK as to its being the Forty-fourth Congress instead of the Forty-first, and reaffirm that the resolution was passed on that date, April 3, 1876.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was just simply trying to get the gentleman straight on his facts.

Mr. FESS. I accept the correction as to the number of the Congress, but I do not accept any suggestion that my statement about the resolution is incorrect. President Grant was over at Long Branch because of the condition of his health, and he exercised some executive functions while over there, and that Democratic Congress so resented his absence from the Capitol that this resolution was passed under suspension of the rules.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. No; I can not yield. With our President away from the shores of the country, if any of us on this side refers either to the inconvenience or should question its wisdom, there seems to be immediately a resentment on the Democratic side as if we had no right to do it. In the light of the Democratic position on this question as expressed in the resolution, this attitude, to say the least, is interesting. So much for the lecture we received from the Democratic Member from Texas a moment ago.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman permit me to make a statement of the reason, briefly?

Mr. FESS. I would rather the gentleman would make it in his own time.

Mr. RUCKER. We will give the gentleman from Ohio more time if he wishes it.

Mr. GARRETT. I can tell the gentleman in a single sentence.

Mr. FESS. I think the gentleman had better do it in his own time. Now, as to this measure before us, there is one of three things that must be done. I am not going to repeat them, because they are well understood, but when we mention one of them—that it may be necessary to increase rates, freight and passenger—instantly some one says, "Are you in favor of it?" as if you were afraid to take a position on the railway question. The other, if you do not increase the rates there must be of necessity a reduction of expenses. Instantly some one will say, "Are you in favor of reducing the scale of wages?" as if the man would be afraid to assert his duty on this question if the issue should arise. What we ought to do, what we must do, is to have the courage, not to think that we can blind the shipping public by refusing to say that we may be required to pay higher rates, or to think we can in any deceptive way keep from the laborer the facts by refusing to say that we may be required to reduce his wages, but meet the situation as it faces us, rather than through our acts here attempt to legislate by deception and play the two ends against the middle by refusing to say either to the shipper and the farmer you must assume an increase of burden or to the laborer "you may be required to reduce the wages in some form," and in this way attempt to deceive by proceeding in a way that nobody knows what we intend to do. That is demagogy.

We will either increase the rates or reduce the expenditures, and I am not sure but that we will have to do both, because the business of transportation must be continued and must not suffer bankruptcy. What the public has a right to demand of this Congress is that the railroads shall not be run for profit alone; that the railroads shall not be run for labor alone; that the element to be considered is not the profit to the owner to the exclusion of other elements, nor is it the wages of the laboring men to the exclusion of others, but the public, the largest factor, has a right to demand efficiency in service for which it pays and a rational economy in the railroad system. If it is necessary to increase the passenger and freight rates or to reduce wages, or both, we have got to have the courage to do it. The one thing of which we are all assured, the present situation can not continue. I am willing to vote the necessary money to insure transportation, and I am hopeful under private operation under governmental regulation will enable the roads to be operated both efficiently and economically, insuring a reasonable profit to the owner, steady employment, under good conditions, at an American standard of wages, and a resumption of transportation on a successful basis.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, how much time is left?

The CHAIRMAN. Five minutes.

Mr. GARRETT was recognized.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield to me a minute?

Mr. GARRETT. Certainly.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I want to use that minute to make a statement to the Members of the House as to the reason assigned by Mr. Hines, Director General, for not approving an increase of rates at this time. In the first place he says that we have gone through the four leanest months of the year, and if we attempted to increase the rates of the railroads based upon the earnings during this period it would be entirely unfair and unjust to shippers, taking into consideration the earnings of the railroads during the whole year. That being true, it is unwise to grant such an increase at this time, because railroad rates are basic, and it would increase the cost of raw material, which in turn would increase the cost of living. It was his opinion that a rate increase should be based upon normal conditions and not upon the abnormal conditions which have existed for the past four months. I agree with him.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I think I can satisfy the curiosity of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] on one point, namely, as to why there is a disposition on the Democratic side to resent the continuous criticism of the President of the United States for being abroad. Whatever may have been the opinions of gentlemen, Democrats or Republicans, as to the propriety of the President going abroad, it is a fact that he did go.

Personally, I never saw any impropriety in it. On the contrary, I approved entirely of his going. Had the President of the United States not gone abroad, those whom he would have sent as commissioners would have been continually under his instruction by cable or letter, as has always been the case, and as always must be the case, in negotiating a treaty of peace on the part of this Republic.

I can see no objection whatever to the President going personally upon the ground and directing operations and methods there. On the contrary, there were many reasons why he should have gone.

But, passing that by, without reference to the opinion of men as to the propriety, Democrats do object to and do resent criticism, because when he went he carried with him the fortunes of this Republic. And when we see gentlemen, who in order to discredit him here are willing and anxious to discredit their country before the world, arise to criticize him and continuously criticize him we do resent it, not because of its political aspect but because of our fondness and affection for the glory and greatness of our own country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] ask unanimous consent to extend and revise their remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House, with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ANDERSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5312) to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for carrying out the act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation system while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918, and had directed him to report the same back with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 305, nays 4, answered "present" 2, not voting 119, as follows:

YEAS—305.

Ackerman	Cleary	Gallagher	Kiess
Alexander	Cole	Gandy	Kincheloe
Almon	Collier	Garland	King
Anderson	Connally	Garner	Kinkaid
Andrews, Md.	Crago	Garrett	Kitchin
Andrews, Nebr.	Cramton	Glynn	Kleczka
Ashbrook	Crisp	Good	Knutson
Aswell	Currie, Mich.	Graham, Ill.	Kraus
Ayres	Curry, Calif.	Green, Iowa	Kreider
Babka	Dallinger	Greene, Vt.	LaGuardia
Bacharach	Darrow	Hadley	Lampert
Baer	Davis, Minn.	Hamilton	Langley
Bankhead	Davis, Tenn.	Hardy, Colo.	Lanham
Barbour	Dempsey	Hardy, Tex.	Lankford
Barkley	Denison	Hastings	Layton
Bee	Dent	Hawley	Lee, Ga.
Begg	Dickinson, Mo.	Hayden	Lehlbach
Bell	Dickinson, Iowa	Hays	Lesher
Benham	Dominick	Heflin	Lever
Black	Donovan	Hernandez	Little
Bland, Ind.	Doremus	Hersey	Lonergan
Bland, Va.	Doughton	Hickey	Longworth
Blanton	Dowell	Hicks	Lufkin
Boies	Drane	Hoch	Luhring
Bowers	Dunbar	Holland	McAndrews
Box	Dunn	Houghton	McClintic
Briggs	Dyer	Howard	McFadden
Brooks, Ill.	Elliott	Huddleston	McGlennon
Browne	Elston	Hudspeth	McKenzie
Browning	Emerson	Hull, Iowa	McKeown
Burdick	Esch	Hull, Tenn.	McKinley
Burroughs	Evans, Mont.	Husted	McLane
Butler	Evans, Nebr.	Hutchinson	McLaughlin, Mich.
Byrnes, S. C.	Evans, Nev.	Igoe	McLaughlin, Nebr.
Byrns, Tenn.	Fairfield	Jacoway	McPherson
Campbell, Pa.	Ferris	Jefferis	MacGregor
Candler	Fess	Johnson, Ky.	Madden
Cannon	Fields	Johnson, Miss.	Magee
Caraway	Fisher	Johnson, Wash.	Major
Carss	Focht	Johnston, N. Y.	Mapes
Carter	Fordney	Jones, Pa.	Martin
Casey	Foster	Juul	Mays
Chindblom	Frear	Kearns	Michener
Christopherson	Freeman	Kelley, Mich.	Miller
Clark, Mo.	French	Kennedy, Iowa	Monahan, Wis.
Classon	Fuller, Ill.	Kettner	Mondell

Montague	Purnell	Sisson	Venable
Moon	Quin	Slemp	Vestal
Mooney	Radcliffe	Small	Vinson
Moore, Va.	Rainey, H. T.	Smith, Idaho	Voigt
Moores, Ind.	Rainey, J. W.	Smith, Mich.	Volstead
Morgan	Randall, Calif.	Smithwick	Walsh
Mudd	Randall, Wis.	Snell	Walters
Nelson, Mo.	Rayburn	Steagall	Ward
Nelson, Wis.	Reavis	Stedman	Wason
Newton, Minn.	Reber	Stephens, Miss.	Watkins
Newton, Mo.	Reed, N. Y.	Stephens, Ohio	Watson, Va.
Nicholls, S. C.	Reed, W. Va.	Stevenson	Weaver
Nichols, Mich.	Rhodes	Strong, Kans.	Webster
Nolan	Ricketts	Summers, Wash.	Welty
O'Conner	Riddick	Sumners, Tex.	Whaley
Ogden	Robinson, N. C.	Sweet	Wheeler
Oldfield.	Rogers	Taylor, Ark.	White, Kans.
Oliver	Romjue	Taylor, Colo.	White, Me.
Olney	Rose	Taylor, Tenn.	Williams
Osborne	Rouse	Temple	Wilson, Ill.
Overstreet	Rucker	Thompson, Ohio	Wilson, La.
Padgett	Sabath	Thompson, Okla.	Wingo
Paige	Sanders, Ind.	Tillman	Winslow
Park	Sanders, La.	Tilson	Wood, Ind.
Parker	Sanders, N. Y.	Timberlake	Wright
Parrish	Scott	Tincher	Young, N. Dak.
Pell	Sells	Tinkham	Young, Tex.
Peters	Shreve	Towner	Zihlman
Phelan	Siegel	Upshaw	
Platt	Sims	Vaile	
Porter	Sinnott	Vare	

NAYS—4.

Anthony	Ramseyer	Thomas	Woodyard

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Booher	McDuffie

NOT VOTING—119.

Benson	Ellsworth	Kelly, Pa.	Riordan
Blackmon	Fitzgerald	Kendall	Robsion, Ky.
Bland, Mo.	Flood	Kennedy, R. I.	Rodenberg
Brand	Fuller, Mass.	Larsen	Rowan
Brinson	Gallivan	Lazaro	Rowe
Britten	Ganly	Lea, Calif.	Rubey
Brooks, Pa.	Gard	Linthicum	Sanford
Brumbaugh	Godwin, N. C.	Luce	Saunders, Va.
Buchanan	Goldfogle	McArthur	Schall
Burke	Goodall	McCulloch	Scully
Caldwell	Goodwin, Ark.	McKiniry	Sears
Campbell, Kans.	Goodykoontz	MacCrate	Sherwood
Cantrill	Gould	Maher	Sinclair
Carew	Graham, Pa.	Mann	Smith, Ill.
Clark, Fla.	Greene, Mass.	Mansfield	Smith, N. Y.
Coady	Griest	Mason	Snyder
Cooper	Griffin	Mead	Steele
Copley	Hamill	Merritt	Steenerson
Costello	Harrison	Minahan, N. J.	Stiness
Crowther	Haskell	Moore, Ohio	Strong, Pa.
Cullen	Haugen	Moore, Pa.	Sullivan
Dale	Hersman	Morin	Treadway
Davey	Hill	Mott	Watson, Pa.
Dewalt	Hulings	Murphy	Webb
Dooling	Humphreys	Neely	Welling
Dupré	Ireland	O'Connell	Wilson, Pa.
Eagan	James	Pou	Wise
Eagle	Johnson, S. Dak.	Ragsdale	Woods, Va.
Echols	Jones, Tex.	Raker	Yates
Edmonds	Kahn	Ramsey	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. YATES with Mr. BENSON.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania with Mr. BLAND of Missouri.

Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania with Mr. BRINSON.

Mr. STINESS with Mr. BUCHANAN.

Mr. STEENERSON with Mr. CALDWELL.

Mr. SNYDER with Mr. CANTRILL.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. CAREW.

Mr. SINCLAIR with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas with Mr. RIORDAN.

Mr. GRIEST with Mr. CULLEN.

Mr. KENDALL with Mr. O'CONNELL.

Mr. MOORE of Ohio with Mr. SCULLY.

Mr. WALTERS with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.

Mr. MANN with Mr. BLACKMON.

Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia.

Mr. HASKELL with Mr. MAHER.

Mr. RAMSEY with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania with Mr. DEWALT.

Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. TREADWAY with Mr. BOOHER.

Mr. SANFORD with Mr. HARRISON.

Mr. SCHALL with Mr. COADY.

Mr. ROWE with Mr. DAVEY.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky with Mr. DOOLING.

Mr. MOTT with Mr. DUPRÉ.

Mr. MURPHY with Mr. EAGAN.

Mr. MORIN with Mr. EAGLE.

Mr. MERRITT with Mr. FITZGERALD.

Mr. MASON with Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. MACCRATE with Mr. GALLIVAN.

Mr. MCCULLOCH with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.

Mr. MCARTHUR with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. LUCE with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. GRIFFIN.

Mr. KENDALL with Mr. HERSMAN.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. LINTHICUM.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota with Mr. JONES of Texas.

Mr. IRELAND with Mr. LAZARO.

Mr. HULINGS with Mr. MCKINIRY.

Mr. HILL with Mr. MANSFIELD.

Mr. HASKELL with Mr. MEAD.

Mr. GRIEST with Mr. MINAHAN of New Jersey.

Mr. GOULD with Mr. NEELY.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. POU.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ with Mr. RAGSDALE.

Mr. GOODALL with Mr. RAKER.

Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts with Mr. ROWAN.

Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. RUBEY.

Mr. EDMONDS with Mr. SEARS.

Mr. CROWTHER with Mr. SHERWOOD.

Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. STEELE.

Mr. COPLEY with Mr. WEBB.

Mr. COOPER with Mr. WELLING.

Mr. BURKE with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania with Mr. WISE.

Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. WOODS of Virginia.

Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. GARD.

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening?

Mr. EAGLE. I was not in the Hall listening, but I would vote "aye," if I could.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was not in the Hall listening.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not qualify.

Mr. BRAND. Mr. Speaker, I was going into the cloak room to get a drink of water when my name was called, and before I could turn around and answer to my name, my name was passed and the Clerk called another name. On the second roll call I was sitting here on the outside listening and did not hear my name.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman was on the outside on the second call?

Mr. BRAND. I was on the inside on the first roll call, and the Clerk passed my name and called another name before I could answer.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will put the question to the gentleman. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name was called?

Mr. BRAND. I was in this Hall and I heard my name called as I was going into the cloak room to get a drink of water, and before I could turn around and answer the Clerk had passed my name and called another name. Those are the facts.

The SPEAKER. So the gentleman attempted to answer and intended to answer on the second roll call?

Mr. BRAND. I did intend to answer and I was sitting here for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. Where was the gentleman on the second roll call?

Mr. BRAND. I was on the outside then.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

Mr. BRAND. I desire to say that if I had had an opportunity to vote I would have voted "aye."

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "aye."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name was called?

Mr. McDUFFIE. No, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. GOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute, in order to make an announcement of interest to the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, word has just come, and I am reliably informed has already been announced in the United States Senate, that in my own State of Wisconsin, the grand old Badger State, the legislature has ratified the woman suffrage amendment. Thus the Badger State leads in beirg the first State of the Union to ratify the amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, may I proceed for 30 seconds?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, word has just come to us that the State of Illinois is of all the States the first to indorse the suffrage amendment. [Applause.]

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until Wednesday, June 11, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, required by the Bureau of Fisheries for conducting demonstrations and instruction in methods of preparing fish, for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 88); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting tentative draft of legislation authorizing the Secretary of War to turn over on requests from other executive departments of the Government ammunition, explosives, and other ammunition components (H. Doc. No. 89); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. STINESS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 530) for the construction of a bridge across the St. John River between Madawaska, Me., and Edmunston, Province of New Brunswick, Canada, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 28), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1711) to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 29), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WEBSTER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2954) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pend Oreille River, between the towns of Metaline and Metaline Falls, in the State of Washington, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 30), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FESS, from the Committee on Education, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5225) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 31), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 5395) to provide soldiers, sailors, and marines with capital for agricultural development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5396) making an appropriation for the construction and completion of an addition to the Central Post Office Building at St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 5397) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the counties of Arkansas, Cleveland, Dallas, Desha, Drew, Garland, Grant, Hot Springs, Jefferson, Lincoln, Lonoke, and Saline, in the State of Arkansas, one German cannon or fieldpiece each; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SANFORD: A bill (H. R. 5398) to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provisions for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 5399) donating a captured German cannon and cannon balls to the city of Horton, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5400) donating a captured German cannon and cannon balls to the city of Seneca; Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5401) donating a captured German cannon and cannon balls to the city of Leavenworth, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5402) donating a captured German cannon and cannon balls to the city of Hiawatha, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5403) donating a captured German cannon and cannon balls to the city of Troy, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5404) donating a captured German cannon and cannon balls to the city of Holton, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5405) donating a captured German cannon and cannon balls to the city of Atchison, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5406) donating a captured German cannon and cannon balls to the city of Oskaloosa, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5407) donating a captured German cannon and cannon balls to the city of Nortonville, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5408) donating a captured German cannon and cannon balls to the city of Topeka, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 5409) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Canon City, Fremont County, in the State of Colorado, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5410) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Alamosa, Alamosa County, in the State of Colorado, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLASSON: A bill (H. R. 5411) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Seymour, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5412) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Kaukauna, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 5413) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to each of the following towns, villages, and cities of Missouri: Maryville, Hopkins, Burlington, Junction, Rockport, Tarkio, Mound City, Craig, Forest City, St. Joseph, Savannah, Bolckow, Weston, and Dearborn, one captured German cannon or fieldpiece with accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5414) to provide quarters or commutation thereof to commissioned officers in certain cases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE: A bill (H. R. 5415) to erect a post-office building in the city of Passaic, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 5416) to authorize corporations organized in the District of Columbia to change their names; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 5417) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the department of parks, borough of Brooklyn, city of New York, a suitable number of captured cannons or fieldpieces, with carriages and outfits of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 5418) increasing the pay of printers and pressmen employed in the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 5419) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended June 18, 1910; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 5420) providing for the enlargement, extension, remodeling, and improving of the present Federal building in the city of Jamestown, in the State of New York; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 5421) amending an act providing for payment of pensions to widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5422) making appropriation for the construction and completion of certain public works on the Missouri River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5423) granting an increase of pension to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War and the War with Mexico and to the widows of such soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 5424) to provide for the incorporation of certain companies engaged in foreign trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 5425) to provide revenue for the Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 5426) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Groton, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 5427) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VOIGT: A bill (H. R. 5428) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Plymouth, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5429) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fort Atkinson, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5430) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Waupun, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5431) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Portage, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5432) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hartford, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5433) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mayville, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5434) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Beaver Dam, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5435) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Port Washington, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5436) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Jefferson, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5437) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of West Bend, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5438) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Watertown, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5439) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sheboygan, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5440) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Juneau, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5441) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Columbus, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DONOVAN: A bill (H. R. 5442) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Fort Washington War Service Honor Roll Committee of the city of New York, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5443) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Twenty-second Regiment Engineers, New York City, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY of California: A bill (H. R. 5444) providing for the construction and equipment of an ammunition manufacturing plant at the United States arsenal at Benicia, Calif.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN: Resolution (H. Res. 103) requesting information regarding parcels-post insurance from the Postmaster General; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial from the Legislature of Hawaii, requesting the Congress of the United States to amend section 2 of the act of Congress approved March 28, 1916; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of California, relative to the extension of benefits of legislation relating to the reservation and distribution of Government lands to include the Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania favoring the pensioning of Spanish-American War veterans after they reach a certain age; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EDMONDS: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, petitioning Congress of the United States to adopt legislation providing for the pensioning of all veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, favoring legislation to pension veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 5445) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin D. Barr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5446) granting an increase of pension to S. F. Fowler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5447) granting an increase of pension to Abraham C. Randle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5448) granting an increase of pension to George W. M. Culb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5449) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Fishel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 5450) granting a pension to Bernice D. Jordan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5451) granting a pension to A. M. Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5452) granting a pension to Eddie V. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5453) granting a pension to Stocton Sponseller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5454) granting a pension to Isaac D. Caldwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5455) granting an increase of pension to John W. Combs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5456) granting an increase of pension to George Dettmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5457) granting an increase of pension to John Grozinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5458) granting an increase of pension to William C. Clendenning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5459) for the relief of Jacob Kesner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5460) to remove the charge of desertion from John Lyons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5461) to reimburse Benson Jacobs, postmaster of Little Falls, Monongalia County, W. Va., for certain postage stamps stolen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DONOVAN: A bill (H. R. 5462) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Ubert; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5463) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in case of Arthur E. Colgate, administrator of the estate of Clinton G. Colgate, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 5464) granting an increase of pension to George E. Lovin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5465) granting a pension to Isabella Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 5466) granting an increase of pension to Jerry B. Andrews; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5467) granting a pension to Ellen L. Curran; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 5468) for the relief of Ellen B. Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 5469) granting a pension to George B. Chapin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 5470) granting an increase of pension to Scott Lone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 5471) granting a pension to Henry Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5472) granting a pension to Mary H. Lauderbaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 5473) to correct the military record of Robert Zink; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 5474) for the relief of John C. Hesse; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 5475) granting a pension to Jean N. Roach; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5476) granting a pension to George Horgis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5477) granting a pension to William R. Neal; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5478) granting a pension to James Noe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5479) granting a pension to James Sullivan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5480) granting a pension to Seaburn D. Wray; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5481) granting a pension to Scott Engle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5482) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Farley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SISSON: A bill (H. R. 5483) to relinquish, release, remise, and quitclaim all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 5484) granting a pension to Herman Alexander; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5485) for the relief of V. E. Schermerhorn, E. C. Caley, G. W. Campbell, and Philip Hudspeth; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5486) granting a pension to Carey O. Amsbaugh; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5487) granting an increase of pension to Robert T. Jellison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5488) granting a pension to Eugene Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5489) granting a pension to Mrs. Arbany Terry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5490) granting a pension to Annie E. Frost; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5491) granting an increase of pension to William F. Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5492) to remove the charge of desertion against Creed F. Casteel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINCHER: A bill (H. R. 5493) granting an increase of pension to William W. Barney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VAILE: A bill (H. R. 5494) granting an increase of pension to George A. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VOIGT: A bill (H. R. 5495) for the relief of J. Ph. Binzel Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 5496) granting relief to Charles H. Prince; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5497) granting relief to the estate of Charles E. Stevens; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of United Cloth Hat & Cap Makers of North America, favoring establishing a system of adequate health and unemployment insurance on the same basis as the present laws on accident insurance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Boston Local, No. 4, Commercial Telegraphers' Union of America, relating to trade-unions; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. ALMON: Petition of Local No. 558, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Sheffield, Ala., to Members of Congress embodying grievances which have been submitted to officials having jurisdiction over nitrate plant No. 2, Muscle Shoals, Ala., without success; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. AYRES: Resolutions from the congregation of Grace Presbyterian Church of Wichita; Methodist Church of Potwin; Wichita Ministerial Association, consisting of 55 Christian ministers; the churches of Walton; the Evangelical Association of Eldorado; and the local W. C. T. U. of Mulvane, all in the State of Kansas, relative to the permanent enforcement of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution and war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOHER: Petition of J. L. Weaver and several other citizens of the State of Missouri; also letter and telegrams from the citizens of the State of Missouri, protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: Resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, favoring pensions for veterans of Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Shickshinny, Pa., protesting against the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Methodist Episcopal Church of West Pittston, 3,000 people; Methodist Episcopal Churches of Wanamie and Alden; St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, of Hazleton; Methodist Episcopal Church and Sunday school of Pittston, 850 members; Parrish Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Wilkes-Barre, all in the State of Pennsylvania, urging against repeal of war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARSS: Petition of Jewish societies of McKinley, Nashwauk, Ely, Duluth, Eveleth, Gilbert, and Hibbing, Minn., protesting against injustice in Jugo-Slav affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DARROW: Resolution of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania in behalf of legislation pensioning veterans of the Spanish-American War when reaching a certain age; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of 61 residents of the twenty-third legislative district, Philadelphia, Pa., opposing repeal of war-time prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 68 residents of West Philadelphia, Pa., opposing repeal of war-time prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of Industrial Lodge, No. 21, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, opposing daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Missouri State Association of the National Association of Letter Carriers, St. Joseph, Mo., relating to increase of salary to postal employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of mass meeting at Oakland, Calif., against the persecution and massacre of Jewish people in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petitions of the Belden Manufacturing Co., the Chicago Insulated Wire & Manufacturing Co., and the Schulze Baking Co., of Chicago; the Burson Knitting Co., the Rockford Mitten & Hosiery Co., the Rockford Chamber of Commerce, of Rockford; the Western Glass Co., of Streator; and the National Sewing Machine Co., of Belvidere, all in the State of Illinois, opposing the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 16 members of John V. Boyd Post, No. 23, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kentucky, for bill to grant pensions of $50 per month to surviving veterans of the Civil War and $30 per month to widows of such veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Farley & Anderson, of Leland; the Ottawa Business Men's Association; and 300 citizens of Rockford, all in the State of Illinois, asking for repeal of luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 58 citizens of Boone and Winnebago Counties, Ill., favoring repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: Petition of Jugo-Slav societies at Dawson and New Dawson, N. Mex., relating to justice for Jugo-Slavs in the peace treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Albuquerque, N. Mex., against the tax on sporting goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASKELL: Petition of Morris Goldebaum, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the persecution of Jews in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of State of New York, opposing repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of New York Pharmaceutical Conference, opposing tax on soft drinks, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIESS: Petition from Keystone Glue Co., of Williamsport, Pa., protesting against any repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition from Third Street Methodist Episcopal Church of Williamsport, Pa., protesting against any repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Tioga County, Pa., favoring the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Wallis Run, Pa., protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 2809, granting an increase of pension to Harry A. McKibben; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of 17 citizens of Pawtucket, R. I., urging repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of M. Tishler and A. Tishler, Baltimore, Md., condemning atrocities against Jews in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Maryland Bankers' Association, opposing Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Board of Trade of Baltimore, Md., relating to dredging of the Baltimore Harbor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Maryland State Grange, Chestertown, Md., protesting against the revision or change of laws on prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of International Association of Machinists, against giving work from navy yards and arsenals to private corporations; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Isaac Hamburgher & Sons, Julius Gutman & Co., Steers No Rent Store, the J. G. Valiant Co., N. Hess's Sons (Inc.), L. Slesinger & Son, Albert A. Brager, the Quality Shop, Lycett, stationer, all of Baltimore, Md., protesting against the luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of McCawley & Co. (Inc.), the Rumford Co., and 1,000 citizens, all of Baltimore, Md., against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of the New York Pharmaceutical Conference and sundry citizens of New York and Brooklyn, protesting against the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., for the repeal of section 630 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of Greenfield Hill Congregational Church, of Fairfield; Second Baptist Church, of Bridgeport; Starr Chapter 271, Epworth League of Methodist Episcopal Church of Danbury, all in the State of Connecticut, against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: Petition of Mont C. Marshall and several hundred other citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., for repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of E. B. Blight, J. C. McKeongh, F. R. Belliotti, T. S. Wilson, E. N. Bavgar, Joseph J. Lojowns, W. H. Rogers, Elizabeth Dort, Henry Mannel, George Reimame, C. N. Reese, C. E. Noble, Peter G. Browner, Charles S. Schench, all of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the repeal of section 907, subdivision 1 (toilet articles) and subdivision 2 (medicinal preparations); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted at annual meeting of National Association of Manufacturers held in New York May 22, 1919, in reference to United States employment service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, resolutions of Rogers-Brown Iron Co., by H. T. Clement, treasurer, protesting against the continuation of the Department of Labor employment service of Buffalo, N. Y.; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Petition from citizens of Shell Lake, Wis., protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of New York Pharmaceutical Conference, druggists of Greater New York and county of Westchester, opposing luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Political Association Redeemed Italians, asking for recognition of Italian claims; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of State of New York, for a national policy of development of water resources; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of American Association of Woolen and Worsted Manufacturers, New York, against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PAIGE: Petition of sundry citizens of Clinton, Mass., etc., against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 12,000 women of Massachusetts Woman's Christian Temperance Union, against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Railway Car Manufacturers' Association, New York, opposing the continuance of United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition and letters asking for repeal of luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions and letters against the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: Petition of Mountain View Shakespeare Club, of El Monte; Friends' Church, of Bell; Sunday School Association of Los Angeles County; Pilgrims Congregational Church, of Pomona; Garvanza Methodist Church, Los Angeles; Reformed Presbyterian Church, Los Angeles, all in the State of California, against the repeal of war prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of American Association of Woolen and Worsted Manufacturers, opposing the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of New York Pharmaceutical Conference, druggists of Greater New York and county of Westchester, strenuously opposing the luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Political Association Redeemed Italians, relating to Italian claims; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Harry F. Scheetz, Frankford Arsenal, to pass an adequate retirement bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Papers to accompany House bill 4047, granting increase of pension to Elijah H. Spencer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petition of residents of Albany, Cohoes, and Rensselaer, all of New York State, favoring the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of residents of Delmar, N. Y., favoring enforcement of war-time prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of several hundred citizens of New York, favoring the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of residents of Albany, Cohoes, Troy, Watervliet, and New York, protesting against the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of residents of Troy and Watervliet, all of New York State, protesting against the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of various residents of the Thirty-third district of New York, for repeal of the tax on sodas, ice cream, and soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Polish people of Meriden, Conn., protesting against Jewish attempts to influence public opinion against Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Resolution of the Business Men's Association of Pottstown and vicinity, urging retention of zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of D. Scott Chisholm et al., against the tax of 10 per cent levied on sporting goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINGO: Petition of 76 citizens of Paris, Ark., protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *June 11, 1919.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thy peace, deeper than the noise and confusion of the world's dread alarm, Thy peace flows in a tide that is too deep for sound or foam. We come seeking Thy peace, because we believe that the peace of the world depends upon Thy peace in the hearts of men. We pray that in this place of power we may have the peace of God that passeth all understanding, and that in all our deliberations and utterances we may be guided and controlled and sweetened and blessed by the abiding peace of God in our hearts. For Christ's sake. Amen.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Beckham	Harris	McNary	Smith, Ariz.
Capper	Harrison	Nelson	Smoot
Chamberlain	Henderson	Newberry	Spencer
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Sterling
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Thomas
Dial	Kellogg	Overman	Trammell
Dillingham	Kendrick	Page	Wadsworth
Edge	Kenyon	Phelan	Walsh, Mass.
Elkins	Keyes	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	King	Poindexter	Warren
France	Kirby	Ransdell	Watson
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Robinson	
Gronna	McKellar	Sheppard	
Hale	McLean	Sherman	

Mr. HARRIS. My colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], is necessarily detained by death in his family.

Mr. ROBINSON. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] are detained on official business.

Mr. DIAL. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SMITH of South Carolina] is absent on account of illness in his family. He is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING]. I ask that this announcement may continue for the day.

Mr. SMOOT. I have been requested to announce that the Committee on Foreign Relations is in session, and, unless it is necessary to secure a quorum, the committee very much prefers to remain in session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will read the Journal of the proceedings of the preceding day.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. SMOOT and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD (S. DOC. NO. 32).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the chairman of the United States Shipping Board submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of $2,417,186.95 required by the United States Shipping Board for recruiting, instructing, and training officers, engineers, and crews for American vessels, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2480) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5312) to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for carrying out the act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. EDGE. I present resolutions signed by 15,000 men employed in the New York Shipbuilding Corporation's shipyards at Camden, N. J. I ask that the body of one of the petitions be printed in the RECORD and that they be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and the body of one of the petitions was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAMDEN, N. J., *April 4, 1919.*

Whereas there now exists the necessity of absorbing in employment men being discharged from the Army and Navy service, and also men being discharged from employment in factories which have been producing strictly war materials, it is vitally important at the present time that workmen should be kept employed to the fullest possible extent in the production of useful product; and

Whereas the steady employment of 15,000 men in the New York Shipbuilding Corporation's shipyards, as well as the employment of the great army of men in the entire Delaware River district and the shipyards of the Atlantic and Pacific seaboard, is of vital importance to this locality and the entire United States; and

Whereas the necessity of having a large merchant marine has been amply demonstrated during the World War, so that we will not be again dependent upon friendly nations to carry our troops to and from places where duty calls them or vital national necessity requires their presence: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the undersigned workmen in the employ of the New York Shipbuilding Corporation, of Camden, N. J., urge upon our Senators and Representatives the early passage of the items in the deficiency and sundry civil bills covering contracts already made and plans contemplated for the enlargement of the merchant marine of the United States.

Mr. CAPPER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Kansas City, Topeka, Dearing, Leanna, Buffalo, Belleville, Eudora, St. Marys, Belvue, Jetmore, and Nekoma, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NEWBERRY presented resolutions adopted by the Michigan Committee to Secure Rank for Army Nurses, favoring the granting of rank to Army nurses, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the Congregation of the St. Joseph Classic Reformed Church of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Niles, Mich., remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of sundry citizens of Ann Arbor, Mich., praying for the repeal of tax on ice cream, sodas, and soft drinks, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of Local Branch No. 31, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, of Syracuse, N. Y., and a petition of Local Branch No. 1, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, of New York City, N. Y., praying for a readjustment of the salaries of postal clerks, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented memorials of sundry citizens of Petosky, Escanaba, Sault Ste. Marie, and Hastings, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of Local Branch Michigan League to Enforce Peace, of Grand Rapids, of the Diocese of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Marquette, and of sundry citizens of Grand Rapids, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Jacksonville, Fla., praying for the repeal of the tax on ice cream, soda, and soft drinks, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McLEAN presented memorials of sundry citizens of Bethlehem, Woodbury, Fairfield, Guilford, Hockanum, Winsted, Wallingford, Portland, Wapping, New London, Danbury, Hartford, Suffield, Baltic, Clinton, New Haven, Naugatuck, East Haddam, Rocky Hill, and Willimantic, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition adopted at the Fruit Growers and Farmers Convention held at Riverside, Calif., praying for the proposed modification of war-time prohibition so as to permit the manufacture of wine and beer, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented petitions of sundry Slavonian societies in the State of Wisconsin, praying for the independence of the Jugo-Slavs and for justice and fair dealing in connection with peace deliberations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HALE presented memorials of the congregations of the Methodist Church of Winthrop and Richmond, in the State of Maine, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Scobey, Mont., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HARDING presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Oak Hill, Ohio, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Ohio, praying for the repeal of the so-called "luxury" tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Harrison County, Ohio, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. PAGE presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Vermont, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SHERMAN presented memorials of sundry citizens of Granite City, Hamburg, Naperville, Batavia, Deer Creek, Farmington, and Chicago, all in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against the repeal or modification of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BRITISH CENSORSHIP OF AMERICAN MAIL.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I wish to present and have printed in the RECORD a very short letter, together with the notations on the envelope, by a business house showing the opening of business letters by the British censor. It is mail going to Norway and Sweden. I believe it shows that the letters are opened and business information extracted and used by our British competitors in the Scandinavian Peninsula to the injury of the business houses in New York City. The same thing is true, I may state, of certain business houses in Chicago doing an export business. I wish to protest against it. I have repeatedly called the attention of the State Department to what I believe to be a violation of the right of censorship under present conditions.

I make this public protest in the hope that it may fortify the Department of State in proper action; and if no immediate relief is had, that we enact some legislation looking to the restriction of British commerce in retaliation. I regard it as a very gross abuse of the power of censorship diverted to private use.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, *June 10, 1919.*

Senator SHERMAN,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I inclose herewith two envelopes in which were contained two business letters, which were evidently opened by the English censor. Kindly investigate the matter and inform me, if possible, when the censorship on American mails to their old customers in neutral countries will cease. I consider the present situation outrageous and scandalous.

Any information you will give me will be thankfully received. We have been doing business with our customers in Stockholm, Sweden, for over 30 years.

Yours, truly, L. BEST.

[Envelope.]

Front: A./B. B. A. Hjorth & Co., Stockholm.
Postmark: Stockholm, 26. 4.19. 8–9 em. AVG. AVD.
Back: Opened by censor, 5770.

[Envelope.]

Front: A./B. B. A. Hjorth & Co., Stockholm.
Postmark: Stockholm, 13. 5.19. 8–9 em. AVG. AVD.
Back: Opened by censor, 4384.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 202) providing for an additional judge for the district of Montana, to report it back favorably without amendment. In reference to this bill I wish to state that later I shall submit a report (No. 13) to accompany the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. WALSH of Montana, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 206) concerning actions on account of death or personal injury within places under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, reported it without amendment.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 1651) providing for the construction of a Pacific cable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A bill (S. 1652) to provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of a free zone in the port of Boston, Mass., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 1653) to amend the act entitled "An act making further and more effective provisions for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916; and

A bill (S. 1654) regulating the salaries of Army field clerks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH of Montana:

A bill (S. 1655) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the memorial committee of the chamber of commerce, Glasgow, Mont., a German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 1656) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Council of National Defense of Montana 25 German cannons or fieldpieces;

A bill (S. 1657) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Red Lodge Chamber of Commerce, Red Lodge, Mont., one German cannon or fieldpiece; and

A bill (S. 1658) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the committee on monuments, Fort Benton, Mont., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 1659) to relieve Congress from the adjudication of private claims against the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1660) to provide a division of tuberculosis in, and an advisory council for, the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 1661) for the relief of Maj. Ellis B. Miller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 1662) providing additional compensation to certain employees of the Post Office Department for overtime service; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. NEWBERRY (for Mr. TOWNSEND):

A bill (S. 1663) to fix the salary of the United States district attorney for the eastern district of Michigan (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1664) granting an increase of pension to Michael Pletcher (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 1665) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase a site and erect a Federal building thereon in Canton, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 1666) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Critchette; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARDING:

A bill (S. 1667) granting an increase of pension to Godfried Ziegler;

A bill (S. 1668) granting an increase of pension to James B. Smith; and

A bill (S. 1669) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Rogers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 1670) for the relief of the Arundel Sand & Gravel Co.; and

A bill (S. 1671) for the relief of the Eastern Transportation Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1672) to amend the act of August 29, 1916; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. HALE. I desire to give notice that I intend to move to amend Rule VII, paragraph 1, by inserting after "concurrent and other resolutions":

Resolutions coming over from a preceding day, when requested by the Senator introducing the same, which resolutions shall be debatable.

Motions coming over from a preceding day to discharge a committee from the further consideration of a bill, resolution, or other matter in the hands of a committee, which motions shall be debatable.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. PHELAN. I desire to have printed as a public document certain papers on the league of nations. I ask that they be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. They will be so referred.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 5312. An act to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for carrying out the act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REGULATION OF RAILROAD RATES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. CUMMINS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 641, the unfinished business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 641) to

amend section 10 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, when the Senate adjourned last evening I was explaining the purpose and effect of the bill now before the Senate. The senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], who, I observe, is not now present in the Chamber, had made objection to that part of the bill—or, rather, that amendment which the committee proposes to the bill—confining it, in its restoration of jurisdiction over rates, to the Interstate Commerce Commission. I said practically all that I desired to say upon that subject in the colloquy between that Senator and myself; but I may observe, further, that it would put the Government of the United States in a very peculiar and a very disagreeable position if we were now to subordinate or subject it to the jurisdiction of the several State commissions with regard to rates. For illustration, if a State were to pass a law, or if a commission of a State were to proclaim rates that in the judgment of the President or of the Railroad Administration were confiscatory, and rates that would not sustain their fair share of the burden of carrying on the entire traffic, it is quite evident that the carrier company could not institute a suit for the purpose of enjoining and finally annulling such rates, for the companies would have no interest whatever in that controversy.

It is equally clear that the Federal Government ought not to be driven to the necessity of instituting suits for the purpose of enjoining the act, direct or indirect, of the State governments. I see no other way to deal with the subject than to allow, in the comparatively short period of Federal control, the right of the administration to institute State rates to remain. But that is a matter, of course, for the final determination of the Congress.

The bill has in it one feature which was not contained in the bill reported to Congress at the last session, and which seemed to meet the general approval of the Members of the Senate, and, indeed, I think, of all the Members of Congress. There is an amendment proposed which prolongs the statutes or orders of limitation respecting the filing of claims with the Interstate Commerce Commission for reparation for overcharges, as you all know, and prolonging the period in which those who have suffered loss or damage in the transportation of persons or property for bringing the suits which are authorized in the act of March, 1918. This has been suggested for a very obvious reason. There have been various orders issued by the Director General of Railroads with regard to the place and the manner of bringing suit for such injuries. The people have not very well understood what their rights really are in that respect.

In view of these well-known facts, it seems to me but fair now to exclude from the time which is to be computed either for filing claims or for bringing suit the period of Federal control; that is to say, to allow these statutes or orders of limitation to begin to run now rather than to begin to run at the time the several causes of action accrued.

I know personally that there has been very great difficulty in adjusting this particular subject in various parts of the country, and I say this without the least implication of any desire to oppress the people in any part of the country. It is one of the natural and inevitable consequences of a transition such as we experienced at the close of the year 1917.

With these observations, I think that I have explained every feature of the bill which is at all material; and I close my remarks by reiterating what I said in the beginning, namely, that the chief purpose—and it is so chief that it may almost be said to be the sole purpose of the proposed legislation—is to restore to the Interstate Commerce Commission the authority which that body had over interstate rates prior to the time that the Government took possession of the railroads, and especially prior to the time we passed the act of 1918.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KING. The Senator has adverted to the attitude taken yesterday by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] and to the apprehensions which he expressed of the evils which would result from leaving intrastate rates subject to the absolute control, as at present, of the Director General. The thought has occurred to me that perhaps this bill would lead to conflict between the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Director General; that is to say, the Director General would impose rates upon intrastate business that would be entirely at variance with the rates imposed by the Interstate Commerce Commission; that the rates intrastate in character might be very much higher than those imposed by the Interstate Commerce Commission and lead to discrimination and injustice.

Has the Senator thought of any method by which that evil, which may perhaps exist only in our fancy, might be remedied? It is, however, clearly an evil which is possible by the exercise of, perhaps, arbitrary power by the Director General or by the exercise of the power within the authority and prerogatives of the Interstate Commerce Commission, but yet power of such a character in the fixing of rates as would disturb the just equilibrium and ratio which should exist between intra and inter state commerce.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, it is hardly possible to conceive such a situation as has been mentioned by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], but I think there is ample power on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission to deal with it if it should arise. The Senator from Utah will remember that a few years ago the question arose before the Interstate Commerce Commission with regard to a discrimination practiced, as was alleged, by some of the States in the rates which they had established as against interstate commerce, and the general claim was that there must be a fair, reasonable relation between the rates imposed by the State for its own traffic and the rates generally in force governing interstate traffic. That controversy finally reached the Supreme Court of the United States, and it was there held that the Federal Government, as represented in the Interstate Commerce Commission, had authority to bring the rates in these two jurisdictions into proper relation with each other.

Again, a question arose in Minnesota, which finally came to the Supreme Court. The claim there was that the intrastate rates did not bear their fair share of the burden of sustaining the carrier, which was engaged in interstate transportation as well as State transportation. The Supreme Court held that was a proper matter for the exercise of the power of the General Government; that is to say, it held that if intrastate rates were so low that they did not contribute their proper share of the revenues necessary to sustain the carrier, the difficulty could be cured and the remedy provided by the General Government through the Interstate Commerce Commission, although it must be admitted that, as the law is now, the Interstate Commerce Commission has not that full and complete authority which, I have no doubt, will shortly be conferred upon it. I mention these two cases as indicating that the General Government, even under the law as it is, through the Interstate Commerce Commission, can and will maintain the proper relation, or a fair relation, between the rates which are purely intrastate and those which are interstate.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I gave notice on yesterday that at this time I would address the Senate on the covenant for a league of nations and the Constitution.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Beckham	France	Keyes	Robinson
Capper	Frelinghuysen	King	Sheppard
Chamberlain	Gronna	Kirby	Sherman
Culberson	Hale	La Follette	Smith, Ariz.
Cummins	Harris	McKellar	Smoot
Curtis	Henderson	McLean	Thomas
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Trammell
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	Kellogg	Phelan	Walsh, Mont.
Elkins	Kendrick	Phipps	Warren
Fletcher	Kenyon	Poindexter	Watson

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I find myself the only member present, I believe, of the Committee on Foreign Relations. That committee is now conducting an investigation under a certain resolution of the Senate; they have witnesses from a distance here, and are now in session in the Senate Office Building. I make this statement in explanation of the absence of the Senators engaged in that undertaking.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. FERNALD, Mr. NEWBERRY, Mr. NORRIS, Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. RANSDELL, and Mr. STERLING answered to their names when called.

Mr. McKELLAR. The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] is unavoidably detained from the Chamber on important business. I should like to have this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. ROBINSON. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] are detained on official business.

Mr. STANLEY, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. SIMMONS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

THE COVENANT AND THE CONSTITUTION.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, in the general assault upon the plan devised by the statesmen assembled at the peace conference at Versailles for a league of nations to insure the future peace of the world, it is insisted that the covenant submitted is in contravention of the Constitution of the United States and ought, for that reason, to be rejected by the Senate. The people of this country have an intense pride in and a just reverence for their national Constitution, esteeming it at once as the palladium of their rights and liberties and as assuring to them the best government ever contrived by the wit of man. If a well-founded apprehension that any policy runs counter to the commands or restrictions express or implied of the organic law can be excited, it serves often as well as complete demonstration to accomplish its rejection, so axiomatic is it regarded that a course condemned by the Constitution can be neither safe nor wise.

It results, as a consequence of this sensitiveness on the part of the public, that scarcely a measure of great national importance comes before either branch of Congress that is not assailed as being unconstitutional in some vital feature.

In my time as a Member of this body I have listened to protracted arguments attacking, on constitutional grounds, the various bills, among others, which eventually became the Federal reserve law, the Federal Trade Commission law, the Clayton law, the child-labor law, the farm-loan law, the eight-hour law, the espionage act, and the draft act, as well as bills which reached the last stage of legislative consideration for granting franchises for the erection of dams for the generation of power in navigable streams and in waters on the public domain, and for leasing nonmetallic mineral public lands.

Of all the acts passed by Congress in the record-breaking calendar it has made since March 4, 1913, including those induced by the stern necessities of the Great War before and after we became participants in it, only the child-labor act has been condemned by the Supreme Court as in contravention of the Constitution, while it has specifically upheld the eight-hour law, the espionage act, and the draft act. The Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit recently sustained the trade-commission act, which was vigorously denounced in the course of its passage as violative of established and recognized principles of constitutional law. A former Member of the Senate recently deliberately and formally walked out of the Democratic Party because, as he asserted, it had ceased to be the guardian of the Constitution or to respect its injunctions and restrictions. Yet he pointed to no single act, save as heretofore stated, for which that party was in any sense responsible which had not stood the test of investigation by the courts.

There was a brief period in our history, not so remote, in which the Constitution was interposed, with some degree of success in and out of Congress against every measure intended to restrain predatory wealth or accord to labor some protection in the unequal struggle in which it has become involved because of modern industrial conditions. The more liberal spirit which has come to prevail has provoked no little repining among certain classes over what they conceive to be the decay of our institutions and the impending dissolution of the social order, no less than the disregard of constitutional limitations.

It has become a habit of mind with many who have been compelled reluctantly to accommodate themselves to unwelcome legislation of the character mentioned to see in every innovation some repugnancy to the Constitution, viewed, of course, in the narrow, illiberal spirit in which they have become accustomed to regard it. How far the influences referred to may be operative, how far general opposition to the league of nations, springing from either partisan or patriotic motives, may account for the attitude taken, it is unnecessary, and perhaps it would be futile to inquire, but it is seriously contended that whatever liberty of action may be permitted to other nations, our country, the first among them all in power and in influence, can not, by reason of its peculiar Constitution, enter into the covenant proposed, though it should accomplish all its most ardent and enthusiastic supporters claim for it, though it should usher in the era when—

> The war drum throbs no longer,
> And the battle flags are furled
> In the parliament of man,
> The federation of the world.

This view has not only been advanced in speeches on the floor, but there was introduced into the RECORD a contribution to the press by an eminent jurist of the District of Columbia, and wide circulation has been given to addresses of a former ambassador, a professor of law, in which it is elaborately supported.

More recently an address by a Federal judge, asserting that the covenant contravenes the Constitution, was made a part of the RECORD, and on yesterday a resolution was presented by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, formerly Attorney General of the United States and later Secretary of State, in which the league is denounced and the demand is made that the covenant be separated from the other provisions of the treaty, one paragraph of the resolution, evidently aimed at the covenant, being as follows:

> That since the people of the United States have themselves determined and provided in their Constitution the only ways in which the Constitution may be amended, and since amendment by treaty stipulation is not one of the methods which the people have so prescribed, the treaty-making power of the United States has no authority to make a treaty which in effect amends the Constitution of the United States, and the Senate of the United States can not advise and consent to any treaty provision which would have such effect if enforced.

The basis of the recital from this high authority that the treaty of which the covenant forms a part is inconsistent with the Constitution will be referred to later.

Journals of wide circulation and more or less influence, antagonistic to the league, have assumed, without any attempt at demonstration, that the contention so made is confessedly sound, and that, as one such at least has expressed it, radical amendments of our organic law will be necessary before the United States can enter into the league. The eminent Senator from Massachusetts in the debate with President Lowell, of Harvard, which attracted wide notice, pursued this easy method of disputation, and having assumed the antagonism to be indisputable, added: "No doubt we could amend our Constitution to fit the league, but it would take some time."

The comment just made is offered lest, in view of the history of our country, to which reference will be made, this effort to refute the contention thus advanced might be deemed a work of pedantic supererogation.

BASIS OF CLAIM.

In the main it is founded upon the claim that by the treaty, of which the league is a constituent feature, in the making of which the House of Representatives has no part, our country becomes obligated in a way in which it can be bound, or becomes committed to a course or policy upon which it can enter only through the action of Congress—that is to say, the concurrent action of both Houses of the national legislature. It is particularly urged that the covenant obligates us to wage war in certain contingencies, while the Constitution (Art I, sec. 8) declares that "Congress shall have power to declare war." The proposition is extravagantly expressed by some as an attempt to transfer the power to declare war from Congress to the league.

In an address delivered in the Senate on December 18 last by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania the question was raised by the following inquiry and comment:

> "Suppose that it were proposed that the United States should bind itself in advance by treaty to go to war in given circumstances. Under the Constitution war can be declared only by the Congress. How could the President, by negotiating a treaty, and the Senate, by consenting to its ratification, bind this country to declare war? A declaration of war is, under the Constitution, a prerogative of the Congress. The appropriations to initiate or to conduct war are in the discretion of the Congress."

It will be noted that the Senator, whose acknowledged ability as well as his experience as Attorney General and Secretary of State give to his utterances on the subject he was discussing unusual weight, did not unequivocally commit himself to the view that the treaty-making power is not sufficiently broad to warrant a convention obligating the Nation to make war, either presently or upon a future contingency, yet the casual reader, and especially one disinclined, for any reason, to give the league his support, would unquestionably receive the impression from the language quoted that the Senator subscribed to and had announced that doctrine.

SUCH A TREATY NOT UNIQUE.

In this connection an incident in our diplomatic history, presently to be referred to, is illuminating. The covenant does undoubtedly, should the treaty be signed, obligate this country to make war. Article 10, frequently referred to, reads as follows:

> The members of the league undertake to respect and preserve, as against external aggression, the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league. In case of any such aggression, or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

That plainly means that if the territory of any member is invaded or threatened by the military forces of any other nation within or without the league, all other members thereof will come to its assistance to repel the aggressor and coerce him

into keeping the peace. It may be that commercial pressure and isolation contemplated by other provisions of the covenant may be found effective to restrain a threatened or anticipated military movement directed at a member of the league, but all efforts less drastic failing, the obligation can be honorably discharged only by joining our forces with those of the threatened or invaded country and of the other nations obligated with us and making war upon the disturber of the general peace.

Much eloquence has been expended in denunciation of this feature of the league, but it is the soul and spirit of the covenant. Cut it out and the heart is cut out of the only plan the statesmanship of the world has been able to devise or has ever been able to offer for the preservation of the peace of the world, as a substitute for the system which has again exhibited itself to an agonized world as a colossal and yet miserable failure, but to which some Senators still exhibit a fatuous attachment. It is true, beyond doubt, that that article obligates us to make war. But we have not hesitated heretofore to assume a like obligation. We entered into a treaty with the Republic of Panama, the first article of which is as follows:

ART. 1. The United States guarantees and will maintain the independence of the Republic of Panama.

No one can doubt the significance of that undertaking. We go to war with any country that attempts to reduce the republic through whose concession we built the Panama Canal. That treaty was entered into in the year 1904, the late Theodore Roosevelt being President of the United States and PHILANDER C. KNOX, now a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania, his Attorney General and official legal adviser. Whatever view may now be entertained by the latter, it is quite evident that in 1904, at least, he harbored no serious doubt of the binding character of a treaty under which the United States became obligated to resort to the dread arbitrament of war. It would be doing him, as well as the President of the United States who negotiated the treaty, a gross injustice to imagine that they accepted the grant of the Canal Zone upon the considerations named in the treaty, the first in importance to the feeble young Republic of Panama being the guarantee of its independence, if either of them at the time conceived that there was any doubt of the authority of the President and the Senate in the exercise of the treaty-making power so to bind the Nation. The comment of the Senator above quoted may well arouse apprehensions on the part of the Government and people of Panama which, in view of his relation to the treaty, he will doubtless hasten to still, if his further study of the subject will permit, by the assurance that whatever doubts he may have entertained in the month of December last concerning the binding character of article 1 of the treaty of 1904, they have, on further reflection, been resolved in favor of the view that it is a solemn obligation of the United States entered into in conformity with the Constitution.

It is persuasive that though the treaty referred to was, at the time it was negotiated, the subject of heated controversy, the right of the President and the Senate under the Constitution to obligate the Nation, as recited in article 1, was questioned by no one, so far as the report of the public debates in relation to the treaty discloses, though there were then in the Senate many profound lawyers, life-long students of the Constitution, including Senators Bacon, Hoar, and Spooner.

Among those voting to ratify it were the following, still Members of the Senate: Senators LODGE, MCCUMBER, NELSON, PENROSE, SIMMONS, SMOOT, and WARREN. It was not without precedent in assuming that there was no transgression of the Constitution in the treaty. In the year 1846 a treaty was concluded with the Republic of New Granada, in which, mention having been made of means of transportation across the Isthmus of Panama and certain concessions in relation thereto granted to the United States, our Government subscribed to the undertaking, evidenced by the following clause thereof:

And in order to secure to themselves the tranquil and constant enjoyment of these advantages, and as an especial compensation for the said advantages and for the favors they have acquired by the fourth, fifth, and sixth articles of this treaty, the United States guarantee, positively and efficaciously, to New Granada, by the present stipulation, the perfect neutrality of the before-mentioned Isthmus, with the view that the free transit from the one to the other sea may not be interrupted or embarrassed in any future time while this treaty exists; and, in consequence, the United States also guarantee in the same manner the rights of sovereignty and property which New Granada has and possesses over the said territory.

At the time of the ratification of that treaty Webster, Benton, Calhoun, and Clayton were Members of the Senate. None of them, so far as history discloses, had any misgivings concerning the power of the President and the Senate thus to agree for the Nation.

Webster had only recently returned after quitting the post of Secretary of State. Shortly thereafter, in the course of a speech delivered in the Senate, he referred to the provision of the treaty above quoted and alluded to it as a binding obligation of the Government, saying:

This Government, looking upon this stipulation as a benefit obtained, a boon conceded by the Government of New Granada, as an equivalent for this consideration, entered on its part into an engagement to protect and guarantee and defend the neutrality of this whole Isthmus This will be seen by reference to the thirty-fifth article of the treaty, which will be found in the volume of the laws of the last session. It is there very distinctly stated. There is no question about it. We are under treaty obligations to maintain the neutrality of this Isthmus and the authority of the Government of New Granada over it.

Senators who insistently protest against the league because the covenant under which it is to operate obligates each member to come to the aid of any that may be attacked by another nation—an obligation which contemplates the waging of war—but into which, it is asserted, this Government can not consistently with the Constitution enter, constitute themselves the special champions of the Monroe doctrine, the maintenance of which they aver to be essential to the preservation of the national integrity. With repeated professions of their devotion to America and her institutions, carrying faintly the suggestion that it is of a quality superior to that of those who differ with them concerning the wisdom of entering into the league, they proclaim that the Monroe doctrine must be upheld at all cost. But what is the Monroe doctrine but a voluntary obligation assumed by the United States to "respect and preserve as against external aggression"—external in this case signifying transoceanic—the Republics of South and Central America? It may be more, but it is at least that. If we were to enter into a treaty with Brazil, say these expounders of the Constitution, by which, upon some consideration moving to us, we undertook to "preserve as against external aggression" her "territorial integrity and existing political independence," it would be a void act, but we are even now bound to do so without a treaty under peril of national obliteration.

The Monroe doctrine lends itself easily to oratory. It was the theme of the most eloquent address delivered in the Senate in many years, so moving in its appeal to an intense nationalism as to evoke the unrestrained plaudits of the listening Senate in disregard of its traditions and of the galleries that went unrebuked by common consent. The peroration was in the nature of a tribute to the late President Roosevelt, whose Americanism was justly exalted and in whose name the orator called upon his associates to denounce before the country any league of nations as essentially at war with the ideas for which his hero stood. But he seemed to have overlooked, as those who followed his advice would have learned with embarrassment from an informed public, that Theodore Roosevelt was long ago committed to the very policy against which his name was invoked. In his speech accepting the Nobel prize at Christiania, in 1910, he said:

It would be a master stroke if those great powers honestly bent on peace would form a league of peace, not only to keep the peace among themselves, but to prevent, by force if necessary, its being broken by others. The supreme difficulty in connection with developing the peace work of The Hague arises from the lack of any executive power, of any police power, to enforce the decrees of the courts.

And in a letter printed in the New York Times October 18, 1914, he indorsed more specifically the essential principles of the plan now submitted for the approval of the world in the following language:

The one permanent move for obtaining peace, which has yet been suggested, with any reasonable chance of attaining its object, is by an agreement among the great powers, in which each should pledge itself not only to abide by the decisions of a common tribunal but to back with force the decision of that common tribunal. The great civilized nations of the world which do possess force, actual or immediately potential, should combine by solemn agreement in a great world league for the peace of righteousness. * * *

They should, furthermore, agree not only to abide, each of them, by the decision of the court, but all of them to unite with their military forces to enforce the decree of the court as against any recalcitrant member. Under these circumstances it would be possible to agree on a limitation of armaments that would be real and effective.

Apparently his courageous heart did not shrink from the task of keeping the world at peace, nor was his virile mind disturbed by doubts as to the power of our country under the Constitution to play its part therein.

HISTORY OF THE CONTENTION.

The controversy over the limitations of the treaty-making power of the Government or of the Executive and the Senate, now renewed, is as old, almost, as the Constitution. It was precipitated by the famous Jay treaty, negotiated in 1794, during the administration of President Washington, and was then disposed of in a way that ought to have been regarded as a final interment of the contention that is the subject of this discussion. Like Banquo's ghost, however, it will not down. It has again and again been urged that in all cases in which, by the Constitution, the action of Congress is neces-

sary—that is to say, participation by the House of Representatives is essential in order that the treaty may be carried out and its obligations discharged—the Executive and the Senate are without authority to enter into the treaty, wanting the concurrence of the House, or the subject altogether transcends the treaty-making power of the Government. The contention has been uniformly rejected, but it renews its youthful vigor from time to time and is urged with all the ardor that ordinarily attends a first presentation, and without the slightest reference to or regard for its unfortunate history.

A Member was one day in the midst of a protracted discussion, in which he was assailing the constitutionality of a measure under consideration, when he was interrupted by another, who called his attention to the fact that the Supreme Court had 75 years before decided the question at issue adversely to his contention. He remarked simply that he disagreed with the court, and proceeded with his argument.

The Jay treaty gave rise to much acrimonious discussion in the country while it was before the Senate; feeling in respect to it, more or less partisan in character, ran high, but it was eventually ratified by a bare two-thirds vote. It provided for the appointment of various commissions to adjust boundary disputes and to report on claims growing out of the War for Independence. In due course, on the exchange of ratifications, bills were introduced in the House of Representatives making appropriations to meet the salaries of the commissioners so appointed and the other expenses attendant on their labors. Thereupon the contention heretofore adverted to was made, that inasmuch as the treaty could not be carried out without action by the House, it remained in the stage of negotiation until the approval of that body was accorded it, that any nation dealing with ours was bound to take notice of the limitation on the treaty-making power thus asserted, so that no breach of national faith could be charged if the House withheld its approval, and that the duty devolved upon that body to enter into an inquiry as to the wisdom of the still imperfect treaty submitted to it. This view secured the adherence of a majority of the House, which adopted a resolution calling upon the President for the correspondence and documents relating or leading to the treaty. President Washington declined to submit the papers, saying in a dignified reply made to the request of the House, "It is perfectly clear to my understanding that the assent of the House of Representatives is not necessary to the validity of a treaty." Among other reasons advanced by him impelling his mind to that conclusion, he observed:

> Having been a member of the general convention, and knowing the principles on which the Constitution was formed, I have ever entertained but one opinion on this subject; and from the first establishment of the Government to this moment my conduct has exemplified that opinion—that the power of making treaties is exclusively vested in the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and that every treaty so made and promulgated thenceforward became the law of the land. It is thus that the treaty-making power has been understood by foreign nations, and in all the treaties made with them we have declared and they have believed that when ratified by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, they became obligatory. In this construction of the Constitution every House of Representatives has heretofore acquiesced, and until the present time not a doubt or suspicion has appeared, to my knowledge, that this construction was not the true one. Nay, they have more than acquiesced; for till now, without controverting the obligation of such treaties, they have made all the requisite provisions for carrying them into effect.

The debate on the bills was renewed on the receipt of the President's reply, his position being eloquently championed by Fisher Ames, of Massachusetts. A resolution that the legislation ought to be enacted was carried by a close vote, and the bills were duly passed.

The baselessness of the contention appeared so obvious to Chancellor Kent that, referring to the resolution of April 7, 1796, heretofore adverted to, in his commentaries he said:

> It can not be mentioned at this day without equal regret and astonishment that such a resolution passed the House of Representatives.

The discussion of the subject was renewed over the Louisiana Purchase treaty. A like resolution was introduced in the House, which was called upon to make provision for the payment of the purchase price of the vast domain ceded by France, $15,000,000, but it was defeated, the Federalists leading in the contention that it was the right and the duty of the House to inquire into the merits of the treaty, as the Republicans, by which name the party of Jefferson was then known, had led in opposition to the Jay treaty. The historian does not hesitate to assign partisan bias as the moving influence in each instance for the attitude of those who insisted that the treaty was void or inchoate, wanting the approval of the House of Representatives, and the circumstance that the leaders of each of the parties of that day took a position in 1803 the very reverse of that they assumed in 1796 leaves little doubt of the justice of the judgment thus passed upon their official acts.

The chronicler of the events of our fateful day will not fail to note how statesmen who, scarcely more than three years ago, when the hope was reasonably indulged by them that the treaty of peace presently to be submitted to us would be negotiated during a Republican administration, extolled the plan of a league of nations to preserve the peace of the world, then contemplated as an integral part of the treaty, as worthy of all praise, a consummation most devoutly to be wished, now that it comes as the result of the labors of a Democratic President, denounce it as an abomination.

The resolution looking to an inquiry by the House of Representatives into the course of the negotiations resulting in the treaty with France having been disposed of, it quickly recognized the binding force thereof, the obligation which, through it, had been incurred by the Nation, and passed the necessary legislation for the liquidation of the debt.

The controversy was renewed, however, in 1816 over the commercial treaty with Great Britain; in 1834 in connection with a later treaty with France; in 1867 after the treaty with Russia ceding Alaska; in 1887 while the Hawaiian treaty was before the Senate; in 1899 over the treaty with Spain, by which the Philippines were acquired; and, in a mild way, in 1904, when the treaty with Panama was being considered.

SUBJECT NOT EXCLUDED FROM TREATY-MAKING POWER BECAUSE CONGRESS EMPOWERED TO LEGISLATE CONCERNING IT.

A number of the treaties referred to called for large appropriations to pay for territory acquired; others required legislation modifying our tariff and tonnage laws; others, as heretofore pointed out, bound us in defensive alliances, contemplating in each case war against the enemy of the other party to the treaty. In no case has Congress ever declined to pass the necessary legislation to make effective or to carry into execution the treaty.

It is of no consequence that the treaty deals with a subject with reference to which Congress is given power to legislate. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is, by the Constitution, given power to make treaties which, with the Constitution and laws of the United States made in pursuance of it, are the supreme law of the land, as the Constitution declares.

It has been held by the Supreme Court so often that reference to specific cases is unnecessary, that a treaty in conflict with a prior act of Congress repeals it, and, e converso, that a later act of Congress inconsistent with a treaty renders it nugatory, the later law prevailing. There could, of course, be no conflict if the two did not occupy the same field.

> By the Constitution a treaty is placed on the same footing and made of like obligation with an act of legislation. Both are declared by that instrument to be the supreme law of the land, and no superior efficacy is given to either over the other. (Whitney *v.* Robertson, 124 U. S., 190.)

The theory that the treaty-making power does not extend to any subject with reference to which power is vested in Congress, if it ever was seriously maintained, was long ago exploded. I can not hope to expose its utter weakness with anything like the eloquence or lucidity with which the task was discharged by Hon. James Barbour, a Senator from Virginia, in the great debate on the commercial treaty with Great Britain in 1816. I submit, however, a few observations in that connection.

The constitution gives to Congress power to legislate with reference to foreign commerce, but this does not mean that the President may not, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, enter into commercial treaties. The Constitutional Convention clearly contemplated that such treaties would come within the power it proposed to confer upon the President and the Senate, since it rejected a proposition to require the assent of two-thirds of all the members of the Senate for the ratification of commercial treaties, though the concurrence of two-thirds of those present would suffice in the case of other treaties. Commercial treaties have been negotiated with nearly every civilized country, dealing with a multiplicity of questions affecting transactions in foreign commerce, in most instances either requiring action by Congress or stipulating against its action or constraining it to action along prescribed lines.

So Congress is given power by the first clause of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution to lay and collect duties, which further provides that all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives. Yet by the Louisiana Purchase treaty it was stipulated that for 12 years the ships of France or Spain entering any of the ports of the ceded territory should be required to pay only such tonnage charges and duties upon their cargoes as should be exacted of the

ships and citizens of the United States, and that such privileges should be extended to no other nation.

By article 1 of the treaty with Cuba, proclaimed December 17, 1903, it is provided that all products of that country then admitted to the United States free of duty should thereafter, so long as the treaty stood, be so admitted without payment of any duty, and by article 2 of the same treaty the United States bound itself to admit all other products of the young Republic with a differential in its favor of 20 per cent. An examination of the record discloses that among those voting to ratify that treaty was the senior Senator from Massachusetts, who, in the debate with President Lowell, told his auditors that the treaty embracing the league covenant, "because the tariff is involved in the article for the boycott" and because it allows other nations to "meddle with our tariff," "runs up against a provision of the Constitution" which "provides that all revenue bills shall originate in the House of Representatives." The covenant contemplates that instead of resorting to war to coerce a recalcitrant nation commercial pressure or commercial isolation may be resolved upon by the league. If it recommends that course, the Nation binds itself to lay an embargo, a procedure expressly held by the Supreme Court more than a hundred years ago to be within the power of Congress to direct. The tariff is only remotely involved, if involved at all. By what provision of the covenant do we permit foreign nations to "meddle" with our tariff? It is difficult to conceive how our tariff could come before the league for consideration. It is a domestic question expressly excluded from those with which the league deals, distinctively a matter of domestic policy which each nation has heretofore solved without question as to its right under international law to do so, in accordance with its own views of its interest. Our tariff has never yet brought us to the threshold of war with any country. If we do not discriminate against any particular nation, and our commercial treaties forbid us to do so, even if our settled policy did not, how can any complain? We have, as stated, repeatedly made treaties by which, in consideration of reciprocal advantages they respectively accorded us, bound ourselves that Congress would not exercise its full powers with reference to the tariff, so extensive as to permit our Government to reward its friends and punish its enemies through discriminatory duties. In that sense we have permitted foreign nations in the past to "meddle" with our tariff. It would seem that even the New England mind could not be quite so supersensitive on the subject of the tariff as to be alarmed at the bare suggestion of "meddling" with it on the part of the league.

Again, the Constitution invests Congress with the power to "raise and support armies" and to "provide and maintain a navy," but that does not preclude the President and the Senate, in the exercise of the treaty-making power, from entering into a treaty limiting the size or nature of our Military Establishment or the number of ships we shall maintain as a part of our Navy or the particular waters in which they may be stationed. We have, in fact, entered into a treaty with Great Britain, scrupulously observed for over a century, not to keep on the Great Lakes more than a limited number of armed vessels, fitted only for police and like duties appertaining to the collection of revenue, a reciprocal agreement having been entered into by the British Government on behalf of Canada. Despite repeated assaults upon that convention it remains a solemn obligation of this Government, as was conclusively demonstrated a few days ago by the eloquent junior Senator from Arizona. There would seem to be no reason why we might not enter into a reciprocal treaty under which both countries interested would undertake not to maintain military posts along the great international boundary line between this country and Canada, a policy that has been pursued by each since early in the last century without a treaty.

Congress is empowered to make laws in relation to the naturalization of aliens, but in perhaps every treaty through which any addition was made to our territory stipulations are found through which the subjects or citizens of the State making the cession, residing in the newly acquired territory, were admitted to citizenship. Such wholesale citizenship was conferred upon the inhabitants of Florida by the treaty of cession with Spain ratified in 1821. The United States even obligated itself by that treaty to admit Florida into the Union as one of the States.

Congress is authorized to make all needful rules and regulations concerning the territory and other property of the United States. We negotiated a treaty with Japan, Russia, and Great Britain by which the United States, in order to conserve the fur-seal herd, whose breeding grounds are on the Pribylof Islands, from extinction through pelagic sealing carried on by the citizens or subjects of those countries, agreed to kill annually the mature bachelor seals resorting to the islands and to divide the skins in proportions specified in the treaty between the nations named and our own, they and we agreeing to make pelagic sealing criminal. It may be that the seals in the sea are feræ naturæ, belonging to no one, but we have all the incidents of ownership in them while they are on the breeding grounds, the property of the United States.

Is there any doubt that a treaty could be made with Great Britain by which this country should make an island in Lake Superior a bird refuge, if she should devote an adjacent island on her side to the same purpose, or with Mexico to the effect that if she would establish a refuge for migratory birds wintering in her territory we would set apart certain territory in Alaska for their protection on which they make their summer home?

Note that the provision of the Constitution gives to Congress power not only to make all needful laws respecting the territory, but as well respecting other property of the United States. We have a treaty with Great Britain concerning the use of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal and another concerning the use of the Panama Canal. In all the heated controversy over the subject of the tolls, participated in by the ablest lawyers in America, no one ventured to contend that the treaty is void because dealing with a subject with reference to which Congress is given power to legislate.

The position that a subject is beyond the treaty-making power because within the powers granted to Congress is utterly indefensible and need be no longer noticed.

Heretofore one of the most distinguished expositors of this theory of our Constitution, now so eagerly embraced by the opponents of the league, was a German jurist—Dr. Ernest Meier, a professor in one of the universities of his country, who in a volume of his lectures commented as follows:

> Congress has, under the Constitution, the right to lay taxes and imposts, as well as to regulate foreign trade, but the President and the Senate, if the "treaty-making power" be regarded as absolute, would be able to evade this limitation by adopting treaties which would compel Congress to destroy its whole tariff system. According to the Constitution, Congress has the right to determine questions of naturalization, of patents, and of copyright. Yet, according to the view here contested, the President and Senate, by a treaty, could on these important questions utterly destroy the legislative capacity of the House of Representatives. The Constitution gives Congress the control of the Army. Participation in this control would be snatched from the House of Representatives by a treaty with a foreign power by which the United States would bind itself to keep in the field an army of a particular size. The Constitution gives Congress the right of declaring war; this right would be illusory if the President and Senate could by a treaty launch the country into a foreign war. The power of borrowing money on the credit of the United States resides in Congress; this power would cease to exist if the President and Senate could by treaty bind the country to the borrowing of foreign funds. By the Constitution "no money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law"; but this limitation would cease to exist if by a treaty the United States could be bound to pay money to a foreign power. * * * Congress would cease to be the lawmaking power as is prescribed by the Constitution; the lawmaking power would be the President and the Senate. Such a condition would become the more dangerous from the fact that treaties so adopted, being on this particular hypothesis superior to legislation, would continue in force until superseded by other treaties. Not only, therefore, would a Congress consisting of two Houses be made to give way to an oligarchy of President and Senate, but the decrees of this oligarchy, when once made, could only be changed by concurrence of President and of senatorial majority of two-thirds.

The war has demonstrated how feebly the German mind has been able to comprehend the American character or the American system. The evils he foresees may, indeed, ensue, but none of them ever have befallen us, and the probability of our experiencing them is too remote to prompt us to revise our Constitution because of the defects and dangers he so generously points out. His apprehensions are quite like those that the opponents of the Constitution sought to arouse when it was before the people for ratification. The dangers inherent in the treaty-making power were a fruitful theme in those days. Indeed, the Constitutional Convention was not without a keen sense of the tremendous nature of the authority it was extending to the Executive and the Senate through the few brief words in which it is conveyed. But it rightly concluded that a compact with a foreign government which commanded the support of the President and two-thirds of the Senate could scarcely be inimical to the welfare of the Union, so far as enlightened public opinion could discern the national interest, and that it was scarcely conceivable that such concert could be secured for a policy that was violative of or destructive to American ideals.

LIMITATIONS ON TREATY-MAKING POWER CONSIDERED.

But it is asserted that though the treaty-making power may be vast it is not unlimited. Undoubtedly so. It is said to be impossible to frame a power of attorney in terms so general as not to be subject to implied limitations. Whatever the limitations on the treaty-making power, they are implied; none whatever are expressed. "He [the President] shall have power,

by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators concur," is the simple language of the Constitution. Nothing is excluded in express terms. No particular kind of treaties is specified, so that all kinds are included—treaties of alliance, offensive and defensive, commercial treaties, extradition treaties, arbitration treaties.

In the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States (Hauenstein *v.* Lynham, 100 U. S., 483) the following is quoted with approval from a speech delivered in the House of Representatives by William Pinkney, of Maryland:

> The word "treaties" is nomen generalissimum and will comprehend commercial treaties, unless there be a limit upon it by which they are excluded. It is the appellative, which will take in the whole species, if there be nothing to limit its scope. There is no such limit. There is not a syllable in the context of the clause to restrict the natural import of its phraseology. The power is left to the force of the generic term and is therefore as wide as a treaty-making power can be. It embraces all the varieties of treaties which it could be supposed this Government could find it necessary or proper to make, or it embraces none. It covers the whole treaty-making ground which this Government could be expected to occupy, or not an inch of it.
>
> It is a just presumption that it was designed to be coextensive with all the exigencies of our affairs. Usage sanctions that presumption—expediency does the same. The omission of any exception to the power, the omission of the designation of a mode by which a treaty not intended to be included within it might otherwise be made, confirms it.

Reliance is placed upon the language of Justice Field in Geofroy *v.* Riggs (133 U. S., 258–267), as follows:

> The treaty power, as expressed in the Constitution, is in terms unlimited except by those restraints which are found in that instrument against the action of the Government or of its departments, and those arising from the nature of the Government itself and of that of the States. It would not be contended that it extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the Government or in that of one of the States, or a cession of any portion of the territory of the latter, without its consent.

Which is followed by this sentence:

> But with these exceptions it is not perceived that there is any limit to the questions which can be adjusted touching any matter which is properly the subject of negotiation with a foreign country.

With much diffidence, but with the utmost confidence, I venture to assert that the territory of a State may either in whole or in part be ceded under the treaty power without its consent, though the dictum of the learned justice is supported by the authority of other great names. Had Mexico listened to the lure of the Zimmermann-Eckhardt note, joined her fortunes with those of Germany in an effort to regain the "lost provinces," and under the stern compulsion of a dictated peace following a decisive victory of Wilhelm and his allies a treaty was signed by the President and ratified by the Senate ceding to Mexico Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona, can anyone doubt the efficacy of the act to transfer the sovereignty over that imperial domain to our prudent neighbor to the south which wisely ignored the invitation? Would it be asserted, for instance, that thereafter a Federal court could continue to function within the region affected, that the United States revenue officers could continue to discharge their duties therein as theretofore, and that their acts would be recognized by our courts as valid because the treaty was without constitutional warrant? Could the Secretary of the Interior be mandamused to issue a patent to lands therein to one otherwise becoming entitled to it? To my mind, it is of no consequence that the President and the Senate may have yielded their assent in order to save from subjection the remainder of the country or to preserve it from desolation. Manifestly an overweening necessity must be assumed to imagine such an exercise of the treaty-making power, but who is to judge of the necessity, who shall say when conditions are sufficiently grave to justify such a treaty? Obviously not the courts, and equally obvious is it that the determination rests with the President and the Senate.

What good reason is there to doubt that an exchange might be effected by treaty of islands lying off our coast, one being within the jurisdiction of one of the States of the Union, but devoted wholly to national uses, the other more suitable to our purposes belonging to the other party to the treaty? Assume the case of two islands in Puget Sound or the Strait of San Juan de Fuca, both uninhabited, the one a part of the State of Washington, and consequently of the United States, and the other within the jurisdiction of British Columbia. She is willing to exchange, and the National Government is desirous of acquiring her island with a view to devoting it to the better protection of that coast against an enemy or some purpose connected with the safer navigation of those waters. Can the State of Washington veto the transfer? It is unreasonable that she should; but is the rest of the country at the mercy of her whim? If the island were densely populated and the inhabitants adverse to going under foreign dominion, in all reasonable probability the President and the Senate would yield unhesitatingly to their desires. But that aspect of the case presents the question of the wisdom or justice of making and not to the power to make the treaty.

Without attempting to specify, I may say that considerations similar to those here advanced have led statesmen and jurists of no less eminence than those announcing a contrary view to the conclusion that under the treaty-making power even the territory of one of the States of the Union may be transferred to a foreign power.

In the adjustment of the northeast boundary dispute the formal assent of Maine and Massachusetts was secured, not because of the surrender of territory over which they asserted jurisdiction, for Massachusetts could claim none, but because they owned in common lands within the region which under the Webster-Ashburton treaty went to New Brunswick, as will appear from the speech of Mr. Webster in justification of the compromise, made on his reentry into the Senate.

This particular inquiry is in the nature of a digression from the general subject. It has been followed to perhaps unpardonable length only to make more clear the very comprehensive character of the treaty-making power conferred by the Constitution.

But, whatever the limitations on the treaty-making power may be, they obviously do not embrace undertakings such as article 10 of the covenant, in effect, as pointed out, a treaty of alliance under which the United States is obligated to go to the aid of any member of the league attacked by another nation contrary to the covenant. Alliances were, and for centuries had been, common among the nations of the earth at the time the Constitution was adopted. The right to enter into such inheres in a sovereign independent State. The Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled having proclaimed, in the Declaration of Independence, that the Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States, continued that as such "they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances," and "do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do."

An alliance in international law is—

> A union or association of two or more States or nations, formed by league or treaty, for the joint prosecution of a war or for their mutual protection in repelling hostile attacks. (Black's Law Dictionary.)

Bouvier has the following definition of the term and comment thereon:

> In international law: A contract, treaty, or league between two or more sovereigns or States made for purposes of aggression or defense.
>
> Defensive alliances are those in which a nation agrees to defend her ally in case the latter is attacked. Offensive alliances are those in which nations unite for the purpose of making an attack or jointly waging war against another nation.

A modern writer on international law says:

> Alliances in the strict sense of the term are treaties of union between two or more States for the purpose of defending each other against an attack in war or jointly attacking third States or for both purposes.—Oppenheim.

It is inconceivable that the founders of our Government should, at its birth, specifically assert the right of the United States as an independent Nation to contract alliances and that they then contrived a Constitution which disabled the Nation from so contracting. As is well known, having declared their right so to do, they proceeded without delay to enter into a treaty of alliance with France. Some provisions of this treaty are interesting in this connection. Article 1 as follows:

> If war should break out between France and Great Britain during the continuance of the present war between the United States and England, His Majesty and the said United States shall make it a common cause and aid each other mutually with their good offices, their counsels, and their forces, according to the exigence of conjunctures, as becomes good and faithful allies.

Article 8 as follows:

> Neither of the two parties shall conclude either truce or peace with Great Britain without the formal consent of the other first obtained; and they mutually engage not to lay down their arms until the independence of the United States shall have been formally or tacitly assured by the treaty or treaties that shall terminate the war.

Article 11, in part, as follows:

> The two parties guarantee mutually from the present time and forever against all powers, to wit: The United States to His Most Christian Majesty, the present possessions of the Crown of France in America, as well as those which it may acquire by the future treaty of peace. And His Most Christian Majesty guarantees on his part to the United States their liberty, sovereignty, and independence. (I Treaties and Conventions, pp. 480–481.)

This treaty was in full force and vigor at the time the Constitution was drafted and adopted. It gave rise to universal rejoicing at the time it was effected, and retained, when the convention was engaged in its labors and throughout the stormy period that preceded the adoption of the Constitution, a high place in popular favor. The excesses of the French Revolution which followed speedily were largely responsible for the determination later arrived at and concurred in by nearly all our leading statesmen, to disregard some of its obligations, speedily

condoned by France, which in a spirit of continued amity and with a quickened sense of a common interest ceded Louisiana to our country under Napoleon. There is no doubt that it was the distressing experience we had had with this treaty with France that led Washington to warn his countrymen in his Farewell Address against "entangling alliances." It will be remembered that in the same connection he descanted upon the unwisdom of entertaining either excessive love or excessive hatred toward any nation, having in mind the prevailing intensity of feeling with regard to France on the one hand and Great Britain on the other, growing out of the War for Independence.

It is unnecessary to say that if in the opinion of Washington, and Hamilton, it might be added, for the latter undoubtedly collaborated in the preparation of the address, the treaty-making power did not, under the Constitution, extend to alliances offensive or defensive, or both, there would have been no occasion to give the warning of which so much has been heard in this debate. The revered statesman who was president of the convention which framed the Constitution would have contented himself with an admonition to observe scrupulously the fundamental law, and a reminder to his readers that it forbade treaties of alliance.

The senior Senator from Massachusetts was quite right when he said, in an address delivered in May, 1916, before the League to Enforce Peace, giving his cordial approval to its general plan and purpose—

> I do not believe that when Washington warned us against entangling alliances he meant for one moment that we should not join with other civilized nations of the world if a method could be found to diminish war and encourage peace.

Some explanation is due his colleagues and the country of how he came to abandon the idea so clearly expressed, to embrace the view that, by the work of the hard-headed statesmen at Paris, in execution of the plan he then approved, "we are," as he told the Senate on February 25 last, "invited to move away from George Washington to the other end of the line, at which stands the sinister figure of Trotski, the champion of internationalism."

Washington was in his day the victim of vilification so coarse and relentless that the story can scarcely be believed by the modern reader, and it is hardly to be expected that Wilson would escape vituperation and abuse from his political antagonists. Though this shaft was aimed at him it carries the accusation as well at Lloyd-George and Clemenceau, Orlando, and Makino, with the representatives of some dozen other civilized States at the peace conference, all of whom must share with President Wilson the responsibility of so much of internationalism as is found in the league and so much of odium as follows from being classed as disciples of Trotski. In that aspect the merit of the remark is chiefly in its rhetoric.

Article 10 is unassailable on constitutional grounds. In its substantive part it is to all intents and purposes a treaty of alliance. It concludes: "In case of any threat or danger of such aggression the council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled." The purpose of this clause is obviously to secure concert of action, but it is left to each nation to determine for itself, the recommendation of the council notwithstanding, whether the occasion calls for action in fulfillment of its obligation and how that obligation ought to be discharged.

Under article 16 each member undertakes that it will, should any other resort to war in disregard of articles 12, 13, or 14, immediately interdict all trade or financial relations with the nations of the covenant-breaking State—that is, institute a complete embargo against the offending State. In such a case it becomes the duty of the council to "recommend to the several governments concerned what effective military and naval forces the members of the league shall severally contribute to the armaments of forces to be used to protect the covenants of the league," the obligation to make war in such case arising, if at all, by virtue of the covenant of article 10. Again, the only power the council has in the premises is to *recommend* what contribution each nation should make, that a recalcitrant may be reduced should a resort to arms be necessary.

NO DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO DECLARE WAR.

A careful study of the covenant will reveal that neither the council nor the assembly has any power to declare war or even to call upon the members to make war, unless the authority to issue such a call and the obligation to respond is implied in the first section of article 11, as follows:

> Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the members of the league or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole league, and the league shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations.

At most the language quoted can not be construed to grant any more extensive authority than is reposed in the council under article 10 should a war of aggression be prosecuted by a member of the league, namely, to advise upon the means by which it is to be suppressed. Even if authority were reposed in either assemblage of league representatives to determine whether the obligation of article 10 had become active, and that it must be discharged by war against the offending State, there could be no valid objection to the covenant on constitutional grounds, for the various clauses through which such power would be granted would amount only to a covenant to make war whenever the league should determine as a fact that through external aggression the territorial integrity or political independence of a member was threatened. In any case there is no delegation of authority to the league to declare war or to make any order or proclamation as a result of which a state of war with all its consequences, like the suspension of all commercial intercourse, with which we have become familiar, immediately follows. A declaration of war by Congress is indispensable to put this country in a state of war unless actually attacked. The league covenant is a treaty by which our country binds itself at most to take the necessary steps to engage in war when the league determines that the occasion has arisen when, under the treaty, it should do so. This was recognized by the junior Senator from Washington in that part of one of his forceful addresses in which he assailed the league as being violative of the Constitution. But he asserted the action of Congress in such case would be perfunctory, there would be no escape from the obligation of the treaty "but in repudiation and dishonor." He is quite right. When by the treaty with France our country agreed to pay $15,000,000 for Louisiana, Congress was called upon perfunctorily to make the necessary appropriation. It could not in honor canvass the wisdom or the unwisdom of the purchase. The treaty obligated us to enact the necessary legislation. There was no escape from that obligation but in repudiation and dishonor. Similarly when by treaty we acquired Florida, Congress was called upon perfunctorily to make the necessary appropriation. And so with each successive acquisition of territory by treaty involving the payment of money—the purchase of Alaska and the Philippines, by way of illustration.

The Senator is right that there would be no escape from the obligation of the treaty but in repudiation and dishonor. But if he is correct in the view for which he contends, that the whole plan is violative of the Constitution, or is so violative in the particular feature involved in any transaction, there would be neither repudiation nor dishonor in declining to observe its terms. There is neither dishonor nor discredit in a man's declining to pay a promissory note executed in his name by one who never was authorized by him to make such an instrument.

It was in the course of the same address, as my memory serves me, that a colloquy ensued between the Senator named and the junior Senator from Nebraska, as a result of which a gross wrong was done the latter by a journalist whose comments on the league betray no studied effort impartially to present what may be said for or against it.

The Senator from Washington was pursuing the argument that a superstate was being erected in the league, to which vast powers were being delegated, among others to make war and peace and to prescribe what armament and military establishment the various nations shall maintain. In this connection the Senator from Nebraska remarked, "But it is only a treaty," clearly meaning, as he must have been understood by all who heard him, that there was no "supersovereignty" created by the covenant, but that our country had simply obligated itself thereby, quite as it had repeatedly done by other treaties, to make war in certain contingencies, to reduce its military forces, as provided therein, and to observe the other stipulations of the compact. This remark was interpreted as a flippant suggestion that we might wisely enter the league and then disregard its obligations when the day of trial came, as interest or inclination might prompt.

But the Senator was not more grossly misrepresented, as indicated, than has been the covenant being considered by not a few who have professed to enlighten the public concerning its terms and their significance. One of the members of this body has not scrupled to assert through the public press that if Ireland should rise in rebellion against Great Britain it would be the duty of the United States to aid in suppressing the insurrection.

FURTHER GROUNDS OF ATTACK CONSIDERED.

The reference just made to the question of the limitation of armaments prompts a further word on that subject. It would be gathered from much that has been said upon this subject

that the league was to assume control of the whole subject, increasing or authorizing an increase in the case of any nation at will, reducing or prescribing a reduction at its pleasure. Before attempting to consider how grievously the Constitution is disregarded in this particular it will be well to have in mind what authority is conferred.

The league is authorized to propose a plan for the reduction of armaments, which becomes operative when approved by the nations affected. They all agree, assuming all approve the plan, to reduce accordingly. This is the voluntary act of each Government. Then each agrees not to increase so as to exceed the limit agreed upon without the permission of the league; that is, beyond a further limit to be fixed by the council. The only reason urged against the constitutionality of these provisions is that as Congress is given power to "raise and support armies and to provide and maintain a navy" the stipulation is an invasion of the exclusive power of Congress. But if it has not been demonstrated beyond cavil or controversy that it is no valid objection to a treaty that it deals with a subject as to which Congress is given power to legislate this feeble effort has been all in vain.

Some suggestion has been made to the effect that the mandatory provisions run counter to the Constitution, but in what particular is left vague. There is no longer any doubt of the right of our Government to acquire new territory and to govern it. If we can exercise complete sovereignty over new lands for all time, it will be difficult to establish that we can not exercise a limited sovereignty for a limited time. Then it is offered that article 20, by which each signatory stipulates that it will not enter into a treaty inconsistent with the covenant, is void, because otherwise the treaty-making power would be limited. That condition arises in the case of every treaty made with two or more powers. In the case of every such treaty no new compact could be made with either or any of the other signatory powers inconsistent with the general treaty, without violating it as to the party not participating in the later treaty. In effect the contention is that the United States may not enter into a treaty with two or more States.

Finally, referring to the dictum of Mr. Justice Field, quoted above, to the effect that the treaty-making power is not so extensive as to justify a treaty which makes a change in the character of the Government, it is urged that by reason of the large powers with which the league is invested the United States is transformed from an independent Nation into a constituent subject member of a "supersovereignty" or "superstate." This is mere declamation. It may be said in passing that this particular limitation, pointed out by the learned justice, does not arise by reason of any peculiarity of the Constitution of this country. Such a limitation is implied in the case of the representatives of every nation to whom is intrusted the treaty-making power. Clemenceau could no more, through a treaty with some other power, transform France from a Republic into a monarchy than Wilson and the Senate could accomplish a like result as to the United States.

What are these "vast powers" that are conferred upon the league? I shall omit those which are arbitral in character, assuming that no one in this day will assert that the United States may not, consistently with the Constitution, enter into treaties of arbitration, or that, in setting up a tribunal of arbitration, it surrenders any part of its sovereignty, or that it is in any sense violative of the Constitution to agree, on its part, faithfully to carry out the judgment and order of the arbitrator or arbitrators in the matter submitted.

By article 4 it is provided:

> The council may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action or affecting the peace of the world.

But it is given no power to do anything. Obviously this clause merely charges the league with the duty of considering, advising, and recommending. To a certainty, our Government has not bound itself by that clause to do anything, as it has, for instance, by article 10. That clause is clearly intended to make the league a forum in which the representatives of the various powers would be brought together to adjust differences that might result in war.

By article 8 the league is authorized to formulate plans for a reduction of armaments, the only power given to it, as heretofore pointed out, being to grant to any country after the plan has been adopted, authority to exceed the limit thereby fixed, a unanimous vote being required for the authorization.

By article 10 the league, through the council, "shall advise upon the means by which the obligation" into which the members enter shall fulfill the obligation thereby undertaken, namely, "to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and political independence of all members of the league."

Article 11 provides:

> Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the members of the league or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole league, and the league shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations.

But what action can it take other than to endeavor to compose, to advise, or recommend? The league has no army to make war; it has no treasury to meet the expenses of war. It can not initiate a blockade, nor even lay an embargo. No nation has bound itself by any provision of the covenant to observe any directions that may be given it in the premises by the league or to follow any recommendations it may make. The same article provides:

> It is also declared to be the fundamental right of each member of the league to bring to the attention of the assembly or of the council any circumstance whatever affecting international relations which threaten to disturb either the peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends.

The observations made apply equally to these provisions.

By article 13 the members agree to submit international controversies to arbitration. "In the event of failure" on the part of any nation which has thus submitted a controversy in which it is interested to carry out the award made, "the council shall propose what steps should be taken to give effect thereto." As no nation has ever declined or omitted to comply with an award, this duty is not likely to be burdensome, but all the league can do in the premises is to "propose" the steps to be taken in order to give effect to the award. The very term used implies that the nations affected may or may not take the steps proposed. None of them agree to do so or to take any steps at all.

Article 14 authorizes the league to set up a permanent court of international justice, which may or may not be resorted to by any of the powers, and which may be called upon for an opinion by the league.

By article 16 the council is authorized to recommend to the several Governments concerned what effective military or naval forces the members of the league shall severally contribute to the armaments of forces to protect the covenants of the league should any member make war in disregard thereof. It may do likewise under article 17 should a nonmember resort to war against a member, the latter declining to accept special membership in the league for the consideration of the controversy, or, having done so, making war in violation of the covenant.

By article 22 the league assumes a supervisory control over new governments brought into being by the treaty and over the German colonies and other regions similarly situated, incapable of governing themselves, and undertakes to govern them, respectively, through members willing to undertake the task.

If full governmental authority may be exercised for all time over newly acquired territory consistently with the Constitution, how can it be doubted that a limited authority may be exercised for a limited time over regions not now a part of our possessions.

Article 23 speaks for itself, as follows:

> ART. 23. Subject to and in accordance with the provisions of international conventions existing or hereafter to be agreed upon, the members of the league (a) will endeavor to secure and maintain fair and humane conditions of labor for men, women, and children both in their own countries and in all countries to which their commercial and industrial relations extend, and for that purpose will establish and maintain the necessary international organizations; (b) undertake to secure just treatment of the native inhabitants of territories under their control; (c) will intrust the league with the general supervision over the execution of agreements with regard to the traffic in women and children and the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs; (d) will intrust the league with the general supervision of the trade in arms and ammunitions with the countries in which the control of this traffic is necessary in the common interest; (e) will make provision to secure and maintain freedom of communication and of transit and equitable treatment for the commerce of all members of the league. In this connection the special necessities of the regions devastated during the war of 1914–1918 shall be in mind; (f) will endeavor to take steps in matters of international concern for the prevention and control of disease.

It is idle to assert that an organization thus equipped is a government at all. It has no army and no treasury, and no means of securing either. It is not even invested with authority to appoint a commander in chief, should the nation members, in accordance with the terms of the covenant, take the field to force observance by a recalcitrant or to repel an attack made in violation of article 10. Though it may render decisions, it can not make laws, neither can it levy taxes. It deals with States as entities—not with individuals—negativing the idea that it is a government, according to Alexander Hamilton, who said, in urging the adoption of our Constitution:

> We must resolve to incorporate into our plan those ingredients which may be considered as forming the characteristic difference between a league and a government; we must extend the authority of the Union to the persons of our citizens—the only proper objects of government. (Federalist, No. 15.)

It may pass in this Chamber or on the hustings, but it is ventured that there is not a lawyer among us who would have the hardihood to contend before the Supreme Court of the United States, in a proceeding to enjoin the expenditure of public funds to pay the salaries of our league representatives, or in some other cause in which the question might properly be raised, that the covenant is void because, in the language of Justice Field, it effects "a change in the character of the Government." Incidentally it may be remarked that no treaty has ever been held by the Supreme Court to be violative of the Constitution, either in whole or in part.

TO AMEND THE TREATY IS TO REJECT IT.

Mr. President, I have undertaken to deal with one specific objection to the covenant of nations to secure the future peace of the world, not to canvass its general merits—a task that has been fully discharged by able Senators and other publicists. No one contends that it is perfect. Aside from the frailties that inhere in every work of man, it is to be remembered that any document which is to form the basis of such a league as is contemplated must meet the varying views or at least have the acquiescence of the representatives of more than a dozen nations and be sufficiently inviting to 40 or more, despite any burdens it may impose or disadvantages it may entail, to induce them to join. It may be that wiser statesmen, had they been delegated to represent us at Versailles, might have worked out in more perfect detail the general idea of the league to which the people of the United States have given overwhelming evidence that they are devoted. Their skill has not been put to the test. It may be that they, or others associated with them, could command, through superior talents and more adroit diplomacy, the unanimous assent of the representatives of the allied and neutral powers to the more perfect draft of a covenant thus prepared.

That is pure speculation. In all probability any draft, the product exclusively of the representatives of any one nation, would undergo modifications not altogether to the liking of its authors before it would be accepted with unanimity by the other parties to the treaty. But the people of the United States decreed in the manner prescribed in the Constitution that President Wilson and others of his choice should conduct the negotiations on our part. They have done so and we must accept their work or we must reject it. It is mere subterfuge to talk of amending the treaty of which the covenant forms an integral part. A vote to amend is a vote to reject. It is a plain misuse of language to assert that the Senate has any power to amend, however expressions long employed may tend to excite a contrary belief. The treaty can be amended only in the manner provided therein or by the concurrent action of all the parties signatory to it. What the Senate may do is to propose amendments, which in substance is a rejection of the treaty with a condition that it may stand as ratified provided all the other parties assent to the amendments proposed. The whole subject is thus opened up and negotiation must be resumed. Doubtless other nations dissatisfied with particular portions of the treaty would, in that event, propose amendments or will assent to the amendments proposed by us only on condition that certain changes in which they are interested be made.

The threatening discord about the territory on the eastern shore of the Adriatic breaks out once more; the Saar Basin again becomes a subject of controversy; Japan insists again on recognition of racial equality. The stupendous labors of the past six months are all undone, the delegates must reassemble to resume, like Sisyphus, the task they have just completed; peace is as far away as it was last November; business halts, unemployment becomes chronic, and some, at least, of the brave men who gloriously won the fight for us and are desperate to return to their homes and their business are perforce detained abroad to await eventualities, while the disorder necessarily attendant upon the present state of affairs in continental Europe develops into anarchy or chaos akin to it.

Some amelioration of conditions abroad, in the event that the Senate fails to ratify the treaty, may be expected should Germany sign and three of the leading powers associated with us approve it, since by its terms it will then become effective as between them. But that would only aggravate the deplorable state of affairs so far as American interests are concerned, because while our Allies would be at liberty to open up trade with Germany immediately, our products could seek that market only under the restrictions and embarrassments incident to a state of war relieved only by an armistice, if they could enter at all. American copper and American cotton, American wheat and American meat for German consumption would be marketed in England and resold to German houses.

This consideration may, perhaps, be entitled to little weight with those who regard the league as "treason," who are opposed to it fundamentally, but to those who indorse the general plan but object to the details only through which it is worked out it may properly be accorded attention. At least it may prompt a closer analysis of the reasoning on which their objections are founded to ascertain whether after all partisanship has not unduly magnified their importance, as it did those which were urged against the Jay treaty and the one which gave us the imperial domain of Louisiana.

The specious demand that the "covenant" be separated from the "treaty" and each be voted on separately is another way of expressing a desire to amend. Assuming a division possible, and it is not in view of many provisions of the treaty, a ratification of one and a rejection of the other would get us nowhere. The treaty is an entirety. No nation is bound by any part of it as to us unless we accept the whole.

The situation is not unlike that which was presented when our Constitution was submitted to the States for ratification. Its opponents, open and secret, were all strong for amending the draft submitted. Richard Henry Lee, whose brilliant talents and fiery zeal in the cause of independence all admired, was so strenuously opposed to the plan of "a more perfect union" that he declined to go as a delegate to the convention which framed the Constitution. He was insistent on "amending" it when it came before the several States for ratification, and making ratification conditional upon the acceptance of the proposed amendments. The same policy was generally followed by those in opposition. Elbridge Gerry, a delegate who declined to sign the completed draft, endeavored to have Massachusetts ratify only on condition that amendments were adopted. Washington was not deceived by this method of attack.

If another Federal convention is attempted—

So he wrote to Charles Carter, of Fredericksburg—

its members will be more discordant; will agree upon no general plan. The Constitution is the best that can be obtained at this time; it is free from many of the imperfections with which it is charged. The Constitution or disunion is before us to choose from. If the Constitution is our election, a constitutional door is open for amendments and may be adopted in a peaceable manner without tumult or disorder.

In contrast with this course was that taken by Hamilton. The Constitution which was evolved through the labors of the convention conformed very feebly, as is well known, to his ideal.

In an effort to persuade several hesitating members to sign the completed draft, he said that no man's ideas were more remote from the plan than his own were known to be.

Scant consideration was given to the plan he submitted. For brevity I quote from Bancroft's terse summary of it:

The assembly, which was to be the corner stone of the edifice, was to consist of persons elected directly by the people for three years. It was to be checked by a senate elected by electors chosen by the people and holding office during good behavior. The supreme executive, whose term of office was to be good behavior, was to be elected by electors, chosen by electors chosen by the people. "It may be said"—these were his words—"this constitutes an elective monarchy; but by making the executive subject to impeachment the term 'monarchy' can not apply." The courts of the United States were so instituted as to place the General Government above the State governments in all matters of general concern. To prevent the States from passing laws contrary to the Constitution or laws of the United States, the executive of each State was to be appointed by the General Government, with a negative on all State legislation. (2 Bancroft, p. 44.)

And yet he became the ablest exponent as well as the most convincing advocate of the Constitution in the actual preparation of which, for one reason or another, he had had little part. It is but a just tribute to say, without disparagement of the loyal work of others, that but for his assistance the Constitution never would have been adopted. I have not been a follower of his school of political thought, but am able to understand the admiration in which he is held by those more ready to accept the principles which governed him in his political conduct. Some of them might profitably, in this crisis in the affairs of the Nation, emulate him in the unselfishness and patriotism he displayed in the rôle he played as defender of the Constitution.

Another example from the same period commands our reverent attention.

When the work of the convention was completed and the immortal document it produced was ready for the signature of the delegates, Benjamin Franklin, then a feeble old man past 80, too frail in body to make himself heard, but with a ripened wisdom that distinguished him among his fellows, even in his youth, asked Mr. Wilson to read the following address to his associate delegates:

I confess that there are several parts of this Constitution which I do not at present approve, but I am not sure I shall ever approve them: For having lived long, I have experienced many instances of being obliged by better information or fuller consideration, to change opinions even on important subjects, which I once thought right, but found to be otherwise. It is therefore that the older I grow, the more apt I am to doubt my own judgment and to pay more respect to the judgment of others.

I doubt too whether any other convention we can obtain may be able to make a better constitution. For when you assemble a number of men to have the advantage of their joint wisdom, you inevitably assemble with those men all their prejudices, their passions, their errors of opinion, their local interests, and their selfish views. From such an assembly can a perfect production be expected? It therefore astonishes me, sir, to find this system approaching so near to perfection as it does, and I think it will astonish our enemies who are waiting with confidence to hear that our councils are confounded like those of the builders of Babel, and that our States are on the point of separation, only to meet hereafter for the purpose of cutting one another's throats. Thus I consent, sir, to this constitution because I expect no better, and because I am not sure that it is not the best. The opinions I have had of its errors I sacrifice to the public good. I have never whispered a syllable of them abroad. Within these walls they were born, and here they shall die. If every one of us in returning to our constituents were to report the objections he has had to it and endeavor to gain partisans in support of them, we might prevent its being generally received and thereby lose all the salutary effects and great advantages resulting naturally in our favor among foreign nations as well as among ourselves from our real or apparent unanimity * * *.

On the whole, sir, I can not help expressing a wish that every member of the convention who may still have objections to it would with me on this occasion doubt a little of its own infallibility, and to make manifest our unanimity, put his name to this instrument.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, asks conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GOOD, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 2480) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, to strike out the word "and" in line 14, page 66, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I notice from the press reports that the stockholders of the International Mercantile Marine Co. will hold a meeting on Monday, the 16th of June, for the purpose of approving or disapproving of the sale to a British syndicate of the Marine Co.'s British-owned ships. I was glad to see that the American International Corporation, which I understand is the largest stockholder in the International Mercantile Marine, intended at the meeting to vote its stock against the proposed sale, that a meeting of the board of directors of the American International Corporation was held on Thursday, the 5th, for the purpose of taking action with reference thereto, and that at the meeting the directors directed that the stock be voted against the proposed sale and among other reasons for their action gave the following:

The principal considerations which influenced the board in taking this action were, first, the corporation has made its considerable investments in the common and preferred stocks of the International Mercantile Marine Co. in pursuance of its definite purpose to aid in maintaining and increasing transportation of American merchandise in American-owned ships; that the fleet is one of the best in the world to-day; that the decrease in American-controlled tonnage would come at a time of maximum demand for shipping facilities at profitable rates; and that the sale of the British ships and assets would almost unavoidably lead to the liquidation of the American company as a going concern. This would mean the giving up of terminal facilities, dock leases, and the closing of agencies, etc., throughout the world—all these representing a business good will and assets established in the course of many years, and being of great, in some cases of irreplaceable, value.

I am very much gratified to note that the American International Corporation is taking this laudable stand. It seems to me that no greater discouragement could come to this country in its efforts to build up a merchant marine at the present time than for this sale to be made. One of the greatest questions confronting the American people to-day is the establishment of an American merchant marine. This being the case, how suicidal it would be for the greatest shipping company in this country, and probably in the world, to dispose of approximately 703,000 tons of magnificent shipping to foreign interests. Of what avail is it to people who are interested in building up an American merchant marine to bend their efforts toward establishing a policy of this Government whereby we can have such a merchant marine as we need if the greatest men who are now engaged in that business dispose of 703,000 tons of ships at one time. It naturally would mean the disintegration of the company and a damper upon the enthusiasm of men who want to go into the shipping business, and will lead the ordinary man to think that those who are now in the business and who supposedly have the best knowledge of what the future of it will be have no confidence that an American merchant marine can be built up. Therefore, having been interested in this question for years and doing what I could to see that this country has a merchant marine second to none, I earnestly hope that the stockholders will emphatically disapprove of this proposed sale, and that the magnificent fleet will still be continued to be owned by an American company.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I desire to say that I heartily indorse the views just expressed by the senior Senator from Florida. In my judgment it would be a national calamity for the sale of those ships as proposed to take place.

Mr. JONES of Washington subsequently said:

Mr. President, I understand that a few moments ago the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] presented a statement with reference to the proposed sale of ships owned by American interests but now under the British flag. I had previously seen that statement, it having been inserted in the RECORD. I heartily indorse it. I concur in the sentiments and opinions expressed therein. I regretted very much to see those ships go under a foreign flag, and I hope that our people will see their way clear to hold the interest which they have in those ships.

PRINTING OF PEACE TREATY.

Mr. BORAH. I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document the proposed peace treaty which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATSON in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. FLETCHER. There is some requirement with reference to the printing of a document which I think ought to be observed, and that is that there must be an estimate of the cost. For that reason I think it ought to be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. BORAH. I ask, then, that it be printed and that the request be referred to the Committee on Printing. Is that all right?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BORAH. May I suggest to the Committee on Printing that if it is printed it be printed in a little larger type than the ordinary type?

Mr. SMOOT. May I also call the Senator's attention to the fact that there are maps accompanying it and that he includes them in his request?

Mr. BORAH. I include the maps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair hears none.

REGULATION OF RAILROAD RATES.

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 641) to amend section 10 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918.

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask that the bill be read and that the amendments of the Committee on Interstate Commerce be considered as they are reached.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. McKELLAR. Before the reading of the bill begins I ask the Senator from Iowa if he will yield to me long enough to read into the RECORD a short resolution?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have no objection.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is a resolution adopted by the General Federation of Women's Club in biennial session at Asheville, N. C., May 29, 1919:

Whereas the covenant of the league of nations is presented to the United States for popular action; and

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs, now assembled in biennial session, representing the interests of 2,000,000 women and exerting the influence they may exercise in their communities:

Resolved, That the council send its approval of the revised covenant of the league of nations to members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, the President of the United States, now in France; and

Resolved, That the members of the State federations ask their Senators to vote in support of the league of nations.

Mr. BORAH. I ask leave, out of order, to present a resolution by the Friends of Irish Freedom of Central Ohio. I desire to have it printed in the RECORD following the resolution read by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. McKELLAR. May I ask what organization it is?

Mr. BORAH. It is an organization of the Friends of Irish Freedom of Central Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The resolution referred to is as follows:

Resolved by the Friends of Irish Freedom of Central Ohio, assembled at Columbus, Ohio, this Easter Sunday evening, A. D. 1919, That it is the sense of this meeting that Ireland, in conjunction with other small nationalities, is entitled to the right of self-determination, and that she of right ought to be a free and independent nation. We respectfully but earnestly request the President of the United States to urge the peace conference to recognize the republican government now existing in Ireland; be it further

Resolved, That we are opposed to the adoption of any covenant for a league of nations which will trespass upon the rights of American sovereignty or permit foreign nations to determine the course of action of the United States whenever any question of the protection of American rights be involved. We believe that the American people will determine every question justly, and we oppose any diminution of the supreme power of the United States to determine its own course of action.

Resolved further, That we are in favor of the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine in all of its vigor, and we believe in the soundness of the advice of Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Madison, and Monroe, that it is to the best interest of this country to avoid entangling alliances with any foreign nation.

Resolved further, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to Hon. Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, and to the United States Senate; and be it further

Resolved, That a cablegram of greeting and best wishes be forwarded to the Irish-American envoys, Messrs. Walsh, Dunne, and Ryan, now awaiting a hearing at the peace conference at Paris.

JOHN A. CONNOR, *Chairman.*
L. A. JORDAN, *Secretary.*
TIMOTHY S. HOGAN,
Chairman Committee on Resolutions.

THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN in the chair) laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. UNDERWOOD conferees on the part of the Senate.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, which was read:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 2480) entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920," the Clerk be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to strike out the word "and" in line 14 of page 66 of said bill.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate concur in the resolution of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. KING. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATSON in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Borah	Henderson	Norris	Smoot
Culberson	Hitchcock	Nugent	Spencer
Cummins	Johnson, Cal.	Page	Sutherland
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Phelan	Thomas
Dial	Kellogg	Phipps	Trammell
Elkins	Kenyon	Pittman	Underwood
Fernald	King	Poindexter	Walsh, Mass.
Frelinghuysen	Kirby	Pomerene	Warren
Hale	McKellar	Ransdell	Watson
Harding	Moses	Sheppard	
Harris	Newberry	Sherman	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of absent Senators.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. NEW, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. SWANSON answered to their names when called.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona, Mr. WALSH of Montana, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. JONES of Washington, Mr. EDGE, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. MCNARY, Mr. LENROOT, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. DILLINGHAM, Mr. FALL, and Mr. LODGE entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

REGULATION OF RAILROAD RATES.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 641) to amend section 10 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Interstate Commerce was, on page 3, line 6, after the word "right," to insert "as to interstate commerce"; in line 8, after the word "upon," to strike out "it" and to insert "said right"; in line 14, after the word "regulations," to insert "directly affecting interstate commerce"; and in line 23, before the words "Director General of Railroads," to insert "President or the," so as to read:

That during the period of Federal control the right to initiate or change rates, fares, charges, classifications, regulations, and practices exercised by the carriers now under Federal control, prior to the 29th day of December, 1917, shall hereafter be exercised by the President, or by the Director General of Railroads, but such right as to interstate commerce shall be exercised under all the limitations and conditions which were imposed upon said right by the act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887, as amended; and the Interstate Commerce Commission shall have as full and complete authority and jurisdiction to set aside, change, modify, suspend, or otherwise review all such rates, fares, charges, classifications, and regulations directly affecting interstate commerce as though the Government had not assumed the possession and control of said transportation systems. To that end the said act to regulate commerce, as amended, is hereby declared to be in full force and effect with respect to rates, fares, charges, classifications, practices, and regulations, anything in the act approved March 21, 1918, to the contrary notwithstanding. The procedure before the Interstate Commerce Commission shall be the same as formerly, except that the President or the Director General of Railroads shall stand in the stead of the carriers, and all notices theretofore required to be given to or served upon carriers shall be given to or served on said Director General. All orders or findings of the commission shall bind the Director General to the same extent as they formerly bound the carriers.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 6, after the word "regulations," to insert "directly affecting interstate commerce," so as to make the clause read:

In determining any question concerning any such rates, fares, charges, classifications, practices, or regulations, directly affecting interstate commerce, or any changes or proposed changes in the same, the reasonableness thereof or any discrimination therein, the rule to be applied shall be the same as existed under the said act to regulate commerce, as amended, and under the general law of the subject as it was prior to the Government's possession and control.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 12, to insert:

In computing the time allowed in the present law for presenting claims to the Interstate Commerce Commission for reparation, the period of Federal control preceding the passage and approval of this act shall be excluded, and, likewise, in computing the time for presenting claims or bringing suits for loss or damage arising out of the transportation of persons or property, the period of Federal control prior to the passage and approval of this act shall be excluded.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I am very glad that this legislation has been begun. I hope that the office of the Director General of Railroads will soon be divested of all control over interstate rate making.

I referred yesterday very briefly to some of the exorbitant and inequitable increases in freight charges. I have never been able myself to understand why it should be published to the world that there was but a 25 per cent increase in freight rates, when, as a matter of fact, by reason of certain changes in the classifications, those rates went as high as from 50 to 60 per cent when it came to the shipment of coarse grain; to 240 per cent when it came to the shipment of tea from New Orleans; and, as one of the Senators before the committee said, he had information from his own section of the country that increases were made as high as 500 per cent.

The hearings which we had before the committee, and which covered a number of weeks during the last session, convinced me that the Director General and his staff were very much more interested in making orders that would suit their convenience than to suit the convenience of the shippers themselves.

I want to call two or three instances to the attention of the Senate, in order that the public may perhaps better understand what has been done. The Railroad Administration sought by different orders to change the rule of liability; they sought to change the place where suits should be begun; and they denied the right of certain claimants against railroad employees to begin garnishee proceedings. I want merely to take the time of the Senate for a few moments to refer to two or three of these matters.

Lawyers all know that under the rule of bailments a common carrier is supposed to furnish a car that is fit for the purpose for which it is intended to be used. It does not take a lawyer to understand that should be the rule, common sense suggests it, and yet they issued the famous general order No. 57 with relation to the shipment of grain. They provide in that order that the shipper himself must inspect the car to ascertain whether or not it is in a condition such as to preserve the cargo. I want to read just a paragraph from this rule. Under paragraph 2 of the rule they say:

While carriers are expected to furnish suitable equipment, it is the duty of the shipper to reject a car which is unfit for the loading intended.

Shippers should not load bulk grain in a car with door post shattered or broken, or with other defects of such character as to render car obviously unfit, or with inside showing the presence of oil, creosote, fertilizer, manure, coal, or other damaging substances of like or kindred character.

Under this rule the Director General's office proposed that if a shipper should use a car which had previously been loaded with some such substances, then he would not be able to collect if he sustained any damage. If the car leaks on its journey to its destination and a large part of the cargo is lost, if the car had not been inspected by the shipper, he is to be chargeable with the fact that he did not have a proper car and his right of recovery defeated. I do not think that the Attorney General's office had any authority under the railroad-control act to adopt a rule of that kind, but nevertheless they did it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. POMERENE. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I suggest to the Senator that this bill does not interfere with the continued operation of that rule as to shipments wholly within a State?

Mr. POMERENE. I realize that very fully, and referred to that fact yesterday to some extent. I hope we will get to a point later on, when it comes to shipments within a State, that the local authorities will have a proper control of that intrastate commerce; but that is another question.

I wish to call attention to another proposition. In my State, and I dare say in nearly all other States of the Union, there are certain statutes, local in character, which permit the creditor of an employee by garnishee proceedings to tie up 10 per cent of the funds of an employee in the event that a debt has been incurred for necessaries, such as food supplies or clothing or rent.

That has been the rule in my State for probably 15 or 20 years; but the Director General's office issued an order to the effect that no suit shall be brought against a railroad company and thereby tie up its funds. Is there any justification for that? They excuse themselves for making this order by reason of the fact that under some provision of the railroad-control act the earnings of the company are regarded as public funds and therefore they should not be garnisheed, ignoring entirely the rights of creditors in the various States.

Whether the Director General has this power or not I will not take the time to discuss, but I am sure his course has been very bad policy.

Let me call attention to another of their rules. Under the Carmack law, which was later amended and supplemented very materially by a bill introduced by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], now the able chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, it was provided that bills of lading should be so framed as to make the company issuing them responsible in damages for losses occurring on another line between the point of shipment and point of destination, and suits might be brought against the initial carrier, and, if damage accrued to the cargo, that all the shipper would have to do would be to prove the fact that there had been a loss, and it would make no difference whether it was on the lines of the initial carrier or on those of some intervening carrier. The Railroad Director General's office changed that rule so as to provide that a suit shall only be begun against the initial carrier in the event that the shipper resides in the county or district in which the shipment originated at the time he begins the suit, or that he shall go to the place where the loss occurred; in other words, if there were a shipment of grain from Minneapolis to Baltimore via Pittsburgh by one who did not live in that district or county, or if he lived there at the time of the shipment but later moved away, he could not begin the suit in Minneapolis; but if the loss should occur at Pittsburgh on its way to Baltimore, then the shipper would have to go to Pittsburgh, if that was on another line, in order to begin his suit.

It is just such rules as these that have offended the shipping public of the country, and I am glad that the President has seen fit to say that the railroads shall go back to their owners not later than January 1. I hope that the Congress will be able to pass some of the remedial legislation which is believed to be necessary before that time, so that the railroads can be returned to private control at an earlier date.

I now wish to call attention to another matter. When I say this I recognize the fact that the former Secretary of the Treasury did a most wonderful work as Secretary of the Treasury. I think he made the greatest Secretary of the Treasury that we have had for 50 years. I wish I could say as much about the management of the railroads, whether by him or by the present director general. Some reference was made by the distinguished chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee yesterday concerning the finances of the railroads, and I agree with him that, considering the railroad question from that standpoint, the problem is a most serious one. One of the reasons which was urged for a continuance of Government control of the railroads was the introduction of certain economies; and among these economies was the taking away of the large salaries of some of the railroad executives and their counsel.

It was claimed that during the first year they had saved something like $6,100,000 by cutting out high salaries. We were not furnished at that time with a statement as to the cost of the director general's office, and we have not a complete statement of it yet; but we have had a few figures which furnish a side light on the question. Early in January the committee asked for a statement of these expenditures and for a list of the employees. It did not come until a communication was received by the chairman of the committee dated March 1. It did not contain the names of the officials. I did not see it until 2 o'clock on Tuesday morning, March 4, but it contains some little interesting information. While one of the complaints made against private ownership was the large salaries paid under private control, it would seem from an investigation of this document that there is not very much difference between the cost of Government control and private control. I am only going to refer to some of the larger salaries.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. POMERENE. I yield.

Mr. KING. I may not have apprehended the meaning of the statement just made by the Senator. Does he mean to state that it cost as much to operate the railroads when they were under the control of the owners and before the Government took control of them as it has cost to operate them since the Government assumed control of the railroad systems of the country?

Mr. POMERENE. No, Mr. President, I did not mean to say that. I have not sufficient information on that question to discuss the comparative cost of the two managements. What I was calling attention to was simply the fact that there was not any material difference in the salaries which were paid under private control and those paid under Government control.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, I think when the full facts are disclosed it will be shown that there are more employees now than there were before for the performance of the same tasks——

Mr. POMERENE. I think that is true.

Mr. KING. And that the cost of the personnel employed in the operation of the railroads under Government operation is very greatly in excess of the cost of the railroads when in the hands of their owners.

Mr. POMERENE. The statement was made the other day before the committee—and I have no reason to doubt it—that there were about 141,000 more employees now than there were a year or 18 months ago.

But to revert to the question of official salaries, there are 5 men or officials on the Director General's staff each of whom gets $50,000. There are 2 each getting $40,000. There are 3 each getting $35,000. There are 2 getting $30,000 each, 8 receiving $25,000 each, 11 receiving $20,000 each, 1 receiving $18,500, 1 receiving $18,000, 1 receiving $17,500, 6 receiving $15,000 each, 1 receiving $14,000, 1 receiving $13,200, 1 receiving $12,500, 4 receiving $12,000 each, 1 receiving $10,800, 1 receiving $10,600, and 23 receiving $10,000 each; or a total of 72 men on the staff of the Director General receiving salaries aggregating $1,398,100, or an average of $19,418.

I think that when they attempt to show the economies, particularly in the reduction of the salaries of the executives of the railroads under private management, they at least ought to have been fair to the committee and fair to the public in giving a statement as to what salaries they were paying, so that we would be able to compare them.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. POMERENE. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. Has the Senator been unable to obtain a list of the employees under private management, and the salaries they were paid?

Mr. POMERENE. No; I do not have them, but there was a good deal of complaint made because there were salaries of $50,000, $40,000, and so forth. There were some few salaries, I think—at least, I have been so told—that were somewhat in excess of these figures; but, after all, the salaries which are being paid are about the same—I am speaking, of course, in general terms—whether under public management or private management.

It seems to me, however, just a little bit strange that we have a great Chief Justice of the United States on the comparatively small salary of $15,000, yet when it comes to a railroad management we have to have men receiving salaries in the amounts I have indicated. Think of it. Each one of a number of these railroad officials receive more salary than the great Chief Justice and two Justices of our great Supreme Court.

I had intended to go more at length into some of these abuses, and I may do so at some future time, but I felt it not inappropriate at the present time to lay a few of these facts before the Senate. It is just such facts as these, among other reasons which might be urged, that have persuaded me that there is a great necessity for the termination of Government control at the earliest practicable moment, taking into consideration the financial situation.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I would like to ask the author of the amendment a question. The purpose of the bill, as I understand, is to put the power to initiate rates by the President and the Director General under the old condition.

Mr. CUMMINS. That was done in the act of March, 1918.

Mr. KIRBY. Yes; and the rates then were subject to review before they were put into operation, for reasonableness?

Mr. CUMMINS. No. In the act of March, 1918, known as the railway-control act, the right to initiate, change, and modify rates was given to the President of the United States, just as it had been formerly exercised by the several carrier companies. Formerly, however, the Interstate Commerce Commission had the right to suspend and revise those rates before they were put into force, and that right was taken away from the Interstate Commerce Commission in the act of 1918.

Mr. KIRBY. Is it the purpose of this bill to restore that function?

Mr. CUMMINS. It is.

Mr. KIRBY. That is what I understood.

Mr. President, I shall support the amendment; and, so far as the Government control of the railroads is concerned, it does not seem to have been a complete success. It certainly has not been from the financial or money-making standpoint. There have been many reasons, it seems to me, why it has not been successful; and I am not prepared to say that it was due to mismanagement or to lack of efficient management or to lack of employment of talent that ought to have been capable of managing them successfully. The great trouble about the whole matter has been that there was no incentive upon the part of the directors in direct charge of the railroads to manage them successfully and economically, because the Government stood behind them all, and there could not be a loss to the private ownership. The returns and profits were guaranteed.

That has been the great trouble about it all. I understand that the wages have been increased practically—if the increase had extended over a period of a year—$800,000,000 a year. We know that the rates have been increased, and the service has not been improved, but rather has been impaired. It has not been as efficient, to say the least, under war-time management in the delivery of freight, the service to the public as it had been before. I attribute that, however, rather to the conditions that made the war-time control necessary; but I hope it will soon be that we may get down to a condition where the railroads will exist to subserve the public interest and convenience, where they shall have a reasonable amount of compensation for the service they render; and that is all they are entitled to as public-service corporations. The best method for bringing that about is still to be determined by the Congress of the United States. They are in the control of the Government now, and it does not yet appear when they will be released; but before they are released, if it shall become necessary that these roads be returned to private ownership, it is my opinion not only that the Government should retain, through some agency, the power to fix and control and revise the reasonableness of rates, but somewhere and somehow the same agency should have the power to determine the reasonableness of wages to be paid to the employees engaged in this activity. That much control should be retained in some agency of the Government if it becomes necessary to restore the roads to private ownership.

Mr. CUMMINS. So far as the bill that is now before the Senate is concerned, those rights are retained by the President fully and completely. The Director General fixes the wages of all the men; and that he will continue to do so long as the roads are in Federal control.

Mr. KIRBY. I understand the conditions on that point as does the Senator from Iowa; but my opinion is that when the control by the Government is released, or the roads are put back into private ownership, the same agency that has the right to review for reasonableness the rates initiated, or the rates put into effect, ought also to have the power to determine the reasonableness of the wages to be paid the employees engaged in this activity.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think the Senator from Arkansas is stating a conclusion which everybody will have to accept before very long.

Mr. KIRBY. I do not care to discuss the matter further, as it has not reached the point where we are determining what shall finally be done with the railroads.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat, I gather from what the Senator said that he did not understand that the Government has had the right heretofore, under the interstate-commerce clause, to determine the reasonableness of the rates.

Mr. KIRBY. Oh, no; there is no question about that at all. The question with me was whether this amendment was designed to do away with the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission to test the reasonableness of these rates before they were put into effect. The question that I was discussing later on was that when the railroads shall be returned to private ownership, the same agency that controls the rates or revises the rates ought to have the power also to determine the reasonableness of the wages to be paid to people engaged in this activity.

Mr. KING. Without entering into a discussion of that power, does not the Senator think that if the Government should attempt to fix the wages of those who are working for the railroads that are engaged in interstate commerce, appeals would be made that the Government should take over the fixing of wages for every activity—private, corporate, or otherwise—first if the product was interstate and then finally if it was purely intrastate? Does not the Senator think that the moment the Government announced that policy—namely, that it would fix the wages of those employed upon railroads engaged in interstate commerce—appeals would be made that it should fix the wages of all persons whose products might be conceived or considered to be interstate in character?

Mr. KIRBY. I do not think it would necessarily go to any such extent as that; and I say that the function and the power to determine the reasonableness of wages as the reasonableness of rates is determined should also be left in Government control, without regard to when the railroads are turned back to private ownership.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think that in fixing the rates, in determining whether they are reasonable or not—I am speaking now of freight rates and passenger rates—incidentally, if not directly, the question of wages is involved?

Mr. KIRBY. Yes; it must all come into consideration, of course; but suppose these wages are not paid?

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think that with the organization of labor as it exists to-day, and the collective-bargaining system which prevails in this country, and against which no one can or ought to inveigh, there need be very much concern in respect to the power to fix wages?

Mr. KIRBY. Of course, if labor is able to take care of itself without inconvenience to the public or without destruction of the public rights, it might be well; but if it all could be arranged here as it is about the rates, and the employees protected in their wages, and some of the great strikes could be prevented and no injury done to the public, it seems to me it would be well to have the power retained to do that.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think—and I repeat the question which I propounded a few moments ago—that when you invest the Federal Government with the power to fix wages you are to some extent invading the rights and prerogatives of the individual, of the labor unions, of those who engage in labor; and does not the Senator think that if the Government attempted the fixing of wages for those who are engaged in railroad work, inevitably the demand would be made, either by the employers or by the employees or by the public, that it should fix wages in everything else, particularly if the product of the labor was interstate in character?

Mr. KIRBY. The Senator does not appear to get my meaning. I have not said that the Government should fix the wages of the people engaged in this activity, but that it should retain the power to determine the reasonableness of the wages to be paid to the people engaged in this activity in order to protect them.

Mr. KING. Well, after all, does not that mean the power to fix wages?

Mr. KIRBY. I do not think so. That is as far as I care to go.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa a question.

I have a letter from John Barton Payne, the attorney for the Railroad Administration, in which he calls my attention to the fact that this bill provides that—

All final judgments for a plaintiff or plaintiffs rendered in actions for personal injuries or for loss of or damage to property shall be promptly paid.

As it provides; and he then says:

There is no distinction here between judgments on causes of action arising during or prior to Federal control. Unfortunately there are several roads in the country in receiverships and insolvent. This is a mandate requiring the Government to pay all of the judgments against such roads. As a matter of fact, there has been no controversy about the payment of judgments except those arising prior to Federal control, as to which the Director General did not have the say; and the only matters in that connection which have come to my knowledge were brought to my attention by Congressman RAGSDALE, of South Carolina.

I was just wondering whether or not the Senator from Iowa would be willing to have an amendment inserted after the word "judgments," in line 10, page 2, so as to read, "All final judgments arising out of causes of action during Federal control"?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I think the bill as it is does not provide for payment of judgments except upon causes of action arising subsequent to Federal control; but the suggestion of the Senator from Indiana presents an inquiry that the Senate might very well make. Personally I believe that the railroads ought to pay the judgments that were rendered against them prior to Federal control, just as they pay the judgments rendered subsequent to Federal control. It will be seen that the bill is limited to judgments for personal injuries or for loss of or damage to property, and says that they shall be promptly paid by the Director General of Railroads. I did not intend to raise the question; but, now that it is presented, I hope the Senate will deal with it according to its view of the justice of the matter.

When we passed these railroads to the Government we took away from the citizens of the country who had recovered judgments for personal injuries the right to levy upon any of the property of the railroad companies and they had no relief whatever. It has always seemed to me to be rather unjust that these payments should be suspended in the air during the period of Federal control, when their damages should have been paid and the amount charged to operating expense. However, I must say that in drafting the bill I had in mind only the causes of action which arose after the Government took possession and began to operate the property; and if the Senator from Indiana desires to present an amendment of that character I shall not myself resist it.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, it occurs to me that that amendment should be incorporated in the bill. I can well understand the hardship that it worked upon those who had judgments against railroads before Government control; but, after all, since Government control there has been no money with which to pay those judgments, so Mr. Payne says, without doing an injustice to the Railroad Administration. If the railroad companies themselves would furnish the money with which to pay these judgments, there would be no trouble about it; but under existing circumstances it seems as if that can not be done. Therefore it appears that the only safe course to pursue is to incorporate this amendment and permit these judgments to remain suspended, so to speak, until after private ownership shall have been inaugurated.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Do I understand that claims for damages arising out of contracts have not been paid by the operating department?

Mr. WATSON. No.

Mr. KING. Or merely those which sound in tort?

Mr. WATSON. Those which sound in tort [reading]:

All final judgments for a plaintiff or plaintiffs rendered in actions for personal injuries or for loss of or damage to property shall be promptly paid by the Director General of Railroads.

Mr. KING. My understanding has been that actions growing out of injuries to property and damages to property which perhaps might be designated actions ex delicto instead of actions ex contractu have been met by the Railroad Administration and paid.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator is very much misinformed.

Mr. WATSON. Yes; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. CUMMINS. A vast number of these claims have neither been adjusted nor have they been paid after they were adjusted.

Mr. KING. Then, if that be true, perhaps there are valid obligations against the Railroad Administration or against the railroads aggregating millions and tens of millions of dollars which ultimately will have to be paid, and which ought to have been taken into account in determining the cost of governmental control and operation.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator, I am sure, will discover as time goes on, and when the accounts are complete, that there are a good many costs of operation that have not yet been disclosed.

Mr. KING. Then, if I may be pardoned——

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.

Mr. KING. When the Senator stated that the Government was running behind in the neighborhood of about $2,000,000 a day, the Senator did not state that, but, as I understood him to state, perhaps, the loss would be six or seven hundred million dollars for the year——

Mr. CUMMINS. No; I stated that the Govenment had lost last year about $240,000,000, and that the first four months of this year indicated a loss of about $250,000,000, and if that rate were continued throughout the year we would have for the whole period of Federal control a loss of something like six or seven hundred million dollars.

Mr. KING. Accepting those figures, then, the loss would be very much greater if the railroads had paid these valid claims against them, growing out of the loss of property or injuries to individuals.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not know the aggregate of the claims that have accumulated during this period. I only know that I have had a very great number of complaints with regard to claims which have not been paid nor even recognized in the way of adjustment.

Mr. WATSON. I will say to the Senator from Iowa, if he will permit the interruption, that Judge Payne told me over the telephone that they had paid a very great number of these claims, running into a very large amount. He told me that he would give me a memorandum of the payments, but I have not yet received it. I think it may cast some light on this subject.

Mr. CUMMINS. Undoubtedly that is true; but there are a great many of them which remain unpaid that have not yet been considered. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] read certain orders of the administration which attempted to change the rules of the law with regard to evidence or with regard to the liability of the carriers. We were informed in the committee that these claims had been at least delayed and had not been adjusted or paid. I do not want it to be understood that I am criticizing the Railroad Administration. I only state the fact that there is a very large number of claims that have not been paid, and there are judgments which have not been paid. One of the orders of the former Director General—not the present Director General—which was introduced in evidence declared, in so many words, that if the Director General was satisfied that the verdict of a jury or the judgment of a court was induced by prejudice or passion he would not recognize the verdict or judgment.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, my understanding is that the Railroad Administration is entirely willing to pay all judgments arising during Federal control as fast as they get the money. They do not want to undertake to pay these judgments that were secured against the railroad companies before Federal control, because they have not the money and because they want these judgments paid by the companies themselves after they shall have been restored to private management.

If the Senator from Iowa is entirely satisfied to have the amendment inserted, I shall be very pleased to offer it; otherwise I shall not, because I want him to be satisfied upon this point.

Mr. CUMMINS. I want the Senator from Indiana to pursue his own judgment about it. I will say to him, however, that, as the author of the bill, I did not intend to provide for the payment of judgments which were rendered prior to Federal control.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the Senator if the proposed amendment of the Senator from Indiana would not merely clarify that situation?

Mr. CUMMINS. I think so; but I am bound to say at the same time that I think it would be only just for the Government, out of the revenues of the companies, to pay these judgments which had been rendered prior to Federal control.

Mr. THOMAS. I think that is true, with the possible exception of those companies which are in the hands of receivers.

Mr. CUMMINS. That would be a very proper exception. I shall not resist the amendment if it is offered.

Mr. WATSON. Then I offer the amendment, Mr. President.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator read the amendment, if it is not very long?

Mr. WATSON. On page 2, in line 10, after the word "judgments," insert the words "on causes of action arising during Federal control."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question. In the event the Railroad Administration becomes dissatisfied under this measure with the decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission in a rate controversy what recourse has it?

Mr. CUMMINS. The Railroad Administration would have the same recourse that the carriers had prior to Federal control.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then we would have the spectacle of the Federal Government going into court bringing suit in the nature of an appeal from the decision of one of its own subordinate agencies.

Mr. CUMMINS. Precisely; that is one of the anomalies that is inseparable from the assumption on the part of the Federal Government of a business enterprise. I do not think that can be avoided.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Add as a new section at the end of the bill:

That nothing in this act or in any act heretofore passed by Congress shall absolve any railroad or other common carrier from obeying any rate, rule, regulation, or practice of any State with respect to the transportation of passengers or property, or the receiving, delivery, storage, or handling of property wholly within one State and not shipped to or from a foreign country, from or to any State or Territory as aforesaid, unless and until such common carrier shall have secured the judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction holding such rate, rule, regulation, or practice imposed as aforesaid to be unreasonable.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, the pending bill restores the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission over interstate rates, but leaves the United States Railroad Administration in absolute and unqualified control of intrastate rates and shipments. It occurs to me that if the jurisdiction of any agency should be restored that of the States should be included. It seems to me that the United States Railroad Administration is in far better position to control and adjust the interstate rates and shipments than it is the multitude of rates and shipments wholly within the various States and relating to situations wholly local.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am in entire sympathy with the intention and purpose of the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas. I think that matter should be corrected in this bill, but I am just a little afraid that the amendment he suggests will not have that effect. I suggest to him that after the word "systems," in line 16, page 3, the insertion of this language, which would probably correct the trouble, be made:

Provided, That the initiation and regulation of intrastate rates shall be restored to State control as provided prior to said act of March 21, 1918.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, the decisions prior to the date which the Senator mentions had practically given the Interstate Commerce Commission control to a large degree of intrastate rates. The Shreveport case was one notable instance. The railroad commissioners of various States held a national meeting and joined in a protest against the tendency to concentrate control over local and intrastate rates and shipments in a Federal body.

It is the object of this amendment not only to restore and define the jurisdiction of the State commissions during the pendency of Federal control but to counteract any decision that was made in that direction before the period of Federal control, and to operate permanently.

Mr. McKELLAR. In other words, the purpose of the Senator's amendment is to go further than restoring the status quo by the passage of the act of March 21, 1918, and to give the State commissions a little larger authority than they then exercised.

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; to give them authority over the intrastate rates and shipments which they possessed before the decision of the Supreme Court in the Shreveport case and similar cases.

Mr. McKELLAR. That would be an enlargement of their powers, of course.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It would be a preservation of their proper powers.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to what the Senator has just said and what he states to be the purpose of his amendment. I should be very glad to vote for his amendment along certain lines, but if it goes as far as he states it goes I could not vote for it.

I am one of those in the Senate who opposed the taking away the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission when the original railroad act was passed. I did not at that time believe it was necessary, and I do not believe it has proven to be either wise or necessary at this time. I also believe that, as far as that is concerned, it would have been wise to have allowed the State railroad commissions to exercise their powers within their States. If the amendment were limited to the proposition of allowing them to exercise the powers which they had before December 31, 1917, when they took over the railroads, and the limitation of those powers as defined by the Supreme Court of the United States, I would have no objection to the amendment offered by the Senator.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is the Senator familiar with the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the so-called Shreveport case?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am, and I am heartily in accord with it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In that case the Supreme Court held that the Interstate Commerce Commission had a right to raise the rates between Dallas, Tex., and another Texas point, although the State railroad commission had fixed the rates after a careful investigation of all the equities concerned, and although the rates adopted were based on a proper return of revenue upon the capital invested.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am sure that is true, and that is the way I understand the case, and that is the reason why I object to the amendment offered by the Senator. If he will bear with me, I will give my reasons. They may not sound good to him, but they are convincing to me.

It takes a slight historic view of this situation to really understand the Shreveport case. We have to go back as far as the adoption of the commerce clause of the Constitution. The clause in the Federal Constitution that had more to do with the binding together of the States in one central government than any other clause in it was the commerce clause, and it grew out of the fact that we were having a commercial war between the States under the old federation, when one State could adopt its own tariff laws and its own regulations and one State was making war on another. At the port of Newport, R. I., they were attempting to adopt customs tariffs that required their neighbors in New Hampshire, Connecticut, and New York to pay the cost of running the government of Rhode Island. The State of New York was raising a customs barrier across the Hudson River to prevent the commerce of New Jersey from going into New York State and protecting that commerce for itself, and so on down the line. I might give hundreds of instances.

That was not only a commercial war, but it was rapidly approaching a condition where it would have been an actual war between the States if it had been allowed to progress.

Then men like George Washington gathered together to see if some arrangement could not be made to stop that war of commerce between the several States in the federation. Out of that meeting grew the subsequent meetings that ultimately gave birth to our present Constitution. The fathers realized that we could not hold the Union together if commerce in one State was to war on commerce in another State, and they adopted in the Federal Constitution the principles that there should be free trade in these United States, and that a man across a State line should have the same opportunity to dispose of his goods and push his commerce as a man on the other side of the State line.

The State commissions in some of the States have attempted to carry us back to the condition that was in existence before the adoption of the Federal Constitution, not by levying a tariff tax at the State line, but by establishing a railroad discrimination that would let the people in that State control the commerce by discrimination up to the State line against the people living across the State line. That has not only been attempted in the Senator's State, but in some other States, and that is absolutely contrary to the spirit of the Constitution as adopted by the fathers.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. KING. I do not want to interrupt the continuity of his able exposition of this subject, but my understanding has been

that the contention made by the State in the case referred to by the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] was that they were establishing a just and fair rate between the points within the State for freight and passengers with reference to the capital invested in the transportation companies, and not for the purpose of discriminating against any other State; and I think——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As to whether it was a fair rate within the State on the capital invested, of course that question would carry itself to the entire line in its ramifications on every freight rate they levied. This particular rate that was in controversy in the Shreveport case might have been fair and equitable where the distribution of the through rates might not have been. But that is not the question.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, it seems to me there can be a distinction between the two cases, one where the courts of the State justify a rate upon the ground that it is fair for the capital invested, and the attempt to justify a rate where it is discriminatory in aid of internal commerce. In the latter case the courts of the United States ought to reach out and interdict the enforcement of a decree of the State court on the ground that perhaps it was a violation of the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution or at least some provision of the Constitution.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is a violation of the real purpose of the commerce clause of the Federal Constitution.

Mr. KING. Yes, and possibly depriving a person of his property without due process of law.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no contention with the Senator on that point at all. But the Senator from Texas has announced that by the legislation which he proposes in his amendment he purposes to take away from the Supreme Court the power to do the very thing I am contending for. That is the reason why I am objecting to his amendment. If the State commission is merely adjusting a fair business arrangement that is fair to its own people and not discriminatory against its neighbors, I have no objection to it, and I would be in accord with the Senator. But when he goes so far as to say that he offers this amendment to take away the power of the Supreme Court of the United States to say that there is no discrimination against one State in favor of another, I say it goes in the teeth of the very sentiment and foundation of the Constitution of the United States and can bring about nothing but an internecine war in commerce. If one State becomes involved in it, the other will respond, and, instead of having an easy and natural and continuous flow of the commerce of the country along natural lines, we will find ourselves blocked at the borders of every State in the Union by discriminatory railroad tariff rates. Therefore I think we ought to defeat the amendment as it is offered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would the Senator be willing to have an amendment such as I stated a few moments ago, which is simply a proviso "that the initiation and regulation of intrastate rates shall be restored to State control as provided prior to said act of March 21, 1918"? As I understand it, he is in accord with that amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no objection to it. Really, I will state to the Senator, so far as I am concerned, I have always been in favor of the position the Senator from Iowa is arguing here. I was opposed to its being taken away, and, if I could have followed my own lines, we would have let this piece of legislation go over until we take up the whole subject and bring in one single bill to legislate on. But the matter is before the Senate, and it is up to me to vote on it, and I intend to support the bill which the Senator from Iowa has in charge. I have no objection whatever myself to the proposition going as far as the Senator from Tennessee suggests. When we come down to bringing in a general railroad bill to meet the whole situation a few months from now, this thing may have to be changed and readjusted, but I am perfectly willing to restore the status quo in reference to the rate making as it stood before we took over the railroads.

As I understand the proposition of the Senator from Tennessee, I have no objection to it. I have not had a chance to study and read carefully the proposal of the Senator from Texas, but I take his own statement for it that it proposes to prevent the Supreme Court of the United States from continuing to prevent discriminations in commerce, as it did in the Shreveport case.

Mr. SHEPPARD. No, Mr. President.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understood the Senator to say that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My position is subject to no such construction as that placed upon it by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understood the Senator to state that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My object is to write the law so that it can not be construed in such a way as to discriminate against the States.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It takes away the power from the Federal court.

Mr. SHEPPARD. No.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is not my object. I desire to take away no proper power possessed by the court or the Government.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If it is not the object of the Senator, then I hope he will change his amendment. The Constitution of the United States gives the Federal Government power to control commerce between the States, but until the Congress puts a law on the statute books to carry out that amendment the Supreme Court of the United States has no power to enforce it. If by this amendment the Senator from Texas is seeking to repeal or modify the present law so as to take away the power of the Supreme Court of the United States to decide that question, we relegate the whole question back to limbo, where we found it before we adopted the Federal Constitution.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Permit me to say to the Senator that my object is to have the law in such a shape that States will be protected in the control of purely intrastate rates, having no relation to commerce between the States.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I know; but it is not only commerce between the States. Commerce does not mean the actual moving of commerce across a State line. The Supreme Court of the United States has gone far beyond that. If you bring, by reason of your State discrimination, your commerce in Texas up to the line of Louisiana by giving the cities in your State a preferential rate, and thereby prevent, by reason of that preferential rate, the commerce of the State of Louisiana from moving into the State of Texas, you are tearing down the fundamental principle of the Constitution.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, on a shipment wholly within the State of Texas consumers must pay a higher freight rate in order that a city outside of the State of Texas may ship goods into that territory? And they may be compelled to do this, although the lower rate was established by the Texas State commission, after full hearing, and in due regard for sufficient revenue on capital invested?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Undoubtedly.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is a situation which might become intolerable.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Undoubtedly that was the very purpose of granting the power to the Federal Government to regulate commerce between the States. It was in order that we might have free trade between the States of the Union, and the very purpose of the Senator's amendment would be to tear that down. More than that, I want to say that this is a very grave and a very important question, a question that should receive the most careful, full, and deliberate consideration, and I do not think it ought to be passed on by the Senate hastily by an amendment offered on the floor without a careful working out in some committee of the Senate. If the Senator merely wants to restore the status quo of these rate questions before we took the railroads over, I am willing to vote for it; but when he comes down to adopting a new rule, on which the Supreme Court of the United States must function, then I hope to defeat that amendment.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if I may make a suggestion, if this power is to be conferred on the local authorities to the extent indicated by the amendment, it would enable the local authorities to fix a rate which would be out of all proportion to the interstate rate, and thereby place the burden of maintaining the system of transportation upon the interstate rates and relieve the State commerce to that extent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Undoubtedly. The Senator is entirely correct about that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas the amendment that I have already sent to the Secretary's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On line 16, page 3, after the words "transportation systems," insert the following proviso:

Provided, That the initiation and regulation of intrastate rates shall be restored to State control, as provided prior to said act of March 21, 1918.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. While I do not modify in any way the position I have taken on this question, I realize that it opens up a tremendous field of discussion and one that should have

careful analysis and investigation on the part of the Interstate Commerce Committee. Therefore, for the present I shall not insist upon my amendment, but I shall accept the substitute offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

I wish to insert at this point a brief argument which I made before the subcommittee of the Interstate Commerce Committee on this question a few years ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE,
UNITED STATES SENATE,
Friday, June 30, 1916.

* * * * * * *

STATEMENT OF HON. MORRIS SHEPPARD, A SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS.

Senator SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, in view of the shortness of time, I shall make a very brief statement.

The amendment I have introduced is made necessary by the decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission in a proceeding brought by the Railroad Commission of Louisiana, the decision having been rendered on March 11, 1912.

The complaint of the Louisiana Railroad Commission was based on the fact that the rate from Dallas and other Texas points into eastern Texas were lower than the rates into Texas from Shreveport for equal distances. The defendant carriers, the Texas & Pacific and the Houston, East & West Texas Railways, operated lines from Shreveport, La., to Dallas, Tex., and from Shreveport, La., to Houston, Tex., respectively. It was shown that for 60 cents first-class traffic was being carried from Dallas eastward to other Texas points, a distance of 160 miles, while from Shreveport, La., to Texas points the same amount would carry the same traffic only 55 miles.

The defendant carriers claimed that they were required to apply the rates out of Dallas and Houston by the Texas Railroad Commission.

The Interstate Commerce Commission held that the situation constituted an unjust discrimination against Shreveport and ordered the railways heretofore mentioned to charge no higher rates from Shreveport, La., to Texas points than the rates from Texas points eastward and northeastward to other Texas points for like distances. The commission established a scale of rates from Shreveport to Texas points for a distance of 182 miles on the Texas & Pacific Railway and 230 miles on the Houston, East & West Texas Railway.

Let me say here that Shreveport is situated in northwestern Louisiana, about 20 or 30 miles from the eastern border, while Dallas is in north central Texas, about 160 miles west from the east Texas border. Houston is about 250 miles southwest of Shreveport, about 230 miles of the distance being in Texas.

Three of the seven members of the Interstate Commerce Commission—Clements, Harlan, and McChord—dissented from the finding in the case, holding that the commission had no jurisdiction over State rates.

The action of the commission was upheld by the United States Supreme Court (234 U. S., 342). The court said [reading]:

"So far as these interstate rates conformed to what was found to be reasonable by the commission, the carriers are entitled to maintain them and they are free to comply with the order by so adjusting the other rates to which the order relates as to remove the forbidden discrimination. But this result they are required to accomplish."

The court held that the provision of section 1 of the interstate-commerce act that said act had no application to transportation wholly within a State had "appropriate reference to exclusively intrastate traffic, separately considered, and that that act was not limited by this premise when interstate commerce itself is involved."

In 1914 the railroad commission of Louisiana endeavored, by petition duly brought, to have the principles defined in the rulings of the Supreme Court and the Interstate Commerce Commission before quoted applied to the entire territory of Texas. The Interstate Commerce Commission refused this plea, but marked off a large section of the State by drawing a line from Gainesville south to the Brazos River and thence down the Brazos to its mouth, and applied the rules established by the decisions already described to the territory between that line and the western border of Texas. The commission held that in this territory commodity rates should not be greater than class rates, and that the western classification should be observed.

Vigorous objections came from Texas, and the commission ordered the entire matter reopened, the Louisiana commission urging that the rulings before alluded to be extended to all of Texas. This further investigation is still pending, and in the meantime the new rates have been suspended to await final decision. Such is the situation to-day.

Regardless of what the decision may be, the fact remains that the United States Supreme Court has held that the control of the Federal Government over interstate commerce means control over intrastate commerce or commerce wholly within the State. This means that rates on hauls inside a State must depend primarily on rates on hauls originating outside a State. It means that State boundaries are mere fiction and that State sovereignty is an empty name. The State of Texas has large and growing ports through which its wholesale centers receive goods for distribution among its people. And yet it makes no difference how low these inbound rates may be, how efficient the terminal and rail service may be from port to warehouse, how great the volume of business developed at these centers may be, how great and how legitimate the desire to build up enterprises by allowing the lowest consistent rate of carriage to points of delivery—if any or all these factors justify a rate to points within the State lower than the rate from a point outside of the State to the same points, although the point outside the State may not have a single factor in its favor equaling those I have mentioned, the rates from Texas centers to points in Texas must be kept at a parity with the rates from the point outside the State to the same points in Texas. The progress of 5,000,000 people, occupying 265,000 square miles of the most promising territory on the globe, must be subordinated to the interests of a far-inland city, of 35,000 people, in another State.

I have nothing but admiration for Shreveport. My frequent visits there have increased my admiration for its progressive and patriotic people. It has no right, however, to ask that the rate system, builded slowly and ably by the Texas Railroad Commission and adapted to Texas conditions, shall be overturned in order to promote its commercial fortunes.

The Texas Railway Commission can not, under the law, establish any rate unfair to the railroads or the people of Texas; any rate not productive of a fair return on the capital invested in their construction and operation. The State of Texas, through both its own and the Federal Constitution, has authorized its commission to supervise, establish, and regulate railway rates under these conditions. Under the division of powers peculiar to the present system of American Government, Texas has the right to control the rates on shipments entirely within its own borders. This right is part of its reserved sovereignty. To say to Texas that you must fashion your State rates from the standpoint of the interests of another State, and not your own, is to deny that Texas has any identity as a State.

As long as the Texas Railroad Commission fixes rates that are fair to the people and the carriers alike, it lies in nobody's mouth to say that they must rearrange them because interests outside of the State claim injury.

If we consider it desirable to have the Interstate Commerce Commission control intrastate rates, let an amendment to the Constitution be proposed in the usual way, and let the States say whether they wish to surrender the rights they now possess in this regard. Let not the rights be invaded by a process of slow and stealthy usurpation, in violation alike of the Constitution of the Union and the principles of State identity, State unity, and State integrity.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I merely wish to make a very brief statement in reference to the proposed amendment. It is the purpose of the bill to restore the status quo as to the initiation and changing of rates, fares, charges, classifications, regulations, and practices as exercised by the carriers now under Federal control prior to the 29th day of December last. In other words, it restores to the Interstate Commerce Commission the right to regulate rates. When the Government took over the control and operation of the railroads it took part of the jurisdiction that had formerly been exercised by the Interstate Commerce Commission. It also took over the jurisdiction and regulation of rates that had formerly been under control of the State commissions. I think it is manifestly unfair to restore to the Interstate Commerce Commission that part of the jurisdiction which refers to interstate rates and not to restore at the same time the status quo as to intrastate rates.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] on yesterday very clearly and forcefully pointed out the reasons why this jurisdiction over intrastate rates should be restored to the State commissions, and I feel sure that it is but fair and just, and in the very nature of things, that it ought to be done. We should restore the jurisdiction over all rates to the body that exercised that jurisdiction prior to the taking over of the railroads by the Government a year ago.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I wish very much that we were in a position to return these railways to their owners, in which event the full power and authority of the States over intrastate rates would be at once resumed, and very properly resumed; but I want the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to remember that the Government of the United States, not as an established policy, but in order to meet an emergency, in order to aid in the prosecution of the war, is engaged in operating these properties, not as owner, but simply as an operator, simply for the purpose of carrying out its designs, which became necessary in the war. There must be a very great difference between that attitude and an attitude which we will assume when we have established a permanent policy and when we will remit to the State and local authorities all the powers they formerly exercised. If there is no distinction between those two conditions, then, of course, the view of the committee is wrong.

This very question was raised before the committee—that is, the inquiry whether, in the restoration of the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, we would at the same time take away from the President the right to make any rates in a State. Of course, the President has no right to make any rates in a State, except as he got it under the act of March 21, 1918. The committee was unanimous in its opinion that during the short period—we hope a short period—of Government control, in which the President is operating these properties simply for the purpose of caring for an emergency which was thrust upon the people of the United States, that the Government ought not to be required to go to the various State authorities and ask them what the rates for transportation in their respective States should be. I am impressed with the logic of that reasoning; and, as I said to the Senator from Minnesota yesterday, I shall be the last man to withdraw from the States the authority which I believe they have under the Constitution to manage, control, regulate, and supervise purely local business—their own rates—except as the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has said, when they come into contact with rates established by the Federal Government. In that event the Federal Government is, as always, supreme, and the State authority must yield to the general authority. But in the short period through which we are now passing I want the Senators who are suggesting this amendment to

review what the situation would be. If we should adopt the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee, every 2-cent passenger rate in force, either by statute or through the orders of State commissions, would at once be restored; every reduction in rates that has been made by the State authorities would at once be resumed.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] may think that he can assist the people of Texas in having them ride at 2 cents a mile—although I do not know whether his State has such a statute or not—but if that practice is resumed somebody will have to pay the bill. We are already behind $240,000,000 for last year and we are behind more than that this year. Who will pay the bill? It must be paid by general taxation. If we permit the reduced rates in all the States to take effect again, the revenues of the railway companies will fall off accordingly, and we shall be compelled in that event to add to interstate rates, thus increasing the disparity which is so unfortunate if it exists at all.

I hope the Senate will not, during this temporary period, take away the power from the General Government, which we have given to the Government as a war measure to control rates until we have that legislation which we hope will compose the entire situation and will enable the railway companies to resume their business under normal conditions.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to ask, would not the same reasoning adopted by the Senator as to the States be equally strong as to taking away this war authority and giving it back to the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. CUMMINS. No; the Interstate Commerce Commission is a Federal instrumentality. It is just as much charged with the duty from the Federal standpoint of maintaining these rates as is the Director General.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me ask the Senator this question: Suppose the Interstate Commerce Commission should reduce rates generally, as it would have the right to do if this bill passed unamended, and the Director General of Railroads should increase intrastate rates, could not both of those things be done if the bill passes unamended?

Mr. CUMMINS. I think the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] asked me practically the same question——

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not hear the question and the answer.

Mr. CUMMINS. And I answered him in this way: First, it is not conceivable, it is unthinkable, that any such situation shall arise; but if it should arise, in my judgment the Interstate Commerce Commission has entire authority to care for it. The Interstate Commerce Commission has now under the law the authority to create and to maintain the proper relation between the rates in a State and the rates for interstate traffic. It has that authority now.

Mr. McKELLAR. But where there is no relation between interstate and intrastate rates the Director General could apply such rates as he sees fit without regard to State authorities or to State commissions at all; he could increase in each State in the Union the intrastate freight and passenger rates, and he could increase those rates 50 per cent if he so desired and still be within his power, whereas——

Mr. CUMMINS. I have more confidence in a Democratic administration than to believe that is possible.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am submitting a strong case in order to show what the power is. Why leave that power there? If you are going to take away a part of this war power from the Railroad Administration, why not take it all away and restore the status quo?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have endeavored to keep it all in the hands of the Federal Government, where I believe it belongs, until the period of the emergency shall have passed and these properties shall be returned to their owners.

Mr. McKELLAR. But, as I understand the Senator, the Senator believes that the authority that existed within the States before the Federal Government took over the railroads should be ultimately restored to them?

Mr. CUMMINS. I think that there is nothing that can take it away from them. The Constitution preserves to the States, so far as the power to regulate commerce is concerned, whatever authority they have, and Congress is utterly powerless to withdraw that authority from the States. It was only the existence of war that made it possible for the Federal Government to assume the right to prescribe a purely State rate, assuming that it did not discriminate against an interstate rate.

We have not yet returned the property, and we know that we can not do so for some months to come. All that I am insisting upon is, until the period of this emergency shall have passed the power be retained in the Federal Government. I think that is a logical, sound position, and I can not imagine that the people of the States, who are citizens of the United States as well, can be injured by leaving the authority where it now is. Mark you, I do not propose to extend it, but I propose to leave it just where the act of March 21, 1918, placed it.

Mr. KELLOGG addressed the Senate. After having spoken for some time,

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have been informed that there are two or three Senators who desire to speak on this subject, and knowing that we can not conclude the bill to-night, if the Senator from Minnesota is entirely willing, I will make a motion to adjourn.

Mr. KELLOGG. I will yield for that purpose, and conclude to-morrow morning whatever other remarks I have to make.

Mr. CUMMINS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, June 12, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *June 11, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite Spirit, our heavenly Father, in whom we live and move and have our being, let Thy spirit come mightily upon us, to inspire us with large conceptions of life, and truth, and justice; that we may render unto Thee the things that are Thine and unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and so fulfill the law and the prophets in all that we undertake this day; after the manner of the world's Great Exemplar. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF H. R. 5280.

Mr. McKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for change of reference of the bill H. R. 5280 from the Committee on the Public Lands to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for a change of reference of bill H. R. 5280 from the Committee on the Public Lands to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is it about, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. McKINLEY. Mr Speaker, the War Department bought a number of warehouses in Chicago, and among them a cold-storage warehouse. They had no use for the cold-storage warehouse after the armistice, and they traded with the Central Manufacturing Association for a dry-storage warehouse. They made the exchange. The manufacturing association paid a large amount of cash. They discovered when they were going to transfer the title they did not have full power, because the words "cold storage" were not in the power which they had under existing law. The bill was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and was in, if I remember correctly, the Senate bill which was reported but which did not pass. It is a matter for the War Department and one that belongs to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINLEY. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, this is purely a bill that belongs to the Military Committee and not to the Committee on the Public Lands. And in this connection may I again suggest to the gentleman that when they have requests of this kind to make they refer the matter, before making the requests, to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], who ought to be informed in regard to them before they are presented to the House. I was under the impression that the gentleman from Missouri had been informed with regard to this.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is the title of this bill?

Mr. McKINLEY. It is "To authorize the President to dispose of real property by sale, exchange, lease, or otherwise."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if the House will bear with me a minute, I wish to say that I think the suggestion of the gentleman from Wyoming is correct. Somebody has to look after these matters, and unless the gentlemen who have bills inform those who are supposed to look after matters here it precipitates one of these talking fests every morning.

While I was Speaker I asked everybody who wanted to make a motion to recommit, except just a flat motion to recommit, to bring me the motions in advance—and I have no doubt the present Speaker will find that to be of advantage—so you can find out what is in them. Now, half the time you can not hear a thing that goes on in this House, anyhow. Gentlemen get up here with bills that I do not know anything about or anybody else knows anything about. They may be very meritorious, but we do not feel like letting them go through. I have no objection to this change of reference and think it ought to be made.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to suggest that the Chair would be obliged if gentlemen who wish to ask unanimous consent would consult him in advance, and would suggest that in the future the Chair will probably not recognize anyone to ask unanimous consent unless he knows in advance the subject for which unanimous consent is asked.

Is there objection to the request made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKINLEY]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 120) to repeal chapter 154 of the act of the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, being the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

INVESTIGATION OF EXPENDITURES IN WAR DEPARTMENT.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan presents a privileged report from the Committee on Accounts, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Michigan to withhold that until I prefer a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MAPES. I will withhold it.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman from Kansas conferred with the gentleman from Wyoming and the gentleman from Missouri? He certainly has not conferred with the Chair.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I have conferred with the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES]. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 98.

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, appointed under the resolution of the House of Representatives adopted June 4, 1919, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to employ such stenographic, clerical, and legal assistance and such accountants, and to have such printing and binding done as it may deem necessary.

All expenses that may be incurred by said committee, including the expenses of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, when sitting outside of the District of Columbia, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers signed by the chairman of said select committee, or by the chairman of a subcommittee, where such expenses are incurred by such subcommittee.

Also the following committee amendments were read:

Page 1, line 12, correct the spelling of the word "Representatives."
Page 1, line 10, strike out the comma after the word "thereof."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, the amendments have not been adopted yet.

The SPEAKER. The amendments were read. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] has the floor.

Mr. MAPES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. I notice the resolution authorizes this select committee to employ legal counsel.

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I am informed, but I do not know whether my information is correct or not, that about 14 out of the 15 members of this select committee are able and eminent lawyers. I was informed last night by the chairman of this committee that, in his opinion, the committee did not need any legal advice; that it had plenty of legal ability on the committee to advise the committee in all respects. If that is the case, why authorize the employment of legal advice when there are so many eminent and able lawyers on this committee?

Mr. MAPES. I will say to the gentleman that what he says about there being eminent and able lawyers on the committee is true, and my understanding is that the committee does not intend to hire any general counsel, unless in the progress of the investigation it is found necessary to do so. This resolution was submitted to the full membership of the special committee, so the Committee on Accounts was informed, it was recommended unanimously by that committee and reported unanimously by the Committee on Accounts. The chairman of this special committee appeared before the Committee on Accounts and said to that committee that it was not his intention to hire counsel under this provision at present, but he thought the committee ought to have that right if it should be found necessary in the progress of the investigation to do so.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I am afraid if some of these men afterwards went back to the practice of law it might be a lasting reflection on their ability.

Mr. MAPES. Their desire to protect their dignity and standing as lawyers, I presume, will prevent them from hiring unnecessary counsel.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know what may have been said in the committee in regard to the matter of employment of counsel, but I do not think the impression should be left with the House that this committee may not employ counsel, even general counsel—that term has been used—because I think the committee may find it proper and useful and helpful in the public interest to employ counsel. That has been done frequently in the past by committees of this sort. I do not think we should create any impression in the House that that may not be done, that whatever counsel may be deemed necessary and wise and proper may not be employed. My personal opinion is that one of the first things the committee should do would be the employment of counsel.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. MAPES. I desire to yield to one or two Members, but I suggest that we adopt the committee amendments before doing so.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MAPES. I will yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am a member of the Committee on Accounts, which considered this resolution, and I do not think it ought to be adopted by the House without the attention of the House being invited to the broad powers granted in it. There are almost unlimited powers given to the special committee and to the subcommittees that it might be divided into. As a member of the Committee on Accounts I did not object to it, because it was explained to the committee that various subcommittees would be appointed, and they might be sent to different parts of the United States, or perhaps across the water to France, to make certain investigations.

Now, in view of the fact that the House had heretofore authorized this special committee, we felt that we ought not to hamper it in any way in its investigation, and you will note that this resolution provides that the expenses may be paid upon the approval of the chairman of the various subcommittees. The reason why we authorized that and did not require these expenses to come back to the Committee on Accounts for approval was that the subcommittees may be away from Washington at various places throughout the United States or elsewhere. So I am inviting your attention to what is contained in this resolution in order that it may not be regarded as an established precedent. I would not have voted for it——

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes.

Mr. GARD. Is there any limitation on any expenditures for legal assistance?

Mr. HASTINGS. I was about to come to that, if the gentleman will permit. I was about to say that I believe that all these expenditures ought to be approved by the Committee on Accounts except in these exceptional instances.

Now, as to the employment of legal assistance, that question was brought up before the Committee on Accounts, and we were assured by the chairman of this special committee, Mr. GRAHAM, that it was not the purpose of his committee to employ any legal assistance to assist the committee in making any of the investigations, unless perhaps it might be that some subcommittee would find in some State a recalcitrant witness who refused to answer, and it might be necessary to go into the local court in some procedure that the members of the committee were not familiar with. But it was not the intention of the committee or any of these subcommittees to employ any general attorneys for the whole committee or any of the subcommittees.

I want to say to the House that as a member of the Committee on Accounts I asked the chairman of the special committee if he would not come before the House when this resolution was before it and make a statement to that effect, and he assured us that that statement would be forthcoming. I want to say to the House——

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MAPES. I have been waiting to get an opportunity to yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] to make a statement, but so far I have been interrupted so that there has been no opportunity to do so.

Mr. HASTINGS. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I would not have made this statement if it had not been for the statement of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], which seemed to contradict the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM], the chairman of the special committee, before our committee yesterday morning; and if the chairman of the special committee is ready to make such a statement now before the House I am perfectly willing to yield.

But I want to state before yielding that I would not have voted for this resolution in the committee except upon the assurance of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] that it was not the purpose of the committee to employ any general counsel to assist in the development of the facts before the committee, but only in those exceptional cases where witnesses perhaps would decline to answer and where it might be necessary to go into some court and compel them to answer. Now I yield.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I interrupted the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS] to say that I desired to yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM], who is chairman of this special committee, and the only reason why I had not done so before was because of the interruption of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS], who is a member of the Committee on Accounts. His interruption, of course, was perfectly proper. But I had no opportunity up to this time to yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM]. I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM], the chairman of the special investigating committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker and the gentlemen of the House, the other day the House authorized the appointment of a special committee to investigate the expenditures in the War Department. The Speaker honored me by selecting me as chairman of that committee. During the discussions on the proposition I have not taken the floor, and this is my first opportunity to say anything about it.

The work entailed on this committee is necessarily very extensive and will take the constant efforts of the members of that committee for several months to come. In my judgment at least six months will be taken by the membership of the committee in their investigation of these vast expenditures.

As soon as the committee was appointed it was necessary to make some sort of an organization, and I may say to the gentlemen of this House that up to this time no organization of any kind has been effected. The committee has met, but inasmuch as it had no authority by the rules of the House to employ any clerical or other assistance, none has been employed, and hence the work is piling up in my office. My private clerk is swamped with it, and I have as yet no help and have engaged none, nor have I spoken to anyone.

It must be evident to anyone who thinks about the thing that considerable help will be needed. It will be necessary to divide the work of this committee into subdivisions. Just the exact subdivisions have not been worked out by the committee yet, but will be in the near future, as soon as we have the authority to proceed and employ our clerical help. It will be necessary to have several clerks. It will be necessary to have a stenographic force. It undoubtedly will be necessary to have a firm or a number of accountants who can go into the books and accounts of the War Department and can ascertain from an inspection of those books things that we, the members of the committee, do not know. So far as I am personally concerned, I will say frankly to the House that I have no knowledge whatever of bookkeeping or of the keeping of accounts of that kind, and I think the membership of the committee pretty generally are in the same condition of mind; so that it will be necessary in the outstart of our work to hire accountants to represent us. Now, I will say this as regards the matter of counsel. I have said it to the Committee on Accounts and I have said it to men on my own side of the House who have inquired about it: Fourteen of the members of this committee are lawyers. I would like to have this committee go through this work just as economically as it is possible to do it. We expect by the work of the committee to effect economies in the administration of the War Department, and therefore it is not proper, it seems to me, for us to set an example of waste and extravagance in the conduct of the affairs of this committee; and the committee intend, so far as I have talked with them personally, to be as economical as possible. As I say, 14 of us are attorneys in our private business. The other member of the committee is a better lawyer than most of us who are admitted to the bar. So that I think we are reasonably competent to handle the matters suggested to us. I have heard no suggestion from anyone on the committee up to this time that there would be any general counsel employed; but I want to say this to you, that I think it might become necessary under some circumstances for counsel to be employed. I have told the Committee on Accounts that so far as I am personally concerned I do not intend to ask for the appointment of any general counsel until it is necessary to do so. If it is necessary, then the committee will act upon that proposition.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I apprehend that the gentleman will find it will become necessary to employ general counsel, somebody who is thoroughly familiar with the legislation under which the Government has been conducted in carrying on this World War. In other words, I should say if he were not more familiar with it than I am, multiplied by ten, most of the time would be taken up in determining what the law is rather than inquiring into what had been done.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. That may be true. I want to say to you now that my personal judgment is that we ought not to employ general counsel at large expense until we get to a place where we need the assistance of such counsel, and if we need it then we ought to have it, because this investigation that we are starting upon making ought to go to the bottom of these things and ought to find out the facts thoroughly. Both sides of this House are intent upon having that done, I imagine, and it will be done so far as the committee are concerned. So that in the end this vast expenditure of the War Department can be carefully and conscientiously audited and the people of this country may know the facts about the expenditures of this war, as they have a right to know them.

Now, I find in looking over the precedents—I will not weary you with them—that this resolution only follows examples that have been adopted in the past. The so-called leak resolution was adopted in January, 1917. In that proceeding a resolution was offered by Mr. GARRETT to this effect:

That in the performance of the duties imposed upon it by reference to it of House resolution 446 the Committee on Rules shall have the power * * * to employ such stenographic and clerical assistance as may be necessary. The expenses incurred hereunder shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers ordered by this committee and signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on Accounts, evidenced by the signature of the chairman thereof.

Afterwards, on January 17, Mr. POU, from the same committee, offered the following additional resolution:

Resolved, That in the consideration of House resolutions 420, 429, and 446, referred to the Committee on Rules, said committee be, and is—

Now, notice this language—

authorized and empowered to employ counsel to aid in conducting the investigations which it has been directed by the House to make, and also to employ such expert accountants familiar with stock exchange transactions as may be found necessary in conducting said investigations.

In an additional section it was stated that—

The expenses incident to the employment of counsel and accountants and those of the committee or subcommittee when sitting outside of Washington shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers signed by the chairman or acting chairman of said committee.

That precedent is almost exactly like the one we are considering.

In the Ballinger-Pinchot investigation held in 1910 a resolution introduced by Mr. Dalzell provided as follows:

* * * To employ stenographers * * * and to employ such assistance, legal and otherwise, as may be deemed necessary.

All the costs and expenses of said investigation, including all necessary printing, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

There are many other precedents which I do not care to worry you with. In short, let me say I think the House will have to trust the committee to exercise reasonable discretion in making reasonable expenses. So far as I am concerned, I say frankly it will be my effort—and I think I speak for a majority of the committee—to keep down expenses to a reasonable basis and not spend anything out of the Public Treasury that we are not necessarily required to do. If you want the investigation, let us make it right. If we have to have a lawyer—if the united judgment of the committee is that it is necessary—we ought to have the right to employ one. You will have to trust our judgment, discretion, and good sense, hoping and knowing, as I believe you do, that we will exercise the best judgment that we have about the matter.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I will yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I want to ask if the gentleman is not inclined to the opinion that he should follow the precedents of the Pou investigation and ask now for only such help as he needs. The gentleman states that he does not yet contemplate that they will need legal help just now, and, if they find out later that legal assistance is necessary, let him come in and ask for it.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I do not think so, and I will tell the gentleman why. When we get into the investigation many facts will develop. It ought not to be necessary for us to have to stop the work of a subcommittee or the full committee to come into the House and precipitate a discussion about whether we ought to, on account of certain facts then developing before the committee, to hire a lawyer.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all gratified that the gentleman from Illinois, chairman of this important committee, is desirous to keep as low as practicable the expenditures by his committee. But I think the House should understand the magnitude of this investigation, and that there should be no question in the minds of any gentlemen with regard to the possibility of its costing a considerable amount of money. The gentleman from Illinois calls attention to the fact that in a number of instances, with regard to investigations of comparatively limited importance, resolutions almost identical with the one before the House have been passed without any question.

We must trust this committee. The War Department since the war began has expended an enormous sum of money—over sixteen billions—and it has expended it under the trying conditions of war. The American people expect there shall be a fair and honest examination of these expenditures. That is what we anticipate and what we hope for. It will cost a considerable amount of money, and my own personal opinion is that even this splendid committee of able lawyers will need counsel, and they will need what is sometimes called general counsel, and they will need them very early in their investigation.

The fact that counsel is employed, as in the past, will not reflect on these gentlemen, as everybody knows who is familiar with this sort of thing. I do not want to have the resolution adopted with the impression in the minds of any gentlemen that there is going to be any hesitation about employing such counsel and such assistance as may be necessary for the proper investigation that I trust we all on both sides desire. I do not want to leave the impression—it would not be fair to leave an impression—with the House and the country that we do not expect that this investigation will cost much. It may cost a very considerable amount of money. I believe it will. The expenditures will be kept as low as is consistent with a thorough investigation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the genleman yield me five minutes?

Mr. MAPES. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I think everybody is in favor of this resolution. I know I am. It is absolutely necessary for these gentleman to have clerical help. It is absolutely necessary for them to have accountants. It is absolutely necessary for them to have stenographers. Any Member of any considerable experience knows that when some new duty is added to his other duties he gets his own business in a very much belated condition.

Inasmuch as the House has entered on this adventure, which is a very large one, it ought to be made absolutely thorough from top to bottom. There is no question about that. As far as we are concerned on our side, we have no fear about the results of this investigation. As far as employing lawyers is concerned, as a general rule 15 men can conduct these matters—14 of them are lawyers, and very good lawyers—but there may arise some very close and difficult legal problems about the responsibility of people, or about the validity of contracts, that these men would not have time to investigate personally; and on the assurance of the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] that lawyers will not be employed unless they are needed, I see no objection to it.

We all went into this war to win it, and I am going to just take a minute to tell you what I think about this whole business. It will be constantly bobbing up during this Congress as to what happened and what did not happen. I want to say incidentally that I am growing exceedingly weary of so many gentlemen devoting so much time to nagging and criticizing, whether they know anything about what they are talking about or not, and if they do not quit it I am going to get enough time here some day to dress off the whole crowd of naggers. [Applause and laughter.]

The truth is that we got into a stupendous job in that war, and it was sprung suddenly. I do not believe that 5 per cent of the people in the United States believed that we were going to get into that war until we were in it. They kept hoping that we would be able to keep out of it; and we did everything that the Germans thought we could not do, and if they had believed that we could do it they never would have dragged us in. That was to raise a great army, drill it, and send it across the sea in time to help give them a whaling. [Applause.] That is what was the matter with them, and if I were to live a thousand years and studied about it all of the time I would never be able to find out why they did not know that, if we wanted to, we could raise an army of 15,000,000 men and put them in the field, and that practically our material resources are illimitable.

A vast amount of money was spent. We spent the greatest sum that was ever spent by any nation since the world began—forty or fifty billions—and we had to do everything at once. We were all as green as gourds about war. The President was green, and we were green, and the Senate was green, and the American people were green about war.

In the two Houses of Congress there was but one man who had ever set a squadron in the field, and that was Gen. SHERWOOD, who fought in 43 pitched battles during the Civil War. I tell you what I believe will be found out when this is all investigated, and that is that there was some extravagance, a good deal of it, growing out of the hurry with which we did things and the size of the undertaking, and that incompetents were found here and there. You could not study a week to determine whether you would make a man a captain or a colonel or anything of that kind; and, like every war that is sprung suddenly, as this was, there were incompetents up and down the line. There were a good many profiteers, and I wish every one was in the penitentiary, I do not care whether he is a big or a little fellow. [Applause.] I would not be at all surprised if somewhere along the line they found some absolute dishonesty, some plain stealing—not much, but some by some underlings. It has been that way in every war we have ever had. War furnishes opportunity for all sorts of gouging and profiteering. Nevertheless, taken all together, our achievement in conducting the war is splendid, magnificent, glorious.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Michigan to yield me five minutes more.

Mr. MAPES. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It was that way in the Civil War; it was that way even in the brief War with Spain. Those of us who were here then know that the very same complaints were made, and some of them were ascertained to be true. What we want, and I suppose what you Republicans want, is a fair deal in this examination; but my suggestion is that everybody quit nagging and criticizing and lampooning until we ascertain the truth as the result of this investigation which

we are undertaking and which is going to cost a good deal of money. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I take it for granted that nearly everybody engaged in the war desired to do his duty faithfully and well. Some of them did not know how, some of them had to learn how, some of them never did learn how, and some of them never did any good. Take such a vast army as we had in France, and there was bound to be injustices done. You could not run an institution so big as that without it. Accidents happen. Take the expenditure of money here. It is something dreadful, and in the meantime a great many of the newspapers hopped on Congress, no matter what Congress did. We took two days here to pass the first great bond bill, authorizing $7,000,000,000, and the newspapers hopped on us because we did not pass that bill in one day.

When I went home that night, or down to the hotel, after I had signed the bill my wife said to me, "When you ran for Congress the first time you put in about half of your time lambasting Speaker Reed and his Congress for being a billion-dollar Congress. Suppose somebody had got up in the audience and said, 'Mr. CLARK, you will live to sign a bill after two days' consideration that carries seven billion of dollars,' what would you have thought about it?" I replied that I would have said that the fellow who said such a thing ought to be put into a strait-jacket in a padded cell. [Laughter.] That is the way the American people thought about it.

It is astounding that we raised an Army of four million and a half men and sent over two millions of them to France in a few months, that we gave sustenance and help and food and raiment to half the nations in Europe and are still not bankrupt ourselves. [Applause.] It is the most monumental job ever undertaken by the children of men, and we accomplished it and accomplished it well and thoroughly, and as Admiral Schley said about the results of the naval victory in Cuban waters, there is glory enough for all. Let us quit quarreling. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment——

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offered the amendment before the gentleman moved the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman did not, because he was not recognized for that purpose.

Mr. BLANTON. I asked the Chair to take notice that I desired to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair took notice of it. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution as amended.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. I offer a motion to recommit it to the committee.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was passed and to lay that on the table.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask to be recognized to offer a motion to recommit to the committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that this resolution be recommitted to the Committee on Accounts with instructions to forthwith report it back to the House, with the following amendments, to wit:

On line 5, page 1, after the word "clerical," strike out the comma and the words "and legal."

And if it is in order I would like to be heard on the motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the motion comes too late.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the motion comes too late. The resolution has been passed. This is not like a bill where there are three readings. It is a simple resolution, and there is but one reading, and the resolution has been agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. During what stage of the proceedings in action upon a House resolution does it become in order to offer a motion to recommit to the committee unless it is immediately after the vote taken on the passage?

The SPEAKER The Chair would say at any time before the passage.

Mr. BLANTON. The bill has not been passed finally, I submit as a point of order.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to be heard?

Mr. BLANTON. I desire to be heard.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I lay down the broad, true proposition that a lawyer is a poor criterion to fix the fee of another lawyer——

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAPES. That the gentleman is not discussing the point of order that he raised.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas must, of course, discuss the point of order as to why the motion to recommit is in order.

Mr. BLANTON. I thought the Chair recognized me on the motion.

The SPEAKER. No; on the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the motion to recommit any piece of legislation is after the bill has been engrossed and read the third time.

The SPEAKER. And before it has been passed.

Mr. BLANTON. After it has been engrossed and read the third time. Then, as I understand it, it is in order to offer a motion to recommit. As I understand it, the vote which was taken in the House on this resolution was the same as a vote to engross and read the bill the third time, and I submit——

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I make the point of order that the Chair has ruled upon the question——

The SPEAKER. The Chair decided that he would hear the gentleman on his point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I submit to the Speaker in all fairness and in all earnestness that the Speaker saw and heard me on my feet stating that I desired to offer an amendment before the motion was made by the chairman of this committee for the previous question. The Speaker, of course, had the right to ignore a Member on the floor. The Speaker has it in his power to ignore any man on the floor who desires to offer an amendment to a piece of legislation and be heard upon it, but I take it that under the statement that the Speaker made to the House at the time he was elected Speaker in this great House of Representatives that he would at all times be fair to every Member concerning all legislation offered——

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I raise a question of order that the gentleman is entirely out of order. The Speaker has ruled upon the question, the resolution has been adopted, and there is nothing before the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REAVIS. I make the point of order that the lecture the gentleman is giving the Chair is not a discussion of the point of order now before the House and that he is not speaking to the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must confine himself to the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I submit I have done everything within the power of a Member of this House to offer an amendment to change the reading and terms of this resolution.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. BLANTON. Not right now; I am speaking to the point of order. [Laughter.] I submit, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness that I have a good motion here, a motion which would tend to perfect this resolution in the interest of the chairman of the select committee, if you please, in the interest of the chairman of the Committee on Accounts, along with the very purpose and intention of the chairman of the select committee on investigation. If properly amended, I am not against this resolution——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will confine himself to the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Therefore I submit to the Speaker, if I am to be cut off from offering an amendment, what other way have I to propose to the House of Representatives a change in this resolution, except that the Speaker had ruled me out of order and after the Speaker had ruled the previous question in order to make a motion immediately thereafter to recommit this resolution?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Texas rose and said he wished to offer an amendment, and at the same time the gentleman from Michigan who had charge of the bill rose and moved the previous question. The Chair followed the precedent of all Speakers in recognizing the gentleman who had charge of the bill for the motion for the previous question. If the House wished to consider the amendment of the gentleman from Texas and did not wish the previous question it could have voted it down. The previous question, however, was ordered by the House and the gentleman then made no motion to recommit. The resolution itself was then adopted, and after the resolution was adopted the

gentleman from Texas offered a motion to recommit. The time for the motion to recommit is before the passage of a bill, but a resolution differs from an ordinary bill, because with an ordinary bill there is a third reading and after that and before the passage of the bill the motion to recommit must be made. Here there was no third reading, so there was but one motion for the passage of the resolution and the motion to recommit should have been made before that motion. It can not be made after the resolution has passed. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed and to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was passed and to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the right to make the motion.

Mr. BLANTON. I object to the two motions being put.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to reconsider——

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider and lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to reconsider and lay the motion on the table.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the ayes had it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count.

Mr. BLANTON (during the count). Mr. Speaker, I will not delay the proceedings now.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Two hundred and twenty-seven Members are present, a quorum.

So the motion was agreed to.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3478, the third deficiency bill, disagree to all the Senate amendments, and to ask for a conference with the Senate.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will allow the Chair to state the motion. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3478, being an appropriation bill, to disagree to all of the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I will state to the chairman of the committee that by amendment No. 49 the Senate has placed as a rider upon this appropriation bill a provision appropriating $272,000 for the United States Employment Service, in a blanket appropriation, without any limitations or restrictions. If the unanimous request of the gentleman is permitted, will the gentleman now assure the House that before amendment No. 49 is agreed to in conference he will give the membership of this House a chance to vote on that amendment separately?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that but very few days remain of this fiscal year. I think he will appreciate the conferees will have to work with considerable expedition to get the bill in shape and have it passed before the end of the fiscal year. I hope that our work may progress in such a way that if there is any desire on the part of the House to vote on that particular amendment they may have that right. But to say to the House that this amendment or that amendment will be brought back, I hardly think is a question that gentlemen ought to ask.

Mr. BLANTON. May I ask the gentleman this question: After the statement made by an auditor of this Government, which I placed in the RECORD yesterday, concerning the manner in which the $5,500,000 of blanket appropriations heretofore made by this Congress have been spent and thrown away and wasted by this United States Employment Service, is the gentleman in favor of permitting this amendment No. 49 to remain in the bill?

Mr. GOOD. In regard to that, whether I am in favor of any amendment or not, is hardly the question that should govern the conferees. So far as possible they should carry out, if possible, the will of the body they represent. We must agree to the bill in some way, and I do not see how the conferees in agreeing to the bill can take into question some alleged waste that might result. But I will say to the gentleman that if he can convince the conferees that there is any—or, I do not say a majority, but even a respectable number of the membership of the House—when this particular amendment is brought before the House, I am sure there will be no disposition on the part of the conferees to do otherwise than to comply with the request.

Mr. BLANTON. I took it for granted that the House would want to vote on that question, to properly safeguard this $272,000 of the people's money.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman is convinced of that fact, there will be no disposition to prevent a vote.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman can give us no assurance that there will be?

Mr. GOOD. I can not.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I object.

MEMORIAL FROM PHILIPPINE COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from the Philippines [Mr. DE VEYRA] be permitted to present a unanimous-consent request at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from the Philippines [Mr. DE VEYRA] is recognized to prefer a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. DE VEYRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a memorial from the Commissioners from the Philippines to the joint commission of the House and Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from the Philippines asks unanimous consent that a memorial by the Commissioners from the Philippines be inserted in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

CORRECTION IN ENROLLMENT OF INDIAN BILL.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill H. R. 2480, entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920," the Clerk be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to strike out the word "and" in line 14 of page 66 of said bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. WALSH. That ought to be explained, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the enrolling clerk in enrolling the bill found the word "and" a superfluous one, and which disjointed a sentence, and it is for the purpose of making it read correctly that this resolution is introduced.

Mr. WALSH. I did not know that the word "and" ever disjointed anything. I thought it had the contrary effect.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, is this a joint resolution?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It is a concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes, in order to bring to the attention of the House what I consider the greatest single-handed achievement of a private soldier in the recent war.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. KAHN. I will have to object to that, and would suggest to the gentleman that he can do it under the five-minute rule when the Army bill is up for consideration.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I renew the request that I made, to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3478, disagree to all of the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3478, disagree to all the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection, provided the conferees——

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, there is no qualification in that. The gentleman must either object or he does not object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair agreed to recognize the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move now that the conferees be instructed to insist on the elimination of Senate amendment No. 49.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the motion that if such a motion should be passed by the House we would have no conference, that the House Members would be bound to go over there and do a thing which the Senate would not consider under any circumstances.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's point of order is in the nature of an argument against the motion of the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. The ground of my point of order is that the gentleman's point of order is not in order under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is in order under the rule. The gentleman from Texas moves that the conferees be instructed to disagree to Senate amendment No. 49.

Mr. BLANTON. And on that, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The yeas and nays are demanded. Those in favor of taking the vote by yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Only two gentlemen have risen, and the yeas and nays are refused. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 2, noes 216.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair counted 218, a quorum.

Mr. BLANTON. I demand tellers, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MADDEN. I make the point of order that the demand for tellers is not in order to verify the count of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks he has discretion as to that, but the Chair wishes to be fair and will order tellers.

Mr. WALSH. No, Mr. Speaker; it is proper to ask for a count. The gentleman from Texas demanded tellers, and the tellers should only be granted by count of the House.

The SPEAKER. On what ground does the gentleman from Texas demand tellers?

Mr. BLANTON. I thought possibly the Chair might have made a mistake, he being human.

The SPEAKER. The Chair regrets to say that the gentleman is not allowed to ask for tellers on that ground. The rules do not allow it. The noes have it, and the Chair appoints the following conferees on the part of the House: Mr. GOOD, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. LINTHICUM (at the request of Mr. COADY), by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. MURPHY] be granted leave of absence for seven days, on account of serious illness in his family.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would suggest that hereafter such requests be handed in in regular form to the Chair.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5227, the Army appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5227, the Army appropriation bill, with Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5227, the Army appropriation bill. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENCIES OF THE ARMY.

For all contingent expenses of the Army not otherwise provided for and embracing all branches of the military service, including the office of the Chief of Staff; for all emergencies and extraordinary expenses, including the employment of translators, and exclusive of all other personal services in the War Department or any of its subordinate bureaus or offices at Washington, D. C., or in the Army at large, but impossible to be anticipated or classified; to be expended on the approval and authority of the Secretary of War, and for such purposes as he may deem proper, including the payment of a per diem allowance not to exceed $4, in lieu of subsistence, to employees of the War Department traveling on official business outside of the District of Columbia and away from their designated posts, $1,000,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I wish to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 2, line 15, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$300,000."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment proposes to reduce the amount in this item from $1,000,000 to $300,000. The amount passed by the last Congress under this item was $100,000, so that in my amendment I allow an addition of $200,000 for any unexpected expenditure which might be authorized under this section.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. I did not catch from the reading what the item was for.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is for contingencies for the Army. We appropriated last year $100,000. This bill carries $1,000,000.

Mr. CARTER. What is that used for? Will the gentleman explain that?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. As I explained in my statement before the committee the day before yesterday, the greater part of this $1,000,000 would go to the support of the bureau of the director of sales of surplus supplies. My statement will be found on page 903 of the RECORD, and I call the attention of the committee to the testimony in the hearings, commencing on page 415. Mr. Hare, the director of the sales department, formerly of the United States Gas & Improvement Co. of Philadelphia, draws a salary of $25,000. You will find his testimony in the hearings. His first assistant receives a salary of $10,000, and he has two assistants receiving a salary of $8,000 each, and he has nine chiefs of sections receiving $6,000 each.

Some of this money will also be needed by Mr. Hare to take a trip to Europe for a week. He says that he has no accurate knowledge of conditions of foreign markets. Let me read you what he says, on page 419 of the hearings. He says:

I have at the moment no accurate knowledge. But my thought was, if it was decided to make an appropriation as asked for, that before I could tell the Secretary what kind of an organization I needed I should take two of my best men and perhaps go to Europe for a week or so to size up the situation, and then come back. I do not believe it is practical to size up the situation accurately from this side. It certainly would not be my intention, inside of the next week or two, if we were given the authority, to say I should take over any number of men to Europe. I think the thing has got to be approached carefully and a study made, which we have not yet had time to make.

That is only to give you an idea of some of the plans proposed for which this $1,000,000 is asked. I will ask the gentlemen of the committee to read carefully the testimony of Mr. Hare. He testified that he was desirous of making a good record—and that is commendable—and that he wanted the best available assistance; that the men he now has in his service were all making more money in civil life, and that he needed more help. Now, the implication naturally is that these salaries are to be increased and more experts employed.

I do not know Mr. Hare. He is a splendid looking gentleman—a great, big, fine, strapping man—and as he sat there testifying I could not help thinking how splendid he would have looked in khaki uniform. He says that he has several officers, very able and capable men, assisting him, but that these officers are only drawing the salaries of their rank. Now, gentlemen, he admits that he has capable officers in his various departments.

Will anyone here explain why we can not take those officers—why they can not be formed into a committee to dispose of these surplus supplies?

I want to call the attention of the committee to the copper contract, which appears on page 426 of the hearings. Here it is:

EXHIBIT I.

DIRECTOR OF SALES CONTRACT NO. III—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND UNITED METALS SELLING CO.—PURCHASE, STORAGE AND TRAFFIC DIVISION, UNITED STATES ARMY—CONTRACT FOR SALE OF COPPER.

APRIL 10, 1919.

This contract, made this 10th day of April, 1919, by and between the United States of America, by C. W. Hare, director of sales (hereinafter called the contracting officer), acting under direction of the Director of Purchase, Storage and Traffic, and under authority of the Secretary of War, pursuant to the provisions of an act of Congress approved July 9, 1918 (Public—193—65th Cong., p. 6), of the first part, and the United Metals Selling Co., a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware, acting for and on behalf of various copper producers, and having its principal office at 42 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (hereinafter called the purchaser), of the second part: Witnesseth,

Whereas certain copper hereinafter described has been procured and acquired by the United States since April 6, 1917; and

Whereas the United States deems it expedient to dispose of the same to the best advantage:

Now, therefore, the parties hereto, in consideration of the mutual agreements herein contained, have agreed and do hereby agree as follows:

ARTICLE 1. Material to be sold: The United States shall sell and deliver to the purchaser not more than 100,000,000 pounds of electrolytically refined copper, or at its option prime Lake copper, 99.9 per cent pure, and not more than 5,000,000 pounds of copper scrap, and the purchaser shall receive and pay for the same upon the following terms and conditions:

ART. 2. Shapes and grades: A. The copper is to be in the usual commercial shapes of ingots, ingot bars, wire bars, cakes, or slabs.

B. Copper in other than the usual commercial shapes (determined by agreement between an experienced and duly authorized representative of the contracting officer and an experienced and duly authorized representative of the purchaser, and, in the event of their failure to agree, by a third person selected by those two, whose decision shall be final and binding on both parties) shall be delivered to the nearest available refinery at the cost of the United States.

C. Copper scrap, which term shall include what is usually known as scrap, provided the copper is not alloyed with any other metal, shall be delivered at the cost of the United States to the nearest available refinery equipped for handling such material.

The copper content of such scrap copper shall be determined at the refinery by electrolytic assay.

Should any dispute arise as to the assay, a sample of the scrap copper shall be submitted for analysis to Lucius Pitkin (Inc.), 47 Fulton Street, New York City, or Ledroux & Co., 99 John Street, New York City, for determination of analysis. The fee and expense involved in such analysis shall be paid by the party in error.

The purchaser shall furnish to the contracting officer certified assay and sworn weight certificates.

ART. 3. Inventory: The quantity and location of the copper and copper scrap shall be in accordance with an inventory attached to and made a part of this contract, and marked "Schedule A." At any time within three months from the date of this contract the contracting officer may furnish to the purchaser additional inventories for copper and/or copper scrap, provided the purchaser may refuse to purchase any copper or copper scrap included under said additional inventories, and in such event shall give a written notice thereof to the contracting officer within 10 days of the receipt of any additional inventory.

Subject to all terms and conditions of this contract, the quantities included in additional acceptable inventories shall be delivered and paid for in approximately equal quantities each month during the unexpired term of this contract.

The copper and copper scrap specified in said inventories shall be the copper and copper scrap sold and purchased hereunder.

ART. 4. Shipping: The cost of loading the copper or copper scrap on cars or lighters will be paid by the United States, except loading charges at the plants or refineries of the purchaser. From time to time upon receipt of shipping instructions the United States will promptly load the copper or copper scrap specified in said shipping instructions on cars or lighters furnished by it.

Title to the copper in usual commercial shapes shall pass on loading at the locations designated in Schedule A, as evidenced by bill of lading or other document showing shipment, except as hereinafter provided, and no further responsibility shall attach to the United States in respect thereto.

If in the judgment of the purchaser it should be necessary to transfer not more than 50 per cent of the copper herein contracted for from such location as may be designated by the contracting officer to the Raritan Arsenal or to such other United States depot as may be agreed upon by the parties to this contract, such transfer, at the cost of the United States, will be made with reasonable dispatch. In such event title to the copper so transferred will pass upon loading at said arsenal or such other United States depot as evidenced by bill of lading or other document showing shipment, and no further responsibility shall attach to the United States in respect thereto.

Title to copper in other than usual commercial shapes and to scrap copper shall pass on delivery at the plants or refineries of the purchaser, and no further responsibility shall attach to the United States in respect thereto.

The purchaser shall pay the cost of transporting said copper in other than usual commercial shapes, and said scrap copper from the locations designated in Schedule A or in additional acceptable inventories to the nearest available refinery equipped for the handling of such material. Transportation charges so paid shall be deducted from the amounts due from the purchaser to the United States. Adjustment of transportation charges will be made on monthly settlement days, it being the intention of this contract that the United States shall reimburse the purchaser for all transportation charges paid by it in accordance with the provisions of this article. The purchaser shall furnish to the contracting officer sworn statements of freight charges paid, together with copies of receipted freight bills.

ART. 5. Delivery: The copper delivered by the United States and taken by the purchaser shall be not less than the quantities indicated in the following schedule of deliveries:

	Pounds.
During the month of April, 1919	5,000,000
During the month of May, 1919	5,000,000
During the month of June, 1919	5,000,000
During the month of July, 1919	5,000,000
During the month of August, 1919	5,000,000
During the month of September, 1919	5,000,000
During the month of October, 1919	5,000,000
During the month of November, 1919	5,000,000
During the month of December, 1919	5,000,000
During the month of January, 1920	5,000,000
During the month of February, 1920	10,000,000
During the month of March, 1920	10,000,000
During the month of April, 1920	10,000,000
During the month of May, 1920	10,000,000
During the month of June, 1920	10,000,000

Should the total sales of copper owned or controlled by the purchaser and all producers of copper represented by it in any one month during the months of April, 1919, to January, 1920, both inclusive, exceed 50,000,000 pounds, and during the months of February, 1920, to June, 1920, both inclusive, exceed 100,000,000 pounds, in such event the quantities specified in the above schedule shall be increased by an amount equal to 20 per cent of such excess. It is further agreed that by mutual agreement between the contracting officer and the purchaser that the quantities specified in this article may be further increased in any one month.

Deliveries of such excess quantity shall be made during the succeeding month, the copper to be paid for at the contract price during the month within which such additional copper was sold. It is understood that such increase shall not relieve the purchaser from its obligation to take the schedule requirements for any subsequent month until all the copper and copper scrap herein contracted for has been taken.

The purchaser shall furnish to the contracting officer on the 5th day of each succeeding month during the currency of this contract a sworn statement of the total sales of the preceding month, as reported by the producers represented by it.

It is expressly understood and agreed that the entire quantity of copper and copper scrap herein contracted for shall be taken and removed by the purchaser on or before June 30, 1920.

ART. 6. Weighing: The copper herein contracted for shall be weighed at the cost of the United States at the locations designated in Schedule A, or at the locations designated in additional acceptable inventories, or at the Raritan Arsenal, or other acceptable United States depot, by experienced and duly qualified weighers. The purchaser may at its expense maintain an inspector at the point at which each shipment is weighed. Such inspector shall have authority to properly inspect scales and weights. Any disputes as to weights shall be determined by agreement between an experienced and duly authorized representative of the contracting officer and an experienced and duly authorized representative of the purchaser, and, in the event of their failure to agree, by a third person selected by these two, whose decision shall be final and binding on both parties.

ART. 7. Contract price: (1) The contract price for copper in usual commercial shapes is hereby fixed at the monthly average New York price for electrolytic copper, as quoted by the Engineering and Mining Journal (published in New York).

(2) The contract price for copper in other than the usual commercial shapes is hereby fixed at the monthly average New York price for electrolytic copper, as quoted by the Engineering and Mining Journal (published in New York), less one-half cent per pound.

(3) The contract price for the copper content of the scrap copper is hereby fixed at the monthly average New York price for electrolytic copper, as quoted by the Engineering and Mining Journal (published in New York), less 1¼ cents per pound.

In the event that no average monthly price shall be fixed by said Journal for any month during the currency of this contract, the contract price for such month shall be fixed by agreement between a duly authorized representative of the contracting officer and a duly authorized representative of the purchaser, and, in the event of their failure to agree, by a third person selected by these two, whose decision shall be final and binding on both parties.

The contract price for the various shapes and grades of the copper shall be determined on the 5th day of May and on the 5th day of each succeeding month during the currency of this contract.

The contract price determined as above shall apply to all copper and copper scrap which the purchaser has agreed to receive and pay for during the preceding month.

The United States shall allow the purchaser a deduction of 1 per cent of the contract price upon all copper and copper scrap delivered and taken hereunder to cover all necessary expenses in connection with the sale of said material, including storage, unloading, freight charges to the plants of the purchaser's vendees, weighing and assaying charges, and all other incidental expenses, including superintendence, but excluding deductions referred to in subparagraphs 2 and 3 of this article 7.

The contract price shall be paid by the purchaser to the United States in gold or its equivalent at Washington, D. C., or other points indicated by the United States on or before the 15th day of the second month for each month's quota as heretofore specified.

ART. 8. General provisions: The purchaser shall from time to time, and whenever so requested, furnish to the contracting officer statements and reports on the progress of the performance of this contract and full information of all factors relating to performance hereunder. The purchaser agrees at all times to do all things necessary to protect and conserve the best interests of the United States.

ART. 9. Causes beyond the control of the purchaser and the United States: Neither party shall be held responsible for or be deemed to be in default hereunder by reason of delays in performance of this contract due to strikes, transportation embargoes, fires, explosion, riots, acts of God, or other causes beyond their control.

ART. 10. Use of copper by United States: Upon notice in writing from the contracting officer to the purchaser the United States may for its own purposes, but not for resale, use any of the copper herein contracted for prior to the resale thereof by the purchaser.

ART. 11. Officials not to benefit: No Member of or Delegate to Congress or Resident Commissioner is or shall be admitted to any share or part of this contract or to any benefit that may arise therefrom, but this article shall not apply to this contract so far as it may be within the operations or exceptions of section 116 of the act of Congress approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat., 1109).

ART. 12. Contract not transferable: Neither this contract nor any interest therein shall be transferred by the purchaser to any other party, except to the extent permitted by section 3477, United States Revised Statutes.

ART. 13. Notice: Any notice to the purchaser under this contract when not actually delivered in writing to the purchaser shall be deemed to have been sufficiently given when mailed in a sealed postpaid wrapper addressed to the purchaser at 42 Broadway, New York, N. Y. Any notice to the United States under this contract, when not actualy delivered in writing to the contracting officer, shall be deemed to have been sufficiently given when mailed in a sealed postpaid wrapper addressed to the director of sales, War Department, Washington, D. C.

ART. 14. Bond: The purchaser shall furnish to the United States within 20 days after the execution and delivery of this agreement a bond in the sum of $1,000,000, conditioned upon the full and faithful performance by the purchaser of all terms, covenants, and conditions of this contract on the part of the purchaser to be performed. Such bond shall be in the form and with sureties satisfactory to the contracting officer. Unless such bond is furnished within the time limit this agreement may, at the option of the contracting officer, be canceled.

ART. 15. Adjustment of claims and disputes: Except as otherwise specifically provided in this contract, any claims, doubts, or disputes which may arise under this contract, or as to its performance or nonperformance, may be determined upon petition of the party hereto by the Secretary of War. The decision of the Secretary of War shall be final and conclusive on all matters submitted for determination.

ART. 16. Definitions: Contracting officer: The officer in whose name this contract is executed, his successor or successors, or anyone from time to time designated by the Director of Purchase, Storage and Traffic to act as contracting officer, and his or their duly authorized agent or agents who may be specifically delegated to perform the various functions herein attributed to the contracting officer.

The purchaser: The party of the second part, its legal representatives and successors.

In witness whereof the parties hereto have caused this contract to be executed and delivered in triplicate by the proper officers thereunto duly authorized the day and year first above written.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
By C. W. HARE, *Contracting Officer.*
UNITED METALS SELLING CO.,
By T. WOLFSON, *Vice President, Purchaser.*

Witnesses:
C. T. LEWIS.
MORRIS MYERS.

Schedule A attached to and a part of a certain contract between the United States of America and the United Metals Selling Co., dated the ——— day of April, 1919.

COPPER.

Baltimore, Md	2,849,342
Providence, R. I	100,000
Worcester, Mass	18,161
Springdale, Conn	600,519
Waterbury, Conn	13,108,999
Bristol, Conn	2,050,850
Springfield, Mass	958,142
New Haven, Conn	287,527
Bridgeport, Conn	4,204,206
Ansonia, Conn	3,380,000
Seymour, Conn	3,715,000
Torrington, Conn	735,000
Madison, Wis	51
Hammond, Ind	320
Dayton, Ohio	511,381
Louisville, Ky	3,967
Indianapolis, Ind	249
Kings Mills, Ohio	267
Nashville, Tenn	5,530
Toledo, Ohio	53,490
Cleveland, Ohio	3,446,467
Lisbon, Ohio	1,756,648
Detroit, Mich	13,120,719
Port Huron, Mich	892,238
Philadelphia, Pa	950
Eddystone, Pa	240,408
Rankin, Pa	900,576
Huntington, W. Va	146,030
Rome, N. Y	13,314,651
Ithaca, N. Y	12,220
Buffalo, N. Y	6,374,216
Watertown, N. Y	1,718,089
Brooklyn, N. Y	173,498
Perth Amboy, N. J	375,422
Elizabeth, N. J	1,874
Hastings, N. Y	2,018,915
East Alton, Ohio	2,229,338
Lachine, Province of Quebec	2,364,792
New Toronto, Ontario	63,482
Total	81,733,535

SCRAP COPPER.

Penniman, Va	1,925
Perryville, Md	7,037
Baltimore, Md	2,000
Derby, Conn	828,000
Indianapolis, Ind	2,575
Dayton, Ohio	33
Erie, Pa	37,750
Rankin, Pa	35,129
Huntington, W. Va	23,560
Rome, N. Y	1,950,536
Perth Amboy, N. J	5,750,000
Total	8,638,545

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I went into this question the other day, and I ask the committee to read that copper contract carefully and see if it does not give absolute power to the copper monopoly in this country to dispose of this copper as they see fit. The contract speaks for itself. Besides making a profit at the time these copper people sold this copper to the United States, they are now to receive a commission for reselling this copper in such manner as will not disturb the prices that they fixed. Not only to prevent a disturbance of the market. Get the difference between the two. The purpose does not seem to be to prevent dumping on the market and disturbing the market, but rather to maintain the margin of profit fixed by the people who control the copper and still retain control. I believe that a happy medium could have been found.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, this is only a matter of a million dollars, I will say to the gentleman. Never mind the order.

On the lumber which we have for sale the lumber people were called in conference, and they are selling the lumber on a commission of 12 per cent.

Now, I want to point out to the committee that these commissions—12 per cent here and 3 per cent there—given to the agency which actually disposes of these surplus supplies do not come out of this $1,000,000. They come out of the proceeds of the sales, and this $1,000,000 is the overhead charge for the luxury of having this board of experts in Washington.

Now, I agree that the Government should get the best available price without disturbing the market for surplus supplies, but I am certain that the officers now in the various departments, who actually get the customers, who actually get the prices, can continue to do so, can be formed into a joint board among themselves, and that we can easily save $700,000 on this item alone.

It does not take a trip to Europe of these three men to find out what the condition of the market is. We have committees there; we have a liquidating commission there now, which has sold millions of dollars' worth of surplus supplies of the American Expeditionary Forces to France and to neutral countries. Everyone knows the condition of the market there. Lumber will sell itself. If we can get the lumber there, it will sell itself. We do not need to spend a lot of time and money for this extra joy trip to Europe. This has nothing to do with getting the boys home. Let us understand that. This has nothing to do with the military policy or with the reorganization scheme. This is purely an appropriation in a lump sum of money to increase by $900,000 over the amount provided for in the bill last year, over which we have no control, to be spent on the testimony given by the director of this office on salaries ranging from $25,000 to $6,000, and where more help is to be employed. If you will examine the testimony, you will see that this bureau does not exercise the function of directing the sales. It acts purely in an advisory capacity. The actual sales are made by officers in the United States Army, patriotic men who entered the service and are ready to see the war through without asking salaries of $25,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman will admit, however, that all sales made by the bureaus of the department before being completed must be submitted to the central board.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. All sales over $100,000.

Mr. MADDEN. They have control of the coordination of the whole situation and stabilizing the sales, and thereby saving the Government a lot of money.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If the gentleman will read the testimony, it has not worked out that way.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will yield.

Mr. KAHN. My recollection is that Mr. Hare testified that some few transactions that he has had have already got better prices for commodities through his intercession and saved the Government to the extent of $4,000,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Can the gentleman from California give us some of the articles?

Mr. KAHN. I can not recollect; I have not had an opportunity to go into the details of the hearings, but I think he made that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KAHN. On pages 410 and 411 of the hearings the director of sales gives a number of items of raw material where in-

creased prices were received by the Government through his activity.

Then he says:

So you see by following that intensive method it has resulted in the saving of $4,000,000, or in getting an increased price to that amount over and above what the bureau had originally intended to accept.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; those figures were read, but there was nothing before the committee which showed what the offers were submitted to this bureau. This is mostly on metal, and this metal was not sold through the efforts of the director of sales, but simply put into the hands of the copper people. It was along these lines that the director of sales testified. He did not point to anything concrete. There was some testimony about a saving of $10,000,000 by the Ordnance Department, but when cross-examined by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WISE], on page 415, he says:

You disapprove entirely the appropriation asked for for cleaning and repairing?

Mr. HARE. No; I do not, because I am not familiar enough with the details of the appropriation.

Now, I want that to go into the RECORD, because there will be some statements made about this mysterious $10,000,000. But he did not know what the Ordnance Department was talking about.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Is it fair to speak of this as "a mysterious $10,000,000"? Anybody who knows anything about machinery knows that when you lay it up you have to grease it, clean it, put it in a position where it will not deteriorate, and if it takes $10,000,000 to do that with the machinery, guns, and equipment that the Ordnance Department has, that is what it takes, and it ought to be done.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly, and the Ordnance Department knows what it is talking about. I agree with what the gentleman has said; but here is a man who says he does not know what they are talking about, and that is the point I desire to make.

Mr. MADDEN. He was acting as a salesman, not as a mechanic.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a substitute amendment for that of the gentleman from New York, and that is to substitute $500,000 for $300,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the amendment of Mr. LAGUARDIA by Mr. MCKENZIE: Strike out $300,000 and insert in lieu thereof $500,000.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if you will give me your attention for a few moments I will endeavor to explain the reason for offering this amendment. In the first place, this whole discussion applying to the language written in the bill is not consistent. What the War Department asked with additional language by adding to the first paragraph of the bill would make the appropriation and the language agree. The fact is that in the last bill presented to this House we agreed to give them $100,000. The War Department asked for $200,000 to cover incidental expenses. A few days ago the Secretary of War appeared before our committee and said he would like to have us amend that and give them $1,000,000, and his reason for asking that amount was, as he stated, that in France we have what is known as the United States Liquidation Bureau, an organization to dispose of property in France, and that in this country Assistant Secretary Crowell had built up in the War Department what was known as the director of sales department, with Mr. Hare at the head of that organization.

It was further testified that the probable expense of paying the personnel of the experts and others employed under Mr. Hare would be $250,000. The Secretary of War in asking for $1,000,000 stated—and this was in the hearings—that the whole amount was speculative and that no one could tell whether a million dollars would be sufficient to pay the entire expenses or not. With that statement of the Secretary of War I fully agree. It was testified to before our committee that in the Ordnance Department they have a sales organization, men picked out for the purpose, who are now putting the property of the Ordnance Department on the market and selling it. In the Quartermaster Department they have the same thing, and the other different departments of the Military Establishment they have their sales organizations. Now, Mr. Hare and his experts, with their enormous salaries—and I am not saying that they are being paid too much—simply direct and lay down rules of instruction to these men in the Ordnance, the Quartermaster, and the other departments how to make sales, and they report back to this director of sales, and it is a sort of clearing house for all of the sales made in the different bureaus of the War Department.

It was testified to and it is in the hearings that they have made a contract with a lumber concern for the sale of lumber in which they are to pay these men about 12 per cent for handling the surplus lumber that we have in the War Department. They have made arrangements with the copper dealers to feed out to the public the surplus copper we have in the War Department, and to pay them a commission for so doing. I am not criticizing the business end of that proposition, because they argue that it is to stabilize business, and they argue also that in controlling the enormous amount of meat supplies—and I shall put into the RECORD as a part of my statement the number of pounds of meat that we have—they are putting them out at the suggestion of the men interested in the meat concerns of the country in a way that will not disturb the labor in these great packing industries of our country. I might be perfectly willing to agree with them on that proposition if it were not for the further fact that in my judgment if these hundreds of millions of pounds of meat and other food supplies were put upon the market at a little less price than the public is paying to-day the increased consumption of the people of the country of meats would keep the packing houses of the country busy in the packing industry, and it would not affect labor at all. [Applause.] That is my individual judgment about the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I have not the time nor the desire to go into a critical analysis of this proposition, but I want to say to the members of this committee that if we give these men $500,000, that is a big sum with which to pay for their overhead organization, the experts, who simply direct the sale of the surplus stock that we have, and if it proves to be not a sufficient amount and they come back to Congress showing that they have done the country a service there will be no difficulty about getting a deficiency bill through to pay for the balance. But I say to you, and I say to the country, the time has come when it is your duty and it is my duty to cut out every man we can cut out of these special organizations that have been created to carry on the business of this country—outside and above the regular organizations that have been provided for by law. These special organizations have given employment to thousands of men under the guise of serving our country as patriots and business men. I hope they have done it.

Mr. BOIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. BOIES. Why does the gentleman ask for an increase to $500,000 when he says that salaries amount to only $250,000?

Mr. MCKENZIE. I will say to my friend that the $250,000 applies only to the sales organizations in this country. In France the liquidation commission which we have over there also has an overhead organization, which must be paid.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman is aware of the fact that the liquidation commission is not paid out of this fund.

Mr. MCKENZIE. If the gentleman will read the testimony——

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The French liquidation commission is not paid out of this.

Mr. MCKENZIE. But they are going to make a sales organization out of that, I understand.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. What disposition is made of surplus automobiles?

Mr. MCKENZIE. I regret to say to the gentleman from Iowa that up to this time there has been really no disposition of automobiles, except those that have been sent out into the Department of Agriculture and the Post Office Department, and I assume that if the gentleman will investigate the Department of Agriculture he will find some of them down there.

Mr. HAUGEN. But the fact is that millions of dollars are going to waste every day, and no effort is being made to dispose of surplus automobiles or trucks or any other of the supplies of the department, and as every day goes by millions of dollars go to waste. Here we have great departments, and we are spending money every day without results, without a single effort being made to dispose of a single thing.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I want to say to the gentleman that I would be very glad indeed to see some steps taken to sell the surplus

automobiles and trucks in this country, but I realize this fact, that that ought to be handled, of course, with some business judgment, and under the plan laid down by this sales director and this organization they would make an arrangement with the manufacturers of automobiles and trucks and feed these automobiles out as the public could take them without disturbing the trade.

Mr. HAUGEN. It has been hinted that the arrangement made places them beyond the reach of the average man; that the contracts are put up in such shape that the average man can not take advantage of them.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I have been reliably informed that they are selling automobiles, the Ford machine—I do not know whether you call it an automobile or not——

Mr. McKENZIE. A car.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. The Ford cars over in France at $75 a car and that the Cadillac is being sold at five or six hundred dollars each. I wonder if the gentleman has any information on that?

Mr. McKENZIE. I have no information on that.

Mr. ANTHONY. I can say, if the gentleman will permit, that the French Government has interdicted the sale of surplus Ford cars in France at any price, and instead of getting them for $75 people will pay $1,200 if the French would only permit them to buy them. Instead of it being true that Cadillacs are sold at $500 or $600 the authorities in France have offers from Spain of $6,000 for Cadillac limousines for which proper customs arrangements must be made with the Spanish Government. So far they have been unable to make them.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. I am glad to hear that because there is a report they are being sold at those prices.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be granted such time as he may desire—five minutes. I believe this matter is of sufficient importance for him to have that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question? I have read in the newspapers there was an arrangement by which trucks are allotted to the various States and the States in turn have allotted those trucks for use in road work. I have seen those items in the papers. Has the gentleman any information as to the allotment of trucks to the various States?

Mr. McKENZIE. That was the statement made before our committee and you will find it in the hearing. That is one of the plans. I can not say how many have been allotted.

Mr. HAMILTON. I wanted to know if it is true that is being done.

Mr. McKENZIE. That is one of their plans.

Mr. HAMILTON. Is it actually being operated?

Mr. McKENZIE. Well, I can not say as to that, but they contemplate it.

Mr. HAMILTON. They contemplate it?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. I will.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have had correspondence with the Quartermaster General of the War Department in reference to the disposition of trucks. He referred me to a party in the Agricultural Department, to whom the distribution had been committed. I received a letter from this party stating that these trucks would be turned over to the road commissioners of the different States and through the road commissioners distributed to the different counties and municipalities who are engaged in building hard-surface roads. He did not say how many.

Mr. ROMJUE. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri a question. Did the gentleman understand that those trucks were to be allotted to the States and then by the States put in the hands of the road commissioners?

Mr. ALEXANDER. They are by the Agricultural Department delivered to the road commissioners of the different States and through the road commissioners are allotted to the different counties and municipalities. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS] tells me that they have already been distributed in Kentucky.

Mr. FIELDS. I understand there was a distribution made about a week ago at Covington, Ky.

Mr. McKENZIE. If the gentleman will permit me to read I can clear this matter up in a moment. I read from the hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. In regard to motor vehicles, can you give the committee any plan by which you intend to sell your motor vehicles?

Mr. HARE. I can, sir. Under an act we are transferring now, as rapidly as the Department of Agriculture can take them, our surplus trucks. We have about 30,000 carried as surplus, and we intend to deliver 20,000 to the Department of Agriculture, they, in turn, to ship them to the States for their road-building requirements. We are turning over a good many of the other trucks, free of charge, to the Post Office Department, and the small surplus—I doubt very much if in the end we have more than perhaps 2,000 trucks for sale, and those will be offered to the highest bidders. In regard to motor vehicles, the Army has declared no surplus whatever on new cars. It has not, to date, declared any surplus on used cars, but will, very shortly, have comparatively large numbers of used cars in all states of repair, which will be offered at public auction or to the highest bidder.

Mr. HAMILTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama, who has been on his feet

Mr. BANKHEAD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question in order to get some light on this particular item we are considering, the appropriation of $1,000,000. Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] stated that the current appropriation for this fiscal year for this item was $100,000, and the gentleman stated that some one requested that it be increased to $1,000,000. I want to ask the gentleman if this particular department that is expending this money got along during the present fiscal year on the appropriation of $100,000.

Mr. McKENZIE. I will say to the gentleman from Alabama that he has a misunderstanding of the facts. The $100,000 was the amount that we carried in the bill recently passed by this House which failed in the Senate in the last Congress.

Mr. BANKHEAD. How much was the estimate upon which that appropriation was based?

Mr. McKENZIE. Two hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. BANKHEAD. By the War Department?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is it contemplated to increase the number of employees, the personnel of this particular organization, after July 1, 1919?

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman permit——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let us have an answer on that; we are seeking information.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am trying to give it, if I am able. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the gentleman at the time we made the last appropriation there was not one cent asked by the bureau for which we want to appropriate $1,000,000 to-day.

Mr. SABATH. It was not in existence?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. McKENZIE. May I have one minute?

Mr. HAUGEN. I ask that the gentleman be given five minutes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire an extension of time?

Mr. HAMILTON. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMILTON. I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois what understanding has he as to what the Federal Government is to receive for these trucks apportioned among the various States; that is to say, whether the States pay anything for them or whether it simply involves the use of the trucks?

Mr. McKENZIE. In my judgment it would simply be a case of bookkeeping. They would be transferred from the War Department to the Federal Road Construction Department or the Department of Agriculture, and would be charged on the books against those various departments and credited to the War Department.

Mr. KAHN. Regarding the trucks, of course, the Department of Agriculture, receiving the trucks, would make regulations for turning them over to the States. It would not be a War Department matter. It would be a matter for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HAMILTON. Still there is one question that is not completely cleared up. Do the States pay for the use of the trucks?

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not know, I will say to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HAMILTON. They are simply worn out, without any compensation anywhere?

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman is giving information as to the disposition of the trucks. There is a surplus of 2,000 of them. How are they to be disposed of? Are they to be disposed of in the same way as the aeroplanes are to be disposed of; that is, practically given away?

Mr. McKENZIE. The testimony was that they would be sold at public auction to the highest bidder.

Mr. HAUGEN. All of the 2,000?

Mr. McKENZIE. I can not say as to that.

Mr. HAUGEN. What information can the gentleman give as to the disposition of automobiles?

Mr. McKENZIE. I can not give you anything further than what we have in the hearings. They have not disposed of them as yet. It was stated, I believe, that some man had sold a certain number of Dodge cars at a very low price; that it was a fraudulent transaction. He was arrested and tried and convicted, I understand.

Mr. HAUGEN. My information is, and I get it from the office, that not a car has been sold. They are distibuting them among the States. Why are the States entitled to these machines?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I would like to secure some information from the gentleman from Illinois if possible. This item to me presents a rather peculiar and interesting situation. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], a member of the committee, says $300,000 is the amount; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] says it takes $500,000; and the War Department says $1,000,000. Can the gentleman give the House the estimates that were made by the War Department and which led the committee to ask for $1,000,000?

Mr. McKENZIE. If you take the hearings there and read the testimony of the Secretary of War, on page 257, I think it is——

Mr. McCULLOCH. Is the gentleman familiar enough with it to give it to the House? I have not been able to read the hearings.

Mr. McKENZIE. I can only reiterate what I have already said, that he wanted this money to pay the personnel of this division or this organization, which he believed was serving a good purpose, and that $1,000,000 was only a speculative amount; that no one could determine just how much it should be.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Will the gentleman yield further? On what basis, then, does the gentleman reduce it $500,000?

Mr. McKENZIE. I will simply say to the gentleman from Ohio that my experience as a legislator has been that estimates are very seldom, if ever, made below the amount required, but very frequently made higher than are necessary. I feel that that is true in regard to this estimate. And I feel that as a man responsible for making the appropriation that I have just as much right to make a guess at the amount, after studying the question, as has the Secretary of War, and the responsibility is on the Members of this House to appropriate this money. And if we appropriate $500,000 they might be compelled to cut down their organization to some extent. But the fact that they had to cut it down in numbers would not necessarily mean cutting it down in efficiency, in my judgment.

Mr. McCULLOCH. In other words, we have the last guess here.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I hope he is keeping in mind, in making the estimate of $500,000 to cover this item, "Contingencies of the Army," that the item "Contingencies of the Army" is not confined by any means in its scope to this sales commission. It provides for everything in the Army that relates to just exactly that very vague and indefinite sphere "contingencies," and only a part of it is to be devoted to this sales business that has taken up all the time of the committee.

Mr. McKENZIE. My recollection is that in peace time we appropriated $25,000 to take care of those other items.

The statistics respecting food supplies heretofore referred to are as follows:

MAY 23, 1919.

The War Department authorizes publication of the following statement from the office of the Director of Sales, showing estimated surplus meat products on hand in the United States:

Meat.	Container.	Pounds on hand.
Bacon (series 8)	In crates	8,686,118
Bacon (series 10)	12-pound cans	38,536,620
Roast Beef	6-pound cans	11,847,912
Do	2-pound cans	17,333,464
Do	1-pound cans	8,925,594
Do	12-ounce cans	378,124
Corned beef	6-pound cans	5,620,176
Do	24-ounce cans	18,079,005
Do	1-pound cans	8,489,525
Do	12-ounce cans	4,238,550
Corned beef hash	2-pound cans	15,660,636
Do	1-pound cans	5,160,732

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I hope that neither the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] nor the substitute offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] will prevail. I think the majority of the committee decided, after hearing the Secretary of War and after hearing Mr. Hare, that the creation of this sales bureau offered the best possible plan of disposing of about $1,500,000,000 worth of surplus property that the Government ought to turn into cash as quickly as it can economically and safely be done. The committee was confronted by estimates from all the different bureaus of the War Department asking for sums as high as $10,000,000, for instance, from the Ordnance Bureau, for sales purposes. There was one item of $10,000,000 for the preparation of machinery to pack it and grease it and fit it for sale on the market. Mr. Hare told us that, in his opinion, by the creation of this central sales bureau he would be able to undertake the work of selling the surplus material in all these bureaus. For one, I am convinced that he has the business ability and the organization requisite to do it. In reply to my question when he appeared before the committee, as to whether he thought, for instance, that the appropriation of $10,000,000 asked for by the Ordnance Department to sell its surplus machines was necessary, he said, "No; I believe I can sell those machines where they stand."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman does not desire to make a misstatement of facts?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; I certainly do not desire to make a misstatement of facts.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman from Kansas have the kindness to read the testimony on page 415, when the question was put—

You disapprove entirely the appropriation asked for for cleaning and repairing?

And the answer on page 416 was—

No; I do not; because I am not familiar enough with the details of the appropriation.

Mr. ANTHONY. Let me say to the gentleman that if he will look on page 415 he will bear out my statement. I think I am able to read the English language. I asked Mr. Hare the question:

Mr. ANTHONY. I think it was $8,000,000 for the purpose of greasing and packing certain machine tools now in possession of the Ordnance Department. I am corrected on that and told it was $10,000,000. When you begin to sell that class of material your cost of sale is going to run higher?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will such sales of the Ordnance Department come under your supervision?

Mr. HARE. Yes; they will come under our supervision. In regard to that item for repair work which is being done, I believe we can sell these machines to-day without a penny being spent on them.

Now, I do not care to go into it any further.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But the gentleman should state the facts correctly.

Mr. ANTHONY. I believe Mr. Hare will be able to sell that surplus ordnance machinery without the expenditure of this $10,000,000 which the Ordnance Bureau asks. I want to give him the money at least to make an effort. He has shown that he has already saved about $4,000,000 in selling metals and other material, much of it belonging to the Ordnance Department. He has stepped in and has saved this money and I want to give Mr. Hare a chance. We are making this item of contingent expenses large enough to provide eight hundred and odd thousand dollars necessary for the operations of this bureau.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. All I wanted to suggest to my friend is that a part of this money asked for by the Ordnance Department is to be used for slushing machinery and tools, and so forth, to carry out a regular program which they would follow with respect to these machines, whether they were sold or not. A large part of such stores is always put away in that way. It takes thousands of dollars to do it every year.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If the gentleman is correct and I am in error, that the Director of Sales can dispose of these machines without spending the $10,000,000 which the Ordnance Department says is necessary to spend if they sell them, will the gentleman agree to take $10,000,000 off the amount allowed to the Ordnance Department?

Mr. ANTHONY. We have deducted it. We have made savings in every bureau, and we have put what we consider an adequate amount under contingencies to permit the organization of this Sales Bureau to take the place of these larger expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from Kansas be allowed to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Kansas be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman's statement places the War Department in a very embarrassing position. I infer from what the gentleman has stated that the integrity and the business ability of the War Department can not be relied upon, and that it is necessary now to spend $1,000,000 to let some competent people do it.

Mr. ANTHONY. No. The men at the head of the different bureaus of the War Department are largely soldiers, and they are good soldiers and good men, but they are not keen, shrewd business men. We propose to supply this Bureau of Sales with men like Mr. Hare at the head of it, keen business men, who can handle this business to the advantage of the Government.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. McCULLOCH. The gentleman mentioned the figure as something like eight hundred and some odd thousand dollars as the probable expense?

Mr. ANTHONY. That was stated to be the probable cost.

Mr. McCULLOCH. What are the items that entered into it? If we assume that these men are good business men, are they good enough business men to give the committee and the House an estimate of what it is going to cost to do this thing? Are we going to be forced to guess at it?

Mr. ANTHONY. No. Nobody can tell us just what the cost will be.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Have they made any estimate of the probable cost?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; nothing more than what I have stated.

Mr. McCULLOCH. The gentleman reflects on the business ability of the Army officers by such a statement.

Mr. ANTHONY. No; I do not reflect upon them at all. The chairman of our committee informs me that they estimate it will cost about $1,000,000.

Mr. McCULLOCH. What figures enter into it? I would like to get some information about it. I am willing to vote millions for it if it is necessary and proper.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, the items which go into it, as I recall, are salaries and a great amount of printing, and the sending out of hundreds of thousands of letters to buyers all over the world, the collection of data affecting the markets of the world, and matters of that kind.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me just a moment more?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. McCULLOCH. The gentleman has been speaking in generalities, and the gentleman from Illinois used generalities. Is there any budget or any estimate given that can be put into the RECORD justifying Congress in accepting this recommendation of a million dollars for this purpose?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. There is not.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Then I think the committee ought to recall some one and get the necessary information.

Mr. ANTHONY. We had an estimate of $10,000,000 from one bureau for sales operations alone.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. And it is no more reliable than the estimates before the committee now.

Mr. ANTHONY. It is impossible in such a matter to estimate accurately.

Mr. JEFFERIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. JEFFERIS. Did Mr. Hare attempt to give any information as to what this bureau would require?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; the idea was that a million dollars is to be employed to cover the operations of the bureau, and in view of the fact that some of the estimates run up beyond $10,000,000, we prefer to give Mr. Hare's bureau the opportunity to administer it.

Mr. JEFFERIS. I was trying to find out whether the estimate of a million dollars comes from the Secretary of War or does it come from Mr. Hare?

Mr. ANTHONY. It comes from the Secretary of War.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. I have been listening with very great interest to this discussion regarding this appropriation for a new commission to stabilize prices. I am very much in sympathy with that kind of a proposition, but I would like also to have the question answered, Who are these gentlemen, these so-called business experts, that command salaries of $25,000, $10,000, and $6,000 every year? A very good definition of an expert is a fellow that is away from home telling the other fellow how to do it. [Laughter.]

Now, one more statement. I would like to have this Congress spend some money to stabilize the prices downward for the consumer, as well as prices upward for the producer. Here we are asked to appropriate $1,000,000 to stabilize prices for the producer.

Mr. ANTHONY. Oh, no.

Mr. BEGG. That is my conception, to keep the prices from falling.

Mr. ANTHONY. Let me say to the gentleman that that is not the object of the appropriation. The object of the appropriation is to convert these surplus supplies into money and put that money into the Treasury of the United States. Of course, in doing that we do not want to entirely disorganize the markets of the country.

Mr. BEGG. All right. Has this Congress ever appropriated one single dollar during the war when we were buying everywhere, helter skelter—did we ever provide one dollar to keep prices from going up? I know, and you know, and every other man knows that prices in every line are abnormal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that debate on this amendment has been exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama makes the point of order that debate on the amendment has been exhausted, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Is the time limited on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It is. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, what are we to vote on?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. McKENZIE to the amendment of Mr. LaGUARDIA: Strike out $300,000 and insert $500,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment as amended.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, is an amendment now in order?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I move to strike out the "$500,000" and insert "$250,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to amend, and the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out "$500,000" and insert "$250,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the most important question before the people of the United States to-day is the cost of living, and I can not see a more important subject to receive the attention of the House at this moment than the question of this appropriation so that the people of the country may be illumined as to the reason why the United States Government refuses to sell $60,000,000 worth of products that the people want. Mr. Hare, who is the representative of the Government at the present time, according to the report which is before the Members of the House, makes this extraordinary statement:

On account of the inaccessibility of the warehouses where this food is stored, however, it is doubtful whether any considerable portion of the public will come to a sale if carried out.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that this is a most extraordinary statement. I think I am within the bounds of truth when I say that there are millions of Americans who go to bed every night hungry because they can not get proper food on account of the high cost of living everywhere in the United States.

We are appealed to, and properly so, by hundreds of thousands of Government employees who have seen the cost of living increase 100 per cent within the past four years, while their wages have increased on an average 20 per cent. And yet the Government controls this immense amount of food products, has controlled it since the armistice was signed six months ago, and because it may occasion a glut on the market which

would lower the price of beef across the water, or because of the manner in which the warehouses of the country are distributed throughout the United States, the people can not have this beef. And I say to you that this is a situation which we can not dodge. People are hungry in every part of the United States because they can not afford to pay the price for beef, and it is a crime if the Government at Washington can not organize its brains to put this meat where the people can get it and relieve their hungry stomachs.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. In 1912 the Democratic Party was going to reduce the cost of living. Is this an indictment or a confession that they have not made good?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Democratic Party is not responsible for this situation. As the ex-Speaker of the House eloquently portrayed it a few moments ago upon the floor of the House, under the leadership of the Democratic Party the American Army won the greatest victory that the world has ever known. [Applause.] It did it without a suspicion of graft on the part of anybody connected with the administration.

I was here in the Spanish-American War. At that time I was the lone Democratic Representative from the six New England States when that war was fought, and, as the ex-Speaker said, there were charges of graft and they were proven. We heard about embalmed canned beef being fed to the soldiers, and it was proven that it was, though that was an infant war compared to the world conflagration when the United States was called into it as a matter of honor to rescue civilization and humanity. And under the leadership of the Democratic Party and of Woodrow Wilson the United States did it, Mr. Chairman. [Applause.] In this condition of affairs now I am not speaking as a Democrat to Democrats or to the Republican membership of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will ask unanimous consent that my time be extended two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that his time be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The men who were in charge of these supplies have been brought in, as other Members of the House have stated—experts. There are experts when the Republicans are in power; there are experts when the Democrats are in power, and they go with the party in power to prey upon the public of the United States. It is not the Republican Party that is responsible or the Democratic Party that is responsible, unless we fail to rise to our responsibilities in this hour. The other day in New York I spoke to Mr. Barnes and attempted to get some information about flour. I attempted to get some information from the Bureau of Agriculture and from the Food Administration in Washington about flour. They said that the Food Administration was in New York City. I said, "Is not the seat of government here in Washington?" They said, "Yes; but the Food Administration is in New York, and if you want information in regard to the price of wheat and as to whether flour is to be continued at its present price or not, you must go to Mr. Barnes in New York." So I got on the train and took a journey of six hours and went over to New York and went into Mr. Barnes's office, and I said to Mr. Barnes, "What is the condition of the wheat crop? Are we to have $16 flour while it is being sold for $10 in England?" He said, "England takes the loss." I said, "Mr. Barnes, I think the United States should take the loss. Wheat is the staff of life. It is fundamental to the welfare of the people of the country. Every day there are strikes for more wages. Why? Because people can not live because of the cost of living. You must cut down the price of flour and let the Government take the loss if you want the business of this country to proceed along normal lines." But he said he did not believe in that policy. He was the Government, and, though I was elected a Representative, there was nothing else I could do but get out, come back to Washington, and make my protest here on the floor of this House.

Great Britain is fighting the American Beef Trust and will drive it out if it can. To-day's papers report the organization of another beef combination, and among its principal officials are men who have been dictating the world's prices of beef products for the Food Administration. A leopard can not change his spots; neither can these men change their point of view on what constitutes reasonable profits, and as long as they continue in charge the American people are bound to suffer.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, this matter of the sales of the surplus supplies is an exceedingly important one. No business institution in this country, without calling upon the great banking houses, could carry through a proposition involving the sale of $1,600,000,000 worth of supplies.

There is no politics about this thing. The question is, Can we sell the goods to the best possible advantage for the Government, having a due regard for the business interests and the working people of the country.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FITZGERALD] told us about bringing the meat to the people of the country. Let me tell him that right in his city of Boston there are hundreds of retail grocers and small business men who have three or four thousand dollars invested in the stocks of goods on their shelves. They are making a living for themselves and their families selling ordinary canned goods put out on the market.

Mr. LAYTON. May I interrupt the gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Delaware?

Mr. KAHN. I will yield in just a minute. When you dump on the market great quantities of supplies you break the market, and the small dealer is the loser just the same as the big dealer.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. LAYTON. I admit that proposition, but compared with the millions of people in the United States whose stomachs are being broken it is insignificant, and I think it is pretty nearly time that, regardless of politics, this one question of food supplies, which lies at the basis of the employment of labor and wages, should be taken up and met fearlessly even if there is a break on the part of a few grocers or packers in Chicago. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. There will be no break. As a matter of fact, the meat that is packed for the Army is not put up in such packages as the buying public is accustomed to. The bacon which they have on hand is put up in an entirely different way than the ordinary bacon that the consumers of the country are accustomed to. You have to get special buyers for these goods. I am told that it is salted for 23 days and then smoked for 8 days.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The soldiers were going to eat it.

Mr. KAHN. It was prepared especially for them.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And it was excellent.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I asked that very question of the sales commissioner about that bacon. I pointed out the fact that the soldiers were called upon to eat it. He remarked that it was prepared in a special way, that it is good bacon, but that the public does not buy it readily, prepared as it is, without instruction as to how to prepare and cook it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. No; I can not yield just now. As a matter of fact, the sales department has already sold materials that cost our Government $325,000,000 and have recovered $279,000,000, which is a loss of 14 per cent. We were told that the prices that were offered by the purchasers at first were materially lower than the prices that were finally secured. In other words, they succeeded——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman fom California has expired.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KAHN. In other words, the sales managers have already saved the Government millions of dollars more than they are asking us to allow them to make these sales to the buyers of the world.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes; I yield to my colleague on the committee.

Mr. DENT. Is it not a fact that by consolidating this million-dollar appropriation under this item in the head of the director of sales we are saving many more millions that would absolutely have to be expended by the Ordnance Department, by the Quartermaster Department, by the Signal Corps, and every other branch of the service?

Mr. KAHN. That is the idea, exactly, and I thank the gentleman for his statement. As a matter of fact, if we do not have this one consolidated division, that will dispose of these commodities, the very condition that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] refers to would exist. These separate bureaus of the War Department and other departments would be

called upon to engage in the business of selling their surplus stocks.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I can not yield now. As was pointed out by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], the heads of the bureaus of the War Department are soldiers. They are not business men. They do not know the buying public. They do not know the men who require these great quantities of supplies.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. The supplies include everything from a safety pin to a locomotive crane. There are hundreds of articles embraced in the list. It is no mere matter of going out to a street corner and trying to sell to any business man who is passing in the crowd. It requires a systematic method, a long effort, to secure the purchasers for these goods.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. LAYTON. We have a system in this country now already in working operation that ramifies into every crossroads of the United States—the Post Office Department, with its parcels post.

Mr. KAHN. Can you send a locomotive crane through the post office?

Mr. LAYTON. I am not talking about that.

Mr. KAHN. Well, that is one of the items for sale.

Mr. LAYTON. I am talking about one thing; I am not talking about all things. In the matter of food supplies—take the canned goods, for instance—that are stored up all over the country.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I simply yielded for a question.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman seems to think that the only question involved here is the sale of foodstuffs. That is only an incident. There are hundreds of items, as I stated; there are some hundreds of locomotive cranes; there are railroad cars, acids, chemicals, raw materials, scrap, and all kinds of materials to be sold.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am sure that my distinguished colleague does not want to have it appear in the RECORD that any misstatement as to testimony before our committee has been made. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] interrogated the gentleman a few moments ago and asked if this sales department would not take the place of all the other departments in the Military Establishment. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the testimony discloses the statement from Mr. Hare that, so far as making the actual sales is concerned, they have nothing to do with it, that they will be carried out by the different organizations, but the sales department would direct, lay the plans, and perhaps pass finally upon the consummation of the sale?

Mr. KAHN. If my colleague will permit me, my recollection is that this sales department will negotiate sales, will secure the prices, and then finally the various bureaus will deliver the goods when the sale is made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. KAHN. I ask for five minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What is the matter now before the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I make the point of order that debate on that amendment has been exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Let the amendment be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Is it in order now to offer an amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not.

Mr. McCULLOCH. An amendment to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. That would be an amendment in the third degree. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is it in order now for me to offer a substitute for the amendment to my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York may offer a substitute.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I therefore move as a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts to my amendment to read "$300,000" instead of "$250,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman from New York offered originally an amendment to reduce the amount to $300,000 and the gentleman from Illinois offered an amendment to that to make the amount $500,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I desire to offer an amendment. Now, is this the proper time to do it? I ask the Chair that question by way of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. A substitute would be in order; an amendment is not in order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. If a substitute is in order, why was my substitute declared out of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offered an original amendment which has been amended by the vote of the committee.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I desire to offer a substitute——

The CHAIRMAN. The original amendment is the amendment which the gentleman from New York now offers.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I desire to offer a substitute. I move to strike out the "$250,000" contained in the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a substitute. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Division.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment as amended.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, is an amendment to the amendment now in order? If it is I desire to offer one.

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment is in order if it is a proper amendment.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I move to strike out the "$500,000" contained in the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois. That would leave no appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not an amendment; that is striking out the action of the committee just taken. The question is on the amendment as amended.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, the greater part of the money spent for carrying on the war was expended for supplies, munitions, food, clothing, and the other things that soldiers need. After the armistice was signed the War Department continued to receive from the contractors large quantities of these supplies and materials aggregating, as I am informed, some $2,000,000,000. Much is still on hand that was received since November 11, 1918, and much which was on hand prior to that time remains undisposed of.

A great deal has been said in the newspapers and by the public on the subject of the disposition of these surplus supplies. Much public criticism has been made of the way in which it is being sold. The confidence of the plain people of this country is shaken in the ability and willingness of the War Department, through its agents, to realize for the Government a fair return for this surplus. It is being openly charged that no effort is being made in good faith to realize the greatest possible amount for the Government. It is being charged that this surplus is being disposed of, not with the view to giving

the people who want to buy it a fair opportunity to do so, and thereby getting the most money possible out of it for the Government, but with the sole view to protecting those who might be in competition with the sale of it. [Applause.] I believe that I am safe in saying that the average man in this country believes that much of this surplus is being withheld from the markets with the sole purpose of protecting the packers and food producers and dealers and manufacturers generally throughout the country. [Applause.] The common man believes that it is not being disposed of in good faith, but that an effort is being made to protect selfish interests in the disposal of this surplus.

Now, then, the question becomes vital by this opportunity of the Congress to act upon this matter. We now have the chance to restore the public confidence and to insure that the public interest will be safeguarded. We have a chance to insure that these supplies will be honestly sold and in a businesslike way. Are we to sit here and neglect this opportunity? Shall we allow these improper methods to be continued? The statement was made here yesterday that supplies for which the Government paid over $20,000,000 had been sold for only $2,000,000. Are we not going to do anything about it? This is our only chance, gentlemen. Unless you are willing to take some action, do not hereafter complain that the Government was robbed in the disposition of these supplies.

Mr. DENT. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I will.

Mr. DENT. Does my colleague think that the Government should deal directly with the individual in handling this matter?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Not as to all of the items, but the Government can dispose of the supplies in good faith so as to salvage everything possible out of them, and I insist that that should be done. [Applause.] I insist that we ought not to hold acres of automobiles and automobile trucks merely for the protection of manufacturers and dealers in them. I insist that all of the million pounds of meat that remains as a surplus shall not be disposed of in the interest of the packers of Chicago or other meat centers. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. I did not intend to interrupt the gentleman's speech, but I simply wanted to ask the gentleman a question. What is the gentleman's remedy?

Mr. OLNEY. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Not until I have dealt with my friend on my right. I am amazed that the gentleman, who so long graced the Committee on Military Affairs as its chairman, should expect a Member to rise up on the floor of the House and do something the committee itself only could have done in the committee room. It is for the Committee on Military Affairs to devise some measure for the protection of the Government and the people of the United States, and to insure that the millions of dollars in surplus supplies shall not be wasted. Of course, I can not do it. Neither I nor any other Member can get up here and propose a sufficient and adequate measure. The parliamentary situation will not permit it. It would be at once ruled out of order. But the Committee on Military Affairs must report some measure, if they want to vindicate themselves in the eyes of the House, that will protect the people and the Government of this country against spoliation.

Mr. LAYTON. The plan has been asked for——

Mr. HUDDLESTON. If the gentleman will pardon me, I have only five minutes. If I can get more time, I will let the gentleman state his plan.

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Alabama be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. OLNEY. Have you not exaggerated somewhat the amount of canned meats on hand when you say 250,000,000 pounds?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I only give those figures because they come to me through the newspapers, and I admit to the gentleman that that source is exceedingly unreliable. But, anyhow, there is a vast quantity of meat to be disposed of. It does not make any difference whether it is 150,000,000 or 200,000,000 pounds. Honesty requires we shall get the most we can out of it, and I insist that it should be disposed of with that idea in view and that the interest of the packers shall not be considered at all in this situation.

Mr. OLNEY. May I inform the gentleman that I left the sales manager's office this morning, and steps are in progress to dispose of all the surplus products of tinned meat? Thirty-five thousand letters have gone out to State charitable institutions——

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I have only five minutes more.

Mr. OLNEY. I asked that the gentleman have five additional minutes so that——

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Not for the gentleman to make a speech.

I have no particular data on this meat situation. The statement was made in the press, on the purported authority of the War Department a few weeks ago, that they had some 240,000,000 pounds on hand, and they proposed not to find a market for it here, but to sell it on credit to Roumania. But I do know that we have hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of surplus supplies on hand. I do know that honesty to the people of the United States requires we shall get the biggest dollar possible out of the supplies on hand, and I do insist on every principle of common honesty that these supplies should not be disposed of merely to keep them off the market because it might do some dealer a little harm.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. LAYTON].

Mr. LAYTON. The first proposition I wanted to state is that all of this stuff has been bought and paid for by the people's money. My plan is this: I am going to be specific. I will not talk about automobiles or about foodstuffs. You have one of the finest organizations that there is in the United States to-day, known as the parcels post. How easy it would be to send out a single case of this meat to every post office and let the postmaster sell that by retail.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I have data here from the hearings that will give some facts about this meat.

What we have on hand is this: We have 8,686,000 pounds of bacon, 11,847,000 pounds of 6-pound cans of roast beef, 17,333,000 pounds of 2-pound cans, 8,925,000 pounds of 1-pound cans, and 378,000 pounds of 12-ounce cans. Then, we have got of corned beef and corned-beef hash 5,620,000 pounds of 6-pound cans, 18,000,000 pounds of 24-ounce cans, 8,489,000 1-pound cans, 4,238,000 pounds of 12-ounce cans, 15,660,000 pounds of 2-pound cans of corned-beef hash, and 5,160,000 1-pound cans of corned-beef hash.

There are the figures.

Mr. TEMPLE. And I may suggest to the gentleman that on page 465 the totals are given as 141,000,000 pounds, all told.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Why do gentlemen quibble about the quantity of the meat? The matter is one of principle. I am insisting that the people of the United States be protected by their agents who are looking after the public business.

[Here a Member sought to interrupt.]

I have been interrupted so much that I can not say anything in proper sequence, and I hope, under the circumstances, the gentleman will excuse me. I can scarcely say two sentences without being interrupted, and hence, in consequence of the numerous interruptions to which I am subjected, there can be nothing added to my cry except, "Honesty, honesty, and the interests of the people of the United States." That is all I have a chance or an opportunity to say.

But I do want to cap that with one more thing: If the Committee on Military Affairs sits idly by here and proposes nothing to this House which will enable us to pass a measure which will protect the people of the United States against looting, then they will not have performed their duty. I trust this will not rankle them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. KEARNS, Mr. QUIN, and Mr. McCULLOCH rose.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio rises to oppose the pro forma amendment.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address the House for a few minutes in reply to the gentleman who has just attacked the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did recognize the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], but the gentleman from Mississippi was on his feet, and the gentleman from Mississippi is a member of the committee.

Mr. KEARNS. And, Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet before either of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is a member of the committee.

Mr. KEARNS. I happen to be, too.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, am I recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Mississippi at this time.

Mr. QUIN. I thank the Chair. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that these gentlemen in making assertions here can be

making them upon the basis of information. I am sorry to say that I believe they must be ignorant of the facts.

First, I want to assert that the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] are correct in their statements touching this matter. The sales director, Mr. Hare, appeared before our committee and gave his statement. We contend that an appropriation should be made for the director of sales to sell this stuff in a businesslike manner. The aspersions cast upon the War Department and those in charge of these supplies and upon this Committee on Military Affairs by one or two gentlemen here are not warranted by the evidence or by the facts.

I want to say to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] that as to one item alone 650,000 bales of cotton linters were thrown upon the market in one day, and at a much less price than we paid for it.

Now, then, the gentleman rises and says that the Government is hoarding the stuff. It is true that these gentlemen are endeavoring to proceed in a businesslike manner and not throw this material on the market without getting anything adequate for it. Does anyone object, through the instrumentalities of the War Department, to our getting something like the prices that we paid for these vast supplies? Does the gentleman object, for instance, to the fact that the sales director has received $20 a thousand for lumber that the Government paid $28 for, which is now weather marked and depreciated by exposure?

I want to say that the sales department has demonstrated that it is disposing of this great mass of supplies in a practical and businesslike manner, and it should be upheld by this Congress. We can not let every Tom, Dick, and Harry come in with some wild scheme and throw all this mass of war supplies on the market, so that the Government will receive nothing adequate in return for it. The taxpayers of this country have furnished all this money, and they are entitled to have the consideration of sensible men who are disposing of this stuff. Many hundred millions of dollars worth of supplies would otherwise be thrown on the market, and the taxpayers would suffer heavy losses.

Now, gentlemen come here and talk a great deal about the food supply, its shortage, and the high cost of food. The chairman of the committee [Mr. KAHN] told you the truth. These meats, according to the testimony taken before our committee, are packed in great big kits.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. QUIN. No; I can not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi declines to yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has asked questions that should be answered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not take the gentleman from Mississippi off the floor.

Mr. QUIN. This meat must be repacked under the circumstances and put into smaller cans or containers. That is the testimony we had before our committee.

Now, coming down to the analysis, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] read out the total 140,000,000 pounds of all kinds of meats, including beef hash. That would be only about 1½ pounds—not quite that—to each citizen of the United States. Do you believe that the people of the country are going around howling and growling for one little miserable 1½ pounds of meat which the Government is trying to dispose of in a sensible and practical way to the people who can acquire it and use it? When you consider all these different supplies, you find it is the same way. Some gentleman rises up and says, "You ought to use the parcel post and mail a 20,000-ton ship down to some fellow somewhere in the country." Some one says, "You ought to take 20,000 locomotives and mail them down by parcel post to some other fellow." [Laughter.] Other gentlemen recommend that these supplies should be sent to parts of the country where they could not be used, whereas this committee has recommended a regular businesslike method of distribution or disposition by which these things can properly be disposed of.

You ask, "Who is this man at the head of the sales department?" He testified that he was the sales manager of a gas-supply company in Philadelphia that had done a business of $40,000,000 a year, covering the principal cities of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIN. I stated that Mr. Hare, the head of this sales department, left a great concern to come here at the request of the War Department. He has great ability. Anyone who has heard him testify is bound to admit that he is a superior man, and a very practical man, and he has valuable assistants. They are running this thing in an economical way, and if we leave this matter in charge of these good, solid, practical business men, instead of letting it go through the different branches of the military channels, you are going to get something like the value of these things. Of course, we do not expect Mr. Hare or anybody else to get dollar for dollar for all the enormous supplies for war purposes that this Government had on hand at the signing of the armistice, but he can come as near to it as anybody can.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. QUIN. I will yield for just a question. I can not give up all my time.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. The gentleman is a member of the committee, and I should like to ask him a question for information.

Mr. QUIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I wish to ask whether those charged with the disposition of these goods have not heretofore sold some of them to certain private parties?

Mr. QUIN. Why, they sell to anybody who comes up and pays the price. The sales department of this Government, as you will see if you will read all of this evidence, has under it all these different bureaus, and these things are advertised. They can not get bids on some of the goods.

Mr. GODLFOGLE. What I want to know is whether they did not sell, without advertising and without notice, to some of the people who came to Washington and who managed somehow or other to secure a lot of these things?

Mr. QUIN. They may have sold some things in that manner, but it is nothing like what has been stated here, that the Government is being robbed. There is nothing like that. I say to the gentleman from Alabama, Do not believe all these charges in socialistic and anarchistic papers that you may read, which are trying to malign the American Government. [Applause.] The War Department is running as nearly on an honest, sensible basis as we could expect, or as it has ever been run, and I ask you not to take all this enormous supply business out of the hands of practical business men and turn it over to those who know nothing about real business activities. You have a man at the head of this sales department that I never saw in my life until he appeared before the committee, but no man can listen to him without knowing that he knows his business. He has demonstrated to that committee that he can save us millions of dollars a year. He is worth the $25,000 a year that he is drawing. He says he can dispose of this stuff, the major portion of it, in seven or eight months' time. I believe he can do it and will do it, and if this Congress should take away from him the right to do it we would be doing a great injustice to ourselves and a rank injustice to the taxpayers of this Republic. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Alabama has intimated that the Military Affairs Committee is assisting the War Department in holding these supplies and in robbing the people. Does he want that to go before the American public? Does he really seriously believe that this committee or any Member of this Congress should be a party to such a scheme? Does he believe that the Secretary of War or anybody under him in a responsible position would be a party to such a scheme? I have demonstrated to you, if you have listened, that we have an efficient War Department; we have an efficient man as director of sales, who is acting in a proper way; we have an honest and efficient Secretary of War; and yet that charge which the gentleman from Alabama made goes out to the newspapers of this country and reflects upon the entire department in charge of these war supplies.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman is a member of the committee, and in a position to give the information. I know the gentleman is fair and wants to give the information. The gentleman has referred to the disposition of the lumber. Will the gentleman go into details and state to the House how the lumber was disposed of? Was it disposed of in a way to give a monopoly to a lumber trust, and who bought the lumber?

Mr. QUIN. All I can state to the gentleman is what the hearings show—what gentlemen testified to. Mr. Hare is not trying to dispose of this lumber to any monopoly. He is disposing of it to anybody who will come up and pay the price for it.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman declines to answer the question as to lumber. Now, as to Mr. Hare. The statement that a soldier is a soldier, and that it is necessary to have the services of a trained business man, is an old story. We called in experts——

Mr. QUIN. I do not want the gentleman to take all my time.

Mr. HAUGEN. Does the gentleman refuse to answer further?

Mr. QUIN. Will the gentleman ask his question?

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman has called attention to the importance of having trained business men to dispose of the property of the United States. It is the same story that we were told about the Air Service. We drafted into the Air Service trained business men, and what was the result?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. QUIN. I should like to have time to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman state what advantage to the Government there was from that? I will ask that the gentleman's time be extended, so that he can answer my question.

Mr. QUIN. I should like to have time to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks for five minutes more to answer the gentleman from Iowa. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Mississippi be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield for a question? The gentleman from Mississippi is making statement after statement——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York object?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; I do not object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the extension of the time of the gentleman from Mississippi five minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa sought to inject not a question into my remarks but a speech. No; the War Department has not put at the head of the sales department anybody that is going to impose on the Government. Mr. Hare is not going to impose on the Government. The committee is not considering what the Aircraft Board has done. We are endeavoring to realize a proper value on the great stores of war supplies that the Government now has on hand. When the armistice was signed there were many contracts that the Government could not cancel because there was no cancellation clause. It had to take many goods, and I suspect that some of those things are coming in to-day. The Government must be honest in its contracts and it must be honest in its disposal of all the supplies, and that is what it is endeavoring to do and what it will do if the hands of Mr. Hare are upheld in the various works that he is engaged in.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Are these supplies being disposed of at public auction after advertisement or are they being disposed of at private sale?

Mr. QUIN. They are being disposed of in a proper business way, through advertisement, through letters directed to people who are likely to be interested in things that the Government has for sale.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman realizes that the laws on this subject were passed long ago and not in view of the present situation. So we now have hundreds and millions of dollars' worth of supplies being disposed of under a law never framed to meet such a situation. How can the gentleman defend the Committee on Military Affairs in leaving this in such a way as to go without providing anything for the safeguarding of the interests of the people?

Mr. QUIN. They are all safeguarded—first by law on the statute books; second, by an honest administration and an honest Secretary of War and efficient men surrounding him.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. My distinguished colleague has made statements about the ability of the head of this sales department. He has stated that he is the head of a great business concern. Does the gentleman know how many years he was connected with that concern?

Mr. QUIN. No.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does he know that the most of his experience has been as a newspaper reporter?

Mr. QUIN. No.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does he know that the sale of the wood and lumber was not made through him but through the lumber people and that we paid 12 per cent for selling it?

Mr. QUIN. The gentleman can speak for himself. I can not yield further. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from New York knows more about Mr. Hare than Mr. Hare knows himself, more than the Secretary of War knows, if he thinks that Mr. Hare is so incompetent, if he thinks that Mr. Hare is a good newspaper reporter instead of a business man, let him demonstrate it and take it to the Secretary of War, and he will have no difficulty in having Mr. Hare displaced. But it strikes me that this man is the most efficient man who has been before the committee for many a day. I know the Government needs somebody at the head of this disposition of war supplies who knows business and how to dispose of those supplies. Mr. Hare is the man the administration selected. He has made good in every respect, and the evidence shows he has saved many millions of dollars for the taxpayers, and that he will save many millions more for the people if he is left in charge. I am for him and his work. [Applause.]

Mr. KEARNS was recognized.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment be closed in 15 minutes, 5 minutes to be consumed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH] and 5 minutes——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California may fix the time, but he can not apportion it.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the amendment close in 15 minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What is the amendment pending?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is to strike out the last word.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I make the point of order that debate on the amendment is exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama makes the point of order that debate is exhausted and the point of order is sustained. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEARNS] was recognized for five minutes to talk to the amendment. Can he be taken off the floor by a point of order by the gentleman from Alabama?

The CHAIRMAN. After recognizing the gentleman from Ohio the gentleman from California made a motion, and pending that motion the gentleman from Alabama made a parliamentary inquiry. Then he made a point of order, which was within his rights.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the gentleman from Ohio is a member of the committee and was recognized to speak, I will temporarily withdraw the point of order.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, to my way of thinking this is one of the most important items in this entire bill. The Government has undertaken the organization of a sales department to sell the surplus goods it has on hand. The Government has succeeded in getting at the head of the sales department possibly one of the greatest expert salesmen in the United States. It is his plan to sell all of these surplus products, whatever the goods may be, through this one department.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. No; I can not. When this organization was first formed there was practically $2,000,000,000 worth of surplus goods on hand. A part of it had already been sold under a contract. When this department was organized those contracts were recalled immediately, and these goods that had already been sold were resold at a profit of several million dollars. If we grant to this commission $1,000,000 that it is now asking, we are giving it only a part of what it has already saved for the Government.

What they have sold up to this time amounts to something between three and four hundred million dollars, and they succeeded in selling that amount for only about $14,000,000 less than it cost the Government. If these surplus supplies are to be sold from a hundred different departments, there will be no head at all to it. I want to impress upon the House that this department is only newly organized, and yet has already saved many millions of dollars for the Government. They are asking for only a million dollars to go through the coming year. They are going to save this country a half billion of dollars, according to the ratio of what they have already done. It seems to me we ought not to hamper its work by cutting it down to the very

lowest amount possible upon which it could operate. I think we should give them every latitude, because they have already demonstrated that they can do the work.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman says that if this bureau is dispensed with there will be no agency to dispose of the surplus supplies. The gentleman is aware that each department now has its own office of sales and experts in that particular branch?

Mr. KEARNS. No; I am not aware of that; and I do not think that condition exists. If I could imagine myself being at the head of a concern that had the sale of $2,000,000,000 worth of various kinds of property, I am quite sure that I would call an expert salesman and put him at the head of that department.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. On that point does the gentleman conscientiously believe from the testimony before the committee that the present head of this bureau is an expert?

Mr. KEARNS. Yes. He pleads guilty to it himself.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. He does?

Mr. KEARNS. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEARNS. Has the gentleman from New York or any other gentleman any proof that he is not an expert?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly. Does the gentleman wish me to give it to him?

Mr. KEARNS. It does not appear in the testimony.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does the gentleman wish to hear it?

Mr. KEARNS. No; the gentleman can state it in his own time. If this man is going to sell meat, he is going to put an expert meat salesman on the job. If he is going to sell harness, he is going to get an expert harness salesman to sell that harness. If he is going to sell automobiles, he is going to get an expert automobile salesman to sell those automobiles, and so will an expert salesman be put in charge of the sale of each class of goods to be put on the market.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Under that head do I understand from the hearings on page 399 that it is the intention of this department to turn these goods back to the ones who sold them to the Government? In other words, is it the intention to turn this meat back to the packers, the automobiles back to the automobile dealers?

Mr. KEARNS. I get the gentleman's point. I do not know what the intention is further than this: The head of the department said that he is going to sell for the greatest price obtainable for the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. KEARNS. And I know that he is going to put experts at the heads of these various departments. At least he says that he has expert salesmen at the head of each department.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. To strike out the first word.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And I give notice that the gentleman from Nebraska must confine himself to the amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I want to inform the gentleman that that is exactly what I propose to do. I understand that we are now engaged in an effort to dispose of property amounting to about one and one-half billion dollars. The committee seems to have reached a conclusion that the centralization of the work of this sale will be wise and economical. They have made a specific recommendation——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman is not discussing the amendment to strike out the first word.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I am trying to get to the amendment, and if the gentleman will have patience he will realize that I am.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will note the——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Relevancy.

The CHAIRMAN. Relevancy of the discussion of the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Let us take into account for a moment the method of procedure in the purchase of property and the disposition of property under existing law. Whenever the War Department purchases property a record is made as to its disposition.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not in order.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I must make my statement in order to illustrate to the gentleman from Alabama, or he can not understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska will proceed in order.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think the gentleman ought to be admonished what it is to proceed in order, because he is certainly not doing it, although the Chair promised to call him down.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. It may be a question whether the gentleman understands what the regular procedure is.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is to strike out the word "war."

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. And I am talking for the recommendation of the committee and against striking out the word "war."

When the record of these purchases is made they are charged up on the books in the property accounts. When that property is disposed of or disappears the person who is so charged must account for it at the price at which it was charged to him. Whenever it disappears he must account for its value when he sells it, and if the record shows that he has not exercised proper discretion in the conduct of the trust reposed in him he can be called to account, and there is where the special committee organized by this House to investigate these things can find a foundation for practical business.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order, and I want to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Therefore, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the present occupant of the Chair in good faith proposes to execute the rules of the House when I make a point of order in good faith that the gentleman is not discussing the question relative to the amendment, it is the duty of the present occupant of the Chair to sustain my point of order.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I am ready to draw my conclusion, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order and will say if from this on it is the purpose of members of this committee to adhere strictly to the rules of the House with respect to debate on pro forma amendments the Chair will sustain points of order and require the discussion to follow the motion that is pending.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California moves that all debate on this amendment close in five minutes.

The question was taken and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as a member of the committee who has not spoken under general debate I am in favor of the million-dollar appropriation in this paragraph as to the policy of the War Department. In 1903–4 this country probably never faced such panicky conditions nor such hard times. Men were out of employment, commodities were cheap, to be sure, and I am going to try to prove to this House that the wholesale dumping of bacon, tinned goods, surplus products on hand at the present time would be detrimental to the best interests of the people, and by the people I mean all of us consumers, because after all most of us would like a piece of that bacon of which there are 38,000,000 pounds on hand, two and a half million pounds of corned beef, and several million pounds more of tinned meat. After all it resolves itself into a question of common sense. If we are going to dump 38,000,000 pounds of bacon on the American public, which is about a pound of bacon to every three men, and a pound of bacon is a great deal in the normal consumption of a family, you are going to stop production to a certain extent in this country, you are going to stop employment. Just as in the case of the knitting trade, if the surplus product on hand of fifteen to twenty millions of stockings is going to be dumped on the public, and you or I would like to buy a pair at 15 or 20 cents, you are going to stop production in the knitting mills of this country and that means cessation of the knitting industry in the West, New England, and the Middle States, where knitting mills are generally busy to-day.

Mr. HUDDLESTON rose.

Mr. OLNEY. I can not answer a question because I have only five minutes. So it seems to me we are cutting off our nose to spite our face. Now, when we consider the salaries of these men, Mr. Hare, his assistant, his coassistant——

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLNEY. No; I can not.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. OLNEY. No; the gentleman did not yield to me—at $25,000 and $10,000 and $6,000, respectively, we must realize

that in normal times in their own business those men received about double those salaries, and the Government is fortunate indeed to receive the services of those business experts at such salaries. This morning I left the sales manager's office, and he told me that in the sale of tinned meats and in the sale of bacon, about $25,000,000 worth of surplus products, he sent out 35,000 letters all over this country to State charitable institutions, wholesalers, and retailers, and has made as public as possible to all dealers to bid. Those bids close on June 20, and if the bids are not satisfactory the bids will be rejected. After all, it is the duty, it is the function, of these officers to receive just as high a price as possible for that enormous amount of goods we purchased during the war. We paid a tremendous price not only for meats and commodities—of course, that all comes under the law of supply and demand, and we had to pay a big price—but the Government is anxious to secure as near 100 cents on a dollar as possible through the Government experts who are retained for the purpose of cleaning up. I wish to insert in the RECORD the situation as to wool. We bought and paid for during the war 659,000,000 pounds of wool, amounting to $466,000,000. We have on hand 250,000,000 pounds, amounting to $176,000,000. The estimated shinkage and loss in value on that amount of wool which the Government will have to sacrifice in order to meet the foreign market is nearly $50,000,000, but we have to make this sacrifice. Public wool sales were stopped in Boston a few days ago because with the wool on hand it would have been foolish to sacrifice it, and after all, if we want to sacrifice these woolens, turning them over to the public for cheaper clothing, you would not relieve so much the burden from taxation of the people, because after all, the people—the consumer—pay the taxes, and if you want to sacrifice all this amount of material on hand at auction prices the people pay the debt in the end and suffer the consequences.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLNEY. I will.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that there is a ready market for woolen goods right now in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, England, France—cash customers?

Mr. OLNEY. Yes; and I have no doubt these officials are aware of those markets and will advertise in foreign markets as well.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But do these experts know of it, every one knows of it, but do they know of it?

Mr. OLNEY. As a member of the Military Committee I finally got over to France and inspected our best-known battle field, but I was too belated to join the major party. It is needless for me to emphasize our debt of gratitude to our American Army of 2,000,000 in France, what it did for the Nation and the great glory it brought to the United States. The two million men in this country ready to sail should not be forgotten, for they were just as ready to do their part as the Army in contact. I am in favor of the majority sentiment of the committee and an Army of 400,000 men and an appropriation therefor. This is but temporary legislation, continuing to July 1, 1920. When the time seems opportune for a permanent policy I shall favor a system providing for a small Army, not to exceed 150,000, and universal military training.

I insert the following letter from Brig. Gen. H. M. Lord incident to wool bought and sold and on hand:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE,
Washington, June 6, 1919.

Hon. RICHARD OLNEY, 2D,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. OLNEY: The following data relative to the War Department's adventure in the wool business may be the information which you were desirous of obtaining, as per our conversation this morning.

The wool account, as of May 17, 1919 (which is the last statement on record in this office), shows the following status:

	Pounds.	Amount.
Wool bought and paid for	659,244,199	$466,457,010.91
Estimated amount yet to be taken, domestic clip, and South American wool-purchasing syndicate to terminate contracts, etc	2,300,000	1,460,000.00
Estimated amount yet to be taken, second purchase Australian wool	8,500,000	5,700,000.00
Estimated amount due on old Australian purchase, withheld from payment until penny per pound rebate is adjusted with the British Government		3,500,000.00
Balance due on portion of second purchase of Australian wool already shipped		1,200,000.00
Total	670,044,199	478,317,010.91
Wool sold	411,937,119	301,382,187.31
Balance on hand and to be taken over	258,107,080	176,934,823.60

There has been used 50 cents per pound as a basis in arriving at the money value of the wool yet to be sold. If this estimate is a fair one, it means that there will be realized further on the wool account $129,053,540, representing a loss of $47,881,283.60.

Since the compilation of these figures there have been further sales of wool aggregating 4,000,000 pounds; this office has not been advised, however, as to the amount of money realized from that sale.

Very truly, yours,

H. M. LORD,
Brigadier General, Director of Finance, United States Army.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. What became of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, to strike out the entire appropriation?

The CHAIRMAN. That amendment was not made; the Chair has no recollection of it. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment as amended.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 15, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 59, noes 77.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF.

ARMY WAR COLLEGE.

For expenses of the Army War College, being for the purchase of the necessary stationery; typewriters and exchange of same; office, toilet, and desk furniture; textbooks; books of reference; scientific and professional papers and periodicals; printing and binding; maps; police utensils; employment of temporary, technical, or special services; and for all other absolutely necessary expenses, including $25 per month additional to regular compensation to chief clerk of division for superintendence of the War College Building, $9,000.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, while this appropriation bill is under discussion I think it is appropriate to call to the attention of this House the act of a private soldier who, according to my information, has indeed made a most remarkable record.

Oklahomans and the Nation as a whole have a just cause to be proud of the splendid accomplishments of the Ninetieth and Thirty-sixth Divisions, composed of Oklahoma and Texas units. A few days ago I talked to a captain who was most severely wounded while across the seas, and he informed me that Companies A, B, C, and D of the Three hundred and fifty-seventh Infantry, of the Ninetieth Division, were the first unit that was successful in piercing the Hindenburg line. To do this it was necessary to go through five barbed-wire entanglements and two concrete fences. And, in addition, I have had brought to my attention to-day the record of an Oklahoma private, which, according to the information I have received, shows one of the most remarkable accomplishments of the entire war. The name of this young soldier is Will H. Rice. He resides in an inland town called Putnam, in Dewey County, which is some 25 miles from the railroad. According to the records of the French headquarters, he succeeded in capturing 171 Prussians; he charged 50 machine-gun nests and remained in possession of them for four days, until he was relieved. I think that his accomplishment is one of the greatest records that have ever been made by any private soldier. And from the further fact that the French headquarters has ordered him decorated and has made this report, I thought he was entitled to this consideration, and that this information should be given to the House of Representatives. So I am going to ask the Clerk to read in my time an account that was published in regard to Pvt. Will H. Rice, who resides in the Seventh congressional district of Oklahoma.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

[From the Daily Oklahoman, Oklahoma City, Sunday, June 8, 1919.]

OKLAHOMA FARMER'S SON CAPTURES 171 PRUSSIANS, RIVALING FEAT OF YORK.

PUTNAM, OKLA., *June 7.*

Rivaling the feat of Sergt. Alvin C. York, of Pall Mall, Tenn., who has been pronounced the world's greatest soldier, Pvt. Will H. Rice, a Dewey County farmer boy, charged through 200 yards of barbed-wire entanglements, stormed a position hiding 50 machine guns and a numbers of trench mortars, and captured 171 Prussian prisoners, according to word received here from general headquarters of the French Army. Confirmation of the story comes in the form of a citation, announcing an order for decoration, which has been received by the boy's father, J. M. Rice, who lives near Putnam.

Rice is a member of D Company, One hundred and forty-first Infantry, Thirty-sixth Division, and is now on his way home.

"Under violent barrage, Pvt. Rice dashed to the attack of an enemy position, covering about 200 yards through barbed-wire entanglements," the citation says. "He rushed on machine-gun nests, capturing 171 prisoners. He stormed a strongly held position containing more than 50 machine guns and a number of trench mortars, turned the captured guns on the enemy, and held said position four days, in spite of a constant barrage of large projectiles and of gas shells. He crossed no man's land many times to get information concerning the enemy and to assist his wounded comrades."

Pvt. Rice's father was born in Bavaria, Germany, but came to America when he was 16 years old. He was naturalized when 21 years old and has lived on his farm northeast of here for the past 24 years. Pvt. Rice himself is 24 years old. He enlisted May 27, 1918, and was sent to Camp Bowie, Tex., for training. He crossed overseas in August, 1918, and was with the Thirty-sixth Division throughout its campaign around St. Etienne.

[Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to give notice to the committee that it is very important that we get this bill through the House as soon as possible. The statement that has just been made and read is most interesting, but I shall raise the point of order hereafter on matters of that kind. It is very essential that this bill go to the Senate and to the President as speedily as possible, the pay of the soldiers, their transportation, and their subsistence after June 30 being involved in it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the actual and necessary expenses of officers of the Army on duty abroad for the purpose of observing operations of armies of foreign States at war, to be paid upon certificates of the Secretary of War that the expenditures were necessary for obtaining military information, $25,000.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. DYER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

My question may or may not be germane to the paragraph. I received a letter a few days ago from The Adjutant General stating that 8,400 of our soldiers were in Russia and 4,600 in Siberia. Has the committee any information whether they have been ordered to return?

Mr. KAHN. I will state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the soldiers in Russia have already been ordered returned, and I understand that they are now being returned. I saw a statement to that effect in to-day's newspapers. The soldiers in Siberia are being held there with the soldiers of other countries to maintain the railroad lines so that food can be brought to the starving peoples of Siberia and Russia. The committee was informed that our Government is under an agreement with the various Governments of the world, and that each one of those Governments is placing a certain number of its soldiers to protect that railroad.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Has the United States any more soldiers there in proportion than our Allies?

Mr. KAHN. No. The soldiers there who are representing our Government are in proportion to the others. I want to say, too, that the War Department has called for volunteers to go to the Siberian line so as to relieve the drafted men and the volunteers. I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the department is having some difficulty in getting men to volunteer for the Siberian service. But every effort will be made to return the drafted men and the volunteers. They are not doing any other duty than protecting the railroads.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. The Adjutant General informed me that there were few volunteers, but most of them were conscripted men. Those with whom I have talked since their return from Europe state that there are very few men volunteering to go to Russia or Siberia.

Mr. KAHN. That is true.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. DYER. I move to strike out the paragraph just read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DYER: On page 3 strike out the paragraph beginning with line 15 and ending with line 19, inclusive.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, this bill is for the expenses of the Army beginning July 1 next. This item is for the expenses of officers on duty abroad to observe operations of armies at war. Now, I am in hopes, and I believe that the Members of the House are in hopes, that the war in Europe is over and that there is no necessity for having observers abroad during the next year. And to include this item in the bill, unless there is some reason for it which I can not anticipate, I think the House would be doing a bad thing. It would be encouraging in a way the sending of men or officers abroad to observe the skirmishes between the Bolsheviki and other forces of that kind, which, as I understand it, are the only forces at war now.

Mr. KAHN. Has the gentleman from Missouri finished?

Mr. DYER. I am going to yield to the gentleman to state the necessity for the item. If there is any, I will withdraw my amendment.

Mr. KAHN. I asked Gen. Churchill, of the Military Intelligence Division, especially whether we needed that item at this time, and he told the committee that we did. There is a peculiar situation in Europe. The military observers who are operating with the various armies—liaison officers, some of them are called—are needed in Europe and elsewhere, and will be needed in the next fiscal year. One of these is in Dalmatia, another in Egypt, and three are said to be required at the Scoda ordnance works near Pilsen. Of course, so far as fighting is concerned, I want to say to my friend from Missouri that there is some actual fighting being done by the Czecho-Slovaks and the Roumanians and some of the other peoples of Europe. The war is not really over. While the various nations are acting under an armistice, the war is not really over and will not be until peace has been formally declared. The amount here is not a great deal. The War Department says these officers are necessary, and therefore I hope the gentleman will not insist upon his motion.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, from the statement of the chairman of the committee, in whom I have great confidence and who has stated the necessity for this item, I ask leave to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To provide means for the theoretical and practical instruction at the Army service schools (including the Army Staff College, the Army School of the Line, the Army Field Engineer School, the Army Field Service School and Correspondence School for Medical Officers, and the Army Signal School) at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., the Mounted Service School at Fort Riley, Kans., and the School of Fire for Field Artillery, and for the Infantry School of Arms at Fort Sill, Okla., by the purchase of textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, the purchase of modern instruments and material for theoretical and practical instruction, employment of temporary, technical, or special services, and for all other absolutely necessary expenses, to be allotted in such proportion as may, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, be for the best interests of the military service. Not exceeding $300 per month may be used for the payment of $100 per month to a translator at the Army service schools, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., $100 per month to a translator at the School of Fire for Field Artillery, and $100 per month to a translator at the Infantry School of Arms, Fort Sill, Okla., to be appointed by the commandants of the schools named, with the approval of the Secretary of War, $75,000.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WRIGHT: Page 4, lines 3 and 4, after the word "Artillery," on line 3, strike out the words "and for the Infantry School of Arms at Fort Sill, Okla."

Mr. WRIGHT. I offer that amendment because there is no Infantry School of Arms there.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. WRIGHT. There is no Infantry School of Arms at Fort Sill, Okla. It is now an Artillery fire service.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the Chair to hold that new legislation is in order? I take it that it is subject to a point of order, because it changes existing law. The law now authorizes a school of fire at Fort Sill. The gentleman's amendment would change that existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. It is in order to strike out an appropriation at any time.

Mr. KAHN. This affects the amount of the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that it is in order to strike out. I think the members of the Committee on Military Affairs should read the amendment.

Mr. ANTHONY. If the Chair holds it in order, I would like to be heard in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds it is in order.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will not adopt that amendment. Its obvious purpose is to change the location of the School of Fire, which is now authorized at Fort Sill, Okla., and which has been maintained there for a number of years. The Government has a large reservation there; it has a splendidly equipped post and institutions for that purpose.

Since the armistice the War Department has, in my opinion, unauthorizedly expended millions of dollars in the construction of a proposed School of Fire at Columbus, Ga. It has expended money, that we appropriated for the conduct of the war, for the creation of a military post to be used in time of peace. It is obviously the intention of the gentleman now to authorize the transfer of the School of Fire from Fort Sill, where it exists now, to Georgia. In my opinion this would be a great mistake, and a great extravagance, and I hope it will not be authorized by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman from California to an error in spelling on line 4, page 4, in the word "textbook."

Mr. KAHN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that "taxtbooks" be changed to "textbooks."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will send it to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. WRIGHT. I hope to amend lines 15 and 16 by striking out after the words "translator at" the words "the Infantry School of Arms, Fort Sill, Okla."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will send his amendment to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. WRIGHT. I ask that the amendment be reported by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia will restate his amendment.

Mr. WRIGHT. On line 15, page 4, strike out after the word "at" the words "the Infantry School of Arms, Fort Sill, Okla."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WRIGHT: On page 4, lines 15 and 16, after the word "at" on line 15, strike out the words "the Infantry School of Arms, Fort Sill, Okla."

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, there is no such school at Fort Sill, Okla. In fact, many months ago it was by proper Executive order transferred to Fort Benning, Ga., and it is now functioning at that place.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. WRIGHT. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 12, noes 50.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Creating, maintaining, and operating at established Army flying schools, course of instruction for aviation students, including cost of equipment, and supplies necessary for instruction and subsistence of students, purchase of tools, equipment, materials, machines, textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, and instruments and material for theoretical and practical instruction at aviation schools; purchase of supplies for securing, developing, printing, and reproducing photographs made by aerial observers; to maintain and replace the equipment of organizations already in service; equipment, maintenance, and operation of aviation stations, balloon schools, fields for testing and experimental work; procuring and introducing water, electric light and power, telephones, telegraphs, and sewerage; purchase of stoves and other cooking and heating apparatus, kitchen and table ware, and furniture and equipment for kitchens, mess halls, officers' quarters, barracks, hospitals, and other buildings; screens, lockers, refrigerators, and all other equipment; salaries and wages of civilian employees in the District of Columbia or elsewhere as may be necessary; experimental investigation and purchase and development of new types of aircraft, and aviation engines; purchase, manufacture, maintenance, repair, and operation of airships, war balloons, and other aerial machines, including instruments and appliances of every sort and description necessary for the operation, construction, or equipment of all types of aircraft, and all necessary spare parts and equipment connected therewith.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. KAHN. I suggest that the reading of the paragraph be concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed by the Clerk that the reading of the paragraph is concluded.

Mr. KAHN. We had this very question up before, and it has been held heretofore that in the military bill a paragraph means the entire item under a certain heading. That was the ruling of the presiding officer when the question was raised before. I suggest, therefore, that the entire section be read, and then the gentleman can offer his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. If that is agreeable, the Chair will direct the Clerk to read the entire subhead before amendments are offered.

The Clerk read as follows:

And also for the purchase or manufacture and issue of special clothing, wearing apparel, and similar equipment for aviation purposes, $15,000,000: *Provided*, That claims not exceeding $250 in amount for damages to persons and private property, resulting from the operation of aircraft at home and abroad, may be settled out of the funds appropriated hereunder, when each claim is substantiated by a survey report of a board of officers appointed by the commanding officer of the nearest aviation post and approved by the Director of Military Aeronautics: *Provided further*, That claims so settled and paid from the sum hereby appropriated shall not exceed in the aggregate the sum of $150,000. That no part of any appropriations herein shall be used unless all former civilian flying instructors who were dismissed on or about December 31, 1918, shall be reinstated on application to their former positions as from the date of such dismissal up to and including June 30, 1919: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to apply to any civilian flying instructor dismissed prior to December 31, 1918, for misconduct or incompetency.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BLACK. I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I notice that in this paragraph on page 11 there is a provision which reads as follows:

That no part of any appropriations herein shall be used unless all former civilian flying instructors who were dismissed on or about December 31, 1918, shall be reinstated on application to their former positions as from the date of such dismissal up to and including June 30, 1919.

I should like to inquire the reason for that limitation upon the appropriation.

Mr. KAHN. The language of this paragraph is identical with the language of the bill that passed the House in February last. That item was put in on account of some difficulties over civilian instructors. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] is thoroughly familiar with it, and I will ask him to make a statement about it.

Mr. BLACK. I will be very glad to have an explanation.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I will state to the gentleman that in the various aviation schools in this country we had flying instructors. We gathered all the available material that we had at the time and engaged these boys as instructors. A good many of them were eligible for commissions, but they were not taken into the Army and commissioned for the reason that they were wanted for instruction purposes. When the armistice was signed these boys were suddenly discharged, although there was an implied promise that they would be kept on until June 30, 1919.

Mr. BLACK. On that point can the gentleman cite anything in the hearings to show that the War Department had any implied contract with these men to keep them until June 30, 1919? It is undoubtedly true that with the signing of the armistice a great many civilian employees of the War Department and the Treasury Department and the Navy Department and other departments of the Government found themselves without jobs, but are we going to put a limitation on an appropriation and say to the War Department that they can not spend a dollar of it unless they give certain men jobs until June 30, 1919?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman can not make a comparison between some of the favored sons who were of military age, and who received jobs at pushing a pen in Washington, and who did not fulfill their military duties, and these boys who were able and willing to enter the aviation service, but were kept in a more dangerous work, that of instructing. There is no more dangerous work in the Army than instructing in aviation, and if the gentleman does not believe me I will be glad to take him up some day and turn the controls over to him.

Now, these boys were not given their commissions in the Army, and then suddenly, just to satisfy the whim of somebody in the General Staff, they threw these boys out.

Mr. BLACK. Where is the evidence that there was any implied contract on the part of the War Department to keep these instructors until the 30th of June, 1919?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am stating the fact to the gentleman. And if he will read the hearings of last year's bill he will find that it is as I have stated.

Mr. BLACK. I make the point of order on the proviso referred to.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state the language to which he makes the point of order?

Mr. BLACK. Beginning with line 8, just after the figures "$150,000," and including the rest of the paragraph.

Mr. KAHN. The language is clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I should like to be heard on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York on the point of order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I desire to state that the point of order was raised when I offered an amendment to the bill in the last session, and it was then held in order by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], I think.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, in order for this provision to be in order on the bill it would have to reduce expenditures. The effect of the amendment would be to increase the expenditures, because it says to the War Department if you spend a dollar of this $15,000,000 we are appropriating you must put back on the pay roll of the United States Government certain employees who have been dismissed from the service. So the real effect of the proviso is to increase rather than to decrease expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a limitation on the appropriation, but it is a limitation that also calls for affirmative action on the part of the executive. Therefore, it is subject to a point of order, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 11, in lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "director of military aeronautics" and insert in lieu thereof "officer in charge of Air Service."

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the language is obvious, and I do not think that I need to explain it. There is no director of military aeronautics at this time, so the proposed language will designate the person who is to do the work.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 10, line 6, after the word "work," insert "including Bolling Field, at Washington, D. C."

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of maintaining Bolling Field is to have a flying or aviation field in Washington, D. C. The proposition is to abandon Bolling Field on the mere whim of the General Staff. They prepared to do so a few days ago, but owing to pressure that was brought to bear on them that action has been delayed.

Where we have aviation we must cooperate with every branch of the Army, and it is very useful and very necessary that we have a field in Washington where the Artillery, Signal Corps, the radio, and all branches may acquire the experience that comes with aviation. There is nothing in the purpose of abandoning Bolling Field except the pique and whim of the present Chief of Staff. I feel that by including Bolling Field in the general appropriation we will express the desire of the House that Bolling Field be maintained. They have come in and asked for millions of dollars to buy the Dayton, Ohio, field and abandon Langley Field after dumping millions into it. Now they want to abandon it as an experimental station. The general scheme has been to get swamp lands, drain them, and then buy them at an exorbitant price. We have spent millions on Langley Field and that is to be abandoned as an experimental station and buy at Dayton, Ohio. This amendment is to keep an aviation field at Washington, D. C., and not give way to the whims of the General Staff.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Did not the officer in charge tell the committee that the only reason for abandoning Bolling Field was that the Secretary of War had ordered it?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Exactly.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. That he knew of no reason for it?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. When he was pressed for a reason we did not get any.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from California to state the authorization for that portion of the language in the bill as follows:

Purchase of supplies for securing, developing, printing, and reproducing photographs made by aerial observers; to maintain and replace the equipment of organizations already in service; equipment, maintenance, and operation of aviation stations, balloon schools, fields for testing and experimental work.

Mr. KAHN. The only authorization is that it has been carried in previous appropriation bills. The Army appropriation bill from year to year brings in these items and there is rarely any change in the verbiage of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. If there were general authorization for the language already in the bill, adding this specific language as a conditional activity would be in order, but there being no authorization for the activities provided for in the bill there is no authorization for the amendment, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Do I understand the Chair in reaching his decision assumes that there is no authorization for maintaining aviation fields?

The CHAIRMAN. No authorization for language in this portion of the bill. There is no specific authorization for that except the language carried in previous appropriation bills, as the Chair is informed.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I have a further amendment, on line 6, after the word "aeronautics," to insert the words:

Provided further, That no part of any appropriation herein shall be used unless the aviation field at Bolling Field, Washington, D. C., is maintained.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment which the Clerk will report. The gentleman will send his amendment to the desk.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I have to write it first.

Mr. CURRY of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer, pending the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 19, strike out the word "established" and insert the words "United States."

Mr. CURRY of California. Mr. Chairman, the object of this amendment is to prevent the War Department from using Government money in private flying establishments, such as they do now at the Curtiss and the Wright institutions. My amendment was adopted unanimously when this bill was before the House at the last session. It was stricken out in the Senate, and it has come from the Military Affairs Committee as it came from the Senate committee. The adoption of this amendment will save the United States a great deal of money and will result in retaining and developing certain aviation fields under the control of the United States and the United States Army, and prevent their being abolished, and prevent more money being used in the Wright and Curtiss and other aviation stations to the detriment of the country.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I have followed the gentleman's statement. Personally I believe that we would be making a mistake if we were to prevent the training of flyers in any school. This is a very important branch of the Military Establishment. We lost weeks and months of time in having to train flyers when we got into this war. If ever we should get into trouble again, I take it that the people would want to have as many men trained as possible so as to join the colors of the country and participate in the conflict. I do not think the amendment will accomplish any good purpose, and I hope my colleague will not insist upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CURRY of California) there were—ayes 16, noes 42.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 11, line 6, after the word "aeronautics," insert:

"*Provided*, That no part of the appropriations herein shall be used unless Bolling Aviation Field at Washington, D. C., is maintained."

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman that he correct his amendment so that it shall come after the word

"service," because the word "aeronautics" has been stricken out by another amendment.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Then I shall so modify the amendment.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order upon the ground that it requires affirmative action upon the part of the Secretary of War.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order being made, the amendment can not be modified. The Chair sustains the point of order. It is clearly subject to the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all expenses necessary for the completion, preservation, and transportation of the records pertaining to the draft under the act of May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," $25,000.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 20 minutes, as I did not discuss the bill under general debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to proceed for 20 minutes out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, this bill is drawn substantially upon the lines of the bill that was reported to this House at the last session of the last Congress. In fact, that bill is followed in the report of the measure now pending before the House. It is true that the committee recommends some reductions from the bill as reported in the last Congress. The bill as reported at the last session of the last Congress carried in round numbers $1,117,000,000. This bill carries in round numbers $809,000,000, making a difference of a little more than $300,000,000. If gentlemen will examine the items of the bill it will appear that the principal reductions from the bill as reported in the last session of the last Congress are in the pay, the subsistence, and the transportation of the Army. This bill reduces the pay of the Army by $67,000,000. It reduces the item of transportation by $207,000,000. It reduces the item of subsistence by $30,000,000. Together they practically account for the decrease. It was my individual opinion that we should appropriate for an average-sized Army of 509,000 men, as recommended by the War Department, especially when it came to the question of the pay of the soldier, the subsistence of the soldier, and his transportation. We could not possibly have made any mistake if we had appropriated for the pay of an Army of 509,000 men, because if, during the next fiscal year, we did not have an Army of 509,000 men the money could not be expended. That is an appropriation for a specific purpose, and unless you had an Army of that average the money could not be used. I was of the opinion that we ought not to make any mistake in the amount that we appropriated for the subsistence of the Army. I was of the opinion that we ought not to reduce the appropriation for the transportation of the Army, and I do not think that we would have made any mistake if we had made identically the same appropriation for these three items that was made in the bill as reported at the last session of Congress. I am perfectly willing to admit that it is barely possible—I shall go further; that it is most probable—that the average-sized Army the next fiscal year will not exceed 400,000 men. I think that the demobilization of the troops has taken place much more rapidly than the War Department anticipated when they appeared before the committee last January, and that it is most likely that we will not average an Army larger than 400,000 men. Therefore I shall support this bill, although I repeat I think we could not have made any mistake if on those three items which I have mentioned—pay, subsistence, and transportation—we had been liberal, so that there could not have been any possibility of the soldier having to wait for his pay, his food, or sufficient money to bring him from Europe and take him to his home. [Applause.]

As stated by the gentleman from California in his explanation of this bill in opening his remarks day before yesterday, this bill does not establish any regular standing Army. It was not the intention of the committee nor was it the intention of the War Department to fix a standing Army of any particular size. The only purpose of this legislation is to take care of an average sized Army during the next fiscal year. It was estimated by the War Department that it would amount to something like 500,000 men. The committee thought 400,000 was sufficient, and personally I think 400,000 will cover the average number of men who will be in the service during the period of demobilization. I therefore hope that the bill will be sustained and passed with that number of men. So much, Mr. Chairman, for the bill itself.

I have the highest respect and the most kindly feelings toward the chairman of this committee. He has been my friend during the period that I served as the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and has rendered me time and time again invaluable assistance. He has been on the committee longer than any other member. He is one of the best posted men on military legislation in this country, and I am sorry to say that I am unable to agree with the logic of the position which I understood him to take day before yesterday when he was addressing the committee upon the subject matter of this bill. As I understood the distinguished gentleman from California, and he left the impression upon my mind, and I believe upon the members of the committee, that had his amendment to the national defense act, which was enacted in June, 1916, been adopted, by which the Army would have been enlarged to 250,000 men, instead of 175,000, as fixed by the national defense act, that Germany would never have challenged us to combat. I confess that I have been unable to follow the logic of the distinguished gentleman from California that a difference in the size of the Army of 75,000 men would have kept Germany from fighting us.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. BLACK. I desire to ask the gentleman from Alabama if it is not true that in 1916, several months before the gentleman from California offered his amendment, that Congress authorized an additional 20,000 men for duty on the Mexican border, and if it is not a fact that at the time the gentleman from California offered his amendment that the Army had been unable to secure that 20,000 additional men by voluntary enlistment?

Mr. DENT. The gentleman from Texas has accurately stated the fact, as I recall. Now, let us see, Mr. Chairman, what the real facts are. Prior to the Spanish-American War the maximum strength of the Army of the United States was 25,000. After the Spanish-American War the maximum strength was raised to 100,000. I make this bold statement, and I challenge contradiction, that at no time since the maximum strength of the Army was increased to 100,000 has the War Department, either under a Democratic or Republican administration, asked Congress to appropriate for the maximum strength. I came on this committee in 1909, at the first extra session called by President Taft, when this House was under Republican control. The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs at that time was the distinguished gentleman in the person of former Gov. Hull of Iowa. I served two years under the chairmanship of Gov. Hull, when the Republican Party had control of every branch of the Government, and yet neither the War Department nor the Committee on Military Affairs ever asked for an appropriation for the full strength of 100,000 men. Under the national defense act of June 3, 1916, we raised the Army again to a strength of 175,000 men. What were the facts when war was declared, on the 6th day of April, 1917? There was an authorized strength, a peace strength, of an Army of 175,000 men, excluding the Medical Corps, the Quartermaster Corps, and the Signal Corps, and we actually had 127,000, speaking in round numbers, officers and men, in our entire Military Establishment when this Congress declared war in April, 1917. Now, is it possible that the logic of the argument of the gentleman from California can be followed that we made a mistake in not making the Army 250,000 when we made it only 175,000 and, as a matter of fact, only had 127,000 officers and men? The amendment of the gentleman from California did not fix any different way of raising the Army. He did not propose to raise it in any different way from what it was raised under the national defense act. We never reached the maximum limit under the Hay bill, and therefore how can the gentleman possibly argue that had his amendment been adopted Germany would never have challenged us to war? Now, I mention this, Mr. Chairman, not in any spirit of carping criticism, but I do think that the facts ought to be fairly stated. I do know that there has been a great deal of misrepresentation throughout the country, and especially in the press of the country in particular, as to what the position of men in public life charged with duty in regard to military measures has been. I have suffered from that as much as any other man on the floor of this House. I challenge anyone now to answer this question: If it be a fact—and the RECORD will bear me out—that at no time under any administration has the War Department ever asked for the maximum strength of the Army, whatever it may have been, and at no time has the maximum strength ever been urged by the War Department itself, how could we have been any better prepared than we were? I want to say in this connection that you can talk to me about our lack of preparedness as much as you please; you can argue from now until doomsday that this Government was not prepared for war; but I want to say that if it be true that we put over 2,000,000 of men in Europe within 19 months, if we won

this war within a little over a year and a half, my God, what greater accomplishment could there be. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Let it not be forgotten that within a little more than one year and a half we landed over 2,000,000 soldiers upon the soil of France; let it not be forgotten that we had something like a million and a half in reserve back in this country; let it not be forgotten that we transported those soldiers to France with the destruction of only one loaded transport and with a loss of only 733 out of 2,000,000 of men.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will yield.

Mr. LITTLE. Can the gentleman tell me whether the statement I have so often heard, that only 11 per cent of the officers that were prepared at West Point got onto the firing line at all, is true or not?

Mr. DENT. I can not answer the gentleman as to the percentage of officers from West Point that got into the firing line. The information was given to the committee that 40 per cent of the West Point men went to France and actually engaged in operations over there and about 60 per cent remained in this country for training purposes.

Mr. LITTLE. But you do not know what percentage went on the firing line?

Mr. DENT. I do not.

Mr. LITTLE. The value of the preparation would really depend on the number or percentage of those prepared that got onto the firing line?

Mr. DENT. I do not know that I can quite agree with the gentleman in that regard. I think one of the most important things that the West Point graduates did in this war was instructing the novices in the arts of warfare. [Applause.]

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. Is it not a fact that the only preparation that our troops had that was of any value on the firing line was what they got on the firing line? That everything they knew before turned out to be of no particular utility in the present war?

Mr. DENT. Of course this war developed a lot of new things that had never been dreamed of in any previous war.

Mr. LITTLE. And the knowledge was acquired on the firing line?

Mr. DENT. No; I do not think so; but the gentleman is entitled to his opinion.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. As a matter of fact, the West Point officers did train the men in this country and as early as August, 1917, within three or four months after we got into the war, Gen. Pershing sent a cablegram to the War Department asking that the soldiers trained over here be trained in open warfare and not in trench warfare. So they were trained as we had always been training them for any war.

Mr. DENT. I do not think there is any question in the world but that they were trained before they went into the firing line, thoroughly and completely. I think that is one of the most remarkable things that was accomplished.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just a word or two more and I am done. I wish to state to the committee that 13 members of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House visited France in a body. We took along one of the official stenographers to committees. We visited the three base ports of embarkation and debarkation. Further, we went through the service of supply, visited the various business operations behind the Army, and from there we went on the battle field itself, being accompanied by officers who actually participated in these battles, the head officer with us being Gen. Summerall, who described the battles to us. He was commander of the First Division.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. VAILE). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have 10 minutes more.

Mr. DENT. Five minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DENT. These battles were described to us by Gen. Summerall and other officers who actually participated in them, right on the field itself. I mention this for the purpose of stating to the House that it is the intention of those members of the committee who made this trip to France and made this inspection, as soon as we can finish with this appropriation bill, to put the facts that we gathered there together, with the stenographic report of the description of the battles and what we saw in the service of supply, in some sort of a form, to be printed as a House document, not with any comment by the members of the committee, but simply with a statement of the facts as we gathered them on our visit there. I think that this will prove quite an interesting document, because we have the facts taken down in shorthand, right on the field, as described by men that actually participated in those operations. I may say that next to the fighting quality of the American soldier, about which no one anywhere now has any doubt, the most remarkable thing about this whole program to me, and I think that my views on this subject meet with the approval of most of the members of the committee, was the splendid business organization behind the Army, without which it would not have been a success. [Applause.]

In returning from the trip, separately and individually, I asked members of our party this question: "Next to the fighting spirit and the fighting character of the American boys upon the field of battle, what was the most conspicuous outstanding feature of this trip?" And without a single exception each one of them answered, "The splendid, well-organized business plan behind the Army itself." [Applause.] Now, that costs money. We perhaps spent money extravagantly, and you will find, when you come with your investigating committee, that there was a lot of money spent. You are going to find here and there that it was extravagantly spent. But I wish to make the prediction that you will come out of that investigation applauding this Government for the manner in which it has executed the most tremendous task of its kind that ever was even performed in the history of the world. [Applause.] It has not been done, either, by Democrats alone. This has not been a Democratic or a Republican war. It has been a war of the whole American people. [Applause.] Both Democrats and Republicans are entitled to this glory.

Let me remind you, gentlemen, that while the head of the War Department, the Secretary of War, is a Democrat, during the war we increased the number of Assistant Secretaries by two, so that we have three Assistant Secretaries of War now instead of one, as we had previous to the war, and all three of them are Republicans. So that while I think that perhaps it is a good thing to make an investigation of the tremendous amount of money that we expended during this war, I am perfectly confident that in the end an honest report is going to disclose that we are the greatest people on earth and that we can accomplish anything that we go after. [Applause.]

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DENT. I yield.

Mr. OLNEY. In his impressions over there, is not the gentleman of the opinion that Gen. John Pershing combined great military genius with wonderful business and executive ability and that he was just the man for the job?

Mr. DENT. There is no doubt in the world about that. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts in what he says about Gen. Pershing.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas). The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to proceed for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. As long as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLNEY] has reminded me of that, I am going to conclude with this statement: That I believe that no particular man in this war comes out of it with any great conspicuous reputation, as was the case in previous wars, because it has been fought out on an entirely different line. But the one thing that commends Gen. Pershing, the one thing for which he should be praised by the entire people of this country, was his persistent fight to maintain a separate American Army under the leadership of an American officer, and he finally got it, and that is what won the war in the Argonne-Meuse fight. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing in the RECORD a statement which I received this morning from the War Department, showing the strength of the Army, staff and line, under the national defense act, according to the different increments provided by that act, which, I think, will prove interesting reading, together with the statement of the Chief of Staff, issued June 5, 1919. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to insert in his remarks the document indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the statement referred to:

Authorized strength of the Regular Army.

	Staff corps and departments.		Line.		Total.	
	Officers.	Enlisted men.	Officers.	Enlisted men.	Officers.	Enlisted men.
Authorized Mar. 17, 1916	1,363	17,008	3,477	106,030	4,840	123,038
After first increment, Sept. 23, 1916	1,834	21,995	4,012	116,902	5,846	138,897
After all increments, act June 3, 1916	4,247	59,568	8,016	161,477	12,263	221,045
Strength, United States Army, Nov. 11, 1918					188,434	3,456,149

PRESS INTERVIEW BY THE CHIEF OF STAFF, JUNE 7, 1919.

The organizations coming out from Archangel which left there on June 3 are Companies E, G, I, M, and the Machine Gun Company of the Three hundred and thirty-ninth Infantry, consisting of 52 officers and 1,609 men. They sailed direct for Brest. There also sailed at the same time 2 officers and 323 men for England. All the remaining troops of the original Archangel contingent are expected to be out inside of two weeks, leaving there temporarily the railroad engineers, who were sent up for a special purpose this spring.

We have now the embarkation records from France for the month of May, and they break all records, either coming from or going to France, the total number being 333,303, just a third of a million. This total is made up as follows:

Officers	12,276
Enlisted men	315,665
Field clerks	208
Nurses	1,139
Civilians	1,515
Marines	514
Navy	1,307
Miscellaneous	679

The return to the United States of the divisions raised from National Guard and National Army sources has now been completed, and the Regular Army is beginning to return. During the week the Sixth Regular Division began its sailings.

The Army is now, or was on the 5th of June, 65 per cent demobilized. The Army in Europe is reduced to below 700,000, the figures on June 3 showing officers and men, 694,745.

The return of our Army from France continues to be largely through Brest, 49 per cent of the entire number coming out of that port; 71 per cent of all landing in the United States continues in New York.

Our demobilization figures, so far as they have been reported to date, are 2,391,639, of which 119,873 are officers and 2,271,766 enlisted men.

Enlistments reported to date, which do not include the enlistments reported at camps during the present week, 48,023, so we have gotten the first block of 50,000 men called for when we started in a month or two ago. Without question when the reports come in to-day from the camps, it will be found that we have gone above this number.

Enlistments continue with the three-year enlistment predominating over the one-year enlistment.

We have sent to Europe as replacements for the regular divisions there five battalions of troops so far, consisting in round numbers of 5,000 officers and men, the actual number being 4,929.

The number of commissions in the Officers' Reserve Corps, issued to officers, is 44,215, and there are on file 23,701 for appointment in the Regular Army.

The matter of getting places in civil life for men who are discharged from the Army is very well in hand. During the five weeks ending May 31 61,323 discharged soldiers applied for positions—applied to the United States Employment Service, and they actually placed 40,596, or 66 per cent of the entire total, and it may be of interest to note in connection with this that during the last four months, ending May 24, of the million men demobilized only about 30 per cent of them have applied for assistance in getting jobs. The rest of them had jobs waiting for them, or went to their homes or farms.

The Siberian problem is a problem by itself, and the War Department will be in a position to solve it, because a large number of the men who have enlisted have not specified the places to which they wish to be sent. In this general list of figures you will note the places to which the men wish to be sent:

American Expeditionary Force, France	10,219
American Expeditionary Force, Siberia	40
Philippine Department	2,046
Panama	154
Honolulu	1,336
Alaska	24

Those who have specified their place of service aggregate about 14,000 out of the 50,000. We have, therefore, 36,000 men who enlisted without saying to what place they wish to be sent, and, of course, they will go where they are sent. In the meantime the option continues for those who wish to enlist to specify their place of service.

Progress of demobilization and enlistments.

Discharges reported to date:	
Officers	119,873
Enlisted men	2,271,766
Total	2,391,639
Officers and enlisted men sailed from Europe since Nov. 11, 1918:	
Officers	54,614
Enlisted men	1,220,233
Total	1,274,847
Enlisted men ordered demobilized since Nov. 11, 1918	2,514,000

Enlistments reported to date:	
Reported daily from depots and depot posts, to include early returns for June 7, 1919	16,785
Reported weekly from camps, up to and including May 31, 1919	31,238
Total	48,023
Over-sea replacements sailed for American Expeditionary Force, Europe, reported to date (5 battalions):	
Officers	202
Enlisted men	4,727
Total	4,929

Reports in detail follow:

Detailed report showing discharges of enlisted men (including those returned from overseas).

	Up to and including May 24.	Week ending May 31.
Camp Benning	650	45
Fort Bliss	3,722	180
Camp Bowie	31,584	1,203
Camp Bragg	193	.....
Camp Custer	67,570	3,907
Camp Devens	91,309	2,794
Camp Dix	140,784	18,663
Camp Dodge	115,434	4,097
Camp Funston	89,203	633
Garden City	23,259	1,959
Camp Gordon	54,925	2,249
Camp Grant	146,822	10,635
Hoboken	8,109	544
Camp Humphreys	13,595	40
Camp Jackson	46,182	784
Camp Jessup	957	59
Camp Kearny	17,735	483
Camp Kendrick	1,115	.....
Camp Las Casas	11,290	.....
Camp Lee	57,452	2,969
Camp Lewis	44,582	994
Camp Meade	63,770	1,762
Camp Meigs	8,441	82
Camp Mills	1,401	.....
Fort Monroe	4,626	89
Newport News	8,123	667
Fort Oglethorpe	29,542	1,115
Camp Pike	62,628	1,589
Presidio of San Francisco	30,586	875
Fort Russell	18,384	1,208
Camp Shelby	26,597	1,726
Camp Sherman	119,399	6,050
Fort Sill	3,625	19
Camp Taylor	101,009	2,128
Camp Travis	36,864	672
Camp Upton	121,414	4,790
Vancouver Barracks	11,898	2
Departments:		
Central	101,760	253
Eastern	85,509	145
Northeastern	22,317	56
Southeastern	41,934	47
Southern	63,431	1,192
Western	37,118	78
Hawaiian	4,091	.....
Panama Canal	1,313	.....
Philippine	11	.....
General hospitals	11,130	696
Recruit depots	27,989	106
Arsenals	5,725	90
Disciplinary barracks	1,193	3
War prison barracks	206	6
Miscellaneous	20,540	141
Total	2,139,036	77,796
Early returns week ending June 7, 1919	.....	43,903

Detailed report showing discharges of enlisted men by weeks.

Week ending:	
Nov. 23, 1918	6,051
Nov. 30, 1918	37,362
Dec. 7, 1918	101,089
Dec. 14, 1918	206,604
Dec. 21, 1918	199,136
Dec. 28, 1918	75,678
Jan. 4, 1919	65,519
Jan. 11, 1919	78,845
Jan. 18, 1919	77,284
Jan. 25, 1919	90,340
Feb. 1, 1919	85,976
Feb. 8, 1919	79,755
Feb. 15, 1919	71,048
Feb. 22, 1919	54,116
Mar. 1, 1919	52,552
Mar. 8, 1919	54,143
Mar. 15, 1919	57,007
Mar. 22, 1919	67,123
Mar. 29, 1919	62,121
Apr. 5, 1919	84,084
Apr. 12, 1919	64,518
Apr. 19, 1919	65,432
Apr. 26, 1919	60,249
May 3, 1919	78,523
May 10, 1919	85,860
May 17, 1919	87,069
May 24, 1919	91,552
May 31, 1919	77,796
June 7, 1919 (early returns)	43,903
Total	2,260,735

Detailed report showing troops returned from overseas since November 11, 1918.

	Officers.	Enlisted men.
Casuals	3,837	141,089
Sick and wounded	3,639	123,935
Divisional and organization	42,955	834,558
Total	50,431	1,099,582

Detailed report showing enlistments reported to date.

Reported daily from depots and depot posts to include early returns for June 6, 1919	16,700
Reported weekly from camps up to and including week ending May 31, 1919	31,238
Total	47,938
Included in the above total of enlistments are the following:	
For service in the—	
American Expeditionary Forces, France	10,183
American Expeditionary Forces, Siberia	41
Alaska	32
Philippine Department	2,039
Panama Canal Department	142
Hawaiian Department	1,333

Report of Officers' Reserve Corps appointments.

	Last report.	June 5.	To next report.
Appointments disapproved	5,939	5	5,944
Forwarded to The Adjutant General for appointment	32,508	154	32,662
Appointments reported by The Adjutant General	32,163	164	32,327

Commissions in Officers' Reserve Corps since Nov. 11, 1918, made by The Adjutant General from all sources.

	Cols.	Lt.Cols.	Majors.	Capts.	1st Lts.	2d Lts.	Total.
Last report	54	135	1,940	5,745	9,346	26,980	44,200
June 4, 1919	1	3	11	30	28	114	187
	55	138	1,951	5,775	9,374	27,094	44,387
Separations and declinations			11	31	57	73	172
	55	138	1,940	5,744	9,317	27,021	44,215

There are on file in this branch 23,741 applications for appointment in the Regular Army from emergency officers.

Report of discharges and resignations of officers since Nov. 10, 1918.

	Last report dated June 5, 1919.	Reports received to noon June 6, 1919.	Total to next report.
Resignations	992	3	995
Discharges	[1] 118,164	592	118,756
Total	119,156	595	119,751

[1] Includes 402 officers reported discharged by C. G. A. E. F. to date, under provisions Circular 75 and cable 2522 to C. G. A. E. F. dated January 22, 1919. Also includes 7 officers reported discharged by C. G. A. E. F. (Siberia) to date, under provisions Circular 75 and cable 2522 to C. G. A. E. F. dated January 22, 1919.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. KAHN. I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] for his exceedingly kind reference to me. Our relationship has been very cordial and I hope it will always continue so.

Reference was made when we had the bill up the other day to the amendment I offered to the national defense act of June 3, 1916. I find that on May 8, 1916, I secured consideration of and a vote on the amendment which the Senate had inserted in the bill, when it was being considered in that body, authorizing a straight Army—not by increments—but a straight Army of 250,000 enlisted men. These very arguments that have been adduced here were considered then. It was repeatedly asserted that we would not get the men; that it was going to be an expensive proposition. But after all, my friends, psychology plays an important part in these matters. If the German Government had known that we could immediately under our law put 250,000 men into the field they would have hesitated, in my opinion, to sink our vessels on the high seas.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Was not the position of the German Government that whatever might be the size of our Army it would be impossible for us to transport it?

Mr. KAHN. That was one of the considerations.

Mr. WINGO. Was not that the sole consideration which they used on the German people in justifying their fight on the American people?

Mr. KAHN. I do not know as to that, but——

Mr. WINGO. That was their basis in advocating open submarine warfare.

Mr. KAHN. I know that the German officers who surrendered to the American officers said they realized they were defeated when the man-power bill was passed by Congress authorizing the enlistment of all able-bodied men from 18 to 45 years of age. They knew that their reservoir of man power was exhausted, and they knew ours was coming into being. The psychology of the enactment of that legislation was terrific in Germany. And so I maintain that the psychology of the proposed enactment for an Army of 250,000 men in the Regular Army of this country would have been exceedingly beneficial at the time of the enactment of the national-defense act.

Mr. IGOE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. IGOE. I should like to ask the gentleman what is the largest number of men that could have been raised by this country under the Hay bill in an emergency or in time of war?

Mr. KAHN. About 140,000 men.

Mr. IGOE. Was it not something like 300,000 or 400,000 men?

Mr. KAHN. Oh, in an emergency?

Mr. IGOE. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. If they had called out all the increments, about 225,000 men.

Mr. BLACK. You forget that we had the right to draft the National Guard.

Mr. KAHN. Oh, I bear that in mind. I have not forgotten anything about that.

Mr. BLACK. Does the gentleman mean to state that by having the right to call the National Guard into the service and recruit the Regular Army to its maximum strength it would only have amounted to about 225,000 men?

Mr. KAHN. Oh, no; I did not mean that. I meant the Regular Army.

Mr. BLACK. I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IGOE], I presume, referred to the Regular Army, and of course I only referred to the Regular Army.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of officers of the line, $28,605,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 12, line 4, strike out "$28,605,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,300,000."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment and an amendment which I will offer to line 19 brings down the appropriation to an average Army of 300,000. The committee all agreed on the purpose of the appropriation, and on the desire to reduce the Army to the number provided for in the national-defense act, but some of us differ on the methods of procedure. I will state very frankly that if there is a doubt in the mind of any Member the committee figures are entitled to the benefit of that doubt.

This has nothing to do with the pay of the Army. It has nothing to do with the feeding of the soldiers, and I do not believe the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] will seriously contend that this amendment will deprive one soldier of a day's pay or keep him without food for a minute.

So much has been said about speedy demobilization, so much has been said about expediting the return of the Army, and yet we are appropriating here for an average Army of 400,000 men for the whole fiscal year; and if the gentlemen of the committee will take the figures submitted by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT], and if we demobilize all the surplus troops that we have in this country at this time, it will be impossible to use up all of the money appropriated for in this item. It is true the gentleman from Alabama says, "Well, if you do not use it, it is all right; it is there"; but the gentleman from

Alabama and I differ in this respect, that the gentleman from Alabama really believes the General Staff will carry out this policy in good faith and I do not believe so.

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. Is it agreed by the members of the committee that the figures which you desire to reduce this item to will be sufficient to officer 300,000 men?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. An average Army of 300,000 men, because the committee have taken 22 per cent in order to reduce from 509,000 to 400,000, and the same basis of computation will reduce it to 300,000.

Mr. SISSON. Do the committee and the War Department agree that you could take 22 per cent from this amount and that you would then have officers enough for 300,000 men?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If you take 22 per cent from the amount necessary for 509,000, it will leave the amount necessary for officers for 400,000 men.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the War Department does not concede that we can reduce the Army below an average of 509,000 men.

Mr. SISSON. I care nothing about that. I want to know if these figures will supply an Army of 300,000?

Mr. KAHN. I have not figured that.

Mr. SISSON. I want to know if this will supply officers for an Army of 300,000 men, because I want to vote for that sort of a proposition.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will state how I arrive at these figures. The figures submitted to the committee by the Secretary of War is based on 509,000 men in the Army. When the committee decided to reduce it to 400,000 men in the Army, the chairman of the committee inquired of the department what reduction it should make, and reduced it accordingly. Therefore, having the percentage which would reduce it from 509,000 to 400,000, it is a mathematical proposition to reduce it to 300,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. If we provide for an Army of 400,000, what will be the minimum Army at the end of the year?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. We are striving to have the figures provided for by the national-defense act—175,000 plus 50,000 auxiliary.

Mr. MADDEN. If you reduce it to 300,000, what will be the minimum at the end of the year?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The same. We are striving to do the same thing, only my amendment allows less discretion to the General Staff.

Mr. MADDEN. Let me get that through my head. We are proposing, according to the recommendation of the committee, to provide for an Army of 400,000 on the average. That would make a minimum of 200,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. If we adopt the figures of the gentleman from New York, we propose an average Army of 300,000. Does the gentleman from New York say if we adopt an average Army of 300,000 we will still have 200,000 as a minimum?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes. If I am wrong, my whole purpose is wrong. I say we all desire to have at the end of the fiscal year an Army of 175,000 men plus 50,000 auxiliary troops, as provided by existing law. By allowing appropriations for an average of 400,000 men we are allowing too much discretion to the General Staff, and they will keep a larger Army of war soldiers, up to the last day of the last hour of the four months' period after the proclamation of peace. But by cutting down the figures you will compel the War Department to demobilize the minute the troops come back.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman furnish the committee with the estimates of the War Department for a basis of 509,000 men?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. For officers only the War Department asked for $36,910,264. The committee reduced it on a basis of 400,000 men; brought it down to $28,605,000.

Now I bring it down to 300,000 and deduct the same amount that was used to bring it down to an Army of 400,000, and the result is $20,300,000.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. Referring to the question of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], is it not a fact that the amendment which the gentleman suggests would force the War Department to reach the minimum somewhat sooner after peace is declared?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will.

Mr. WINGO. I was not able to get the bill and the hearings until this morning. And let me say that since I have been a Member of the House I have never been able to get hold of the hearings on an Army appropriation bill until the general debate was started. I am not saying it in a critical manner, but simply to justify a question which no doubt I should not ask had I had an opportunity to read fully the hearings.

Mr. KAHN. We have had hearings ever since the Democratic minority members of the committee were appointed and——

Mr. WINGO. I do not care to discuss that matter. As I read the testimony of the Secretary of War, which is found in the hearings, page 8, discussing the estimates for an Army of 509,000 men, the question arose as to the wishes and intention of the department. At the bottom of page 8 I find this:

> Mr. DENT. I think it ought to be made perfectly clear that this is a mere temporary appropriation for an Army of that number during the period of demobilization of the Army as it was organized for war purposes.
>
> Secretary BAKER. In some aspects it is, and in some aspects it is not. This bill will provide for an Army of 509,000 men, and while there is probably no special likelihood of our being able to end the year with 509,000 enlisted men and officers, the preservation of the officer force necessary for that would be more or less permanently provided for by this bill.

Is it the wish of the War Department to provide for an officer personnel for 509,000 men, notwithstanding they will not have 509,000 men at the end of the year?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will say to the gentleman, and it is only my opinion, that it is not their intent, but they will make a desperate struggle to do so.

Mr. WINGO. I do not know whether I interpret the statement of the Secretary correctly or not; but do I understand that he says it is to provide permanently for a corps of officers for 509,000 men, whether Congress provided for that number or not? Is that true?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Exactly. That is what the General Staff is trying to do, and that is why I feel so bitterly against it. They will disregard the intent of this House and of the Senate. They have planned on the 509,000, and unless we take the money away from them for this fiscal year you will see that they will keep up the officer establishment and as many of the men as they possibly can with the money we give them.

Mr. WINGO. With reference to the gentleman's amendment, I would like to get information on this point. The gentleman offers an amendment which will provide for an officer personnel for an average army, because this is based on a yearly average of 300,000 men?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, they still will have pay for an officer personnel for a minimum army of 300,000 men?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Exactly; and the way I figure it is that, if they in good faith demobilize the Army and bring down their officer corps to the number of the soldiers, then this is more than ample; and the reason that I can not agree with the rest of the committee in appropriating this amount and letting the surplus remain unused is that I do not believe they will carry that out in good faith.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. My colleague would not have the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] or any other Member of the House led to believe that the War Department—the General Staff—could fasten permanently 28,000 officers without further legislation?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, no; but for the fiscal year they could.

Mr. McKENZIE. They would be in the reserve corps, except the 10,644 provided by the national-defense act.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Except this, that they could hang on during all of the four months' period, and perhaps longer, into the fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to get some information. I would ask the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] this question: In making these calculations about the Army and how many men they are going to have and how much money they are going to

spend, does the War Department take into consideration the National Guard at all?

Mr. KAHN. Not in this item. The War Department, through the Militia Bureau, has provided for the National Guard elsewhere in this bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We are entitled to 424,800 National Guard men.

Mr. KAHN. No; not as many as that. I think 160,000 in the bill, because we are allowed 200 for every congressional district.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is 800 for every Congressman and every Senator.

Mr. KAHN. That is after a number of years, but at the beginning only 200.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall ask the question direct: Is the War Department trying to abolish the National Guard?

Mr. KAHN. It is not, so far as I can learn. They have submitted figures to pay the officers and the enlisted men of the National Guard in this bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know; but that is to pay them for services rendered. Is the gentleman in favor, individually, of abolishing the National Guard?

Mr. KAHN. I never have been and am not now. I think the National Guard in this war did the country a splendid service and fully justified its existence. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They did just as good fighting as the Regulars, and the Regulars did all they could.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I do not want to weary the House, but this is a very important matter. I am sorry to differ from the position taken by my good friend, the former chairman of this committee [Mr. DENT]. The evidence shows that the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of the Army, told the 13 members of this committee in the city of Paris that by the 1st of September all of the Army would be back from Europe, including the army of occupation in Germany, which, as I understand it, is about 250,000 men.

Why, then, should this Congress grant to the War Department the right to keep up an organization of 400,000 enlisted men? If you are going to give them 400,000, why not in honesty give them the 509,000 that they want and which this committee turned down? It is just as much nonsense to grant an organization of 400,000 as it is of 509,000. The only question, it strikes me, that confronts this Congress to-day is, What is the necessary organization compatible with the security and safety of the American Republic during the next 12 months? The Secretary of War in his evidence on that bill, which the Senate failed to pass by the 4th of March, stated that it was a stop-gap army. Do you know what he meant by a stop-gap army? Listen. If you cut this down to 300,000 as an average army, you can cut the appropriation of every item just as the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] has put forth. You understand the figures that were put up for 509,000 were $1,137,000,000. The War Department actuaries told us that when we cut it down to 400,000 we could cut on a basis of 22½ per cent.

If you cut 100,000 more, you can cut it down on the same ratio all the way through, and if you fail to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], later on it should be put up to this House in a form that no part of this appropriation shall be spent unless the Army shall have been reduced to 300,000 men by the 1st of December of this year. Can they do it? If they are going to bring this entire Army back out of France by the 1st of September, where will you need an average Army in this country for the whole time of 400,000 men? Why would you need that organization of officers for 400,000 soldiers? It is just a question of getting these men who have fought the battles of this country and who are in the camps in the United States demobilized. The only way you are going to get these young men back to their homes and in their gainful pursuits of civil life is to cut this appropriation down for an Army of 300,000 on an average. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], our former Speaker, asked the question, Is the National Guard provided for? It is amply provided for. A hundred and six thousand enlisted men, and they are proportioned to every State in this Union. Yes; we have a National Guard of 106,000 men proportioned to all the States of this Union. Why would this Congress insist that you put upon the American taxpayer to-day an appropriation for an average army of 400,000 enlisted men and the officers necessary to officer them?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I yield.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. My friend on the committee says that the bill provides for 116,000 national guardsmen——

Mr. QUIN. A hundred and six thousand.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Are they in existence as an armed force in this country to-day?

Mr. QUIN. They are going to be ready in the several States——

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. How long before?

Mr. QUIN. Some of them are beginning to take them in now.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. How long does the gentleman expect it will be before we will have these 106,000 men actually in uniform as an armed and competent protective force?

Mr. QUIN. Long before the fiscal year runs out.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. What evidence does the gentleman have in support of that statement?

Mr. QUIN. Because provision is here made for it and some of the States are raising the guard already.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. What is being done in reference to the raising of these men—how far has the work progressed?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. QUIN. I would like to have a little more time.

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. QUIN. Four minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi that he may continue for four minutes longer? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. QUIN. All that the State wants is the appropriation by the Federal Government, and we are giving them that money, and the only way you are going to have a big Army of this Federal Government cut down from an outrageous number, a burden on the taxpayers, is to establish a National Guard, and every State in the Union for its own safety and security is anxious and ready for the National Guard, and the patriotic young manhood of the country will do the rest.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will my colleague answer this question?

Mr. QUIN. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I hope the gentleman will distinguish between pen and ink on a piece of paper, which shows that we have 106,000 men appropriated for, and the actual production of 106,000 men armed and in ranks, trained and ready for business. Where are they?

Mr. QUIN. We will have them. If you have 409,000 men with 22,000 officers, of course they are going to keep down the organization of the National Guard in this country. The only way you are going to get the American people waked up to the defense of their own States is for the Government to cut down this large Army for the Federal Government to maintain, and which so many of the officers of the Army are anxious to keep up. And they are not going to drop it if they can hold together this organization to what the Secretary of War called his stop-gap army for the next fiscal year. If that is done you are going to have the next session of Congress appropriate for an Army of 500,000 men. And now is the time to cut it out through the instrumentality of the purse.

I shall vote for the amendment of the gentleman from New York. [Applause.]

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Unfortunately I was not on the floor the other day, and I want to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] about how many soldiers we have in France at the present time.

Mr. KAHN. We had in Europe on the 1st of May a total of 1,079,120, exclusive of marines, exclusive of the troops we had in Siberia and on the seas. The War Department has told us that they brought home in the month of May about 330,000 men. So I take it that they still have in Europe somewhere in the neighborhood of 700,000 or 800,000 men.

Mr. HASTINGS. Now, about how many soldiers have we in this country who have not been discharged?

Mr. KAHN. Between 400,000 and 500,000, I believe.

Mr. HASTINGS. And then we would have combined, approximately, 1,100,000 or 1,200,000 in this country and in Europe not discharged?

Mr. KAHN. We probably have at this time that many, but during the month of June there will be brought from Europe probably 300,000 soldiers and there will be also that many discharged in this country. So I take it we will have about 800,000 or 900,000 men by July 1, the beginning of the next fiscal year.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Certainly.

Mr. DENT. I have figures here that were given out by Gen. March, the Chief of Staff, last Saturday.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does the gentleman expect to put them in the RECORD in connection with his speech?

Mr. DENT. I will put them in the RECORD.

Mr. HASTINGS. In connection with your speech? Or will the gentleman give them to us now?

Mr. DENT. It shows that the Army on the 5th day of June had been 65 per cent demobilized, and the Army in Europe had been reduced below 700,000 men, or, to be accurate, 694,745.

Mr. HASTINGS. In Europe on June 5?

Mr. DENT. On June 5.

Mr. HASTINGS. How many did we have in this country on June 5, in figures?

Mr. DENT. We had a total strength at the signing of the armistice of 3,640,000 men.

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. Does that include marines?

Mr. KAHN. Oh, no.

Mr. HASTINGS. Just another question, to either the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] or the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT]. How many troops were discharged, say, during the month of May in this country? Have you the figures there?

Mr. KAHN. I have not the exact figures.

Mr. HASTINGS. Do any of you know how many were discharged in the month of April?

Mr. KAHN. They are discharging at this time approximately 450,000 men a month, I understand.

Mr. HASTINGS. That is a little over 100,000 a week. You take it that there have been about 450,000 men discharged during the month of May?

Mr. DENT. I can give the gentleman the total figures up to June 5. The total discharges reported up to June 5 are 119,873 officers, 2,271,756 men, making a total of 2,391,629. Now, the total strength of our Army, I know, was, at the signing of the armistice, 3,640,000 men.

Mr. HASTINGS. That is what I wanted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEARNS], a member of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, offered by the gentleman from New York, simply carries out a policy that seems to be the universal opinion of this House, to have the Army demobilized at the very earliest moment. Some gentlemen profess to believe that if we provide for an Army of 400,000 it will not hinder in any way an early demobilization. Others hold to the opinion that if the money is appropriated for an Army of 400,000, instead of 300,000, the War Department will be slow to let loose its grip upon these men who are now in the Army. I share in the latter opinion. I can not help but believe that the smaller the appropriation the sooner these men will be discharged from the Army. As has been stated upon the floor of this House, President Wilson told a group of Members of this body over in France a short while ago that it was his hope to have all these men demobilized—the entire Army—by the latter part of September. But Gen. March makes the statement in his testimony before the committee that it is the policy of the War Department to keep 225,000 men in Europe as a collecting agency to see that Germany pays to England and France and Belgium and Italy and Japan certain indemnities. I mean by that that we would provide an Army of that size to be stationed in Europe.

Now, we have in the Regular Army only 42,000 men. Where is the Government or the War Department going to get the difference between 42,000 men and 225,000? There is only one solution. If they are given this appropriation, they are going to demobilize the Army down to 225,000 men, and they are going to keep that many men in Europe as long as public opinion will permit, as I said before, to act as a collecting agency to collect for other Governments certain indemnities from the Germans.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. KEARNS. Yes.

Mr. DENT. Do I understand the gentleman to say that Gen. March made the statement that he proposes to keep an Army of that size in Europe as a collection agency?

Mr. KEARNS. He did not say "collection agency." That was my language. I do not know what else they will be kept there for. We might as well be honest with ourselves; we might as well talk in plain blunt English language. Let us not "kid" ourselves. The United States, according to the terms by which we entered the war, and according to the professions of all men who have ever made any profession on the subject, went into this war without hope or desire of any reward except the reward of helping to whip the Central Powers of Europe. We want no indemnities; we want nothing out of it except the credit of having whipped the enemy. But other countries are not so magnanimous. Other countries are wanting indemnities in the way of money and additional territory, and I for one am opposed to any American boy, be he volunteer or a conscripted man, staying in Europe for that purpose. [Applause.] And if we make this appropriation large enough, these men are going to stay there, and they are going to stay there for that purpose.

I have been advised upon reliable authority, and I have seen it stated in the press, that there is no provision in the treaty or otherwise for Japan to keep any army in Europe, and yet Japan is getting out of this war practically every demand she has made. Now, the question I want to put to the Members of this House is, by what process of reasoning do you reach the conclusion that the taxpayers of the United States should pay even a volunteer army of 225,000 men to collect a debt for Japan, when Japan does not furnish a man for that same purpose? I do not know that we owe to Japan a debt of gratitude that we would go to the extent of allowing or forcing the American people to shoulder a debt of that character to collect even a dollar for Japan.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONNALLY. The gentleman's purpose by his amendment is to force the demobilization and the return of the troops from Europe?

Mr. KEARNS. That is the purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the gentleman propose an amendment in the bill, either in the committee or here, providing that no portion of this money should be paid to the troops after a certain date?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNS. That proposition was discussed, I think, in the committee, but I think it was found advisable for some reason or other not to place that proviso in the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the gentleman feels as he says he does, why did he not bring in an amendment providing that after a certain date no part of these funds should be paid to the troops overseas?

Mr. KEARNS. It is sufficient to say that the committee did not put a proviso of that character in the bill. However, we find the bill coming to us just as it is printed, and my position here upon the floor is to plead with the members of this committee to report an appropriation for an average Army during the coming year of 300,000 men, in order to force a demobilization of the boys who want to come home and of the boys who have no interest in collecting money for Japan or England or any other foreign government. [Applause.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. I have not the time to yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I will ask that the gentleman have one minute additional time.

Mr. KEARNS. All right. I will yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I understand that this appropriation for these officers is for an officer personnel sufficient to command 500,000 men?

Mr. KEARNS. Five hundred and nine thousand.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Now, in determining the relative number of officers and men, why is it necessary to provide for an officer force for 500,000 men and an enlisted personnel of only 400,000 private soldiers? I wonder if I am mistaken in my understanding that that is what is provided for?

Mr. KEARNS. I can not answer the gentleman's question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. KEARNS. I will ask for three minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that his time be extended three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNS. I am not sure that I understand the question asked by the gentleman from Texas. I can not answer it.

Mr. MADDEN. To put it in another way, if we have an Army which for the entire year will average 400,000 men, and that reduces the minimum number to 200,000 men at the end of the year, does the gentleman state to the House that notwithstanding the fact that we will have only 200,000 men at the end of the year we will still have officers sufficient for an Army of 400,000 men?

Mr. KEARNS. I think that would be the case. I will ask the chairman of the committee [Mr. KAHN] if that is not the fact?

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman is in error about that.

Mr. KEARNS. The gentleman from California says I am in error, and I am quite sure he is right in any statement he makes about it.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. KEARNS. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. The number of officers was reduced from the estimate of the War Department, from 28,000 to something over 22,000, to comply with an Army on the basis of 400,000 men. Six thousand officers were cut off.

Mr. SISSON. I think, if you will get the hearing, you will find that provision is made for officers for 509,000 men.

Mr. KEARNS. We do know that it is the expressed policy of the War Department to keep 225,000 men in Europe for a period of 5 years, for a period of 10 years, and under certain conditions for a period of 15 years. We know that is the policy that is being advocated by the War Department. We know that there are in the Regular Army only about 42,000 men, and we know that the only way to get those men at the end of the year will be to keep some of the conscripted boys there; and I for one am not willing to keep either a volunteer or a conscripted man in Europe. And we have had experience enough with the General Staff to know that they are not going to let loose of one man until they are forced to do so. [Applause.]

Mr. HOCH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. HOCH. I understand this amendment raises no question as to the general policy with reference to the standing Army, and that the sole purpose of the amendment is to speed up demobilization. If that is the purpose of the amendment I am certainly in sympathy with it. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee whether, in his judgment, it is possible for demobilization to be effected with sufficient rapidity so that the average size of the Army for the year may be reduced to 300,000?

Mr. KAHN. The chairman of the committee felt that an average Army of 300,000 might be sufficient; but when the chairman of the committee takes the figures that are presented to the committee, which show that we have now in Europe 600,000 men and that we have in this country practically 500,000 men, or 465,000 men, and assuming that between 300,000 and 400,000 men will be demobilized during this month, we will have at the beginning of the fiscal year, on the 1st of July, approximately 800,000 men. That will be the apex of the number that we will have in the Army during the next fiscal year. That will be the largest number. Now, assuming that we will bring 300,000 the next month from Europe, you would have in August to provide pay for 500,000 men. I think that they will further reduce the force in Europe so that we will have only about 200,000 over there. Then we will have toward the middle of the fiscal year something like 300,000 men. I do not think they will reduce that 300,000 below 225,000 under the national-defense act so as to conform with the law which Congress passed last February.

So that I take it it will be hardly possible to demobilize the Army on the basis of an average of 300,000 men for the year. I want to say frankly to the gentleman from Kansas and to the House that personally I favored such a reduction. But on mature reflection I am afraid it will be difficult to make it.

Mr. HOCH. If the only danger is that we may not be able to demobilize rapidly enough to reduce it to 300,000, there being a difference of opinion whether it is possible, as long as Congress is going to be in session and we will have an ample opportunity to take care of the boys, if demobilization can not be done fast enough, would it not be a good thing to put on the administration this spur for demobilization? [Applause.]

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOCH. I will yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I saw the figures, and examined them just now, which the gentleman from Alabama has. It shows that the department has discharged 206,000 for the week ending December 14 last, and it also shows that they discharged 77,000 for the week ending May 31. Everybody agrees that all those returned from overseas are being discharged, but a good many believe that the soldiers in this country are not being discharged rapidly enough. [Applause.] If you could discharge 206,000 for the week ending December 14 last, why could you not have discharged them at that rate, so that the soldiers in this country could have been discharged and not have half as many in the Army in this country as there is to-day? That is the criticism that I lodge against the War Department.

Mr. KAHN. If the gentleman will permit, four hundred and odd thousand soldiers that are in demobilization camps now are largely troops brought home from Europe and sent to demobilization camps for discharge. They are not men who have been in the Army in this country all the time.

Mr. HASTINGS. The figures show that only 77,000 were discharged for the week ending May 31, and that 206,000 were discharged the week ending December 14 last. If we have practically a million and a half soldiers both in this country and those over the seas, why were not more discharged for the week ending May 31?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any question in the mind of anybody on this floor at this time as to our agreement upon one policy, at least, and that is that all want the American soldiers brought home from Europe at the earliest possible opportunity and with the most speed practicable under all circumstances. [Applause.]

Nobody disagrees to that; but that is not the question involved in this proposed legislation.

Moreover, if I may be permitted to suggest it to you in all good nature, we have not attempted to read into the figures or the text of this old-time, old-fashioned language of an Army appropriation bill any policy whatever. You all know, as experienced legislators, that the mere setting of sums of money in appropriation bills against the text, which year after year provides for these payments in that language, is not controlling legislation. It may be to some extent limiting legislation so far as immediate expenditures are concerned, but it does not declare the policy or fix the policy or determine who shall fix the policy or how or where or when. It simply provides some one for the time being, with some funds in his purse, to carry out a legislative policy that has already been determined and is not being determined then, because one of the rules of this House makes it out of order to propose new legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that I have told nothing new, and I do not mean to be schoolmastery about it; but if we clear our minds to that extent, if we get to that basis on which to start our reasoning, we will take into consideration, in connection with that, another fact, which we also all know very well and understand as clearly. The President of the United States now has authority under the law, passed by this Congress and still effective on the books, to keep every soldier under arms in this country or in Europe for four months after his proclamation of peace, and he is the only man on the face of the earth so far authorized by the law and the Constitution of the United States to determine when he shall make that proclamation of peace.

Do not you see what sort of an uncertainty we are basing our mathematics upon when we suggest that this bill may be set for any definite and positive number of soldiers to be under arms in this country during the next fiscal year? It is absolutely speculative.

Mr. BOIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but I would like to continue for a moment without interruption.

It is absolutely speculative in so far as we are concerned, and it may be that the President himself, with all his statesmanlike foresight into a future yet undetermined, may not himself be positive which date he will fix upon. And there we are. Yet we know that we must make something like an appropriation for the support of an Army, and we also know that, no matter how much we seek to limit the size of that Army by indirection, by suggestion, by making figures read a certain way, the man who under the Constitution of the United States is Commander in Chief of that Army has absolute authority not only by virtue of that fact, if not restricted by legislation, but actually in this instance supplemented by legislation which we have passed, to maintain every one of more than a million soldiers under arms until four months after the proclamation of peace, no matter with what speed they may be brought back to this country and no matter what the delays may be.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I can not yield now. I would like to continue this suggestion.

What do we benefit by trying this hot, stuffy, late afternoon to read into this bill an executive policy which probably the Executive himself has not yet arrived at and one which, whether we conjecture it or whether he himself undertakes to conjecture it, in the ultimate lies absolutely alone with him to determine and to put into force and effect?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I will not take any time from this House under any conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman has refused to yield to his colleague.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I will not take any time on any conditions. I might yield as a matter of courtesy when it is proposed to me in like mood.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. How do we expect to limit the number and size of this Army when we realize at the very beginning, unless I am mistaken in my statement of the law, that the President of the United States has the authority, which we have given him under express and explicit statutes, to hold the present force until at least, if he so desires, four months after he himself shall fix the date upon which to proclaim that there is peace and then does so proclaim it? How are we going to arrive at anything except confessedly and avowedly to make something like a reasonable mathematical guess?

The War Department, it is true, in its propositions for Army legislation made before us last winter, undertook to get us to commit ourselves to a permanent Army policy of 509,000 men. We did not do it; the committee did not do it; and the House utterly refused to do it, and that language went into the discard. It was proposed in the Senate, but we all remember that the Army legislation died there by reason of what happened in the closing days of the session.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. If the gentleman will defer just a moment. I have not taken any time this afternoon, and I would like to make clear my ideas about this, even if I do not convince anybody but myself.

Now, it is unfortunate that these figures of 509,000 as they are introduced again into the House by the proposition of the War Department, or by anybody else as a matter related to the Army, are associated in the popular mind, and perhaps, to some extent, reflected in our own—until we stop to think it out—as proposing a permanent Army policy, and the result of a determination to maintain 509,000 men during this fiscal year, willy-nilly. We have no assurance of that, and if there was one clear, definite understanding in good faith, the utmost good faith, among all our colleagues on the committee, it was that we should bring this bill out here before you gentlemen absolutely free in every respect from the slightest tincture or suggestion of such legislation by implication, inference, or indirection. The bill was merely at attempt to strike some equation between 509,000, which the War Department said the Army would average, whether from policy or necessity, and the 300,000 that other people thought it ought to average. And we fell in the middle with the 400,000 figure, which, all things considered, when there is speculation and conjecture as to what the President's policy will be and as to what conditions may be abroad or in this country, seems to be a fairly reasonable number. Because, whether we take the figures of 300,000, 200,000, or go back to the War Department's 509,000 or our 400,000, it does not matter which, at the end of the fiscal year if it is apparent that the President, in the exercise of the law and the authority we have already committed to him—and perhaps at that time under conditions and circumstances in this country or abroad which may justify him in doing it—has kept in the service more than 400,000 men, this bill is no limitation on him. He can apply to the Congress for a deficiency, because all the time he has been keeping them in the service under direct and unquestioned authority of law. There is no question about it.

So how do we limit him here unless we repeal that very law? Is there anyone here willing to take that responsibility and actually tie his hands in that respect? Certainly not. No one proposes it in good faith.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. May I have three minutes additional?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not wish to annoy the gentleman, but will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont that he have three additional minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I do not wish to seem to be ungracious to the gentleman——

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I withdraw the request.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I thank the gentleman.

Now, then, I do not think that we can limit his authority by anything we write in this bill under these circumstances.

It is also true that not one dollar of this amount can ever be paid out of the Treasury of the United States unless there is a bona fide soldier in the service of the United States who signs the pay roll in receipt for it, and if there is such a soldier in the service it is only under the authority of the President and by force and effect of legislation which you have yourselves already given to the President to enforce. Now, what does it amount to as a limitation on the Executive when we set some kind of figure here in this bill to provide what we think will be a reasonable amount of money for the expenditures of the War Department in this respect for Army expenses during the next fiscal year? As I say again, if there are more soldiers than were provided for in this appropriation for pay, then they will only be existing under authority of law, and we will have to pay them anyway.

If we want to tie the hands of the President in any kind of fashion at this time, let us do it man fashion and write it in the English language in the bill instead of juggling with figures and pretending to curb him by indirection. [Applause.]

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I would like the attention of the chairman of the committee a moment. He remarked a few moments ago that the number of officers had been cut in the estimate from 28,000 to 22,000. I wanted to be a little more clear as to that. Does that mean that at the end of the next fiscal year there will be 22,000 officers remaining?

Mr. KAHN. No. It means that there will be an average of that many officers in the Army during the next fiscal year. Of course, they will be let out as their organizations are discharged. It means an average of that many.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE], I wish to state that there was no agreement, tacit or otherwise, in the committee that any member of this committee was not at liberty to move an amendment to reduce this amount. And I will say further that I can not agree with the gentleman from Vermont that this Congress, that the House of Representatives and the Senate, are compelled, because the President is the Commander in Chief of the Army, to appropriate any figure which the President may require, for the very reason that the President is Commander in Chief of the Army. Under our Constitution the appropriating power is in this House, and that is the check upon the power given to the President.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Just one minute. I could not get any time.

Mr. KAHN. I wanted to help the gentleman along.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I want to say, further, that the gentleman from Vermont has been on this committee longer than I have, and because the gentleman from Vermont has blindly followed every recommendation coming from the War Department, without exercising his good sense, we found ourselves in 1917 without machine guns, without artillery, and without aviation. If the gentleman from Vermont had exercised his will as a member of the committee, had exercised his intelligence in Army matters—and he is an expert—then he would have protested when appropriating money for machine guns that that money was not expended; he would have taken action to see that our Army had the equipment that was necessary. But the gentleman from Vermont has followed so blindly so long every desire of the General Staff that he has grown in that habit, and now he is shocked to see a new member of the committee doing his duty as he sees it.

Oh, yes; the gentleman is solicitous about the President. He does not want to offend him. He does not want to embarrass him. I would like to know how much assistance the gentleman from Vermont will give to the President when he comes before the country with his peace treaty.

So the gentleman makes his appeal that he does not desire to do anything that might compel the President to move his troops out of Europe any quicker. The gentleman pleads with the committee that the President has the power, and that it would be embarrassing to vote to limit this amount of money. The return of the troops has absolutely nothing to do with it. And I will say to the gentleman from Vermont that the President of the United States told the gentleman and told the committee that it was his intention to get all of the troops out of Europe by September 1, and I believed the President when he said it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, may I have 30 seconds by unanimous consent?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say in utmost seriousness that I will not trespass upon your patience and good nature to make any detailed answer to what has been read into my speech. I prefer to let the notes as the reporters took them stand as what I said rather than the statement of my volunteer interpreter. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the Chair was in doubt.

Thereupon the committee divided; and there were—ayes 59, noes 37.

So the amendment was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HAMILTON having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. UNDERWOOD as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following concurrent resolution:

House concurrent resolution 11.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 2480) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the Clerk be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to strike out the word "and" in line 14 of page 66 of said bill.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of the officers of Staff Corps and departments, $24,600,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I wish to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 12, line 6, strike out "$24,600,000" and insert "$17,429,367."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, this just keeps down the average on the previous amendments, so that I do not think any discussion of it is necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to say a word about this amendment. The House has shown an inclination to adopt the views of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

But some statement has been made here about what Gen. March proposed about the army of occupation, and I think it is only fair that this House should know what Gen. March did say. Gen. March made no statement whatever that it was the policy of this Government to keep 250,000 men in Europe, or any army of occupation there at all. I read from the hearings. Mr. ANTHONY asked him the question, "You do not know whether you are going to maintain an army in Europe or not?" And he said, "We do not," and there is not a line or statement by Gen. March that justifies the statement that we propose to keep any army in Europe at all. I think it is but fair that that should be stated on the floor of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of enlisted men of the line, $106,795,000: *Provided*, That the pay due enlisted men of the Army shall not be withheld from them by reason of the fact that their service records or other official papers showing the status of their accounts with respect to pay have been lost or not returned from overseas and, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, these men may be paid upon their personal affidavit as to date of last payment and condition of their accounts: *Provided further*, That payments made in accordance with such regulations (or which have already been made upon the affidavit of the soldier) shall be passed by the accounting officers of the Treasury to the credit of the disbursing officers making them.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the chairman of the committee one question: What time do you want to quit?

Mr. KAHN. I did hope to get through the item of "Pay of the Army." I do think, if we do not have many interruptions, that we can do that in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 12, line 19, strike out "$106,795,000" and insert "75,728,230."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, this is in keeping with the general plan.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Eighty clerks, at $1,800 each per annum, $144,000.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman a question or two. This is what is known as the Army field clerk section of the bill. I believe The Adjutant General has written to the Committee on Military Affairs giving his views in regard to the number of clerks required, their pay, and so forth, including the question of light, heat, and allowances. I find in looking through this bill very carefully that there is no provision made for these clerks abroad or here for either light, heat, or quarters.

Mr. KAHN. On page 16 there is an item "for commutation of quarters and of heat and light for field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, $76,800."

Mr. SIEGEL. I am not referring to the Quartermaster Corps. We passed an act, as appears in the testimony taken last year before the committee, providing for light, heat, and quarters. These men are required to furnish their own uniforms, pay for their own food, and furnish their own quarters. Congress in its wisdom enacted the statute. There is no provision made in this bill for them. If this bill is passed in the way it reads at the present time, these men, although in the military service, would practically be getting their salaries reduced.

Mr. KAHN. The committee considered the letter of The Adjutant General and did not feel inclined at this time to make additional provision for the purpose that the gentleman states.

Mr. SIEGEL. Does the gentleman think it is a fair proposition to those men who are in the service on the other side and who have been there the entire time and who can not leave the service that they shall get less pay, while at the same time Congress is appropriating $240 a year for every civil employee in the service of this Government? Some of these men, by the way, have been in the military service for 40 or 45 years.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEGEL. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. STEVENSON. Is not the provision the gentleman speaks of found in line 4, page 16?

Mr. SIEGEL. Oh, no; that simply provides $23,000 for practically 2,000 or 3,000 men, who are now in the service.

Mr. STEVENSON. To which of those embraced in this paragraph does that refer?

Mr. SIEGEL. I assume it refers to the 29 messengers probably.

Mr. STEVENSON. Does the gentleman assume that they provide for 29 messengers and for none of the others?

Mr. SIEGEL. It seems that that is the situation.

Mr. STEVENSON. It does not state distinctly for whom it does provide.

Mr. SIEGEL. If $23,000 is to be divided up amongst 3,000 men, it would provide about $7 apiece for light, heat, and quarters. I suggest that that part of the bill be passed over till to-morrow, until we can learn exactly what the War Department desires done. I will say that the same kind of an error was made when the bill was up the last time and the same procedure was adopted.

Mr. KAHN. I will say to my friend from New York that the matter was under consideration in the committee, and the committee decided for the present to make no appropriation other than the amount carried in the bill.

Mr. SIEGEL. Does the chairman of the committee think it is fair to some of the men who have been in the service a long time, some of whom received distinguished-service crosses for gallant service on the other side while actually under fire, to take away from them what Congress gave them last year and the year before, when at the same time Congress appropriates millions of dollars to give the civil employees of the Govern-

ment $240 apiece extra? These men over there, relying on what Congress did last year, are in the service, and being kept there against their will, have to provide their own clothes, food, and quarters, and does not the gentleman think that they should receive the same amount of money which we gave them in the act of Congress last year, when the emergency is not over, as the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] stated a few minutes ago?

Let me read some of the letters giving the views of high officers of our Army in reference to the work of Army field clerks:

HEADQUARTERS CENTRAL DEPARTMENT,
Chicago, Ill., June 4, 1919.

From: Commanding General, Central Department.
To: The Adjutant General of the Army, Washington, D. C.
Subject: Army field clerks and field clerks, Quartermaster Corps.

1. My attention has been invited to H. R. 3154, introduced in the Sixty-sixth Congress, relating to Army field clerks and field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, providing for permanent allowances for quarters, heat, and light, for two additional grades of pay, and that the minimum or entrance pay shall be $1,200 per annum; for increase of pay for service beyond the continental limits of the United States; for retirement and longevity pay.

2. Army field clerks and field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, are an important and essential part of the administration of the Army and should be considered an integral part of the Army, and as such should be dealt with accordingly. Their work has always been characterized by a high degree of conscientiousness and efficiency which merits due recognition.

3. With the following exceptions, I approve the provisions of this bill and strongly recommend that it be passed:

The first exception is the two increased grades, $2,250 and $2,500, respectively. I believe that there are, under the present law, a sufficient number of grades provided, and the provision in this bill covering longevity pay will, in my opinion, make the pay of chief clerk and principal assistant adequate for the reason that these positions are not usually arrived at until after considerable service.

The second exception is the clause providing for the method of computing service for the purpose of the act, and in this clause it is recommended that the words "all governmental service" be stricken out and the following words substituted therefor, "service rendered as Army field clerk or field clerk, Quartermaster Corps, or clerical work of a similar character under the War and Navy Departments."

4. In my opinion the most important item in this bill is the provision for retirement. This provision assures the clerk who has devoted his life to governmental service in the administrative branch of the Army a sufficient competence to keep him decently after he has completed his period of usefulness. It is well known that many clerks now in the Government service who have reached the age for retirement—that is, the age at which they have lost their efficiency—are kept in the service with gradual reductions in pay, because humanity demands that a man who has devoted his life to the service be not discarded in his old age. The knowledge that retirement awaits the clerk at the end of his period of usefulness through old age promotes efficiency, certainly among the older men, in that it relieves their minds of the constant dread of the uncertainty of their tenure of office and of how they can care for themselves and their families after they have lost their positions. This is the dread of all older salaried men who have no assurance of retirement. This fact is recognized by all of the larger corporations doing business in this country, and they have made provision in their terms of employment whereby their employees, after having reached a certain age or after having given the corporation long, faithful service, are eligible for retirement at a certain fixed rate of pay.

5. While it is recognized that some of the provisions of this bill should be applied to all employees in Government service, nevertheless it is in these classes of employees that I am intensely interested, for it is their work that I have come best to know and to realize the value of through association with them in time of peace and time of war.

LEONARD WOOD,
Major General, United States Army, Commanding.

—

HEADQUARTERS, NORTHEASTERN DEPARTMENT,
Boston, Mass., May 14, 1919.

From: Commanding General Northeastern Department.
To: The Adjutant General of the Army.
Subject: Legislation for Army field clerks.

1. With reference to H. R. 13910, introduced on January 9, 1919, by Mr. SIEGEL, regulating the salaries of Army field clerks, providing for a salary of $1,200 per annum for the lowest grade, and adding two grades with salaries of $2,250 and $2,500, respectively, per annum, and providing further that Army field clerks and field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, shall receive the same allowances and benefits, including retirement and longevity pay, as are now allowed by law to second lieutenants of the Army, I am informed that another effort will be made at the extra session of Congress called for May 19, 1919, to secure the enactment of this bill into law, and I desire to record my concurrence with the objects aimed at.

2. The work developing upon this class of clerks is very special in its nature; their value rapidly increases with their experience, making it especially desirable to retain their services as long as possible, and they are subject to the Articles of War and are frequently called upon to change station, thus being deprived of an opportunity to establish themselves permanently in any locality. They are members of the Army's mobile personnel and as such have good reason to look for consideration of the same nature as that shown other members of this personnel. It appears to me to be in the interests of the Government, as well as those of the clerks themselves, to provide for them in the manner they seek.

C. R. EDWARDS,
Major General, United States Army.

—

HEADQUARTERS SCHOOL OF FIRE,
Fort Sill, Okla., June 5, 1919.

From: The Commandant.
To: The Adjutant General of the Army, Washington, D. C.
Subject: Legislation for Army field clerks.

1. The Army Field Clerks' Association having requested me to express my opinions relative to the merits of a bill (H. R. 3154) entitled "A bill regulating the salaries of Army field clerks, and for other purposes," the following is submitted.

2. The principle of graded pay with provisions for advancement and retirement is believed to be just, and the enactment of law-making provision for this is recommended. However, the bill as drawn does not appear to sufficiently protect the rights of either the Government or the individual clerks. Some provision should be made to insure the appointment of men fully competent and to insure subsequent advancement being made with justice to all concerned.

D. H. CURRIE,
Brigadier General, United States Army, Commandant.

—

HEADQUARTERS PORT OF EMBARKATION,
Hoboken, N. J., May 21, 1919.

From: Commanding General.
To: The Adjutant General of the Army, Washington, D. C.
Subject: Army field clerks and field clerks, Quartermaster Corps.

1. My attention has recently been called to a bill making a more liberal and just provision for Army field clerks and field clerks, Quartermaster Corps.

2. The work performed by these clerks is arduous and unceasing and they are deserving of a more liberal provision for those who remain in the Government service for any considerable period of time. Living expenses all over the country have increased, making it a matter of impossibility for a man to live in anything like comfort on the salary now provided for these clerks.

3. It is a matter of impossibility for any of them, provided he be a married man, to lay aside any considerable sum as a provision against old age and future needs. Some provision is an absolute necessity in the way of retirement, longevity pay, increase of pay for foreign service, etc.

4. I earnestly recommend the passage of the bill as drawn, believing that it will be a means of holding those of our field clerks whom it is very desirable that the Government shall retain in service.

DAVID C. SHANKS,
Major General, United States Army.

—

HEADQUARTERS OFFICE OF THE COMMANDING GENERAL,
Camp Custer, Mich., May 22, 1919.

From: Commanding General Camp Custer, Mich.
To: The Adjutant General of the Army.
Subject: Status of Army field clerks.

1. The present status of Army field clerks is very unsatisfactory and deserves careful consideration in connection with any legislation that may be undertaken for the improvement of the Army.

2. In order to be able to retain in the service certain high-grade men, at least two more grades should be added on the upward scale, and due to the increase in cost of everything there should be a substantial increase in pay for all grades. There should also be allowance for quarters and longevity pay as well as retirement for long and efficient service.

3. Field clerks are subject to military discipline and are under strict military control, but they are not given adequate compensation to give them a reasonable chance either for their own betterment or for the benefit of the service coming from extensive experience in military affairs. This increased value is correctly recognized in the officers and enlisted men and should be no less recognized in the intermediate grade of field clerk.

4. I recommend that this matter be carefully considered in connection with other Army legislation.

WILLIAM G. HAAN,
Major General, U. S. Army, Commanding.

—

HEADQUARTERS EL PASO DISTRICT,
El Paso, Tex., May 19, 1919.

From: James B. Erwin, Brigadier General, United States Army.
To: The Adjutant General of the Army, Washington, D. C.
Subject: Betterment of condition of Army field clerks by legislation.

1. Having had frequent and daily opportunity to observe the excellent conduct and qualifications of many Army field clerks, both in the United States and France, I believe it would be of great advantage to our Government to retain the services of these men.

2. This can be done by legislation providing that they shall receive the same allowances and benefits, including retirement, longevity pay, and increased pay for foreign service, as now allowed by law to second lieutenants of the Army; and I so recommend.

JAMES B. ERWIN.

—

HEADQUARTERS SOUTHEASTERN DEPARTMENT,
Charleston, S. C., April 7, 1919.

From: Commanding General Southeastern Department.
To: The Adjutant General of the Army, Washington, D. C.
Subject: Army field clerks and field clerks, Quartermaster Corps.

1. In connection with such legislation as may be recommended to Congress, looking to the return of our Army to a peace basis, it is desired to call to the attention of the War Department the provisions of the following bill, which was introduced in the last session of Congress, and to earnestly urge that it be incorporated in such legislation as may be submitted to the next Congress for its consideration:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That Army field clerks shall receive pay at the rates now provided by law: *Provided*, That the minimum or entrance grade for Army field clerks shall be $1,200 per annum, and that the grades of $2,250 and $2,500 per annum are hereby created: *Provided, however*, That Army field clerks and field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, shall receive the same allowances and benefits, including retirement and longevity pay, as allowed by law to second lieutenants of the Army: *And provided further*, That in computing service for the purpose of this act governmental service shall be counted."

2. During the present emergency Army field clerks and field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, have been highly essential to the organization and administration of our Army; their work has been characterized by efficiency and industry; their services have been well-nigh indispensable; and in order to retain in the service the best of these men, who are specialists in their line, and in order to give to men who have served long and faithfully what they are justly entitled to, some such provision as the foregoing seems very desirable.

3. The feature of this bill which provides for retirement is particularly commendable. This privilege is enjoyed by practically all other persons in the military service upon qualification as to service or age,

and in view of the military status accorded these men it is not thought that they should be excepted. The granting of this privilege to Army field clerks and field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, would be a good business proposition on the part of the Government. Many of these men have grown old in the service; some are veterans of Indian campaigns, while others served with credit during the Spanish-American War.

4. The matter of longevity pay also seems worthy of favorable consideration. Army field clerks and field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, are to my knowledge the only persons in the military service who do not receive some additional compensation for increased service. This appears to be an injustice which should be corrected. As a reward for long and faithful service and as an incentive for experienced men to remain in the service it is strongly recommended that this as well as the other provisions of the proposed legislation be recommended to Congress.

HENRY G. SHARPE,
Major General, United States Army.

HEADQUARTERS SOUTHERN DEPARTMENT,
Fort Sam Houston, Tex., May 26, 1919.

From: Department Commander.
To: The Adjutant General of the Army, Washington, D. C.
Subject: Army field clerks and field clerks, Quartermaster Corps.

1. Bills (H. R. 13910 and S. 5505) were introduced in the last Congress looking to the relief of a most deserving class of Army personnel; i. e., Army field clerks and field clerks, Quartermaster Corps. The provisions of these bills were substantially as follows:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That Army field clerks shall receive pay at the rates now provided by law: *Provided*, That the minimum or entrance grade for Army field clerks shall be $1,200 per annum, and that the grades of $2,250 and $2,500 per annum are hereby created: *Provided, however*, That Army field clerks and field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, shall receive the same allowances and benefits, including retirement and longevity pay, as allowed by law to second lieutenants of the Army: *And provided further*, That in computing service for the purpose of this act governmental service shall be counted."

2. While I can not subscribe unqualifiedly to certain features of the bill referred to, such as the two new pay grades and to unqualified retirement, I feel that legislation looking to the relief of this class of Army personnel, in certain respects, should be had.

The main features of the proposed legislation are obviously retirement and longevity pay.

The retirement feature, properly safeguarded, is particularly commendable, but unless the maximum age in which this branch of the service may be entered is definitely fixed so as to base retirement on length of service I can not subscribe to this feature. I recommend that the age limit for appointment as Army field clerk or field clerk, Quartermaster Corps, be fixed at 40 years, and that, except for physical disability incident to the service, 25 years of service be made a requisite for retirement, including commissioned and enlisted service. Thus modified, I recommend the enactment of this legislation.

The longevity pay feature should also be enacted, provided the base pay is not placed so high so as to render longevity increase unjustifiable. I recommend that the pay grades for Army field clerks and field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, be fixed at $1,200, $1,400, $1,600, and $1,700 base pay, and that they be allowed the same increase of pay for longevity as is now allowed commissioned officers of the Army.

3. During the present emergency the work of Army field clerks and field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, has, in the majority of cases, been characteristic of efficiency and industry. In order to retain in the service the best of these men, those who are specialists in their line, and in order to give to men who have served long and faithfully what they are justly entitled to, some such provision as the foregoing seems very desirable, and I recommend that suitable legislation to accomplish this be submitted for consideration of the present Congress.

DER. C. CABELL,
Major General, United States Army.

HEADQUARTERS MIDDLE ATLANTIC COAST ARTILLERY DISTRICT,
Fort Totten, N. Y., May 15 1919.

From: District Commander.
To: The Adjutant General of the Army (through Commanding General Eastern Department).
Subject: Army field clerks.

1. In view of the fact that legislation granting certain allowances and benefits to Army field clerks is to be introduced when Congress convenes in the near future for extra session, I wish to make the following remarks regarding Army field clerks.

2. Seven Army field clerks have been constantly under my personal observation during the entire emergency and have fulfilled their duties in a manner entirely satisfactory to all concerned, and I believe it proper that I should say a word regarding Army field clerks at this time. I found these clerks to be thoroughly reliable at all times, and in general a valuable asset to the efficient administration of the district and worthy of the highest commendation.

3. It is therefore recommended that these legislative measures be given favorable consideration in order that those clerks who are now in the service and who have arrived at a high state of efficiency in their particular line will have some inducement to remain in the service, thereby maintaining in the Army a staff of clerical help commensurate with its requirements.

(Signed) WILLOUGHBY WALKE,
Colonel, C. A. C.

[First indorsement.]

HEADQUARTERS EASTERN DEPARTMENT, *May 19, 1919.*

To Commanding General Eastern Department:

1. The office work of the Army is as essential to its existence and its purpose as are the arms bearers in the trenches. The office work is performed by clerks, whose status has not been made secure. These clerks constitute an integral and important part of the fighting machine. They must have superior intelligence and fair education. They make the Army their life work and become experts in their respective lines. They are indispensable. They are paid a salary that barely enables them to live in modest fashion. It is not possible for them adequately to provide for their declining years. As their years advance their capacity for work declines after a certain period. Being specialists in Army work, they can not find employment elsewhere. Some of them have grown feeble in the Government service, and their long and faithful work is deserving of recognition. Having no income except the pay roll, they are held in service until they die.

2. Such a condition is unworthy of the great Government they serve and against that Government's best interest. It is a condition that has long called for remedial action. The wisdom and desirability of remedial action has long been recognized. The condition, however, has been permitted to drift for lack of forceful and earnest presentation. It is a condition that must terminate sometime. The sooner the better. Efficient service, credit to the Government, and justice to the clerks demand remedial action. I believe what is best for all interests would be accomplished by the enactment of a law as follows:

"A bill to increase the efficiency of the Army, and for other purposes.

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That Army field clerks and field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, shall receive pay at the rates now provided by law: *Provided*, That the minimum grade for Army field clerks shall be $1,200 per annum, and the grades of $2,250 and $2,500 per annum are hereby created: *And provided further*, That Army field clerks and field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, shall receive the same allowances and benefits, including retirement, longevity pay, and increase of pay for foreign service as are now or shall hereafter be allowed by law to second lieutenants of the United States Army; and that for the purpose of this act all governmental service under the War and Navy Departments shall be counted.

"All laws and parts of laws inconsistent with the provisions of this bill are hereby repealed."

I recommend the passage of the bill as drawn.

H. O. S. HEISTAND,
Adjutant General, Adjutant.

[Second indorsement.]

HEADQUARTERS EASTERN DEPARTMENT, *May 20, 1919.*

To The Adjutant General of the Army, War Department, Washington, D. C.:

1. I concur in the first indorsement and earnestly recommend, in the interest of the very deserving employees referred to, such legislation as is suggested in the second paragraph of the first indorsement.

2. This has been a burning question for years, and I know of no more deserving or faithful employees than those cited, and something should be done in their interest.

(Signed) T. H. BARRY,
Major General, United States Army, Commanding.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, when the Committee on Military Affairs had the bill under consideration it was presented with a great many propositions to increase pay and increase the allowances of many men in the Military Establishment. The committee decided that in this bill those matters would not be taken up. In the first place, it became incumbent upon the committee to get speedy action on the bill and get it before the House. The committee felt that every time one of these increases would come upon the floor the probability was that a fight would be made on the item and a great deal of time consumed in the passage of the bill. The committee realizes that the bill must pass before the 1st of July. Otherwise, every soldier who is demobilized after that date can not receive his final pay or his transportation home until the bill passes. It was in the interest of economy of time that the committee, when considering the bill, decided not to take any action on these matters of increased pay or allowances.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield to me for an inquiry?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman hope to complete his bill to-morrow?

Mr. KAHN. I hope that I may be able to do that.

Mr. MONDELL. May I make the announcement that if this bill is completed to-morrow, or when it is completed, the House will take up the naval bill? It is rather important, as the gentleman from California has just suggested, that the House dispose of this bill as soon as is consistent with due and proper consideration of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Seven clerks, at $2,000 each per annum, $14,000.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. A short time ago I made a statement in the House that it was the policy of the War Department to keep 225,000 men in Europe as an army of occupation. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] a few moments ago called me to task for that statement, and said that Gen. March had not given me the right from any statement of his to draw such a conclusion as that. I want at this time, having asked the privilege of trespassing on your time and patience, to read you one or two lines from Gen. March's testimony, and you can draw your conclusion as to whether I was justified in putting that interpretation on his statement:

Mr. CALDWELL. In making up the figures for the 509,000 men, about what proportion did you consider would be in the army of occupation?
Gen. MARCH. I have thought personally that about 225,000 men would be sufficient.
Mr. CALDWELL. So that practically half of them would be an army of occupation?
Gen. MARCH. Yes.
Mr. CALDWELL. That would be eight divisions?
Gen. MARCH. That includes the service of supply troops.

I do not know whether I can read understandingly the English language or not, but I can trust you to put the same interpretation on that language that I have.

Later on he was asked to define what he meant by an army of occupation, and in substance he says, but not his language, "My idea of an army of occupation in Europe is an army that will force Germany to live up to her agreement as to indemnity." [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Five hundred and twenty-six clerks, at $1,200 each per annum, $631,800.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to correct the total.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 20, strike out "$631,800" and insert "$631,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

One hundred and nineteen messengers, at $720 each per annum, $85,580.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to correct the total.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 23, strike out the figures "$85,580" and insert $85,680."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Thirty-nine messengers, at $720 each per annum, $28,800.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to correct a total.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 2, strike out "$28,800" and insert "$28,080."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

All the money hereinbefore appropriated for pay of the Army and miscellaneous, except the appropriation for mileage to commissioned officers, contract surgeons, expert accountant, Inspector General's Department, Army field clerks, and field clerks of the Quartermaster Corps, when authorized by law, shall be disbursed and accounted for as pay of the Army, and for that purpose shall constitute one fund.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 5227, the Army appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that to-morrow immediately after reading the Journal and the disposition of preferential business I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes. I wish to explain that I was on the list of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] on Monday for general debate, but owing to absence on account of illness I was prevented from taking that opportunity.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that on to-morrow immediately after the reading of the Journal and preferential business he be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not want to appear as preventing any gentleman from addressing the House on matters which I am sure are of interest to the House. I am exceedingly anxious to get this bill through. I did hope to finish to-morrow evening before we adjourn. I presume the Members of the House will not object to staying 20 minutes longer in the evening in order to finish the bill. I shall not object, but I say to members of the committee and of the House that I hope to finish this bill to-morrow, no matter how late we have to stay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. MORIN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

S. 120. An act to repeal chapter 154 of the acts of the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, being the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FIELDS, for two days, on account of illness.

To Mr. KITCHIN, indefinitely, on account of illness in family.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, June 12, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

CALENDAR OF MOTIONS TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEES—NOTICE.

Under paragraph 4, Rule XXVII,

Mr. EDMONDS submitted a motion in writing to discharge the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1233) to provide for ocean mail steamship lines to South America, and to provide for their operation and disposition, and for other purposes in connection therewith, the same having been referred to such committee 15 days prior to this date.

Mr. MADDEN submitted a motion in writing to discharge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 376) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, by providing for equal and identical rights, accommodations, etc., the same having been referred to such committee 15 days prior to this date.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of appropriation required by the Treasury Department for the purpose of gathering information asked for by the House of Representatives in House resolution No. 75 (H. Doc. No. 92); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a tentative draft of a provision proposed to be included in the naval appropriation bill, transferring a part of the military reservation of Fort Taylor at Key West, Fla., to the Navy Department (H. Doc. No. 93); to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting certain correspondence with reference to legislation for the relief of Creeden & Avery (Ltd.), Vancouver, Canada, and for the transfer of property at Key West, under control of the Army, to the Navy Department (H. Doc. No. 94); to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the chairman of the United States Shipping Board submitting revised estimate of appropriations required by the United States Shipping Board and Emergency Fleet Corporation, for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 95); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, required by the Engineer Department of the Army, for flood control, Mississippi and Sacramento Rivers, fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 96); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required for support of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers (H. Doc. No. 97); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 72) authorizing the President to extend invitations to other nations to send representatives to the World Cotton Conference, to be held

in New Orleans, La., October 13 to 16, inclusive, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 34), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAPES, from the Committee on Accounts, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 104) providing for the appointment by each Member of the House of Representatives of one secretary and one clerk, whose names shall be placed on the rolls and paid in monthly installments, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 33), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 5498) relating to the sale, charter, and operation of merchant ships owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 5499) to permit the use of surplus profits of the newspaper published by the American Expeditionary Forces in France, known as the Stars and Stripes, for the benefit of the French children; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 5500) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Corsicana, Tex., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5501) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hillsboro, Tex., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5502) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Bryan, Tex., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5503) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Mexia, Tex., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5504) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Groesbeck, Tex., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5505) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Cameron, Tex., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5506) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Fairfield, Tex., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5507) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Centerville, Tex., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5508) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Franklin, Tex., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 5509) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Pomeroy, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5510) to increase the cost of the public building at Gallipolis, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GOODYKOONTZ: A bill (H. R. 5511) to amend an act of Congress approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stats.); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5512) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Princeton, in the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 5513) to establish a national highway system, to create a Federal highway commission, to encourage efficient and economical highway transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5514) to create a Federal home loan board and home loan bank for the purpose of aiding in financing the construction of homes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 5515) to amend section 402 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended by the act approved October 6, 1917; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5516) to permanently transfer the United States Coast Guard from the Treasury Department to the Navy Department; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 5517) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of St. Paul, Nebr., one German cannon or fieldpiece and caisson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 5518) to provide for the purchase of a site and for the erection of a public building at Clovis, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CULLEN: A bill (H. R. 5519) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Brooklyn, city of New York, for Red Hook Park, cannon or fieldpieces, with carriage and suitable complements of projectiles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5520) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Brooklyn, city of New York, for Carroll Park, cannon or fieldpieces, with suitable complements of projectiles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5521) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Brooklyn, city of New York, for Sunset Park, cannons or fieldpieces, with carriage and suitable complements of projectiles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5522) donating a captured cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Powell, Ind.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 5523) for the purchase of a site for a Federal building at Hastings, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 5524) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Sturgis, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5525) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of South Haven, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5526) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Benton Harbor, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5527) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of St. Joseph, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5528) to purchase a site for the erection of a post-office building in the city of St. Joseph, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5529) to regulate the interstate transportation of immature calves; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 5530) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Enid, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5531) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cherokee, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5532) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fairview, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5533) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Alva, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5534) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Waynoka, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5535) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Woodward, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5536) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Buffalo, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5537) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Beaver City, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5538) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Guymon, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5539) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Boise City, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5540) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Perry, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5541) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ponca City, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5542) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Blackwell, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5543) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Newkirk, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5544) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Medford, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5545) to provide homes for soldiers, seamen, and marines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 5546) to increase the number of the directors of Federal reserve banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 5547) to repeal paragraph 450 of an act entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1913, and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 5548) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building for the accommodation of a post office at Honesdale, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 5549) to provide for the manufacture and sale of high-proof spirits for other than beverage purposes, and to insure an ample supply of alcohol and promote its use in scientific research and in the development of fuel, dye, and other lawful industries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 5550) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Spencerville, county of Allen, State of Ohio, two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 5551) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Wautoma, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5552) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Weyauwega, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5553) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Scandinavia, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5554) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Iola, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VESTAL: Resolution (H. Res. 105) authorizing an extension of time for taking testimony, arranging orderly procedure, and providing other relief in the Alaska contested-election case; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 110) to prohibit the United States Shipping Board from selling any vessel purchased or constructed by or transferred to said board until further authorized by Congress so to do; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) requiring the Postmaster General to make an account and report to Congress; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MONDELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 112) relating to the fuel supply of the city of Casper, Wyo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial from the Legislature of Pennsylvania, asking pensions for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of Pennsylvania, protesting against the brutal treatment of innocent men, women, and children of the Jewish faith in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial from the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, protesting against the discontinuance of the Park Hill Hospital, located in Boston; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial urging an investigation of the treatment of the Pennsylvania National Guard by the Regular Army officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULINGS: Memorial from the Legislature of Pennsylvania, favoring pensioning all veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MORIN: Memorial of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, for the adoption of legislation providing for the pensioning of all veterans of the Spanish-American War when said veterans have reached a certain age; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REBER: Memorial from the Legislature of Pennsylvania, favoring pensioning all veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VARE: Memorial from the Legislature of Pennsylvania, asking pension for veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 5555) for the relief of Marcus Billstein; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 5556) granting a pension to Harriet E. Cantwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLEARY: A bill (H. R. 5557) for the relief of John J. Ahern; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURRIE of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 5558) granting a pension to Margaret Donahue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 5559) for the relief of Carl G. Lindstrom; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5560) granting a pension to Mary G. Leary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 5561) for the relief of Henry H. Elliott; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 5562) granting a pension to Salem Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 5563) granting a pension to Wesley H. Crockett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5564) granting a pension to Henry F. Baldwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5565) granting a pension to Rose E. Wicoff; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5566) granting a pension to Sallie E. Doolittle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5567) granting a pension to Emila Granger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5568) granting a pension to Amanda J. Kemberling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5569) granting a pension to Frank Mead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5570) granting a pension to Rebecca McCullough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5571) for the relief of Alonza Hannis, alias Albert Webb; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5572) for the relief of Thomas H. Thorp; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5573) for the relief of Amanda Honert; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5574) for the relief of Myron Powers; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5575) for the relief of James W. Houser; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5576) granting an increase of pension to J. K. P. McClary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5577) to correct the military records of the United States so as to muster Stewart C. Burt in and out of the service of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5578) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Almeron E. Calkins; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: A bill (H. R. 5579) to place Albert Hamilton on the retired list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 5580) granting six months' pay to Anton Kunz, father of Joseph Anthony Kunz, deceased, machinist's mate, first class, United States Navy, in active service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HERSEY: A bill (H. R. 5581) granting an increase of pension to Joseph N. Stockford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 5582) for the relief of Harry C. Bradley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 5583) for the relief of Capt. Leonard F. Matlack; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 5584) to authorize payment to the Southern Iron & Metal Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 5585) granting a pension to Carolina Greenwold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 5586) granting a pension to Sarintha A. Cashman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 5587) for the relief of Asbury Scrivener; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5588) granting an increase of pension to Julia Kemper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 5589) for the relief of Michael Sweeney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5590) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to lease San Nicholas Island, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 5591) granting a pension to Katherine Hallbaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5592) for the relief of Alden H. Baker, postmaster at Westfield, Ind., for postage, war-savings and thrift stamps stolen by burglars; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5593) granting a pension to John Ferman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROSE: A bill (H. R. 5594) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Mackin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 5595) granting a pension to James W. Mitchell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 5596) granting a pension to Emma Cornelia Troy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5597) for the relief of Maj. Ellis B. Miller; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5598) granting a pension to James F. Romines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5599) granting a pension to Annie E. Frost; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5600) to provide for the erection of a statue or monument to the memory of Gen. John Sevier; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5601) granting a pension to Lenora Stewart; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 5602) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Dunham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BABKA: Petition of Brooklyn Post, No. 368, Department of Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic, approving the Fuller pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of John A. Jarumzewski, druggist, Cleveland, Ohio, urging repeal of tax on soda water and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of the Religious Society of Friends of Hancocks Bridge, Salem County, N. J., favoring enforcement of prohibition law and extension of prohibition to Americans in China and wherever else treaties permit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hancocks Bridge, for strict enforcement of prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Petition of residents of Audrain County, Mo., asking the repeal of the tax on soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE: Petition of Central Labor Union of Marion, Ohio, favoring self-determination for Russia and all other peoples and the immediate withdrawal of all United States soldiers now in Russia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of the Bascom charge of the United Brethren Church, Bucyrus; First United Brethren Church, Bucyrus; Protestant Church; and the Dunkirk Christian Endeavor Society of the United Brethren Church, all of the State of Ohio, protesting against the proposed repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COPLEY: Petition of residents of Dundee, Ill., urging that there be no modification of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of numerous residents of the city of Schenectady, N. Y., praying for the immediate repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of American Citizens' Committee of Polish Birth and Descent, relating to affairs in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, relating to the housing problem in New York City and other cities of the country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOOLING: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, opposing repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York State, for a national policy of development of water resources; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of druggists of Greater New York and county of Westchester, against tax on soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of Illinois Agricultural Association, for immediate repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Andrews & Beckington, of Belvidere, and C. W. Hayden, of Sycamore, Ill., favoring repeal of the tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Illinois Lumber & Builders' Supply Dealers' Association, opposing revision of rates in Illinois; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Chicago Belting Co., opposing repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the National Live Stock Exchange, favoring increased appropriations for Bureau of Animal Industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HERSEY: Petition of Louis A. Perkins and 37 other residents of Sangerville, Me., urging retention of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of residents of city of Binghamton, N. Y., for repeal of tax on soft drinks, ice cream, and soda water; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of residents of the city of Binghamton and Johnson City, N. Y., for the repeal of tax on ice cream, soda water, and soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of residents of Worcester, the village of Sidney, and the village of Walton, N. Y., for the repeal of the tax on ice cream, soda water, and soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Petition of many customers of Schillici Bros., of Bessemer, Ala., for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of many customers of Gus. Harduval, Ensley, Ala., for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULINGS: Petition of citizens of Oil City, Pa., asking repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Resolution of the Kearsley Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Flint, Mich., protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KETTNER: Telegrams from Union and Alameda sugar companies, Western Sugar Refinery, and Spreckels Sugar Co., San Francisco, opposing amendment to Senate bill 684, to regulate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, protest in form of resolution of Kern County Farm Bureau, Calif., against bill No. 4023, giving right to city of Los Angeles of exclusive right of way and use of a zone 4 miles wide on either side of Los Angeles Aqueduct; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, resolution of Federal Employees' Union No. 1, San Francisco, Calif., approving the bill for lands for returning soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, protest of Merchants & Manufacturers' Traffic Association, Sacramento, Calif., against restricting the discretion of the Interstate Commerce Commission in administering the present long-and-short-haul clause in the interstate commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, protest of J. Jessop & Sons, San Diego, Calif., against war tax amounting to 5 per cent on gross sales; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of congregation of Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church of San Diego, Calif., against lifting of ban on beer and wine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition signed by residents of the Alamo district, Holtville, Imperial County, Calif., against lifting of ban on beer and wine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protest of Imperial County Christian Endeavor Union, representing 200 Endeavorers, Church of Christ, Brawley, Calif.; Epworth League of Imperial County, representing 200 Epworth Leaguers; and Los Angeles County Sunday School Association, Los Angeles, Calif., against repeal or amendment of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protest of Glenwood Mission Garage, Riverside, Calif., against war tax on autos; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of the Marston Co., San Diego, Calif., against section 904 of the excise tax bill, and paragraph 18 of section 900 of said revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of directors of Riverside (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce, urging retention of present zoning system in postage rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolution of Riverside Chamber of Commerce, Riverside, Calif., indorsing adoption of a national budget in the United States Government; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolution of directors of Riverside Chamber of Commerce, Riverside, Calif., urging enactment of good-roads measure to furnish employment for soldiers and sailors, and for the land bill for them; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolution of Retail Dry Goods Merchants' Association of Los Angeles, Calif., urging retention of zone advances and opposing any repeal of legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolution adopted by California State Fruit Growers' and Farmers' Convention, at Riverside, Calif., urging that Congress definitely act upon prohibition matter for the sake of grape growers of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protests of San Diego Chamber of Commerce; Brownstein-Louis Co., of Los Angeles; Kullman, Salz & Co., San Francisco; and Merchants' Association of San Diego, all of the State of California, against repeal of daylight-saving act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: Petition of sundry citizens of Newark, Bloomfield, and Orange, N. J., protesting against tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of James H. Brown, E. H. Breckan, and Frederick Susser, all of Buffalo, N. Y., for the repeal of tax on drugs and medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Christian Women's Board of Missions of New York and New Jersey, for enforcement of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of the membership of the Lafayette Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, of the city of Syracuse, N. Y., protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition, and requesting that legislation be enacted to enforce both the war-time prohibition and the constitutional amendment on prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of a mass meeting of all the Jews of Grand Rapids, Mich., protesting against the attacks upon the Jews in Poland and Roumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: Memorial of sundry citizens of Nebraska, for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NOLAN: Resolution by the fifty-first convention of Fruit Growers and Farmers of California, at Riverside, Calif., May 29, 1919, petitioning Congress to take immediate action on the question of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution from the San Francisco Labor Council, suggesting amendments to the Volstead prohibition-enforcement bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition from the San Francisco Labor Council, asking Congress to carry out President Wilson's recommendations regarding labor in his message to the Sixty-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York City, relating to the housing problem; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Soda Fountain Association of New York, against the tax on sodas, soft drinks, ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of American Citizens' Committee of Polish Birth and Descent, relating to affairs in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PAIGE: Petition of L. D. Stautt and other citizens of Massachusetts, against repeal of the so-called war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin: Petition of officers of Wisconsin Anti-Saloon League, Racine Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and 173 other societies, churches, and organizations, purporting to represent 228,000 citizens, requesting the continuance and enforcement of war-time prohibition and immediate enactment of code to enforce the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of California State Sunday School Association, in session at Sacramento, and Melrose Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, of Los Angeles, against the repeal of war prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REBER: Petition of B. S. Simonds, secretary Outdoor Club, Pottsville, Pa., against the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RHODES: Petition of First Baptist Church of Fredericktown, Mo., protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Jefferson County (Mo.) Auxiliary of the League to Enforce Peace, favoring a league to enforce peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of sundry citizens of New Rochelle and New York City, N. Y., protesting against the so-called luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of American Citizens' Committee of Polish Birth and Descent, Philadelphia, Pa., relating to affairs in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Beekman Hill Methodist Episcopal Church, George Adams, pastor, and 500 members, urging against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of National Retail Dry Goods Association, New York, and more than 1,000 others, opposing so-called luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Bloomingdale, N. Y., favoring prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petitions of Common Council of Rome, N. Y., and church and congregation of Boonville, N. Y., Baptist Church, against legislation removing the so-called war-emergency act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of various residents of Oriskany Falls, N. Y., for the immediate passage of a national prohibition enforcement act and protesting against repeal of the war-prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: Petition of Branch 263, National Federation of Postal Employees, at Knoxville, Tenn., for an increase in salary, and request that this increase be made permanent July 1, 1919; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of rural carriers of Rhea and Meigs Counties, at Dayton, Tenn., that all postal employees be granted a substantial increase in salaries to meet the enormous increase in cost of living; that rural carriers be granted a just compensation for horse and vehicle upkeep; that a just and equitable retirement bill be enacted, and that time and one-half time be granted to all postal employees working over eight hours per day; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petitions of B. W. Russell, Enon Valley, Pa., Mary Miller, East Brook Grange, No. 1706, East Brook, Pa., and others, asking for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition relating to the controversy between Italy and the Jugo-Slavs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions urging speedy enactment of a measure that will effectively provide for the enforcement of war-time prohibition and the national constitutional amendment; also protesting against the sale of beer and wine after July 1, 1919; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition signed by W. W. Wolfe, 289 Clay Street, Rochester, Pa., and others, urging the withdrawal of troops from Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions protesting against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Sherwood, Ohio, protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Salem Welsh Presbyterian Church, Venedocia, Ohio, protesting against any change in prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Defiance County Retail Druggists' Association, Defiance, Ohio, protesting against the so-called luxury tax and asking for its repeal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolutions relating to the detention of Rev. T. A. Rahilly at Ellis Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Roger Casement Branch of the Friends of Irish Freedom, relating to the league of nations and Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Roger Casement Branch of the Friends of Irish Freedom, against the representation of any foreign flag or ensign on the postage or coinage of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VAILE: Petition of Denver Branch, Fourteenth Division of Railway Mail Association, asking for increase in salary; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Park Hill Methodist Episcopal Church, of Denver, Colo., protesting against any removal of war-time prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Wilbur F. Steele, of University of Denver, against repeal of prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WASON: Memorial of Advance Grance No. 20, Wilton, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Concord Central Labor Union, urging the retention of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *June 12, 1919.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thy throne is established in the heavens. Thy kingdom ruleth over all. Justice and judgment are the habitation of Thy throne. We come to Thee with the work of our hands, feeling our insufficiency, our proneness to err, admitting before Thee that we have come short of Thy glory. We pray that Thou wilt look upon us with Thine infinite compassion, and lead us, that we may measure up to the divine purpose and ever be willing to follow the divine counsel. Hear us to-day. Bless us, for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. MCKELLAR and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hale	Newberry	Spencer
Beckham	Henderson	Nugent	Stanley
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Sterling
Culberson	Kellogg	Page	Sutherland
Cummins	Kenyon	Phipps	Swanson
Curtis	King	Poindexter	Thomas
Dial	Kirby	Reed	Trammell
Dillingham	La Follette	Robinson	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	McKellar	Sheppard	Walsh, Mont.
Elkins	McLean	Sherman	Warren
Fernald	McNary	Smoot	Watson

Mr. SHEPPARD. The junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY] is detained on important public business.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] are detained from the Senate on official business.

Mr. DIAL. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SMITH of South Carolina] is necessarily absent on account of illness in his family. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. NEWBERRY. The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] is detained at home by the serious illness of his wife.

Mr. KIRBY. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], who are engaged in a hearing before the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. NELSON answered to their names when called.

Mr. HARRIS. My colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] is necessarily detained from the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Washington, Mr. MYERS, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. LENROOT, Mr. PHELAN, and Mr. FRANCE entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I present a petition of citizens of Memphis, Tenn., now in the employ of the Standard Oil Co. of Louisiana, praying that six months' pay be granted to every soldier, sailor, and marine. I ask that the petition, together with the signatures, be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the petition, together with the signatures, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMPHIS, TENN., *May 26, 1919.*

Hon. K. D. MCKELLAR,
Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We, the undersigned, having served our country in the Army, Navy, and Marines, now in the employ of the Standard Oil Co. of Louisiana, do hereby petition and request that you lend your assistance and vote toward the passing of a bill now before Congress to give every soldier, sailor, and marine six months' pay.

Thanking you in advance for your kind consideration, we are,

Sincerely,

H. T. Sonnemann, yeoman, second class, United States Naval Reserve Force; L. B. Hodges, second lieutenant, Infantry, United States Army, Machine Gun Training Center, Camp Hancock, Ga.; W. T. Milans, sergeant, first class, United States Army Base Hospital No. 57, American Expeditionary Forces; Charles J. Wright, second lieutenant, assigned to United States Reserves; Wallace E. Blount, Twenty-fourth Company, Cavalry Officers' Training School, Camp Gordon, Ga.; W. W. Rice, second lieutenant, Infantry Reserve Corps, United States Army, Camp Gordon, Ga.; Walter A. Townsend, Company A, One hundred and thirteenth Machine Gun Battalion; F. S. Perry, medical department, Camp Pike, Ark.; Arthur F. Mullikin, Battery B, One hundred and fifteenth Field Artillery; Clifton G. McCormick, private, first class, Base Hospital No. 57; J. W. Graham, headquarters detachment, Camp Jackson, S. C.; Evan C. Tifft, Base Hospital No. 16; R. S. King, Base Hospital No. 15; Gordon Gildart, sergeant, Headquarters Company, Sixth Field Artillery; H. J. Geiger, seaman, United States Naval Reserve Force.

Mr. SHERMAN. I present a telegram from the mayor of Chicago protesting against the proposed increase of telephone rates for local service in the city of Chicago. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 7, 1919.*

LAWRENCE Y. SHERMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Chicago Telephone Co. has issued an announcement that "by direction of the Postmaster General" telephone rates will be raised in Chicago, effective June 16. As you represent a Chicago constituency, I ask you to protest against such an unjustifiable exercise of the war power of the Federal Government, and I suggest, further, that Congress take appropriate action to divest the executive branch of the Government of power to arbitrarily fix rates to be charged by public utilities for local service, which power may be abused and the interests of the people sacrificed to the utility corporations. The public has a right to be heard on a question of the magnitude the decision of which means millions of dollars to our people. Previous efforts of the telephone company to raise rates have been considered by our citizens as brazen attempts to rob the people of Chicago.

WILLIAM HALE THOMPSON, *Mayor.*

Mr. WARREN presented memorials of sundry citizens of Johnson County and Park County, in the State of Wyoming, remonstrating against the proposed extension of the Yellowstone National Park, which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. PHIPPS presented memorials of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Hotchkiss, Olathe, Julesburg, Colorado Springs, Las Animas, Genoa, Ouray, Walsenburg, Denver, Sterling, and Fort Morgan, all in the State of Colorado, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NEWBERRY (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of sundry citizens of Detroit, Mich., praying for the repeal of the tax on ice cream, sodas, and soft drinks, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented memorials of sundry citizens of Saginaw, Holton, Elk Rapids, Constantine, Yale, and Weston, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of Gilead Grange, No. 400, Patrons of Husbandry, of Bronson, Mich., praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a memorial of Local Union No. 1330, Millmen's Union, of Grand Rapids, Mich., remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SUTHERLAND presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Grant County, W. Va., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON. I have here a letter in the form of a petition praying for the repeal of the daylight-saving law. It is very short, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF EQUITY,
HASTINGS, MINN., *June 6, 1919.*

Hon. KNUTE NELSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The annual convention of the Minnesota State Union American Society of Equity was held in St. Paul on June 3 and 4. Over

200 delegates were present at this convention, representing the farmers in every section of the State.

This gathering of actual tillers of the soil were unanimously opposed to the further continuation of the daylight-saving law and condemned it as a nuisance on the grounds that it causes discontent among the farm boys and hired help on the farms and actually interferes with the production, harvesting, and marketing of farm products.

You, of course, understand that the heavy dew prevents work in the fields early in the morning at certain seasons of the year. This change in the time causes the loss of an additional hour in the morning during these periods, which are the busiest of the year.

The new time also brings the hour for resuming work after the midday meal right in the very heat of the day, making it impossible for either man or beast to perform their labors to the best advantage. Then, again, the new time brings the hour to quit field work in the afternoon just at the time when the heat has subsided and the most efficient effort could be put forth.

There is not the slightest doubt but what by far the greater majority of the farmers are opposed to the present daylight-saving law, and the Minnesota State Union American Society of Equity respectfully requests that you do all in your power to secure the repeal of this law at an early date.

Very truly, yours, C. R. WHITAKER,
Secretary Minnesota State Union,
American Society of Equity.

Mr. CAPPER presented petitions of sundry citizens of the counties of Harvey, Chase, Marion, and Butler, and of Local Union No. 282, Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers Union, of Pittsburg, all in the State of Kansas, praying for Government ownership of railroad, telephone, and telegraph lines, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Overbrook, Erie, Dodge City, and Kinsley, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of Local Lodge No. 658, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, of Sheffield, Ala., setting forth its grievances relative to working conditions, etc., at nitrate plant No. 2, Muscle Shoals, Ala., which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

DEFICIENCY IN RAILROAD OPERATION.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5312) to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for carrying out the act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918, reported it without amendment.

LOAN OF TENTS.

Mr. LENROOT. From the Committee on Military Affairs I report back favorably with amendments the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan tents and other material to the State of Wisconsin for National Army Encampment to be held in Milwaukee, Wis., and I submit a report (No. 14) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 7, to strike out the words "National Army" and insert "Army of the United States"; in line 10, after the word "tents," to insert the word "and"; in the same line, following the word "cots," to strike out "mess kits, blankets, field ranges"; on page 2, line 4, to strike out the words "and utensils of all descriptions"; in line 11, to strike out the words "guarantee to" and insert in lieu thereof the word "fully"; after the word "protect," in the same line, to insert "in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War"; and in lines 13 and 14 to strike out the words "not necessarily incident to the use specified" and insert "and for its return," so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, authorized under such restrictions as are usual in such cases, without expense to the Government of the United States, to loan to the State of Wisconsin for use at the reunion encampment of the demobilized members of the Army of the United States from the State of Wisconsin, to be held in September, 1919, at Milwaukee, Wis., and for such use to deliver to said State of Wisconsin such tents and cots, such of the United States ensigns, flags belonging to the Government of the United States, as may be spared and are not in use by the Government at the time of said reunion. And also for the purpose of caring for the sick and injured on the occasion of said reunion, such hospital tents and camp appliances and other necessities, hospital furniture, stretchers, Red Cross flags and poles belonging to the Government, as may be spared and are not in use at the time of the encampment; that such property and appliances loaned to the State of Wisconsin shall be delivered at such time and place as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of War and a duly authorized officer of the State of Wisconsin: *Provided*, That the State of Wisconsin shall fully protect in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War the Government of the United States against any loss or damage to the property loaned under authority of this resolution and for its return.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator having the joint resolution in charge a question. I made a request a few days ago of the War Department for the use of tents for the Boy Scouts in one of the Western States. The report was submitted, as I recall, that there were no tents available in the War Department for purposes of that kind; indeed, that all the tents the department have on hand, except a few which could be sold, and which they desire to sell, were needed for the Army.

I was wondering whether the information conveyed to me was accurate and whether there are tents available for the purpose indicated in the joint resolution now under consideration.

Mr. LENROOT. I think perhaps the Senator was somewhat misinformed. The War Department now can not loan tents and equipment to any organization other than the Grand Army of the Republic and the Confederate Veterans without special authority. This encampment is to be held in September in Wisconsin. Application was made by the governor to the Secretary of War, and a letter which accompanies the report states that they will be glad to loan the tents to the State if they have authority from Congress to do so.

Mr. KING. The Senator did not quite answer my question. The information which I received in addition to that which I indicated was that there are not sufficient tents in the War Department for purposes of this kind, except some that might be sold which are not needed.

Mr. LENROOT. All that I know is what the Secretary states. This is merely an authorization. If they have not the tents, they can not be loaned. It is not a direction; it is merely discretionary.

Mr. KING. Then there is no assurance that there are tents available for this purpose?

Mr. LENROOT. No.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan tents and other material to the State of Wisconsin for an encampment of veterans of the Army of the United States to be held in Milwaukee, Wis."

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LENROOT:

A bill (S. 1673) for the relief of the St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BECKHAM:

A bill (S. 1674) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Bastin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 1675) to establish the National Chamber of Agriculture for the purpose of promoting the equitable distribution of farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1676) to provide for the settlement, registration, transfer, and assurance of titles to land, and to designate a court of land registration, with jurisdiction for said purposes, in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 1677) to increase the utility of the postal savings bank, to encourage savings among the people, and to secure the largest returns for such savings consistent with adequate security; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 1678) to create a national rural credit society for the purpose of promoting agricultural credit, of devising forms of obligations eligible for rediscount at Federal reserve banks and acceptable as security for Federal deposits, of acting as fiscal agent for the United States Government, and of establishing a suitable form of investment for postal savings bank funds, trust funds in possession of United States courts or departments, and time deposits in national banks;

A bill (S. 1679) to establish a landschaft system of rural credit in the United States;

A bill (S. 1680) to provide for the establishment of national cooperative banking associations; and

A bill (S. 1681) to provide for the establishment of national cooperative rural banking associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 1682) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building thereon at Canton, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 1683) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 1684) authorizing the President to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint Irvin Edward Kenter, late a major in the Infantry of the United States Army, a major in the Infantry on the retired list, and increasing the retired list by one for the purposes of this act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 1685) for the relief of John C. Hesse; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING (by request):

A bill (S. 1686) to protect the Government of the United States of America, its national emblem, its securities and obligations, and its military and naval forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 1687) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Department of Utah, Grand Army of the Republic, one German machine gun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWANSON (for Mr. MARTIN):

A bill (S. 1688) for the relief of the estate of Arthur F. Clift, deceased;

A bill (S. 1689) for the relief of the widow of W. J. S. Stewart; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1690) granting an increase of pension to Charles D. Tibbets (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1691) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia A. Nickels; and

A bill (S. 1692) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth E. Baker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 1693) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Fisheries.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States giving to Congress the power to extend the right of suffrage to the residents of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NUGENT:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 53) for the relief of N. B. Pettibone; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. WARREN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 54) relating to the fuel supply of the city of Casper, Wyo.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 55) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to authorize uniform laws on the subject of marriage and divorce, and to provide penalties for enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LANDS IN COLORADO.

Mr. PHIPPS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1307) granting to the State of Colorado public lands to aid in the construction and maintenance of public roads, to promote the study of forestry, to promote the study and development of horticulture, and to promote vocational education in the State of Colorado, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. HALE. In compliance with the notice which I gave on yesterday, I submit the following resolution, and ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on Rules.

The resolution (S. Res. 77) was read and referred to the Committee on Rules, as follows:

Resolved, That Rule VII, paragraph 1, be amended by inserting after "Concurrent and other resolutions," the following:

"Resolutions coming over from a preceding day when requested by the Senator introducing the same, which resolutions shall be debatable.

"Motions coming over from a preceding day to discharge a committee from the further consideration of a bill, resolution, or other matter in the hands of a committee, which motions shall be debatable."

PEACE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. STERLING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 78), which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the ratification of the terms of the treaty of peace, including the covenant for a league of nations, lately proposed by the allied powers and associated nations to Germany and to Austria should be on the following express conditions or reservations, to be attached to and become a part of said treaty and covenant, and not otherwise:

That the United States of America, in view of their remote situation with reference to European States or other States of the Eastern Hemisphere and their more immediate interest in the territorial integrity and free institutions of the sovereign States of the Western Hemisphere and policies concerning which and the cordial relations with which the United States will endeavor to maintain, expressly reserve to themselves the right to determine, through the Congress, the justice or expediency of any fulfillment on the part of the United States of the obligations contained in or imposed by article 10 of the covenant for a league of nations, so far as such obligations at any time apply to the situation of any State or States of the Eastern Hemisphere.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege. I send to the Secretary's desk an editorial published in a newspaper which has been sent to me by one of my constituents—an anonymous one, by the way—with this notation:

Please read this article, by one of America's most enlightened thinkers and teachers.

I ask that the editorial be printed in the RECORD, the name of no Senator except the one now having the floor to be inserted, unless by consent of the different Senators who are mentioned therein.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the article referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The article referred to is as follows:

THE ENORMITY OF THEIR CRIME.

By Dr. Frank Crane.

When a man commits a crime he never knows what its consequences will be. They may be trivial, they may be appalling.

The universe is so complex that to throw one grain of criminal sand into its delicate machinery may bring unutterable ruin.

But there are some acts of mischief whose enormity is manifest. Among these I know of no greater than the activities of such men as Senators SHERMAN, REED, and BORAH in their desperate efforts to defeat the ratification of the league of nations by the United States.

Mr. Vanderlip, recently returning from Europe, has told us—and he is certainly an intelligent observer and of conservative temper—of the deplorable conditions in Europe, which are the aftermath of war. That Continent is completely disorganized industrially—man power has been alarmingly cut down. The men who survive do not want to work, but prefer idleness and revolt, which is the usual effect of war. Animals for farm work have been destroyed in the carnival of destruction. And Mr. Vanderlip is not pessimistic. It is the facts he brings us which are pessimistic.

Mr. Davison of the Red Cross says that we can not conceive of the horror of starvation and disease that is darkening Europe.

After war comes worse than war, even as hell follows death.

Think of the conditions in distracted Russia, in the territory of the central powers! Italy, we are told, dare not disband her army because she has no work for its men. England trembles upon the verge of revolution.

The wayfaring man, though a fool, knows this. And every human being who is capable of any cerebration at all knows that there is but one possible program that gives any promise of preventing further wars, followed by further famine, pestilence, and riot. The program is the league of nations.

Careful readers of the newspapers must know that, amid all that has been said against the league, no one has ever suggested any other way except the league of nations by which future wars can be prevented.

And yet there is a lively and determined movement on the part of certain men in the United States to defeat the league! In nothing is the utter hideousness of partisan politics more apparent than in this spectacle of men who, to gain partisan advantage, are willing to bring the human race to ruin.

Bad as this war is, all scientific thinkers are agreed that it was mild indeed compared to what the next war will be, unless by some league of nations it can be obviated.

Looking at all this, I would deliberately say that I would rather take my stand with Judas Iscariot, with Abdul the Damned, with the members of that vile court that sentenced Joan of Arc to flames, with John Wilkes Booth, or Charles J. Guiteau, than line up with a purpose so diabolical, so far-reaching in its mischievous effects as that of defeating the league of nations. For it means to put out the only light that glimmers in the darkness of the world, to wreck the only lifeboat laboring to the rescue of humanity.

Mr. SHERMAN. The substance of the article is printed on the editorial page, that all who are opposed to the league of nations are committing an enormous offense. They are classified with various historical characters from Judas Iscariot down to a number of modern assassins. Ordinarily I pay no attention to this kind of an article, but it represents a type of a certain class of critics in this country, Mr. President, and so long as it mentions myself and other Senators by name, I feel inclined to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my reply to all of them in order to save correspondence.

The article in question is by Dr. Frank Crane. Frank Crane was once a minister of the Gospel. As such he ranked as a doctor of divinity. Abandoning the ministry, he wrote books, essays, on almost everything, raged on the lecture platform for hire, and precipitated himself into unorthodox controversy on every subject that agitated the public mind. Like a lawyer, he must be retained before he discovers the merits of his subject. He is an author belonging, among other clubs, to the Lambs' Club, in New York City, a club of authors. So long as he is a "Lamb" in good standing, I conceive it to be my duty and my privilege to shear the aforesaid lamb now, as it is early in the spring. His books, which I have had the pleasure and sometimes the pain of reading, give no promise of lighting his name down to future generations. As a chronicler of current events,

it is my duty to embalm this insect in the amber of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Posterity may thereby gaze upon him properly preserved in the queen's English and visible in his natural state.

In the ex-doctor's random lambasting of everybody and whatever he chances to have his enmity directed against, he has been on all sides of most questions, and has criticized in language far from churchly many men in public and private life. He wrote a book called the "Religion of To-morrow." It suits him exactly. Most of the doctor's religion is of to-morrow rather than of to-day or of present practice. Another, two years later, entitled "Human Confession," is enough to make Rousseau wish he had never confessed anything. The same year, 1911, witnessed the birth of "God and Democracy." The good doctor thinks this is the league of nations coupled with the peace treaty, although he has never read the combination of both unless he has found it recently in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. "Just Human," in 1915, suggests plagiarism from Nietzsche. "Adventures in Common Sense" and the "Looking Glass," in 1916–17, show the utter futility of titles to mere books indicating in title or text much about their author. The whole series, as well as the author, is fitly described by the title of another book, known as "Lame and Lovely." Let the ex-doctor of divinity rest in peace under this alliterative and descriptive phrase.

Ordinarily the man who dedicates himself in earlier life to the salvation of souls and abandons that salvation later convicts himself of caring more for the emoluments of the lecture platform and syndicated sensational press articles than he does for the spiritual welfare of his brethren. Whosoever devotes his life to the spiritual service of his fellowmen and follows it faithfully to the end is the best of the human race. There is no purer, holier character; no more exalted soul hallows the earth with his unselfish presence; but the charlatan who, having left the pulpit, skulks behind it to sanctify his carnal misdeeds or give respectability to his degenerate emotions excites pity or contempt according to his mentality. One who deserts the holy calling of the church is apt to keep his sacerdotal robes well in front to cover any malevolent atrocity he commits. Many demons originally were fallen angels, all of whom in the science of demonology and in literature down to Milton's Paradise Lost and Paradise Regained prate much of their former life in the abode of the saints. So doth the good doctor. The good Crane always hangs out the "doctor" before his name to advertise his former sanctity and lend respectability to his worldly villianies. We are justified in believing the word "doctor" to refer to his former title of doctor of divinity, for no one in his right mind, after reading his books or weighing his system of morals, would ever suspect him of being a doctor of literature or anything else recognized in the world of learning.

A peculiarity of this type is their infallibility in all secular affairs. Their word must be accepted as final. A refusal consigns the recalcitrant to utter abomination and woe. It is sometimes difficult to separate the doctor's maledictions as a modern Jeremiah and seer from the plain hack writer at so much per column. The infallible Dr. Crane reverts to type in the article referred to, delivering the Senators opposing the league to a lurid inferno bounded only by his limited vocabulary and knowledge of history. Here our apprehension is aroused lest the doctor lapse into the rich expressive vernacular of the unredeemed or an apoplexy if his neurotic delirium continues. An ex-clergyman is universally allowed to possess authority to plunge his fellow men into a gulf of bottomless infamy. Having lived on familiar terms with perdition before he forsook the pulpit, because he was orthodox, even as one of the laity he still knows who ought to be delivered over to the buffetings of satan. I am content to let the versatile Crane keep company with the obsequious Taft. For our absent President they are the Timothy Crabshaw and Jeremy Diddler of his administration. A noble pair, indeed, are they. If the league be defeated, the spectacle of these two worthies weeping on each other's neck will melt a world in convulsive tears. Even the German will pause in sheltering himself behind the 14 points long enough to remark the harrowing scene.

I rejoice, Mr. President, that I can not meet the ex-doctor of divinity on his own level of epithets. His anathemas against the Senators who decline to accept without knowing the contents all coming from Paris via the President and Col. House neither convince nor terrify. His articles so bristle with language permissible only to a reformed clergyman that I forbear quotations. It is sufficient to say that death, hades, oblivion, the person totally void of understanding designated by a short Middle English word, hideous partisanship, treason, and as many unsavory characters as he can ransack from his memory, ranging from Judas Iscariot to several well-known modern assassins have honorable mention over such Senators. I shall await further developments with a mild degree of curiosity tempered with anxiety for the reverend doctor's health, because the furious Crane and I were once neighbors when in his more godly days he occupied a Chicago pulpit. Chicago was too slow for the doctor. He emigrated to the East where social relaxation consequent on a more Bohemian life of letters and berating chosen sinners is more liberal. A habitat where garments are changed oftener before taking nourishment appeals to the doctor. Since he separated himself from holy orders we have been going in opposite directions at a high rate of speed. Because of parliamentary rules insisted on in this body I am unable to say which way the doctor is headed or his ultimate destination, to which I earnestly exhort him to go. [Laughter.]

CONSTRUCTION OF FOREIGN SHIPS IN AMERICAN YARDS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 9, being Senate bill 1274. This is a bill which passed the Senate at the last session. Under the law as it now exists it is unlawful to construct or to enter into a contract for the construction of a ship for foreign account without permission of the Shipping Board or of the President. The Committee on Commerce have gone into the matter very thoroughly, and have reported this bill. The administration has no objection to it, and the Shipping Board has gone as far as it can by issuing an order that any such contract shall now be approved immediately upon presentation. This bill simply, in a legislative way, removes the legislative restrictions making such action unlawful. I hope the Senate will favorably act upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1274) making it unnecessary to secure permits from the United States Shipping Board for the construction of ships in American shipyards for foreign account, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "shipyards," to insert "except for alien enemies or alien enemy countries," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act it shall not be necessary to secure a permit from any governmental agency to enter into a contract for the construction of ships for foreign account in American shipyards, except for alien enemies or alien enemy countries.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I do not rise to oppose the bill, but, on the contrary, am in favor of it. I wish simply to observe that every country in the world, I believe, is limiting the construction of ships in their own shipyards to their own people or subjecting it to some control by some agency of the respective governments. I think it was good policy for us to have legislated as we did originally on this subject and leave this matter somewhat in the control of the Shipping Board, because of the fact that we needed all of our resources, all of our labor, and all of our material in the construction of ships for the Government and for our own people. I think now we have the opportunity of establishing the industry of shipbuilding in this country permanently and on a scale heretofore unknown, and that throwing open the American yards, which are greater in number and contain more shipways than will be needed for Government work and enabling them to take contracts for foreign account as well as for domestic account, is a wise thing to do. That is the purpose of the proposed legislation. The effect of it will be no longer to require that any proposals or contracts of that sort will be submitted to any agency of the Government, but that the yards will be free to make such contracts as they may wish to make on such terms as they can best obtain. It is somewhat a change of policy, but, under present circumstances, I believe that it is perhaps the wise thing to do.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill making it unnecessary to secure permits from any governmental agency for the construction of ships in American shipyards for foreign account, except for alien enemies or alien enemy countries."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

REGULATION OF RAILROAD RATES.

Mr. CUMMINS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 641, the unfinished business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 641) to amend section 10 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] will not press his amendment. There is this distinction between the interstate rates and the intrastate rates which are in existence: Interstate rates are created by Federal authority, and no one, I think, will claim that those rates do not continue until they are changed by Federal authority. As to the intrastate rates which existed before the war, many of them were created by statute and others pursuant to statutory authority. I believe there are some 10 or 12 States which have 2-cent passenger rates. Now, whatever may be said about the increase of rates, it would be absolutely disastrous for the Federal Government automatically to have such rates come into existence when this bill is enacted into law.

Does the Senator realize the condition of the railroads today? I am speaking as a friend of local administration in the States. I believe in maintaining local administration, for I do not believe that people should be required to come to Washington to settle all these questions of police regulations applying to the railroads in the various States. If the railroads are turned back to their private owners in their present condition, it is a conservative estimate that more than half of them will be in the hands of receivers within 60 days, involving more than ten billions of property. Such a disaster should be prevented if possible. Permit me to remind the Senator of the earnings of the railroads to-day in the hands of the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me there?

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The intrastate rates are comparatively a small portion of the entire freight rates of the income of the railroads. That is true, is it not? They are comparatively small, about 10 per cent. Then, if it is going to bring calamity to the railroads to restore this 10 per cent at this time, why does the Senator favor the bill for restoring 90 per cent to the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. KELLOGG. We do not propose to restore any rates by this legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. But we are restoring the right of the Interstate Commerce Commission over freight rates that it had exercised before the war measure which turned the railroads over to the Government.

Mr. KELLOGG. No; we are simply transferring the power from one Federal agency or authority to another. The interstate rates already established do not require any affirmative action of the commission to continue them. They continue as a matter of law until the Interstate Commerce Commission changes them.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Was it the opinion of the Railroad Administration or its representatives who came before the committee that the administration would be helped by this transfer of authority over rates to the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. KELLOGG. No one representing the Railroad Administration appeared before the committee on this particular question during the last hearing.

Mr. McKELLAR. There were no hearings on this bill.

Mr. KELLOGG. Hearings were held, of course, during the last session of Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. Do I understand that the committee did not have representatives of the Railroad Administration before it?

Mr. KELLOGG. During the previous session, but not during the present session.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then the committee did not have the Railroad Administration before it on this particular question of restoring the power over rates to the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. KELLOGG. Not on that question alone.

Mr. CUMMINS. But the Senator from Tennessee can find no satisfaction in that, because the predecessor of the present Director General was before the committee on this identical bill, and I inquired of him especially in respect to it, and the matter was very fairly developed. To be perfectly candid, the former Director General was very much opposed to the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the point I was trying to bring out. Why was the Director General opposed to the bill?

Mr. CUMMINS. He was opposed to withdrawing from himself any power whatever.

Mr. KELLOGG. I misunderstood the Senator from Tennessee. I thought he referred to hearings during the last week.

Mr. CUMMINS. No; we have had no hearings in the last week or 10 days.

Mr. McKELLAR. The reason I asked the question was because the Senator from Minnesota is arguing the matter here in behalf of the Railroad Administration, and I thought perhaps he was speaking without full knowledge of what had actually taken place. That was the reason of my calling his attention to it.

Mr. KELLOGG. I was referring to the last week.

Here is another situation: Suppose the freight rates which were established by statute prior to the war and Federal administration were automatically effective during the period of Government possession and control. The railroads can not bring a suit to set aside those statutes or orders on the ground that they confiscate their property under the Constitution of the United States, because their property is in the hands of the Government, and they are not interested in the earnings, the Government alone being concerned. Shall we force the passage of a bill restoring State rates and force the Federal Government to sue a State to set aside rates? It can not be done. For the short time the railroads are to remain under Government control and management it is my view that the Government through some agency should have complete control. I am not arguing as to what may happen when the railroads are returned to their owners. Then, of course, the companies may resort to the courts for relief and protection.

The present condition of the railroads in this country is, I think, rather appalling. The rates have been raised substantially 25 per cent, yielding in revenue between $900,000,000 and $1,000,000,000 a year, which has all been absorbed, and more, too, simply to meet wage demands, to say nothing about other increases in operating expenses. During the year 1917 the Government guaranty was approximately $900,000,000 to all of the class 1 railroads in the United States, being the average of the preceding three years' earnings; but in 1918 the railroads failed to earn that guaranty, suffering a deficit between $225,000,000 and $250,000,000, and during the last four months they have lost $250,000,000 more.

That is not all. I have here a quotation from a letter by Mr. Prouty, the accounting officer of the Railroad Administration, written to the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, in which he says:

> If the result of the first three months of the present year be taken as an index, the Government will not earn what it would be paying for the use of these properties by from $500,000,000 to $800,000,000 in 1919.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator if the Railroad Administration does not feel that its revenues will be decreased with the passage of this bill unamended? In other words, if, by the passage of this bill, the right to control rates is restored to the Interstate Commerce Commission, will that not take away from the Director General of Railroads the right to fix rates and thereby decrease the revenues of the Government in the operation of the railroads during the remainder of this year? Is not that their contention?

Mr. KELLOGG. I do not think so.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the Senator think that that would be the legitimate effect of the passage of this bill?

Mr. KELLOGG. Not at all. I can not conceive that the Interstate Commerce Commission or any intelligent man, in view of the present operating expenses of the Railroad Administration, could for a moment think of reducing rates; but the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee automatically puts in force a number of statutes which the States might not pass now—I presume that they would not—but which are already in existence; that is the trouble.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why does the Railroad Administration not approve of this bill as it is written, without amendment?

Mr. KELLOGG. I presume the Railroad Administration would much prefer—I think that is their position—to have the entire power in the hands of the Director General. I wish to say frankly to the Senator from Tennessee that during the remainder of the Government administration of the railroads I for one am willing to leave it there; but there has been a great deal of complaint about the relative adjustment of rates, much more than there has been with regard to the amount of the rates; and it is impossible for one man to adjust all of these rates without the aid of a commission whose long experience and knowledge enable it to settle these differences.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield right there?

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, if the Senator's reasoning is correct in that respect, ought we not to have the advantage of the various State commissions in order to adjust rates?

Mr. KELLOGG. The objection is not interposed to the State commissions, but the Senator proposes automatically to cause a reduction of rates all over the country in accordance with statutes and orders which now exist, and the Railroad Administration, in behalf of the United States Government, will be compelled to ask the legislatures of the various States to repeal their laws and the commissions to change their orders.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee whether he has any reason to believe that the present Director General is opposed to this bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have never talked to him about the matter at all, but I can easily see that he would object to the delegation of this authority to some commission which may regulate the rates so that his administration would not receive as much revenue from the operation of the railroads while he has charge of them. I imagine, without knowing, for I have never talked with him or with anyone else about it, that he feels that he can not make as much revenue if the right to regulate 90 per cent of the rates of this country is taken away from him.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee knows, I presume, that the Interstate Commerce Commission has the right to regulate rates. That right never was taken away from it.

Mr. McKELLAR. It has the right to regulate rates, but it has not the right to initiate rates. The Director General has, under the present law, the right to initiate rates; and that means to make them higher when he wants to do so; and he has done so time and again.

Mr. CUMMINS. And he will have the same right under this bill if it becomes a law.

Mr. McKELLAR. But the rates so fixed will be subject to the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission; otherwise there would be no reason for passing this measure.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is to say, the Interstate Commerce Commission would have the right to suspend the rates before they go into force.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course.

Mr. CUMMINS. Had the Senator from Tennessee been here yesterday when the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] and myself were discussing the matter, he would have heard what I said with regard to my own conversation with the present Director General about this bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not hear the Senator yesterday, and will be glad to hear him now.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have no reason to believe that he is opposed to the bill. He has not made any objection to it, so far as I know. If the Senator from Minnesota will permit me a word further, the only question the Director General ever asked me about the bill, although he knew I was the author of it and knew I was pressing it, was this: "Do you intend to try to take away from the President the right to control intrastate rates?" I told him there was no such purpose on my part, and that seemed to be entirely satisfactory to him.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, just a word further about the expenses of the railroads. It is not alone the increase in wages which has so greatly increased operating expenses; it is because of the increase in nearly every item under the interstate commerce classification of expenses of the railroad companies. According to the report of Mr. Hines, filed with the committee in January, 1919, there were 139,846, or substantially 140,000, more railroad employees, transacting less business, than there were in December, 1917, under private management; and, as nearly as one can determine, that means $210,000,000, which is 3 per cent on every dollar of capital stock of all the railroads in the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield further to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no doubt that the Senator's figures are accurate, but I am wondering why the committee does not bring in a bill here to restore the railroads to their owners and let us be done with the matter. I think it ought to be done. I wish to vote for a bill that will restore the railroads to private ownership.

Mr. KELLOGG. I shall tell the Senator why the committee has not done it. The committee sat nearly every day for two months during the last session of Congress hearing the testimony of railway representatives, security holders, representatives of communities, traffic associations, farmers, labor associations, and all classes of associations entitled to be heard. Full hearings were given. The committee has within a few days taken up the subject. Does the Senator realize the tremendous importance and character of such legislation—that if the railroads were turned back as we turned back the telephone companies, half of them or more would be in the hands of receivers within 60 days? Such a course is impossible. It would be a most serious public offense to wreck transportation systems by any such act.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator think that the telegraph and telephone companies are going into the hands of receivers because they are turned back?

Mr. KELLOGG. No. They have not suffered as the railroads have suffered. Their operating expenses have not been increased to any such extent as those of the railway lines.

I did not intend to discuss this question at this time, but I should like to have the Senate understand the condition of the railroads of the United States. I am having compiled a statement showing not what the Government paid them but the actual earnings during 1918 and during the last three or four months. Let me remind the Senator of a few of such cases; and I shall not take extreme cases.

I will take first the Pennsylvania Railroad system, which, I think, no one will claim is excessively capitalized and which I think everyone will admit has always been a fairly model railroad.

The Government's guaranty to the Pennsylvania system for 1918 was $65,992,740. The Pennsylvania Railroad actually earned $22,428,838, and it lacked $31,756,909 of earning its ordinary dividend of 5 per cent.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the Senator think that that affords a very cogent reason why the Government should turn over these railroads to their owners?

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes, it does, just as soon as we can pass legislation which will provide for their proper control.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield for a question.

Mr. TRAMMELL. What is the basis upon which that remuneration is determined?

Mr. KELLOGG. It was the average three-year earnings preceding the war, which was fixed by Congress as the standard return.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I knew that that was the maximum amount authorized by the act of Congress, but I did not know whether or not the Director General had exercised the full maximum privilege.

Mr. KELLOGG. He has.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Is the Senator in possession of information as to what percentage that will amount to upon the investment?

Mr. KELLOGG. I will give the Senator the percentage. It was only a little more than the interest upon the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.'s bonds, which do not amount to a third of the value of the property; and it was about, as I remember, 2 per cent on its total property value.

I also have the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.'s earnings for the year and three months of Government control. The total deficit of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. during that time was $39,000,000, and its net operating income for 1918 was less than 2 per cent of its total property investment. If the Pennsylvania Railroad was turned back under those conditions, it could not pay the interest on its bonds which are outstanding, and no one questions that those bonds equal not more than 33⅓ per cent of the value of the property.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator think the Government ought to continue to make up this deficit, or does he think that the Government should interpose and aid the Pennsylvania Railroad in any way in earning full interest on its bonds and dividends on its stock?

Mr. KELLOGG. Who has caused this deficit? Not the Pennsylvania Railroad, but the Government. When possession of the roads was assumed by the Government the Pennsylvania Railroad was earning its interest and over 5 per cent upon its stock. The Government has increased its operating ex-

penses, which are a charge ahead of its mortgage, so that it can not recover; and the Government has no right to take over the property of a railroad company, increase its operating expenses, make it bankrupt, and then discard it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I take it that there is no difference of opinion about the deficit that has already been caused by Government operation; but is there any reason why the Government should continue in the future to guarantee to the Pennsylvania Railroad that it shall earn the interest on its bonds and dividends on its stock? Does the Senator take that position?

Mr. KELLOGG. No; I am not in favor of any such Government guaranty. The Government's guaranty ceases when the railroads are turned back, as soon as we can draft proper legislation; but I desire in a few instances to remind the Senator of the condition which would exist if these railroads, after the Government has increased their operating expenses to such an abnormal extent, were returned. If we should say, "You can take your property and take care of it," it would not only be bad judgment, ruinous to the finances of the country, but it would be dishonest. No private individual would think of doing such a thing, and the Government will not think of doing it.

Take the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad, a great system in my section, which for many years was considered one of the safest and best-managed railroads in the country. Its average earnings for the three years preceding the war were $27,594,551. That is its contract with the Government. It actually earned, under the operating expenses imposed upon it by the Government, $3,643,192, and its bond interest was over $17,000,000. It earned practically nothing on its bond interest.

Take the Chicago & North Western. The Chicago & North Western Railroad is one of the oldest and one of the best-managed and lowest-capitalized railroads in this country. The present head of that company—I say "head of the company"; he is now the head of the corporation, but he has not anything to do with Government management—Mr. Marvin Hughitt, has been president of the Chicago & North Western Railroad for more than 40 years. I have known him intimately during that time. No one ever claimed that that company had any watered stock or that it was not honestly and well managed; and now let us look at it. Its dividends are moderate. It lacked $8,340,628 of earning its dividends last year. Its total Government guaranty was $23,201,016. It actually earned about half that—$12,441,437—and it is doubtful if the North Western Road at its present rate of earnings could pay the interest on its bonded indebtedness if it were relinquished, because its condition in the last four months is worse than it was during last year.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an inquiry there, just for information?

Mr. KELLOGG. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Is the deplorable condition of these roads the result of the diversion of traffic from them to other systems, or is it largely due to the increased expenses of operation owing to mismanagement or maladministration or incompetency, or to what would the Senator attribute this condition?

Mr. KELLOGG. I attribute it principally to the enormous increase of operating expenses in all branches of the administration, increase of compensation of employees, increase of expenses of material and supplies, increase in the number of the employees, and—a thing which I believe to be inevitable—a decrease in efficiency due to Government operation.

I stated when the bill was before the Senate in February, 1918, that there was no necessity for assuming control of the railroads of this country; that the administration of the railroad officials during eight or nine months of the war in 1917 had been efficient, and had enormously increased transportation without increasing the cost.

You can not take a great business such as involves the railroads of this country and make it prosperous and efficient unless you have behind it the enterprise, the incentive, and the ingenuity of men. I prefer no charges against any of the gentlemen who are operating these roads on behalf of the Government. The system is inefficient and impossible. The Government has increased and doubled the operating expenses; and while the rates have been increased, they have been wholly inadequate to meet the enormous operating expenses. There are only two courses open to Congress. The Congress must consider the whole subject, and return the railroads under a system of strict Federal control, which I am in favor of, which will permit them to benefit by the competitive and individual enterprise of the American people, or the Government must perpetuate the inefficiency by purchasing the roads and meeting the deficits, which it alone could do. I am in favor of strict Government control, particularly with regard to the issuance of stocks and securities, and I also favor giving the commission the sole power to fix minimum as well as maximum rates, preserving, however, the competitive system of operation, and infusing railroad management with the enterprise and ingenuity of the American people.

I also believe in local administration, but I ask the Senator to give the Congress an opportunity to solve the most difficult financial problem that ever confronted the American people, which has been created by the inordinate desire of the Federal Administration to control the business of the country, upon the theory that Government control transcends private management, which is a fallacy.

I shall not consider the condition of all the companies. I do not know whether there has been favoritism shown or not. The transcontinental railroads, the Union Pacific and the Santa Fe and some of the other companies, have shown better results, but a great many of the large and well-managed railroads of the United States are not earning to-day, under the present Government rate of expenses, their interest, or any more than their fixed charges. For instance, the New Haven Railroad, without paying a dollar of dividends, last year lacked $7,521,859 in its earnings to cover operating expenses and interest on its bonds and fixed charges. No one claims that that road is bonded for its value.

I do not believe that it serves the interests of the American people to have a great Government bureau in Washington supervising the railroads of this country. I am in entire harmony with the views of the chairman as he expressed them yesterday. The Federal Government must have control of the interstate rates, and I can see no objection to that control being placed in the hands of a commission which knows the conditions as they exist. I am willing to leave it where it is.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think that the passage of this bill may delay somewhat action by the committee of which he is a member in restoring the railroads to private ownership, or at least in adopting some different and better plan of management and control than that which now prevails?

Mr. KELLOGG. I do not see how it can affect it in the least, one way or the other.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, with the Senator's permission I will state that the committee of which I am chairman will work every available hour until it is able to present to the Senate a plan of readjustment and reorganization which it believes will accomplish the purposes which the American people so sincerely want.

Mr. KING. I am sure, if the Senator will pardon me, that he and his committee will be doing a great public service, and none greater can be done at the present time.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Utah, I hope, will remember this: Including the plans put before the committee and those that have been submitted to me personally, I have had more than 30 distinct and complete plans for the readjustment of the relations between the Government and the railroads, or the reorganization which it is thought must be made.

Mr. KING. I have no doubt that every crank and faddist in the country is here to advise the committee.

Mr. WATSON. Yes; but if the Senator will permit me——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. KELLOGG. I do.

Mr. WATSON. Not only the cranks and the faddists, but men engaged in the railroad business, railroad presidents, railroad managers, men connected with the Railroad Administration, men representing every phase of railroad activity, have different plans for the reorganization of the service. We all understand that it would be what I consider the very height of folly to cast these railroads back without suitable legislation, because, as the Senator has already said, it would undoubtedly throw 50 per cent of the railroads of the United States into the hands of a receiver within 60 days, and no power could prevent the precipitation of a panic in the United States such as has not cursed this country for many years in the past; and, therefore, there must be wise and salutary legislation before this step can be taken. Under these circumstances, as the Senator has so well said, it is the duty of this committee to sit day after day, until to the best of our knowledge and ability this question shall have been solved, and until we shall have presented to this body the result of that deliberation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield for a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will yield for that purpose, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I can understand the difficulties of this situation, and I can understand the great amount of work that it will require and the very considerable time that will have to be given to it, so that the railroads may be retransferred in a fair and just and equitable way, taking into consideration their own interests and the local and all other interests; but can the Senator from Iowa, the chairman of the committee, inform us about when we may expect action by the committee on the matter of restoring the railroads to their owners?

Mr. CUMMINS. I can not with any accuracy, Mr. President. I shall be very much disappointed if we are not able to present a plan or present the legislation that in our view will accomplish the purpose early enough to have it acted upon during the present year.

Mr. KELLOGG. The Chicago Great Western Railroad Co., with a line about 1,500 miles in length, extending west from Chicago, has a bonded indebtedness, as I remember, of about $25,000 a mile. Its total net earnings last year under the Railroad Administration were $21,457. I understand that the president of the road claims that it was $61,000, which yields practically nothing on its bonds. That is a result of mortgaging it with enormous operating expenses.

[At this point Mr. KELLOGG yielded the floor for the day.]

Thursday, June 12, 1919.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, when the Senate adjourned last evening I had practically completed the remarks I intended to make upon this bill. I have, however, been requested to place in the RECORD the statements showing actual earnings of several companies to which I referred yesterday, which contain evidence that many of the leading conservative railroads of this country are not earning to-day the interest on their bonded indebtedness, without regard to the dividends which they have paid for many years.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the Senator any figures showing how much the Railroad Administration would lose if the regulation of intrastate rates were restored to State control?

Mr. KELLOGG. I have not the figures.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the Senator any view about how much would be lost? It was stated here yesterday by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] that there would be a very great loss to the Railroad Administration if the regulation of intrastate rates were restored to State control; and I was wondering if the Senator had the figures, or anything approximating them.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. KELLOGG. I do.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have no positive or definite information upon that point, but I think I can suggest an estimate that will be fairly accurate. I believe upon the whole the revenues of the railroads derived from intrastate business are about one-fifth of the entire revenues. I state that from the merest recollection, because I have not examined the reports recently upon that point. If that be true, it will work out in this way:

In the year 1918, the first year of Federal control, the railroads earned four billions nearly nine hundred millions of dollars. If one-fifth of those revenues were derived from what is called intrastate traffic, the result would be that about a billion dollars came from that source. If we may assume that the increases that were made by the Director General averaged 20 per cent upon the State rates as well as upon the interstate rates, the amount of the increase upon State rates would be in the neighborhood of $200,000,000; and if the State rates were restored immediately upon the passage of this bill, the Government would lose in revenue something like $200,000,000 per year. In view of the facts which are now being stated by the Senator from Minnesota, and which I outlined yesterday—namely, that we lost in 1918 $240,000,000, and that we are losing now at the rate of more than $700,000,000 per year—the effect upon the Treasury of the United States of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee can be readily seen.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa for that statement. I wish to remind the Senate that owing to the enormous increase of operating expenses the Government is now losing anywhere from five to eight hundred million dollars per year, as estimated by the expert of the Railroad Administration, Mr. Prouty; but that is not the most serious phase of the question. I suppose the taxpayers of the country must meet the deficit, but if you turn the railroads back—and they must be returned soon; the President advises the 1st of January—you return them mortgaged with operating expenses which the companies are absolutely incapable of liquidating. Nothing is more difficult to reduce than the operating expenses of a railroad, which must be met before they can pay their interest; and the country can not afford to revise those rates during the period of Government operation.

As I stated yesterday, when the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Chicago & North Western Railroad—undercapitalized, conservatively managed—would be compelled to default on their interest if they were turned back to-day, the Congress and the country ought to realize the calamitous results of Government operation. This Congress has no more difficult question to-day to solve among all its vast economic problems than that involving the return of the railroads to their owners and again enlisting the enterprise, ingenuity, and initiative of American men and averting total bankruptcy and disaster. We must not overlook the fact that railroad bonds—I mean first-class, prior-lien bonds—which for years had been the best security in this country, are held by the hundreds of millions by savings banks—in the case of the savings banks of Connecticut 32 per cent are railroad securities—and by insurance and trust companies, in which all the people are interested. The Comptroller of the Currency has been compelled to permit national banks to list the bonds regardless of the market quotations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the situation is so serious, why do you attempt to disarrange it by making such a fundamental change as that contemplated in this bill?

Mr. KELLOGG. I do not think this bill makes any particular change.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You deprive the Railroad Administration of its authority over rate making.

Mr. KELLOGG. I am perfectly willing to leave it where it is. I should be very glad to do so, I will say to the Senator. I am not anxious to have it changed, but I do not want it made any worse, and I want the Senate to understand and the people to understand the problem which has developed from the railroad situation in this country. The railroads must be placed where they can earn a fair income on their value, obtain money enough to furnish satisfactory transportation, make extensions and betterments sufficient to meet the demands of this country, or our commerce will suffer as a consequence.

The railroads are the arteries which carry the lifeblood of our commerce, and nothing is more important than that we adopt a policy which is wise and conservative and adequate for the needs of the country.

Let us consider the Rock Island, which was considered one of the overcapitalized lines; but it has been reorganized and its capitalization reduced so that to-day it is conservative and a good railroad system. Its guaranty by the Government was $15,883,891 for the year 1918. It actually earned only $9,118,405, which about equals the interest on its bonds, to say nothing of interest on the unfunded debt, rentals for leased properties, or dividends. No one will claim that the Rock Island road's value is represented by its bonds. It earned a little more than half of its guaranty.

The Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha is one of the very best lines of railroad in my section. Its guaranty for 1918 was $4,934,790, its actual earnings $2,624,720, and with its income from sources other than transportation it earned only $2,460,040. Its bond interest alone was $2,260,475, approximating the amount of its earnings, with no dividends; and that road has paid 5 or 6 per cent dividends since I can remember.

The same is true of the Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie.

I ask permission, without further comment, to have these statements printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks. [See Appendix A.]

As I said yesterday, the rates have been increased about 25 per cent and with no particular increase in the business. Class 1 roads earned approximately $900,000,000 more in 1918 than they earned in 1917 under private management, while the actual net earning was about $300,000,000 less. There is a change of over twelve hundred million dollars in the operation of railroads whose gross earnings approximated $5,000,000,000.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KELLOGG. Certainly.

Mr. KING. The amount stated by the Senator as being the increased earnings, I suppose, was the gross earnings?

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes; the gross earnings.

Mr. KING. And they were based entirely upon the increase in rates and business.

Mr. KELLOGG. There was not much increase in business in 1918. In fact, the business is less now than it was in 1917.

Mr. KING. Was there anything before the committee to indicate whether or not the Railroad Administration is now routing freight over certain favored lines, if I may be permitted that expression, with an apparent discrimination against other lines?

Mr. KELLOGG. No; there was no testimony to that effect before the committee. As I said yesterday there are some roads that have not suffered so much. The roads generally in the southern district south of the Ohio River, as well as some of the transcontinental roads in the West, have done very well, but in districts where traffic is heavy, where the population is most dense, where you would expect the roads with increased business to have improved earnings, their operating expenses have so enormously increased that their actual earnings have very greatly decreased, and such is their present condition that if they were turned back to-day many of them, as I said before, would go into a receiver's hands.

I also ask permission to print at the end of my remarks a condensed statement of the operation of all class 1 railroads in 1918, 1917, and 1916. It is a very brief statement, also covering the months of January, February, and March, and the three months were condensed in one statement. Senators will there have a general sketch of the condition of the railroads in the country.

It stands to reason that something must be done. The Government has no right to take over a railroad or any other public utility, and under the guise of its war power to so increase its operating expenses as to destroy its property and earning capacity and then return it to its owner without providing a corresponding increase of income.

APPENDIX A.

Pennsylvania R. R. Co., income account, calendar year 1918.

[Source, annual report to stockholders.]

Item.	Actual (basis of Government guaranty).	Adjusted (basis of income actually earned).
Guaranteed compensation from United States Railroad Administration	$65,992,740	
Net income earned, Federal operation		$22,428,838
Deduct:		
War taxes	3,827,649	3,827,649
Corporate organization expenses	371,640	371,640
Adjustment of accounts prior to 1918, net	1,674,872	
Add income from outside sources	22,601,747	22,601,747
Corporate income available for fixed charges, dividends, etc	82,720,326	40,831,296
Deductions:		
Interest on funded debt	13,509,568	13,509,568
Interest on unfunded debt	2,848,042	2,848,042
Rent for lease of road	21,282,019	21,282,019
Dividends	29,950,704	29,950,704
Appropriations out of income	2,313,202	2,313,202
Other deductions	2,684,670	2,684,670
Total deductions	72,588,205	72,588,205
Surplus	10,132,121	
Deficit		31,756,909

Chicago & North Western, income account, calendar year 1918.

[Source, annual report to stockholders.]

Item.	Actual (basis of Government guaranty).	Adjusted (basis of income actually earned).
Guaranteed compensation from United States Railroad Administration	$23,201,016	
Net income earned—Federal operation		$12,441,437
Deduct:		
War taxes	925,000	925,000
Corporate organization expenses	149,577	149,577
Adjustment of accounts prior to 1918, net	4,671,889	
Add income from outside sources	2,262,661	2,262,661
Corporate income available for fixed charges, dividends	19,717,211	13,629,521
Deductions:		
Interest on funded debt	8,816,106	8,816,106
Interest on unfunded debt		
Rent for lease of road	128,980	128,980
Dividends	11,952,275	11,952,275

Chicago & North Western, income account, etc.—Continued.

Item.	Actual (basis of Government guaranty).	Adjusted (basis of income actually earned).
Deductions—Continued.		
Appropriations out of income	$111,480	$111,480
Other deductions	961,303	961,303
Total deductions	21,970,144	21,970,144
Surplus		
Deficit	2,252,933	8,340,632

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul, income account, calendar year 1918.

[Source, annual report to stockholders.]

Item.	Actual (basis of Government guaranty).	Adjusted (basis of income actually earned).
Guaranteed compensation from United States Railroad Administration	$27,594,551	
Net income earned—Federal operation		$3,643,192
Deduct:		
War taxes	376,628	376,628
Corporate organization expenses	163,041	163,041
Adjustment of accounts prior to 1918, net	4,331,338	
Add income from outside sources	1,310,725	1,310,725
Corporate income available for fixed charges, dividends	24,034,269	4,414,248
Deductions:		
Interest on funded debt	16,696,503	16,696,503
Interest on notes	474,888	474,888
Rent for lease of road		
Dividends		
Appropriations out of income		
Other deductions	534,985	534,985
Total deductions	17,706,377	17,706,377
Surplus	6,327,892	
Deficit		12,292,129

Chicago Great Western, income account, calendar year 1918.

[Source, annual report to Interstate Commerce Commission.]

Item.	Actual (basis of Government guaranty).	Adjusted (basis of income actually earned).
Guaranteed compensation from United States Railroad Administration	$2,953,450	
Net income earned—Federal operation		$21,457
Deduct:		
War taxes	92,000	92,000
Corporate organization expenses	35,381	35,381
Adjustment of accounts prior to 1918, net	507,753	
Add income from outside sources	73,339	73,339
Corporate income available for fixed charges, dividends	2,391,655	[1] 32,585
Deductions:		
Interest on funded debt	1,032,820	1,032,820
Interest on unfunded debt	8,001	8,001
Rent for lease of road	480,000	480,000
Dividends	[2] 878,532	[2] 878,532
Appropriations out of income		
Other deductions	70,833	70,833
Total deductions	2,470,186	2,470,186
Surplus		
Deficit	78,531	2,502,771

[1] Deficit. [2] Dividends from surplus.

New York, New Haven & Hartford, income account, calendar year 1918.

[Source, annual report to Interstate Commerce Commission.]

Item.	Actual (basis of Government guaranty).	Adjusted (basis of income actually earned).
Guaranteed compensation from United States Railroad Administration	$17,095,884	
Net income earned—Federal operation		$7,534,334

New York, New Haven & Hartford, income account, etc.—Continued.

Item.	Actual (basis of Government guaranty).	Adjusted (basis of income actually earned).
Deduct:		
War taxes	$84,255	$84,255
Corporate organization expenses	99,730	99,730
Adjustment of accounts prior to 1918, net	1,157,833	
Add income from outside sources	5,558,699	5,558,699
Corporate income available for fixed charges, dividends	21,312,765	12,909,048
Deductions:		
Interest on funded debt	9,677,782	9,677,782
Interest on unfunded debt	3,093,052	3,091,052
Rent for leased road	6,020,712	6,020,712
Dividends		
Appropriations out of income		
Other deductions	1,639,361	1,639,361
Total deductions	20,430,907	20,430,907
Surplus	881,858	
Deficit		7,521,859

Rock Island Lines (Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific and the Chicago, Rock Island & Gulf), income account, calendar year 1918.

[Source, annual report to stockholders.]

Item.	Actual (basis of Government guaranty).	Adjusted (basis of income actually earned).
Guaranteed compensation from United States Railroad Administration	$15,883,891	
Net income earned—Federal operation		$9,180,405
Deduct:		
War taxes	548,780	548,780
Corporate organization expenses	123,655	123,655
Adjustment of accounts prior to 1918, net	2,204,423	
Add income from outside sources	555,032	555,032
Corporate income available for fixed charges, dividends	13,562,065	9,063,002
Deductions:		
Interest on funded debt	9,204,830	9,204,830
Interest on unfunded debt	269,446	269,446
Rent for lease of road	361,583	361,583
Dividends	3,566,027	3,566,027
Appropriations out of income		
Other deductions	449,529	449,529
Total deductions	13,851,415	13,851,415
Surplus		
Deficit	289,350	4,788,413

Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha, income account, calendar year 1918.

[Source, annual report to stockholders.]

Item.	Actual (basis of Government guaranty).	Adjusted (basis of income actually earned).
Guaranteed compensation from United States Railroad Administration	$4,934,790	
Net income earned—Federal operation		$2,624,720
Deduct:		
War taxes	192,000	192,000
Corporate organization expenses	38,261	38,261
Adjustment of accounts prior to 1918, net	693,456	
Add income from outside sources	65,581	65,581
Corporate income available for fixed charges, dividends	4,076,654	2,460,040
Deductions:		
Interest on funded debt	2,260,475	2,260,475
Interest on unfunded debt	89,105	89,105
Rent from leased road		
Dividends	1,715,986	1,715,986
Appropriations out of income		
Other deductions	14,349	14,349
Total deductions	4,079,915	4,079,915
Surplus		
Deficit	3,261	1,619,875

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie, income account, calendar year 1918.

[Source, annual report to Interstate Commerce Commission.]

Item.	Actual (basis of Government guaranty).	Adjusted (basis of income actually earned).
Guaranteed compensation from United States Railroad Administration	$10,547,429	
Net income earned—Federal operation		$3,858,723
Deduct:		
War taxes	220,702	220,702
Corporate organization expenses	56,546	56,546
Adjustment of accounts prior to 1918, net	669,958	
Add income from outside sources	662,972	662,972
Corporate income available for fixed charges, dividends	10,263,195	4,244,447
Deductions:		
Interest on funded debt	3,558,170	3,558,170
Interest on unfunded debt	16,194	16,194
Rent for lease of road	3,424,338	3,424,338
Dividends	[1] 2,646,714	[1] 2,646,714
Appropriations out of income		
Other deductions	50,626	50,626
Total deductions	9,696,042	9,696,042
Surplus	567,153	
Deficit		5,451,595

[1] Dividends for surplus.

APPENDIX B.

United States railways of class 1.

REVENUES AND EXPENSES FOR THE YEAR ENDING DEC. 31.

Item.	1918	1917	1916	Test period average.
Total operating revenues	$4,913,319,604	$4,050,463,579	$3,622,057,141	$3,395,231,314
Total operating expenses	4,008,894,762	2,858,212,210	2,373,439,156	2,297,162,443
Net operating revenue	903,424,842	1,192,251,369	1,248,617,985	1,098,068,871
Taxes	185,652,096	182,778,423	158,587,793	152,422,793
Uncollectible revenues	613,206	697,093	893,009	723,485
Railway operating income	719,159,540	1,008,775,853	1,089,137,183	944,922,593

REVENUES AND EXPENSES FOR THE MONTH OF JANUARY.

Item.	1919	1918	1917	1916	Test period average.
Total operating revenues	$396,786,536	$285,083,748	$300,843,745	$260,054,306	$258,364,946
Total operating expenses	360,465,815	270,756,750	215,496,356	182,881,269	187,382,282
Net operating revenue	33,320,721	14,326,998	85,347,389	77,173,037	70,982,664
Taxes	15,325,889	14,684,639	13,708,362	12,216,566	12,379,619
Uncollectible revenues	58,056	42,779	51,485	41,185	44,030
Railway operating income	20,936,776	[1] 400,414	71,587,542	64,915,286	58,559,015
Equipment rents	[1] 824,613	[1] 1,795,599	[1] 3,338,030		
Joint facility rents	[1] 1,328,461	[1] 1,092,192	[1] 1,009,986		
Net operating income	18,783,702	[1] 3,288,205	67,239,526		

REVENUES AND EXPENSES FOR THE MONTH OF FEBRUARY.

Item.	1919	1918	1917	1916	Test period average.
Total operating revenues	$351,946,353	$289,683,833	$265,362,397	$261,904,120	$244,126,243
Total operating expenses	324,520,617	260,590,900	207,795,297	183,677,515	182,168,038
Net operating revenue	27,425,736	29,092,933	57,567,100	78,226,605	61,958,205
Taxes	14,938,289	14,630,828	13,664,826	12,234,141	12,298,291
Uncollectible revenues	58,345	45,996	40,759	51,374	49,662
Operating income	12,429,102	14,416,109	43,861,515	65,941,090	49,610,252
Equipment rents	[1] 1,409,454	[1] 1,068,656	[1] 1,136,763		
Joint facility rents	[1] 913,380	[1] 1,104,816	[1] 1,032,888		
Net operating income	10,106,268	12,242,637	41,691,864		

[1] Deficit.

United States railways of class 1—Continued.

REVENUES AND EXPENSES FOR THE MONTH OF MARCH.

Item.	1919	1918	1917	1916	Test period average.
Total operating revenues	$376,896,509	$365,912,476	$317,149,867	$289,176,150	$279,275,047
Total operating expenses	347,373,090	283,428,186	229,028,449	193,643,319	195,801,224
Net operating revenue	29,523,419	82,484,290	88,121,418	95,532,831	83,473,823
Taxes	14,968,947	15,097,140	14,179,712	12,374,477	12,562,470
Uncollectible revenues	64,531	78,889	60,170	57,352	56,801
Operating income	14,489,941	67,308,270	73,881,536	83,101,002	70,854,552
Equipment rents	[1] 2,198,263	[1] 3,074,744	[1] 2,380,283		
Joint facility rents	[1] 1,449,070	[1] 1,058,660	[1] 1,002,173		
Net operating income	10,842,608	63,174,866	70,499,080		

REVENUES AND EXPENSES FOR THE 3 MONTHS ENDING MAR. 31.

Item.	1919	1918	1917	1916	Test period average.
Total operating revenues	$1,125,277,471	$941,442,319	$883,356,010	$811,134,576	$781,766,236
Total operating expenses	1,032,109,888	816,973,889	652,320,102	560,202,103	565,351,544
Net operating revenues	93,167,583	124,468,430	231,035,908	250,932,473	216,414,692
Taxes	45,231,880	44,400,246	41,001,402	36,825,184	37,240,380
Uncollectible revenues	180,078	168,195	152,363	149,911	150,493
Railway operating income	47,755,625	79,899,989	189,282,143	213,957,378	179,023,819
Equipment rents	[1] 4,416,558	[1] 6,219,640	[1] 6,840,273		
Joint facility rents	[1] 3,677,689	[1] 3,319,989	[1] 3,045,522		
Net operating income	39,660,778	70,360,360	179,396,348		

[1] Deficit.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], I agree that this legislation might very well have awaited a report by the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate upon the general subject disposing of the railroad question as a whole. One of the primary purposes of the pending bill is to restore to the Interstate Commerce Commission control of the adjustment of rates, charges, fares, and classifications affecting interstate commerce.

The question asked by the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] during the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] is pertinent. The Senator from Texas inquired if it is dangerous to restore to State instrumentalities control of intrastate rates why is it not also dangerous, in view of all the existing circumstances, to restore to the Interstate Commerce Commission control of rates affecting interstate commerce? I think I can answer that question to the entire satisfaction of the Senator from Texas.

In the first place, Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] will automatically put into operation prewar rates, both as to passengers and freight affecting intrastate commerce. The provision in the pending bill will not automatically restore prewar rates in interstate commerce. It will leave in effect the rates that have been established by the Federal administration touching interstate commerce, and they can only be reduced or modified in the manner required by the interstate commerce law, and with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

It requires no argument to emphasize the importance of this distinction. Every Senator knows that prior to Federal control there were in effect as many various standards respecting intrastate rates as there are States. There were a number of laws fixing passenger rates at 2 cents per mile These will become effective if the pending amendment is agreed to. The Federal Administration of Railroads caused an increase in both interstate rates and intrastate rates, as stated by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], approximating 20 per cent. The effect of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee then will be to leave in operation, for the present, at least, all increases of rates relating to interstate commerce, and to repeal all increases relating to intrastate rates.

Let us look for a moment into the final result of such legislation. It is admitted that existing rates are barely adequate to meet the expenses incident to railroad operation under Federal control. If we adopt the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee resulting in an immediate reduction in railroad revenues arising from intrastate rates to an amount approximating $200,000,000, as estimated by the Senator from Iowa—which estimate I believe to be as nearly correct as any which the figures available will sustain—that action will make it necessary to further increase interstate rates in order to meet the additional deficit which will thus be caused by reducing the revenues on intrastate commerce. So it is perfectly clear that intrastate rates would be reduced approximately 20 per cent by the adoption of this amendment, whereas the rates on interstate commerce would not be reduced at all. The disproportion which will arise between interstate commerce revenues and intrastate revenues will be approximately $200,000,000.

There is another reason, though, which I will state in answer to the question of the Senator from Texas, why no serious detriment can result from the enactment of the pending bill, in so far as it relates to restoration of control to the Intersate Commerce Commission over rates on interstate fares and freights. As a matter of fact, and I think this is the statement made by the Senator from Iowa in his opening discussion of this bill, the Railroad Administration is now in most instances using the Interstate Commerce Commission as its instrumentality for determining interstate questions of the character involved in the provision pending before the Senate, and the passage of the bill will not bring about any very great change in the system that is now prevailing. The benefit that is alleged to accrue from it will be to restore to the legally constituted tribunal, familiar with questions of the character to be determined growing out of interstate commerce, its legal and complete control over those questions. It will also secure to complaining shippers prompt hearings before a tribunal especially qualified to determine their rights.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I ask the Senator a question at that point?

Mr. ROBINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What agency does the United States Railroad Administration make use of in the matter of intrastate rates at present?

Mr. ROBINSON. My information is that it has boards or committees appointed to make summary investigations of questions affecting intrastate rates, and these committees determine those questions in a somewhat summary manner.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I should like to say to the Senator that the amendment which I introduced did not contemplate the restoration of prewar intrastate rates at this time, but applied simply to the authority of the State commissions. That amendment I withdrew because it opened up too large a subject for disposition at this time.

Mr. ROBINSON. In that respect, if the amendment of the Senator from Texas was confined to that issue alone, it is less objectionable than the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], because it is perfectly clear that rates on intrastate freights which might have been fair and just in the prewar period and during the period when the State commissions had the power to exercise their authority would not be right now. Everyone knows that along with the general increase in the prices of nearly all commodities has come an increased cost in the operation of railroads, due principally to two general circumstances—first, enormous increase in wages and, second, great increases in the cost of materials. It was principally to meet those two increased expenditures that the Railroad Administration found it imperative to raise both interstate rates and intrastate rates, and it would have been unfair and inequitable to have placed the whole burden on interstate commerce.

If you assume, for the sake of argument, that the proportion of revenues raised on interstate commerce and on intrastate commerce prior to Federal control was approximately just, and that as a result of increased expenses in the operation and maintenance of railroads rates had to be increased, innumerable inequities would arise from placing the whole burden of that increase on one branch of commerce. That is undoubtedly the theory upon which the Railroad Administration has acted in advancing both the interstate and intrastate rates. It could not have acted on any other theory. You may admit for the sake of argument that, as a result of adjustments that have taken place under this power during Federal control, incongruities have arisen and injustice has been done in some instances, but an irreparable injury will be done not only to the commerce of the country but to the Government itself, to the people as a whole, and to the railroads, if this amendment prevails.

It would be impossible for me, without giving careful attention to the language in which to express my thoughts, to outline to the Senate the many ways in which confusion will arise if this amendment is agreed to. It has been stated on the floor of the Senate that during the period of Federal control one State has reduced intrastate rates to a point approximately one-half of what they were before the Federal Government took charge

of the railroads. Thus it would not only result that the pre-war rates as to intrastate commerce would go into effect but also rates of the character I have just described, those which I think every Senator will agree with me must be unreasonably low. Nothing else could result from reductions like that to which I have just referred, where a State is said to have reduced the rates approximately one-half below what they were when the war began.

A great deal has been said during the consideration of this question as to the importance of maintaining railroad credit, and as to the effect of increasing or reducing rates on railroad securities. There has been propaganda designed to create a feeling throughout the country that rates now taken as a whole are inadequate to meet the requirements of justice. I express no opinion concerning the merits of that contention. The subject of rate making, considered in its connection with its effect on railroad securities, considered with regard to its relation to future conditions, is too complicated to be determined by the simple expression of an opinion concerning the adequacy of given rate schedules.

A member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Mr. McChord, has issued a statement containing information of value concerning the subject of railroad earnings, and also suggesting facts of great importance in their bearing on the railroad problem as a whole, and I am going to ask to insert that statement in the RECORD as reflecting, in part, the contrary theory to that asserted by those who insist that the rates must be further increased, or that the Government must guarantee a fixed return on railroad investments to avert financial disaster. I will insert that statement in the RECORD in connection with the remarks that I am now making, unless there is objection to that course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCUMBER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement referred to is as follows:

The importance of adequate and efficient transportation systems in this country can not well be overestimated. The framing of laws that shall give expression to a national policy of regulation of railroad and water transportation for the future involves questions which affect immense property interests, as well, to a large extent, the welfare of the people as a whole.

It is apparent that some of the so-called problems have been needlessly magnified. After all, this is not entirely a new or novel phase of legislative action. For more than 30 years the common carriers of the country by railroad have been operating under more or less effective Federal and State control. The record has been made and is available for use and guidance at this time. Many of the propositions that will be presented should no longer be subject to controversy. They have become settled through court construction or through recognition of their efficacy by carriers, shippers, and the public. There is a disposition upon the part of some people to tear up by the roots the existing system of regulation, and to call for the framing of an entirely new statute, based largely upon new and untried theories. This would be a long step backward, and no warrant can be found for such a radical change, judging from results that have flown from the regulation we have had. The good in existing laws should be preserved, and where necessary they should be bolstered and reinforced by amendment or addition. Not less but more efficient regulation is the demand that experience dictates. In order that the public should realize the best results from consistent and just regulation, and in order that common carriers may be in a situation to secure to themselves the benefits of such regulation, the railroads, as determined by the President, should be returned to their owners by January 1 next.

It has been repeatedly stated by officials high in railway councils that if the railroad managers were left to themselves they could and would demonstrate their ability to handle and transport the commerce of the country in an efficient and satisfactory manner. When the officials return to duty the roads will have full opportunity to demonstrate their ability to perform as they promise.

My position with respect to this should not be misunderstood. From the very best study I have been able to give the subject, I am firmly of opinion that what I advocate is in the best interest of the public and the carriers. I am not an unalterable opponent of Government ownership if that becomes necessary and is safeguarded by proper legislation. There might be greater evils attendant upon the settlement of the railroad problem than Government ownership. That alternative we can resort to if in the future it becomes imperative. What I do believe is that just now is a very inopportune time to enter upon so stupendous an undertaking. I read that the indebtedness of this country, in part as a result of the war, will approximate $30,000,000,000. The value of the railroads of the country as computed by them is about $18,000,000,000. Add to this what the Government is now obligated to pay the railroads under the Federal-control act, in order that they shall be restored to their owners in as good physical and financial condition as when taken over, a conservative estimate is that the total cost of the transportation systems of the country would not be less than $20,000,000,000. An issue of bonds to pay for the railroads in that sum would increase the national debt to about $50,000,000,000, or over $450 for every man, woman, and child now resident in this country, assuming the population to be 110,000,000. At 4½ per cent interest the annual charge on the total indebtedness would be $2,125,000,000, or about $20 per year for each resident. No one should at such a time as this, when the business and industrial interests are endeavoring to resume business and production on a peace basis, advocate national expenditures on so stupendous a scale. Of course, the Government would operate the roads with no purpose of securing a profit, else the real incentive to such ownership would disappear. Under Government ownership the public must pay the bills the same as under private ownership. It is to be remembered that not all the railroads of the country have paid their owners a return on investment. Prof. F. W. Taussig, in Principles of Economics, second volume, page 364, in discussing some of the difficulties of Government ownership of the railroads of this country, says:

"It follows from this obvious but often forgotten fact that a railway is not economically advantageous to the community unless it pays its way. This conclusion is not in accord with a common opinion. It is often said that a railway or other means of transportation may bring gains to the community, though it be not profitable to its owners. Similarly it is often argued that a government in operating a railway may accept a financial loss, because the people as a whole have gained something that offsets such loss. The contrary view seems the just one. No gain comes from carrying a thing from one place to another unless it can be produced at the first place so much more cheaply that it can afford the cost of carriage to the second. Ability to stand the transportation charge is the test of the utility of the carriage * * *. It would be desirable, obviously, to have all transportation free, and to have every commodity produced once for all where it could be most cheaply produced. But so long as transportation involves labor and waiting a real advantage from exchange is got only if, at a point of consumption, the total cost can be met, including transportation."

Under our traditional policy with respect to our railroads we have invited the investment of private capital. It is claimed by some that under the impulse of public demand, mingled with the speculative element of the American mind, many railroads were constructed that ought not to have been constructed. Some railroads were improvidently built, resulting in excessive cost; many were the victims of inexcusable and vicious financial manipulation, and many are not so located as to yield any warrant for the conclusion that they can in the immediate future earn a return upon the money invested in them.

In this connection it is well to state that many of the so-called weak roads are either branch lines of great systems, separately operated, or are largely owned by the latter. From reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission for the calendar year 1917, it appears that railroad companies are among the largest stockholders of railroads. On 572 class 1 roads and their nonoperating subsidiaries the 20 largest stockholders aggregated 8,301 persons, estates, corporations, or partnerships in number, and their aggregate holdings were 50,873,322 shares, of which railroad corporations owned 48.4 per cent, or nearly one-half.

On December 31, 1916, railroads held securities of other railroads, not including switching and terminal companies, to the amount of $4,716,730,254. It is true that there are many small roads, and some large weak roads, which are not now in a position to meet a large decrease in revenue that may result from a decrease in business due to transition from a war to a peace basis. But they would be in no worse condition than they would have been had there been no taking over by the Government, except only disorganized management, increased cost of labor and materials.

If we enter upon Government ownership now we can not separate the sheep from the goats and purchase only the former. No railroad is so poor that it does not reach some people who have a right to demand a continuation of service. Many poorly located or poorly managed, or mismanaged, railroads have never earned a return on the money invested in them. If they continue to operate, the deficit must be borne by some one. Government ownership is a means of shifting the burden from the owners where it belongs, to the general public where it does not belong. Under wise and effective regulation many of the so-called "weak sisters" in the railroad world may be fed and nurtured so as to restore them to some sort of transportation strength. If the protecting hand of the Government is placed on them they will make little effort to better their situation, but will settle down to a condition where they will be a continual drain upon the Public Treasury. I have never been convinced that Government ownership of a losing railroad proposition will transform it into a gainful one. Remove from all the transportation systems of the country the individual initiative and reduce the management to the dead level of one system of management we will soon find that the country will have only such service as is absolutely necessary, with no incentive in any particular railroad to excel in any direction. In other words, if you take the American idea of "hustle for business" from the railroad world, you reach a dead center of inactivity and inefficiency. I have great faith in the ability of the average American to succeed if he be given opportunity to go ahead. A protecting Government hand in time of war is quite apt to become a restraining Government hand in time of peace.

The hand of the Government should be lifted from the industry of the Nation. The law of supply and demand should be given full play. Business and industry are now marking time. They stand at attention awaiting some action they fear the Government may take, or that is proposed it should take. The war is over, why not enter upon an era of peace so far as our industries are concerned? There is no good reason why the business of the country should remain inactive. Give the business and industrial interests a chance, and they will work out their own salvation. It is not proposed by anyone that the Government should take over the vast business and industrial interests of the country. These interests should be unshackled at once and let them proceed to do business on the terms which experience and good judgment dictate.

For these reasons and many others that might be stated were it necessary, I believe that we should defer consideration of Government ownership, Government guaranties, and Government protection until broader and more effective regulation of privately owned carriers has been given a fair trial.

When it is suggested that the railroads be promptly returned to their owners there is great excitement evident in certain interested circles. It is asserted with confidence and vehemence that to return the railroads to their owners now would be to force many carriers into receiverships, and imperil the financial stability of the Nation itself. It has often been stated that a return of the carriers without some sort of guaranty of future earnings would result in the bankruptcy of at least one-half of them. This dire prediction has been reiterated so continuously and so vehemently that to some extent it has gained lodgement in the public mind. Examination of the facts in respect to this is sufficient to dispel any illusion of the kind.

On December 2, 1918, the President in his address delivered at a joint session of the two Houses of Congress gave notice that the railroads would be returned. In the course of the address he said:

"Every approach to this difficult subject matter of decision brings us face to face, therefore, with this unanswered question: What is it right that we should do with the railroads in the interest of the public and in fairness to their owners?

"Let me say at once that I have no answer ready. The only thing that is perfectly clear to me is that it is not fair either to the public or to the owners of the railroads to leave the question unanswered, and that it will presently become my duty to relinquish control of the roads, even before the expiration of the statutory period, unless there should

appear some clear prospect in the meantime of a legislative solution. Their release would at least produce one element of a solution, namely, certainty and a quick stimulation of private initiative."

Later in the same address he said:

"I stand ready and anxious to release the roads from the present control, and I must do so at an early date if by waiting until the statutory limit of time is reached I shall be merely prolonging the period of doubt and uncertainty, which is hurtful to every interest concerned."

The President was right then, and nothing has occurred since to change the situation, except to make more imperative the propriety of the prompt return to the owners of the railroads. In his last message to Congress he has designated January 1, 1920, as the time at which they will be handed back. The claim is now made that unless certain guaranties are provided financial disaster will result from their being turned back, so they must be retained under Federal control for an indefinite period.

More than six months have elapsed since the armistice was signed. To all intents and purposes, with respect to our railroads and business, the war ceased when the armistice was signed last November. No exigency now exists for retention of Federal control of the transportation systems of the country. Under existing peace conditions Federal control is expensive and unnecessary. The expense and inefficiency inheres in the very nature of the system, which, while imperative in time of war, is a misfit in time of peace. The individual control has been removed. The incentive for effort to secure business by good service and superior facilities with respect to the units that go to make up our transportation system as a whole is wanting. The watchfulness as to the success of each carrier is gone. The hand of the individual who directed and controlled the destiny of each separate carrier has been lifted. The effort is to make a success of the whole without necessary attention to the success of the parts. The attempt to initiate all rules, regulations, and practices with respect to the operation of individual roads from Washington by one controlling head could not in the very nature of things result in the most efficient or economical operation. Such an arrangement can not be made responsive to the needs of the commerce of the country in time of peace. A traffic manager or operating official on the ground, in touch with the situation, with first-hand information, is in a far better position to more efficiently and satisfactorily adjust operating problems as they constantly arise. There has not been and there can not really be any denial that the present arrangement is an expensive manner of controlling the transportation systems of the country. The longer it is continued the greater the expense. The longer it is continued the less readily may the railroads be returned to their owners with assurance that they can resume their normal functions with efficiency. There can be no question that physically the sooner the railroads are placed in the hands of their owners the better for them and the better for the country as a whole.

A representative of substantially all the railroads under Federal control has publicly announced that Federal control and operation of the railroads has destroyed their credit, and that to return them to their private owners without at the same time providing for some sort of governmental guaranty of earnings would result in disaster. Let us examine this contention.

When the railroads were taken over by the Government they were more prosperous than they had been in the past. To substantiate this reference may be had to the return made by the railroads themselves to the Interstate Commerce Commission. I submit herewith a table which gives the average rate of dividends declared on dividend-yielding stock of the railroads of the country from June 30, 1892, to June 30, 1916, and for the calendar years 1916 and 1917, the earnings per mile of line, average operating income per mile of railroad, per cent of property investment per mile for the same period, and the corporate surplus accumulations for each year from 1910:

	Average income per mile of line.	Dividend rate.	Ratio of income cost to cost per mile of line.	Miles of line.	Surplus accumulations.
1892	$2,194	5.35	3.77	162,397.33	
1893	2,099	5.58	3.88	169,779.84	
1894	1,729	5.40	3.20	175,690.96	
1895	1,743	5.74	3.26	177,746.25	
1896	1,853	5.62	3.48	181,982.64	
1897	1,781	5.43	3.29	183,284.25	
1898	2,088	5.29	3.75	184,648.26	
1899	2,188	4.96	4.02	187,534.68	
1900	2,479	5.23	4.53	192,556.03	
1901	2,593	5.26	4.69	195,561.92	
1902	2,776	5.55	5.02	300,154.56	
1903	2,852	5.70	5.19	205,313.54	
1904	2,707	6.09	4.23	212,243.20	
1905	2,896	5.78	5.10	216,973.61	
1906	3,212	6.03	5.58	222,340.30	
1907	3,343	6.23	6.61	227,454.83	
1908	2,841	8.07	4.78	227,257.02	
1909	3,145	6.53	5.34	232,981.11	
1910	3,487	7.50	6.73	236,986.51	$1,371,107,759
1911	3,156	8.03	4.87	243,433.61	1,541,991,152
1912	3,044	7.17	6.62	246,828.74	1,583,032,034
1913	3,420	6.37	6.12	242,657.12	1,767,320,318
1914	2,869	7.97	4.19	245,624.55	1,648,596,111
1915	2,840	6.29	4.09	256,213.61	1,556,787,176
1916	4,050	6.48	6.82	257,511.82	1,935,019,191
1916[1]	4,277	6.75	6.17	257,324.61	2,159,768,716
1917[1]	3,811	6.81	5.27	258,913.19	2,628,638,922

[1] Calendar year.

From this table it appears that considered from the viewpoint of dividend payments, operating income to asserted cost, or surplus accumulations, the railroads were in a more prosperous condition from 1910 to January 1, 1918, than before that period. Under the act passed by the Congress the railroads of the country which were taken over by the Government are guaranteed earnings equal to the average operating income for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1915, 1916, and 1917. Thus there is insured to the railroads during the period of Federal control the largest net return as a three-year average ever received by them. And it is difficult to understand how there is in this situation anything that can form the basis for a claim that railroad credit has been destroyed by reason of Federal operation.

A guaranty of minimum earnings and a limitation of the amount of earnings have all the evils of government ownership with none of the benefits. If we are to guarantee earnings, we might as well enter upon government ownership at once. A guaranty would destroy inspiration and individual initiative. Mr. Howard Elliott, one of the foremost railroad executives in this country, in an address recently delivered said:

"There would seem to be no more reason for a guaranty of a return upon railroads than a return upon banks, coal mines, electric light plants, etc. A guaranty would lead to a divided responsibility and to an increased participation by the Government as the guarantor in the actual management of the properties, which would eventually lead to government ownership. There can be no enduring middle ground; there must be private ownership and operation, with reasonable governmental regulation, or there must be government ownership and operation."

Mr. Samuel Rea, president of the Pennsylvania Co. and other companies forming the Pennsylvania Railroad system, and a man of equal standing in the railroad world with Mr. Elliott, in a recent address before the Chamber of Commerce of the United States with respect to the effect of a government guaranty said:

"A governmental guaranty would plunge the country into a wholesale financial reorganization of the railroads extending over a period of years and would ultimately mean government ownership. But to temporarily palliate the situation the guaranty is to be coupled with private operation. What is to be the capitalization of these private operating corporations? Are they to be mere shells with no large financial stake in the properties they operate and administer? Is there any business man present who would recommend the Government to guarantee returns on property having a value of about $18,000,000,000 and turn it over to 6, or even 18, private operating companies without demanding the power to thereafter define its operating and financial policy? Can any stockholder or bondholder imagine that our Government will guarantee railroad stocks and bonds and charge nothing for that guaranty? Should capital improvement be thereafter made according to the business necessities or on the political judgment of each administration? Would political favoritism as to new improvements, branches and extensions, and orders for supplies be inevitable in the government guarantee plan? Should we then employ officers and men who have political influence? Should we impose this guarantee plan on the country in the midst of the great struggle she must meet to reconstruct her industries and put national affairs and taxation on a peace basis? What period do you think it would take to work out the financial reconstruction of all the railroads of the country, and all their leaseholds, guaranties, and other obligations, and what is to occur meanwhile? * * *

"American industry has made its wonderful progress because the industries and men conducting them have been rewarded for efficiency and penalized for inefficiency. It is the fear of failure as well as the hope of reward or commendation that incites men to do their best. A Government guaranty on private capital invested in transportation would to a large extent remove the fear of failure; but would it be in the public welfare or be helpful to our industries which pay freight rates? If the Government could keep rates at a level that would provide sufficient revenues for all roads to earn their guaranteed income and operating expenses, why can we not equally assume that the Government will allow such adequate rates under a system of Government regulation, stimulated to economy and efficiency by private ownership and initiative and without the blight of a Government guaranty? The guaranty is not a solution of this great economic question, but a patch upon it."

What is needed by the railroads is the return to that individual effort which is a spur to more efficient and adequate service. A guaranty of earnings would be to repeat the experiences of the Government of France. The guaranty system in that country has resulted in a steadily increasing demand on the public treasury. In a recently published statement respecting the guaranty to French railroads, Mr. Frank H. Fayant, assistant to the chairman of the Association of Railway Executives, said:

"But the results of the French guaranty system have been disappointing. There has been no profit sharing. The Western, after 44 years' continuous appeal to the State on account of its guaranty, became so hopelessly involved in the treasury finances that the State in 1908 was compelled to exercise its purchase option. Incidentally it has become a greater burden to the treasury under State operation than it was under private operation. The Midi (Southern) in the half century prior to the war was able in only a dozen years to meet its interest and dividends out of earnings. The Paris-Orleans, which at one time had some hopes of becoming self-supporting, was just before the war making large appeals to the treasury. The Est (Eastern) was self-supporting before the war. The Nord (Northern) and the Paris-Lyon-Mediterranean have always been prosperous and had no need of a guaranty.

"State aid in the pioneer days of railroad building in France was of great assistance in providing the capital needed for these enterprises and in bridging the companies over the early lean years, but in later years the guaranty has only served to entangle the weaker roads in politics and public finance. It has been a handicap to progress and has stunted private initiative. The spirit of the initiative is killed and there is lowering of operating efficiency."

In the course of his statement he also said:

"If we are to retain the advantages of private initiative, and save our transportation system and all our machinery of production from the deadening blight of political meddling, we ought to consider well the dangers involved in any proposal for a financial partnership between the railroads and the Government. While, before the war our system of public control had its obvious faults, under it was developed the most perfect transportation machine in the world. The best railroads of Europe are many years behind ours in engineering development and operating efficiency. With this achievement before us, should we not attempt to correct the recognized faults in our system of regulation, and build on the sure foundation of the past, rather than enter on an era of political experimenting with new and untried policies"?

When the railroads are returned, Congress by appropriation of the necessary moneys should provide for payment to them the agreed sums to which they are entitled, return to them the moneys taken from them by the Government, and restore them to their owners in the same condition as when taken over. When this is done, the railroads as a whole would resume their normal functions on a most prosperous basis.

But it is said that the wages of employees of railroads have been raised to such an extent as to absorb the increased rates initiated by the Director General, and that unless there is some guarantee of in-

creased rates on their return they will not be able to earn the same net income as they were earning when taken over. The figures submitted to the commission do not show that the carriers are suffering from lack of gross income. In January, 1919, the gross receipts of class 1 railroads exceeded by $111,427,193 the receipts of the same month in 1918. In February, 1919, they exceeded by $61,924,937 those of February, 1918. It does appear that there has been a decline in operating income. This decline is no doubt due in part to increased operating expenses. How much of the increase is due to the fact that there has been a revolution of management and operation can not be determined with accuracy. That this change has an important bearing on the matter there can be no doubt. The removal of individual supervision and direction from the operation of the railroads of the country has resulted in large increases in operating expenses. The expression of a fear that more effective regulation will deprive the railroads of the country of a just return for service rendered is but a reassertion of the old fear that was given voice before the taking over. The people of this country have ever been and they are now ready and willing to pay to the railroads such rates of freight, passenger fares, and other charges for service rendered as shall be just and reasonable. There is no good reason for not believing that just and reasonable rates will be provided for the future. If wages and cost of materials are such as to demand higher freight rates and other charges in order that the railroads shall render adequate and efficient transportation service, the regulating body on being shown the facts can be depended upon to deal justly with the situation.

The business of our country is not to stand still. I have faith enough in the American producer to believe that our national commerce will continue to expand as it has in the past. The commerce of the country can not expand to any marked extent without entailing benefit on our transportation system. They will grow with the growth of industry. Transportation and industry are indissolubly linked together. That time is not at hand, nor is there any prospect that it will ever come, that the public will be so blind as not to see that so great an industry as the railroads can be crippled without at the same time crippling the others.

As before stated, while under Federal control the income of the railroad companies is based on the operating income they received for the three fiscal years of 1915, 1916, and 1917. They are insured that income no matter what has been or what may be the conditions of traffic. Under the law their properties are to be returned to them in as good physical conditions as when they passed to Federal control.

The net income the railroads now receive is based on the highest average earnings they have ever received in any three-year period. The average yearly return on which payment is now made is approximately $936,000,000. A comparison with the returns for the years 1912, 1913, and 1914 is interesting. The following table compiled from sworn reports of the railroads to the commission gives the operating revenues, income from operation, and average income per mile of line for those years:

	Operating revenues.	Income from operation.	Average income per mile of line.
1912	$2,906,415,869	$751,266,806	$3,044
1913	3,193,117,834	829,863,248	3,420
1914	3,111,396,422	704,685,079	2,869

The average income for the three years was $761,938,378. For the year 1915 the operating revenue was $2,956,193,202; income from operation, $727,546,101; and average income per mile of line, $2,840.

The following table gives the operating revenues, income from operation, and average income per mile of line for the calendar years 1916, 1917, and 1918:

	Operating revenues.	Income from operation.	Average income per mile of line.
1916	$3,691,065,217	$1,100,545,422	$4,277
1917	4,115,413,056	986,819,181	3,811
1918	4,995,362,625	732,064,301	2,780

It will be observed that the average income for the latter three years is $939,809,635, about $3,000,000 more than the guaranteed income. The income from operation in the calendar year 1918 was $29,874,077, or 3.9 per cent less than the average for the three years, 1912, 1913, and 1914; $21,967,175, or 2.9 per cent less than the average of 1913, 1914, and 1915; and $15,948,711, or 2.2 per cent more than the average for 1914 and 1915, while the average income for the calendar years 1916, 1917, and 1918 exceeds that for the fiscal years 1912, 1913, and 1914 by $177,875,257, or 23.4 per cent.

It is true there has been an increase in capital issues and property investment since 1912. From reports of the railroads to the commission the average percentage of operating income to the average outstanding capital for the three fiscal years, 1912, 1913, and 1914, was 3.98 and to property investment 4.59. The average percentage of operating income to the average outstanding capital for the calendar years 1916, 1917, and 1918 was 4.75, and to property investment 5.08. This shows that the percentage of operating income to capital increased 0.77 per cent and to property investment 0.49 per cent.

From the returns already received, which include only a few of the roads of the country, it appears that the credit balances will be as large on January 1, 1919, as on January 1, 1918. During the year 1918 dividends were paid in substantially the same amount as during the previous year, while the roads were under private management. The guaranteed operating income for 1919 will be the same as received in 1918. Add to this the corporate income for the year and the credit balance of the railroads as a whole will be substantially the same on January 1, 1920, as on January 1, 1918.

It is now asserted that the carriers of the country during January, February, and March of this year did not earn the Government guaranty by some $200,000,000. This assertion is on the assumption of an equal monthly accural of the annual compensation which the Government must pay the roads. The early months of any year, however, are not equal in earning power to the average per month for the year.

The fallacy of estimating the operating income of any one year by the operating income of the first three months, January, February, and March, is graphically illustrated in the following table, which refers to reports of class 1 roads only:

	Railway operating income for first 3 months.	Railway operating income for 12 months based on the first 3 months.	Actual railway operating income for 12 months.
1912, fiscal	$137,779,550	$551,118,200	$736,466,326
1913, fiscal	152,023,732	608,094,928	816,510,793
1914, fiscal	89,822,685	359,290,740	692,330,572
1915, fiscal	133,783,495	535,133,980	716,476,186
1916, calendar	213,957,378	855,829,512	1,081,556,496
1917, calendar	189,282,143	757,128,572	970,197,438
1918, calendar	81,343,850	325,375,460	719,159,540

If a comparison is made between the railway operating income of January, February, and March, 1919, and the corresponding months of the test period, 1915, 1916, and 1917, it will be found that the income for the first quarter of 1919 was one hundred and thirty-one millions less than for the corresponding part of the test period, and for the first quarter of 1918 ninety-eight millions less, or one hundred and fourteen millions as the average of the first quarter of the years 1918 and 1919, and not about $200,000,000, as asserted.

In his statement in a communication addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury made public May 25, the Director General, in explaining the deficits for the years 1918 and 1919 in operating revenue under that of the guaranteed return for the first quarter of the years 1918 and 1919, in part, says:

"The operating deficit for the year 1918 was due largely to two facts: First, the winter of 1918 was unprecedented in its severity and in its costly effect on railroad operations; and, second, the increases in passenger and freight rates, averaging about 25 per cent, were in effect for only a few days in excess of 6 months, while heavily increased expenses due to war conditions were effective on an ascending scale throughout the 12 months.

"The operating deficit for the first four months of 1919 is due in part to the cumulative high levels of cost, brought about by the war, for labor and materials and in part to the sudden and abnormal falling off of business as a result of the cessation of war activities, the sudden drop in the demand for fuel and for other basic commodities, and the general state of hesitancy due to the transition from war conditions to peace conditions. The fact that the present period is transitional and apparently on the eve of important changes has made it expedient to defer, until the matter can be more accurately measured, the consideration of the question, now frequently raised, of an increase in rates."

In giving the figures and making the comparisons I must not be understood as taking the position that the railroads of the country have earned as much or more than they should have earned or were entitled to earn. My sole effort has been to give the facts as I find them to be, in order that the situation may be looked squarely in the face and to ascertain whether there is a foundation for the statement that our railroads will be confronted with bankruptcy should they be restored to their owners.

What is there in the situation that the carriers will occupy on January 1, 1920, that warrants the claim that their being turned back would mean bankruptcy to them? It is said that the outlook is bad, and that the railroads can not now stand alone. The claim is made that business is at low ebb; that wages and expenses are at high tide; and that to meet that condition there must be a radical reorganization of our transportation systems that shall involve some sort of a guaranty upon the part of the Government that net incomes of all carriers shall never be less than a return on property investment that shall be as great as or greater than the average return for the years 1915, 1916, and 1917, without regard to the location of particular lines or their previous financial history.

In the Railway Age of May 9, 1919, the following discussion of traffic conditions appears:

"It is true there has been a decline of traffic, and some refer to the business which has been handled thus far this year as abnormally small. It is smaller than that of 1918 or 1917; but conditions in 1917 and 1918 were not normal, and the traffic handled in those years showed a vast increase, largely due to war conditions. Let us go back to the first three months of 1916. In that year the railways had the largest increase of traffic that ever occurred in any single year. They made the largest operating income ever made in one year. Everyone remembers this. Doubtless, consequently, most people assume that because of the recent decline in traffic the business which has been moved thus far this year has been much less than in the remarkable year 1916. It is somewhat disconcerting, therefore, to find that in the first three months of 1919 the freight traffic of the railways was 85,000,000,000 ton-miles, while in the first three months of 1916 it was only 80,000,000,000 ton-miles, an increase in 1919 over 1916 of over 6 per cent. Furthermore, the traffic handled in the first three months of this year was only 10 per cent less than that moved in the corresponding three months of 1917 and 1918. The railways moved less freight in February and March of this year than in the same months of 1917 and 1918, but they moved more in January than in either of those years."

In its issue of May 30 the Railway Age says:

"A mistake in compiling statistics caused the Railway Age to make a misleading comparison in the editorial in its issue of May 9, entitled "The Railroads—a Bankrupt Industry," between the traffic handled in the first three months of 1916 and the first three months of 1919. It was stated in the editorial in question that in the first three months of 1919 the freight traffic of the railways was 85,000,000,000 ton-miles, while in the first three months of 1916 it was only 80,000,000,000 ton-miles, an increase in 1919 over 1916 of over 6 per cent. A recheck of the statistics shows that the total mileage in the first three months of 1916 was almost 90,000,000,000. With this correction the statistics show that the ton-mileage in the first three months of 1919 was 5 per cent less than the first three months of 1916, while the total earnings of the railways were 38 per cent greater and the operating expenses 85 per cent greater."

There always have been and there will be periods of business depression. No law that can be conceived or enacted and no tribunal that may be appointed can control the yield of crops or the production and sale of the industries of the country. Rates of freight or other charges for transportation can not be so made that they will rise and

fall in response to the volume of production from season to season. If the carriers of the country may not be safely returned on January 1, 1920, when in receipt of the guaranty for the preceding two years, it may be asserted with confidence that they never will be in condition to be so returned.

It is a fact that operating expenses have increased during Federal control, due to wage increases, increased cost of materials and supplies, and to unavoidably expensive operation and changed operating and financial management during the war. Unless it is to be assumed that war conditions are to continue indefinitely in times of peace, there is bound to be a decrease in operating costs. As pointed out by the Director General in a recent statement, the organization of the carriers is now equipped to handle a much larger business than is offered for transportation. If the railroads are returned, there is little doubt that decreases in operating costs can be effected.

On every hand there are prophecies of business activity and prosperity. Reports from our Agricultural Department are to the effect that bountiful crops are in prospect. Under such circumstances, the owners of the railroads of the country should welcome a return to efficient and economical management of their properties, and they should do this with confidence that in the coming prosperity they will receive abundant share.

It is asserted by the Secretary of the Treasury that the last public loan has been made. In the future the Government is not to be in the market as a borrower from the public. If this be so, apparently there is no good reason for apprehension that after January 1 next the railroads may not secure from the public moneys to refund maturing obligations or to provide for improvements and betterments at reasonable interest rates. In addition to this it is proposed that issues of securities, etc., by railroads shall be placed under Federal control. If a railroad desires to borrow money for any purpose this Federal authority should have power to examine into the outstanding obligations of such railroad, and when it determines and finds that the purpose of acquiring the money is one necessary to promote the transportation interests of the country, and the railroad is in a position to earn sufficient to pay interest on the obligation, the question of securing the money at a reasonable rate of interest from the investing public should be assured.

It is often said in connection with the return of the roads that it is necessary that State commissions should be deprived of all rate-making power, and that all the making and determination as to the reasonableness of railroad rates, fares, and charges should be lodged with some Federal authority. Quite aside from any constitutional question I do not believe that the proposal in this respect should be adopted. In the first place the conflict between State-made rates and rates made by Federal authority is more apparent than real. I have seen it stated that only about 15 per cent of the commerce of the country moves wholly intrastate, while about 23 per cent of the total revenue is derived therefrom. If this is so then at least 85 per cent of the traffic of the country is now under direct Federal control and the remainder under indirect control where it casts an undue burden on the other. I am not one who believes that the 15 per cent controls the 85 per cent to any such extent as to be disastrous to the railroads of the country. In times past there has been evidence that State commissions unduly favored shippers of their own States as a matter of retaliation against acts of commissions in adjoining States. The State commissioners themselves now willingly concede that retaliatory action of the kind is neither just nor proper. There does not now apparently exist any of that spirit in the State commissions. Free and full cooperation between State commissions and the Interstate Commerce Commission will bring about that uniformity of rates, charges, and regulations between States and interstate traffic which should lead to prosperity of carriers and the public alike. A certain amount of traffic begins and ends in a State. The movement of such traffic has no relation to interstate traffic. The making of rates on such traffic should be by State authority. To place such traffic under control of a Federal body beyond the power now vested to prevent unjust discrimination against or undue burden upon interstate commerce would be a reversal of our dual form of government, which no one proposes to change.

It has also been proposed that the Congress should provide for the consolidation or merger of all railroads in a given territory under a Federal charter, all such merged roads to be operated as one. This is only a difference in degree from the national consolidation which now exists as a war necessity. We should go slow in the way of permitting or requiring the consolidation of the railroads of the country. The inevitable tendency in such consolidations is to level down the best in order to level up the poorest. The country had some experience with consolidation in the New York, New Haven & Hartford attempt to consolidate and control all the transportation systems of New England. When the scheme originated the New York, New Haven & Hartford was regarded as one of the best managed and operated railroad systems in the country. Its stocks and bonds were recognized as securities of the highest standard. A citizen who died and was able to leave his family a substantial block of New Haven securities did so with confidence that they were amply protected. Some one devised the consolidation. It was inevitable that one of two things was bound to happen—either that the New Haven bring its consolidated interests up to its high level or that it go down to the lower level of the others. The latter happened, and we see the New Haven's present difficulties. It were well enough, perhaps, to give authority to a regulating body to permit or require consolidation of railroads in the interest of the public, but the exercise of the power should be sparingly used, and then only in a clear case that public benefit would result. A consolidation of a number of carriers in any region of this country will doubtless increase the cost of transportation to the public and at the same time reduce the service nearer to a level of bare necessity. There is good in railroad competition. It results in better railroads, better equipment, and more adequate facilities and service. The good that comes from competition should be preserved, with power in the regulating authority to discourage or prevent wasteful competition which sometimes exists with respect to transportation of freight and passengers between rail and water carriers. We occasionally hear a reference to cutthroat competition between carriers. With respect to this, it is safe to say that as regards rates no such competition now exists, nor has any such existed in this country for many years past.

Among the things that should be provided in a regulatory statute should be control of securities of carriers, provisions for more adequate control of facilities and equipment, and terminals should be opened at junction points for service to carriers reaching those points to meet the requirements of the public upon terms that shall be just as between the carriers. It is true that in most large cities of the country one or more railroads dominate the terminals and refuse access to them or charge exorbitantly for the privilege.

There has been much talk among some interests with regard to the provisions of the fourth section of the act. Bills have been introduced in Congress to provide that no carrier shall charge less for a long haul than for a shorter haul included in the longer. If the Federal regulatory body be given power to prescribe minimum as well as maximum rates, it would be in a position to more adequately control the situation respecting rates for long and short hauls. In this connection it is to be observed that rates by water and by rail in this country are so closely related that adequate and effective regulation is not practicable unless water and rail transportation are placed in control of the same authority. If that is done, means are thereby provided for the necessary encouragement and protection of transportation by water. With power to prescribe minimum rates the regulating authority can effectively prevent the stifling of water transportation by way of inordinately low rates by rail.

It has been suggested that the Congress should provide for regional commissioners or deputy commissioners, who should reside in certain sections of the country and there hear and dispose of the cases arising in the region, with appeal to the full commission in Washington. There are many reasons why such an arrangement would be unwise. In the first place, the location of the regional commissions about the country would be very expensive. To be effective such commissions should be supplied with complete tariff files and a corps of experienced tariff and other experts. The expense necessary would not result in compensating benefit.

Local representatives would soon reflect in their findings and decisions the influence of local or special interests. The commission as it now is constituted is composed of commissioners selected from various parts of the country. In reaching its conclusions the commission renders its findings from the viewpoint solely of the interests of the whole country. Railroad rates and rate adjustments are so made that there is a relationship between different sections of the country. The decisions by one regional commission will lead to confusion and embarrassment as between the different regions, from which we are now free.

Full and free cooperation with State commissions and power given the Federal body to use the personnel, records, and facilities of State commissions should insure greater uniformity and bring into review the local necessities and conditions.

Decisions by regional commissions from which appeal may be taken to the full commission would delay final adjudication. What is needed in rate controversies is prompt decision. Manifestly, this prompt disposal of such controversies is in the public interest. Under the act of Congress providing for a division of the commission into bodies of three for the disposition of cases, opportunity is afforded for the prompt disposal of them; but the commission did not get the new plan in complete working order before war was declared and the railroads taken over by the Government. Action by a commission on rules, charges, and regulations must be as nearly uniform as possible, and regional commissions can not in the nature of things lead to uniformity.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, no one can doubt that the effect of adopting the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] will be to increase the deficit that everyone now concedes already exists in railway revenues under Federal operation. I express the opinion that in important matters the Federal administration of railroads has been successful, and when the subject has been analyzed with a view to a fair conclusion criticisms which are being heaped upon the Federal administration of railroads will be found in many particulars to be unfair and unjust; but whether that be true or not, it is a fact that under existing rates the revenues are inadequate to meet the expenses of the Government in the operation of the railroads. The shortage this year, as has been stated by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], will not be less than $500,000,000, and it may be $800,000,000. If you add to that an additional shortage of $200,000,000 occasioned by an automatic and ill-considered reduction in intrastate rates, you will have a shortage of something like eight hundred million or one billion dollars, and you will make imperative a great and an immediate increase in the rates that are now being levied on interstate commerce.

That is not the only effect. If you adopt this amendment and cut off $200,000,000 of revenue from the railroads arising from intrastate commerce you will further depress and impair the value of railroad securities. I do not assert that the market value of railroad securities depends solely on the revenues arising from the rates levied on commerce, but I do know that if you establish a policy to levy rates which are admittedly inadequate to meet the expenses of operating the railroads you will inevitably decrease the value of securities, and, in addition to that, you will make it difficult, if not impossible, to secure additional investments in railroad properties and securities. This is related to the biggest question before Congress affecting the commerce of the country. If you cut off this revenue, which is fair, on the whole, you will depress railroad securities and involve the Government in a larger burden of debt and at the same time make doubtful, if not impossible, necessary improvements in railroad properties.

Mr. POMERENE. And, Mr. President, it would also compel an increase in the rates in interstate commerce.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; I have stated that a time or two, but I thank the Senator for suggesting it in this connection. The burden on interstate commerce would, of course, be correspondingly increased.

It is said that $1,000,000,000 should be invested in the improvement of railroads within the next year. I do not know whether or not that estimate is accurate, or even approximately so, but I do know, in order to meet the requirements of the expanding commerce of this country, some large fund must be invested.

We are committing ourselves to the policy of private control and operation of railroads. I think I need not argue the fact that in this country sentiment in favor of public operation and control—public ownership—is diminishing, and there is no probability of reaction in the early future, however much some Senators may desire it. Then, if it is necessary and imperative that, in the interests of the commerce of the country, large additional sums be invested in railroad improvements and securities in the coming year, why should we make that action impossible by enacting the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee?

The only effect that the adoption of this amendment would have, in my opinion, would be to encompass the defeat of any legislation on the subject of rate regulation at this time. I do not believe that any member of the Interstate Commerce Committee who has studied the question—and some of us have been studying it for years—I do not believe that any Senator who has studied the question diligently would expect anything else to result from the adoption of the amendment than the recommittal of this bill to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, I ask, out of order, to file a report from a committee.

Mr. ROBINSON. I object.

Mr. KNOX. I do not ask for any action on it; I merely want it to go to the calendar.

Mr. ROBINSON. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I am not going to argue this question at all, but I share the opinion of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], that it would be most unfortunate if this amendment were to be adopted. We want to get back to normal times just as quickly as we can; but we can not do everything in a minute. If we are going to keep these interstate rates up as they now are—and they will be there for some time—and confer upon the State commissions the right within a short time to reduce the intrastate rates below the needs of the transportation companies, we are going to that very extent to cripple the entire transportation system of the country. I trust the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I merely want to say that on further investigation I find that the McKellar amendment has a different object from mine. The object of my amendment was to put the State commissions on the same basis as this bill puts the Interstate Commerce Commission. It had no purpose of restoring at this time the intrastate rates as they existed before the war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

The amendment was rejected.

NATIONAL PEACE POLICY.

Mr. KNOX and Mr. TRAMMELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KNOX. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] having withdrawn his objection to my request to file a report from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I now renew the request.

Mr. SWANSON. It is understood that after this is done a motion will be made to adjourn over until Monday?

Mr. KNOX. I so understand.

Mr. ROBINSON. With that information, I take pleasure in withdrawing any objection I have made to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KNOX. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I report back favorably, with an amendment, the resolution (S. Res. 76) defining a peace treaty which shall assure to the people of the United States the attainment of the ends for which they entered the war, and declaring the policy of our Government to meet fully obligations to ourselves and to the world, and I submit a report (No. 15) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. LODGE. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

REGULATION OF RAILROAD RATES.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 641) to amend section 10 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I have an amendment which I desire to offer to the pending bill, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 16, after the word "systems," it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That no intrastate rate shall be increased until at least 30 days' notice of the proposed increase has been given to the shippers of the State in which the increase is proposed, and a hearing granted.

Mr. CUMMINS. In so far as I have authority to do so, or can do so, I accept the amendment.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I move the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING obtained the floor.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President——

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. TRAMMELL. On yesterday an amendment was offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], and it was adopted, providing that recovery should not be had against the Railroad Administration on claims which accrued prior to Government control. The amendment was offered and passed rather hurriedly and without very much consideration. After some reflection I am impressed that it is a bad amendment, and, therefore, I wish to make a motion that the vote by which it was adopted be reconsidered if that is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators have heard the motion——

Mr. POMERENE. My attention was attracted to another matter. I do not understand the import of the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I will explain it briefly. The substance of the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana is that if a judgment is rendered against the Railroad Administration, recovery can not be had against the proceeds of the property in the hands of the Government, unless it is upon a claim which accrued after Government control; in other words, if the judgment is based upon a claim which accrued prior to Government control, no recovery can be had; therefore staying the remedy and the rights of the claimant upon his judgment for a claim that accrued prior to Government control. I think it would work a great injustice to those who have claims against the railroads and would practically suspend the operation of their judgments. That is the reason I make the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, while I do not think the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] is necessary, yet I think that the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] has not stated it, as I recall it, with entire accuracy. There is a provision in the bill that final judgments shall be promptly paid by the Director General either from the revenues of the properties or from the revolving fund. The Senator from Indiana moved that that requirement be limited to judgments recovered upon causes of action arising after Federal control. It does not, however, in any way impair the remedy of the plaintiff in connection with judgments rendered upon causes of action arising before Federal control, except that they can not levy their judgments upon the property of the carrier so long as it is in Federal possession, and the collection of such judgments, unless they can find property which is not within the control of the Government, is postponed until some further adjustment is made. I think it is quite clear that the Federal Government ought not to be required to pay all of the judgments that were rendered against the railroad companies before the Government took possession either out of the revolving fund or out of the current revenues. It is one of those difficult and vexatious questions that will have to be adjusted, in my opinion, at a later time.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Take a judgment of the character that we are now discussing—that is, a judgment against a railroad that is under Government control—is it not within the purview of the authority of the administration to pay that judgment and charge it up against the compensation that the railroad is entitled to receive?

Mr. CUMMINS. Unfortunately it is not at the present time. I assume that Congress could possibly give the Government that

authority; but I think it is perfectly clear that when the Government takes over these properties in order to operate them for a public purpose it can not allow interference with that operation by levying process for the collection of a debt upon the property being operated. I am sure the Senator from Florida will agree with me about that.

The next inquiry is, Whether it would be wise to require the Government to take from the revenues which it is receiving in the operation of the property sufficient to pay the judgments which had been recovered before the Government took possession or upon causes of action which arose before the Government took possession? It is a very difficult matter to adjust, but it is hard to be entirely equitable in the transition that was made originally from private to public operation and which we must shortly make when we return to private operation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would it not be manifestly equitable, fair, and just to insert a provision in this bill that where final judgments have been rendered against the railroads the Director General is authorized to pay them out of the rents and profits that are guaranteed to the railroad corporations? I think that by all means ought to be done.

Mr. CUMMINS. I would be entirely willing to see an amendment of that kind made——

Mr. McKELLAR. I will offer an amendment of that kind.

Mr. CUMMINS. But that is not the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana, which the Senator from Florida now seeks to reconsider.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is perfectly manifest that these litigants who have heretofore obtained judgments ought not to be postponed or deprived of their recoveries against the railroads.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think the Senator from Tennessee is right about that.

Mr. McKELLAR. And I will offer an amendment on that subject, if the Senator from Iowa will pardon me a moment.

Mr. CUMMINS. An amendment that simply authorizes the Director General to take from the compensation that is due to these companies from time to time sufficient to pay judgments which have been rendered against the companies would be entirely agreeable to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. Final judgments that have been rendered.

Mr. WATSON. Yes; and I shall not object to that amendment, though, after all, I think it makes but a slight difference in the long run.

Mr. McKELLAR. The difference about it is that a number of judgments have been in suspense for quite a while, and when the Railroad Administration took charge of the railroads it was held by it that it had no authority to pay these judgments; and I know a great many of them have been held up—judgments that ought to have been paid and are simply being postponed. I will prepare an amendment along that line.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think that the claim of a judgment creditor is superior to the interest of either the stockholder or the bondholder, and I think such judgments ought to be paid.

Mr. WATSON. I shall not object at all to the amendment that is to be proposed by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will have it ready in just a moment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, are these judgments which are to be paid, under the view suggested by the Senator from Tennessee, to be deducted from the amount guaranteed by the Government to the railroad companies, or out of any sum that might go to the railroad companies above the guaranteed amount to be paid?

Mr. CUMMINS. There is not anything that goes to the railroad companies above the guaranteed amount.

Mr. KING. I understand that there is not, except perhaps in some instances where the railroads have had a very large earning capacity. I conceived that it was possible that some companies might receive more than the guaranteed amount.

Mr. CUMMINS. But the Senator from Utah, I think, does not remember the law of March 17, 1918, correctly. The Government pays to these railways a certain sum, ascertained in the manner provided by law, as compensation for the use of the property. If the property earns more than the sum which the Government has agreed to pay, the excess belongs to the Government of the United States and not to the railway companies.

Mr. KING. I find, then, that I am in error. I supposed that a portion of that excess went to the stockholders of the corporation.

Mr. CUMMINS. No portion whatever.

Mr. KING. May I ask, in this connection, whether the Government has received any amount from any of the railroads above the guaranty?

Mr. CUMMINS. I am not able to answer that question with absolute certainty, but I do not know of any such railroad. It may be that there are one or two which have earned more than the compensation which the Government agreed to pay; but if there are they have not come to my notice.

Mr. KING. Of course, there were a number of railroads which, before the Government took control of them, earned an amount in excess of that which they are now receiving.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not think there is a single railroad that earned more. I do not mean that they did not earn a little more in 1917 or 1916 or 1915 than the Government agreed to pay; but there is no railroad, so far as I know, which has earned in excess of the average net income for the three years before the war, and that is the basis of the contracts for compensation.

Mr. KING. I did not have the three-year period in mind; but my recollection of the figures is that a number of the railroads did receive an amount in excess of that paid by the Government at some period, not very remote, before the Government took over the railroads.

Mr. CUMMINS. No. The Senator from Utah will remember that the Government deals with each road separately.

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. And it agrees to pay that road the average net income for the three years preceding the war. Now, so far as I know, there is no road whose average net income for 1918, and up to this time in 1919, equals the average net income of that road for the three years prior to the war.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I believe the question now is the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana was adopted yesterday, which is, on page 2, in line 10, after the word "judgments," to insert the words "on causes of action arising during Federal control."

The question now is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida to reconsider that amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS. I very much hope that will not be done.

Mr. WATSON. I trust that will not prevail. I think the Senator from Tennessee has prepared an amendment that will meet the objection of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. TRAMMEL. Mr. President, of course I do not know just what the Senator's amendment is going to provide. I can not quite comprehend, however, how it will meet the objection, as this amendment specifically provides that judgments shall not be paid upon claims accruing prior to Government control. Of course, he might write an amendment which would be directly in conflict with it, and the two would have to be construed together. What I had in contemplation when I made the motion was that if we reconsider this amendment I will then offer as a substitute for this amendment an amendment on page 2, in line 14, which will provide as follows:

> And upon claims accruing prior to Government control it shall become a charge against the defendant company.

In other words, the Railroad Administration will go ahead and settle the claim, but it shall be a charge then against the defendant company, or the corporation involved in the judgment. Of course, I had in mind, doubtless, just what the Senator from Tennessee is covering with his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment in line 10, page 2, was adopted. [Putting the question.] By the sound, the noes seem to have it.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I call for the yeas and nays; and, pending that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Beckham	Harris	Myers	Smith, Ariz.
Capper	Harrison	Nelson	Smoot
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Spencer
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Newberry	Stanley
Curtis	Kellogg	Nugent	Sterling
Dial	Kendrick	Overman	Sutherland
Dillingham	Kenyon	Page	Thomas
Edge	King	Phelan	Trammell
Elkins	Kirby	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Fall	La Follette	Poindexter	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Lenroot	Pomerene	Warren
France	McCumber	Ransdell	Watson
Frelinghuysen	McKellar	Reed	Williams
Gronna	McNary	Sheppard	
Hale	Moses	Sherman	

Mr. HARRIS. My colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], is necessarily detained from the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-eight Senators having responded to the roll call, there is a quorum present. The ques-

tion is on the motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] was agreed to on yesterday.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I ask to have the question stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the pending question.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Florida moves to reconsider the vote by which the Senate on yesterday adopted the following amendment, offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]:

On page 2, after the word "judgments," in line 10, the following amendment was inserted:

On causes of action arising during Federal control.

So that, as amended, it reads:

All final judgments on causes of action arising during Federal control for a plaintiff or plaintiffs rendered in actions for personal injuries or for loss of or damage to property shall be promptly paid by the Director General of Railroads, either from the operating revenue of the defendant or defendants or the revolving fund herein created.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Upon that the Senator from Florida demands the yeas and nays.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I find that the object sought by me may be reached by an amendment without a reconsideration of the amendment just stated. Therefore I withdraw the motion for the reconsideration of that vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider is withdrawn.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I move that the bill be amended, on page 2, line 14, by inserting after the word "created," the words "and final judgments based on claims accruing prior to Government control shall be paid by the Director General of Railroads and charged against the compensation account of the particular railroad involved." I move the adoption of that amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, with the spirit of the amendment just offered by the Senator from Florida I have no quarrel. I think it is entirely proper that these railroads shall pay out of their compensation the judgments which have been rendered against them before Federal control, or judgments upon causes of action arising before Federal control; and therefore I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 14, after the word "created," it is proposed to insert a comma and the following words:

And final judgments based on claims accruing prior to Government control shall be paid by the Director General of Railroads and charged against the compensation account of the particular railroad involved.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Florida if he will not accept an amendment to his amendment, to insert after the word "Railroads" the words "out of such compensation as is or has been agreed to be paid to such railroad company."

Mr. TRAMMELL. That will be accepted.

Mr. McKELLAR. In other words, it will be taken out of the railroad's funds.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think the two amendments mean the same thing.

Mr. McKELLAR. Precisely the same.

Mr. TRAMMELL. They seem to me to mean the same thing. It is just a question of the selection of verbiage and phraseology.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Florida will be so modified. The Secretary will state the amendment as modified.

The SECRETARY. As modified, the amendment now reads:

On page 2, line 14, after the word "created," insert a comma and the following: "and final judgments based on claims accruing prior to Government control shall be paid by the Director General of Railroads out of such compensation as is or has been agreed to be paid to such railroad company."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I was called from the Chamber a few moments ago. I had been here pretty steadily during the day and on returning to the Chamber I understand a motion has been made that when the Senate adjourns this afternoon it shall adjourn until Monday next.

I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry and then I shall ask to be heard upon it. Is a motion to reconsider in order made by one who confessedly did not vote on the question? I was out of the Chamber, and I did not vote.

I can not understand, Mr. President, why it is that the Senate should adjourn from this afternoon until Monday when there is business here to be transacted. I had up a few days ago a very important measure providing vocational training for men injured in industries. We had an hour and a half or two hours' consideration of that measure. It was then set aside because of the unfinished business, the resolution of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. This other important measure that has come up now will be finished, I suppose, this afternoon. I had assumed that the Senate would go ahead with the other bill at the conclusion of the bill which is now the unfinished business, and I had intended to make a motion to that effect. That bill could have been passed certainly by Saturday night, or defeated, if it is to be defeated, but I do not like to have it submarined in this manner.

Mr. GRONNA. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. GRONNA. I am very glad the Senator from Iowa has called the attention of the Senate to the agreement to adjourn over. I will say for the information of the Senate that I had hoped to be able to report the Agricultural appropriation bill to the Senate on Saturday. Certainly we ought to dispose of the supply bills as quickly as possible. I can see no reason why we should adjourn for three days at a time when the appropriation bills are now being considered in committees, and, of course, will shortly be reported.

Mr. CUMMINS. Will my colleague and the Senator from North Dakota be willing to postpone the discussion of this subject until the pending bill has been passed?

Mr. KENYON. When does my colleague think it will be passed?

Mr. CUMMINS. I think it can be passed in less than three minutes.

Mr. KENYON. I have been waiting all day for its final passage. If some one then does not immediately move to adjourn, which is not a debatable motion——

Mr. McKELLAR. Why not let the pending bill be passed and then take up the bill the Senator from Iowa has in charge? It is a measure in which I am very greatly interested, and I do not see why we can not pass it this afternoon.

Mr. KENYON. May I ask whether a Senator who is not present can make a motion to reconsider?

Mr. WATSON. Why not let the discussion of that question go over until the pending bill has been passed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa withdraw his request?

Mr. KENYON. I withdraw the request for three minutes, until the pending bill can be passed.

Mr. WATSON. Then the junior Senator from Iowa can move to take up his bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment. If there be no further amendment, it will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION.

Mr. KENYON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 18) to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has heretofore been read and certain committee amendments have been agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. There are some Senators who are opposed to this bill. I do not see them in the Chamber and I think in fairness I should suggest the absence of a quorum. I make that suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Henderson	McCumber	Smith, Ariz.
Beckham	Hitchcock	McNary	Smoot
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Moses	Thomas
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Trammell
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Underwood
Dial	Kendrick	Nugent	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	Kenyon	Overman	Walsh, Mont.
Elkins	King	Page	Watson
Fletcher	Knox	Poindexter	Williams
France	La Follette	Pomerene	
Hale	Lenroot	Ransdell	
Harrison	Lodge	Sheppard	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOSES in the chair). Forty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is

not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. PHELAN, and Mr. SUTHERLAND answered to their names when called.

Mr. NEWBERRY, Mr. EDGE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. STANLEY, and Mr. WARREN entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Secretary will state the first amendment of the Committee on Education and Labor which has not been acted upon.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is very solicitous that this measure should go over until Monday. He is very persuasive about it. I think it is a mistake myself. There is no reason why the Senate should not stay here and do business to-morrow and the next day. But inasmuch as the Senator has so urgently requested it, I am not going to insist on going on with the bill this afternoon. I understand that it is now the unfinished business. Would the Senator object to a few minor amendments which have been proposed, or would he prefer to have it all go over until Monday?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inform the Senator from Iowa that there are committee amendments not yet acted upon.

Mr. KENYON. I know all the committee amendments have not been agreed to.

Mr. KING. On several of the committee amendments I want to make some observations, but if they are verbal changes or minor amendments I have no objection.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator would prefer that the amendments should go over until Monday?

Mr. KING. I would prefer that course.

Mr. KENYON. Inasmuch as the Senate has already agreed to adjourn until Monday—and I presume that motion will stand, as this bill is the unfinished business—I give notice that I am going to insist on a fair consideration of the measure until we reach a conclusion upon it one way or the other.

Mr. KING. I shall join with the Senator in any request he may make in respect to that matter.

Mr. KENYON. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEFICIENCY IN RAILROAD OPERATION.

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5312) to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for carrying out the act entitled, "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for carrying out the act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918, there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated $750,000,000, which shall be in addition to the appropriation of $500,000,000 made in section 6 of said act, and shall be subject in all respects to the same authority for, and restriction of, expenditure as the said $500,000,000.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, this is——

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield? Does the Senator know whether the Committee on Interstate Commerce have given any consideration to this measure and whether it meets with their approval?

Mr. WARREN. I addressed that interrogatory to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce. I did so as late as yesterday. He had nothing to say against its passage in the regular way.

Mr. KING. By that I understand the Senator to mean——

Mr. WARREN. I understand he has no objection whatever to the bill.

Mr. KING. Does the Interstate Commerce Committee approve of it affirmatively and not in a negative way?

Mr. WARREN. It never has been submitted to that committee for approval, and I do not know why it should be. It is under the law a shortage of an appropriation; it exists in the form of a deficiency, which we must in some manner make up.

Mr. KING. I did not understand that the entire amount was a deficiency, but that it was to meet——

Mr. WARREN. All of it is a deficiency, and I am sorry to say that we shall have more of this same kind of deficiency later on.

Mr. POMERENE. I think as one member of the Committee on Interstate Commerce I can say that we regret very much that there is such a deficiency, but we do not know how to escape it.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMERICAN SOLDIERS' CEMETERY IN FRANCE.

Mr. SPENCER. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (S. 122) authorizing a commission to acquire and maintain a cemetery in France in the name of the United States for the reception and interment of the bodies of American officers and men who lost their lives in connection with the European war, and to appropriate $500,000 therefor, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, this measure is the result of a bill which I introduced at the last session and a bill which was sent here by the War Department at the last session. The Committee on Military Affairs, taking the two bills, practically made this bill. It was reported at the last session and was passed by the Senate, but because of the expiration of the Congress it got no further. This bill is practically the same bill, with a verbal change, that was introduced and passed at the last session.

Mr. KING. Was the bill reported by the committee unanimously?

Mr. SPENCER. It was reported unanimously and placed on the calendar.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to ask the Senator whether the bill will lead to any discussion, because if it does I shall ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. SPENCER. I will withdraw the request if there is any discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business has been already temporarily laid aside.

Mr. SMOOT. I had not heard the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill indicated by the Senator from Missouri?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subject to the laws relative to national military cemeteries within the United States so far as such laws may be applicable, and subject to the permission of France, by treaty or otherwise, a commission shall be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire in the name of the United States a suitable plat of land in France, preferably on or near one of the important battle fields where American troops were conspicuously engaged, and there to establish a national cemetery, to be known as the American field of honor, and to properly prepare said plat of land for use as such and thereafter to care for, preserve, and maintain the same.

SEC. 2. That in said field of honor, in section 1 of this act provided for, may be buried, and shall only be buried, the remains of officers and members of and persons accompanying or serving with the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps who have died or hereafter shall die while serving with the overseas forces during the present war with Germany or during any period of occupation immediately subsequent thereto; and the Secretary of War is hereby directed to cause the remains of each of the persons aforesaid to be buried in said field: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall interfere with the return to the United States of the remains of any such officers or men whose nearest relative may desire such return to the United States.

SEC. 3. That for the purchase of the land and the original cost of the preparation thereof for use as a national cemetery, as in the first section of this act provided, and for the cost of transfer of remains and the interment thereof in said cemetery, as in the second section of this act provided, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary therefor.

SEC. 4. That the commission referred to in section 1 of this act shall consist of three Members of the Senate and three Members of the House of Representatives, appointed, respectively, by the Vice President and the Speaker of the House, who will become the permanent board to administer the cemetery and its maintenance. Vacancies shall be filled as in its original organization.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have no intention of opposing this bill. On the contrary, I shall vote for it with a great deal of pleasure. I rose, however, for the purpose of referring for a brief moment to the bill which has just been passed by the Senate without debate. It is the bill which appropriates $750,000,000 to enable the Government to meet the deficiency occasioned by its operation of the railroad systems of the United States. It was one of several large appropriation bills which had been reported from the committee and which were upon the calendar during the closing days of the last session. Those days were devoted to a general, indiscriminate, and long-continued discussion, ostensibly of one or more of the bills, but really of everything on earth except the substance of the bills. The reason assigned for their procedure at the time by gentlemen then occupying the attention of the Senate and the country was that these bills were of such transcendent importance that they involved questions and issues and considerations so vital to the welfare of the people of the country, with which they should be made acquainted in the fullest possible manner, that Senators were unable to square their conscience with their duty and permit those bills to pass without extended considera-

tion. I note that the bill took just about five minutes for its presentation and passage to-day, and that not one of the Members of the Senate who were conspicuous in their opposition to the consideration and passage of these bills at the last session was present and in his seat at the time of the enactment of this great measure, carrying almost a billion dollars.

Mr. SMOOT. So that the Senate may know just why the bill was not passed at the last session of Congress, I wish to state that the reason of it was because the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], having the bill in charge, and the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], would not allow the bill to be presented to the Senate, but used it to force, if possible, the passage of other bills, knowing that everyone wanted the passage of the appropriation bill containing the $750,000,000. I know myself that there were propositions made to those Senators that if they would bring the appropriation bill before the Senate it would pass in a very few moments, but it was refused and held back so as to try to force the other bills to passage.

Mr. THOMAS. While what the Senator has said may be true, which I neither affirm nor deny, I wish to call attention to the fact that two of the bills which at that time were upon the calendar have passed with almost as little difficulty and waste of time of the Senate as the one just disposed of.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] was on the committee with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and myself. On account of illness the Senator from Virginia was not able to take charge of the deficiency bill entirely in the closing hours of the last session, and he left it to my charge to a large extent. Therefore I happen to know the facts.

When the bill carrying $750,000,000 came over from the House there was considerable objection in the committee to a vote on it and a good deal of criticism, but it developed that if the bill were reported to the Senate in the form it was reported at this session there would be an effort made to put a rider on it in the shape of legislation that would involve the long-and-short-haul clause with reference to railroad matters, and would have brought on interminable debate and an endless contest on the floor of this Chamber. We knew that; everybody knew that. If the bill had come in as it was reported at this session, as a separate bill, it would have been open to that amendment, and it was stated that that amendment would be made to the bill and other amendments made to it which would have probably resulted in its ultimate defeat; but if the amount of the appropriation should be put in the deficiency bill it would not be subject to those amendments.

The amount of this appropriation was reported in the deficiency bill, which everybody expected would have a fair opportunity to go through and become a law, and it would have gone through carrying this appropriation if there had not been a filibuster on the other side of the Chamber. That is the historic fact. Nobody can deny it. The RECORD shows it. I am not here to criticize other Senators. Every Senator has a free right to handle bills on the floor as he sees fit, and if Senators on the floor of the Senate desire to enter into endless debate at the close of a session and to destroy the life of a bill, that is their responsibility; they must assume it; and I am not here to criticize it.

In the absence of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], I am not willing to let the statement go on the floor that he was responsible for not bringing in the bill, when he was anxious to do so, and only put the provision on a deficiency bill because that was the direct line to secure its passage without having riders put on the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I made the statement I did in answer to a statement which was made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. I do not think that the Senator from Virginia or the Senator from North Carolina would object to my statement if they had been present. There was no question but that the deficiency appropriation bill would have passed this body at the last session of Congress had not other bills been put ahead of it, and no other business could be attended to until they were disposed of.

Now, I will say to the Senator from Alabama that I took no part whatever in the filibuster. I was perfectly willing——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not saying that the Senator took part in the filibuster, but I say other Senators on his side of the Chamber did so, and they were responsible for the death of that bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I merely wanted the RECORD to show the fact. If I had had my way the bill would have passed; but I did feel that the real situation as it existed ought to have been stated.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. From what I have said I do not want to be understood as charging the filibuster to the Republican Party, because they were not responsible for it. The filibuster was conducted by three Members of the Senate. It is a fact that their affiliations are with the Republican Party, but the organization, I think, is as free from responsibility for it as is this side.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, in view of what has been said I think we might as well state in a word what the fact was and cease to indulge in camouflaging. The bill referred to was defeated by a filibuster conducted by certain Senators. There is no escape from that, and let us recognize the fact as such.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISTRIBUTION OF CAPTURED WAR TROPHIES.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If it is in order, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator from New York to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar Order No. 10. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object. The understanding was that we would adjourn after the completion of the bill just under consideration and not displace the measure that is the unfinished business of the Senate.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the bill gives rise to debate, I am perfectly willing to agree not to press it for consideration this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest that the unfinished business will not be displaced if the bill suggested by the Senator from New York is taken up by unanimous consent.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 643) to provide for the equitable distribution of captured war devices and trophies to the States and Territories of the United States and to the District of Columbia.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to apportion and distribute pro rata among the several States and Territories of the United States and the District of Columbia, in corresponding ratio as the total number of men serving in the armed forces of the United States, as hereinafter provided, from each State or Territory and the District of Columbia bears to the total number of men so serving from all States and Territories and the District of Columbia, all cannon, gun carriages, machine guns, minenwerfers, mortars, bomb throwers, flame throwers, gas projectors, and other war devices and trophies captured by the armed forces of the United States from the armed forces of Germany and allied nations, with the exception of such cannon, gun carriages, machine guns, minenwerfers, mortars, bomb throwers, flame throwers, gas projectors, and other war devices and trophies as may be required for experimental purposes or for actual use by the armed forces of the United States; and the further exception of such of the devices aforementioned as may be required for display in museums of a national character or for monumental purposes in Arlington National Cemetery and in other national cemeteries, national parks, and national monuments wheresoever situated.

SEC. 2. That the apportionment and distribution provided for in this act shall be undertaken and completed as soon as practicable after the return of the aforementioned war devices and trophies to the United States; and that for the purposes of this act the Secretary of the United States Navy, or such person as he may direct, and The Adjutant General of the United States Army, shall separately or jointly compile or cause to be compiled a report or reports showing the number of men in the armed forces of the United States accredited to each State or Territory of the United States and to the District of Columbia, either by enlistment or by the process of the selective-service act, or otherwise drawn into and becoming an integral part of the armed forces of the United States during the period hereinafter specified, and that such report or reports shall be laid before the Secretary of War as soon as practicable after the passage of this act, and in no event later than six months from date hereof, and shall serve as the basis for the pro rata apportionment and distribution among the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, as hereinbefore provided.

SEC. 3. That in the case of the States and Territories the apportionment and distribution, as provided for in this act, shall be made through the governor or chief executive of each of the several States and Territories.

SEC. 4. That for the purposes of this act the term "in the armed forces of the United States," wherever used in this act, shall be construed to include all men enlisted, drafted, or otherwise drawn into and becoming an integral part of the United States Army, the United States Navy, the United States Marine Corps, the United States Coast Guard, and all other armed forces of the United States whatsoever; and that the period of service in the armed forces of the United States, as hereinbefore provided, shall be construed to begin with the effective date of the declaration of a state of war between the United States and Germany on April 6, 1917, and to end on the effective date of the armistice between the United States and Germany at 11 o'clock on November 11, 1918; and that the report or reports of men accredited to each of the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia shall be confined to the period between those two dates, inclusive.

SEC. 5. That all transportation charges on war devices and trophies, as indicated from point of shipment to point of final delivery within the several States, Territories, and counties thereof, and the District

of Columbia, shall be borne by the United States Government, but not the expenses or costs incident to erection in local communities.

SEC. 6. That on and after the passage of this act no award or distribution of war devices or trophies captured during the period specified shall be made except as herein provided, and all legislation conflicting herewith is hereby repealed.

SEC. 7. That to carry out the provisions of this act there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be administered by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I have read the bill and I have listened to the reading of it by the Secretary, and I am very much in favor of its passage. As I understand the provisions of the bill, it will eliminate the necessity of several score of bills being considered for various communities. Let me ask the distinguished Senator if I have grasped the measure correctly? First, these war trophies, such as they may be, are to be distributed to the various States, and then the proper executive officer of the State is to distribute them to the various towns and cities as the State may see fit?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is correct.

Mr. ASHURST. It obviates, then, the necessity of passing at least 300 or 400 bills in cases where various communities are asking for war trophies.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think the Senator from Arizona underestimates the number of bills.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if I also may ask the Senator from New York a question: I assume that this distribution by the governors of the several States will depend upon such powers as may be conferred upon them by the legislatures of the several States?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I assume the legislatures will legislate upon that topic.

Mr. POMERENE. Now, let me ask the Senator a further question. I have in mind now one request from a very excellent college in Ohio that had a very large number of students in the service. The president of the college wrote me sometime ago—I refer to the Mount Union College, of Alliance, Ohio—asking that one of the large guns be given to that college. I introduced here a bill to that effect. Is there anything in this bill which would preclude that college getting one of those cannons or guns?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I see nothing in this bill that would prevent that. If the governor of Ohio desires to give it to the college, I think he could do so under this bill.

Mr. POMERENE. But if the governor of Ohio did do that, would it be violative of any provision of this bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I know of no provision of this bill that would be violated by any such act. I call the Senator's attention to section 3, which is only four lines long, and which reads:

SEC. 3. That in the case of the States and Territories the apportionment and distribution, as provided for in this act, shall be made through the governor or chief executive of each of the several States and Territories.

Mr. POMERENE. Now, let me ask the Senator another question and, if I may, make a preliminary statement. There is a very large number of these heavy field guns and other military supplies which were captured by the Thirty-seventh Division, which was made up largely of Ohio troops. Of course, the troops from the other States rendered a similar service with similar success. Necessarily the Ohio soldiers would have a little bit more interest in the trophies captured by them than they would have in trophies which were captured by the troops of other States, and it seems to me that due regard ought to be had to that fact when it comes to the distribution of these different military supplies. Is that provided for in the bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is not specifically provided for in the bill, but I should think that an intelligent administration of this act would prompt the Federal authorities to see to it that whenever it is possible the trophies assigned to a given State shall be the trophies captured by the troops from that State.

Mr. POMERENE. Why could there not be an amendment offered declaring the purpose of Congress in that behalf now?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think it would be rather difficult to draft legislation to meet that requirement. We might get into difficulties if we tried to make that a rigid requirement under the law.

Mr. POMERENE. I realize very well that could not be done, but if there were some statement declaring the purpose of Congress in that behalf as a guide to the military department when they come to the distribution of the various trophies, I think it would be desirable. I can understand, for instance, that where there was a division containing one regiment from New York, another regiment from Ohio, and another regiment from Pennsylvania, all of them rendering most loyal and efficient service, the trophies should be distributed among those several States in proportion, perhaps, to the number of troops engaged.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think that is a matter which can be easily handled by an intelligent administration and by adjustment of the situation between the several governors and the War Department. It seems to me that in making up the apportionment of the trophies to go to the several States, the War Department, if it operates at all intelligently, will take that into consideration. It certainly should, and perhaps the very discussion which the Senator has initiated here this afternoon will indicate the temper of the Senate upon it. It is, however, a very difficult question upon which to legislate.

Mr. POMERENE. I may say that Gen. Farnsworth, in charge of the Thirty-seventh Division, has already made recommendation to that effect, as I understand, to the War Department, and I have no doubt it will be respected.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And undoubtedly the other division commanders and members of other divisions will make similar suggestions on many occasions.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I do not know that I understood the Senator from Ohio. Is it his idea that trophies should be divided up in proportion to the captures by the various troops?

Mr. POMERENE. Oh, no; I did not say that. That does not quite express my thought.

Mr. McKELLAR. I merely wish to suggest to the Senator that if we divide the trophies in that way it would probably be unfair. Take, for instance, the case of Sergt. Alvin C. York, of my State. He would be entitled to practically all the machine guns there are. It seems that he captured on one occasion most of this character of guns the Germans had. Of course, under these circumstances it would hardly be generous on the part of Tennessee, as the home of this gallant and remarkable soldier, to demand all that he captured, and I think that we can well afford to be considerate of our less fortunate sister States and divide the machine guns on the basis as provided in the bill.

Mr. POMERENE. I am quite willing that Sergt. York shall have all the German prisoners he captured.

Mr. McKELLAR. And all the machine guns?

Mr. POMERENE. Yes; and all the machine guns. He should have them.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator absolutely in that regard.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. KENYON. Before the motion is agreed to I should like to inquire if the unfinished business is now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. SMOOT. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 2 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 16, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 12, 1919.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Bruce Alexander to be United States marshal, northern district of Mississippi.

Floyd Loper to be United States marshal, southern district of Mississippi.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *June 12, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, our Father in heaven, for the wise, the true, the noble men, who have witnessed the terrible disasters which a world-wide war has left in its wake, who are striving to form a league of nations to prevent its recurrence in all future.

Let those who object to a league of nations visit Arlington, our national cemeteries, and those in France where our American dead lie in abundance. Let them witness the wounded and maimed, with arms, legs, eyes, health, gone; ponder these unsightly scenes before they lift their voices against those who would prevent such scenes and think twice before they speak.

Above all, let the religious denominations lay aside their petty creeds and unwarranted dogmas and unite on the common

ground of humanity to uphold and sustain peace among the sons of men, for God's sake, for Christ's sake, for humanity's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs I report the bill making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, together with the accompanying report.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to reserve all points of order.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, may I give notice to the House that immediately upon the completion of the pending Army appropriation bill I shall move for the consideration of the bill which I have reported.

The SPEAKER. The bill is referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, together with the report, and ordered printed.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. BRUMBAUGH, a qualified Member from Ohio, who has been unavoidably detained on account of illness, is here and desires to take the oath of office.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH presented himself before the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

MEMORIAL OF CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF PORTO RICO.

Mr. DAVILA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a memorial addressed to me by the Chamber of Commerce of Porto Rico dealing with the matter of the improvement of harbors in the island.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Porto Rico asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a memorial. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the length of this memorial?

Mr. DAVILA. It is a memorial dealing with the improvement of harbors in Porto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

APPOINTMENT.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House, according to the provisions of the act of June 10, 1872, the following appointment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TEMPLE, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with the order of yesterday, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STEELE] is recognized for 20 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, out of regard for the wishes of those who are charged with the Army appropriation bill and who desire to speed the passage of that bill, I have asked only for the minimum time, and therefore will have to ask that I be allowed to proceed without interruption; and for the same reason, Mr. Speaker, I ask that I may be given unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, last week this House by a unanimous vote passed a resolution authorizing the appointment of a committee of 15 to investigate the war-time expenditures of the War Department. Yesterday the House by a like vote, in order to show the scope which that investigation will likely assume, gave its consent to the unlimited use of funds in making that investigation, the idea being, as stated by former Speaker CLARK yesterday, that this investigation should be most thorough in all its aspects. The only surprise to me in connection with this resolution was that it was limited to the expenditures of the War Department, for my thought is that if investigation is to be made it should not only be thorough as to that department, but thorough as to all other departments and bureaus of the Government having charge of the expenditures of war appropriations. I am told, however, it is the purpose of the majority to introduce such resolutions in the near future. In the discussion of this resolution it was interesting to note the reasons given by the majority for the passage of the resolution. As stated by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], it was:

If in this riot of expenditure induced by the war there has been extravagance, if the extravagance was such that it could not be avoided, the country will probably excuse it. If it could have been avoided, there is no reason why the country should not know it.

Similar reasons were given by others in speaking in behalf of the majority of this House. The reasons that were given on behalf of the majority for the passage of this resolution, then, reduce themselves to the allegation of extravagance.

There was no specific charge at all during this discussion of any fraud or corruption in connection with these expenditures. Just what this investigation may develop, as stated by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] yesterday, no one can prophesy at this time; but, so far as we know at the present time, the sum and substance of the allegations is that there was extravagance.

Now, the great outstanding fact of this whole war proposition is that this country was successful in its aims, and successful where our enemies did not believe it was possible for us to be successful. Balancing all of the considerations growing out of the entire conflict, it shows that the decided advantage to our arms is an equivalent for all other considerations in the matter; and that extravagance was likely to be one of the features of such a situation is not at all a new feature of wars. All wars are extravagant, all wars are wasteful, and that has been the history of wars from the Roman times down to the present. Not only are they wasteful, but the incidents growing out of them breed waste and breed extravagance.

The fact is that we were absolutely unprepared for this war, and we were not only unprepared for the war but it was thought at that time it was necessary to prepare for a prolonged war, and this situation was well stated a few weeks ago by Admiral Sims in a victory loan speech which he made in Philadelphia, where he said:

Mistakes, of course, have been made in the Army. They could not be avoided. I am sure you will be interested to hear my mistakes. Well, you will learn them in the inevitable after-war investigation. You will probably hear then that I spent too much money over there. True. If the Germans had given me six months' notice as to when they were going to quit, I would have spent no more than necessary. The expenses to which I have just referred were indeed vital. We had to prepare for a prolonged war.

Now, in view of the discussion which has taken place in the House at various times growing out of the expenditures of the present war, I thought it might be interesting to indulge for a brief time in a discussion of the lessons of other wars in this particular, and the only other war in our history which would bear any resemblance to the one through which we have just passed is the Civil War. That war also was one which arose suddenly. It was a great emergency, and the preparations for it had to be made quickly. It lasted almost double the time that this war has lasted, so far as we are concerned, and therefore it may have given rise to conditions which would not have existed to that same degree if it had ended more speedily. But the conditions were quite similar. And in referring to these conditions I do not wish to be understood for a moment as intending to reflect upon the honesty or integrity of the Government during that period of war. Everybody will concede that President Lincoln came out of that war as one of the greatest figures in the world's history, absolutely stainless in his record. [Applause.] Neither do I wish in any degree to reflect upon the integrity or honesty of Secretary of War Stanton, whose unbending honesty was recognized at all times and who endeavored to the best of his ability to ferret out any malfeasance which existed during that period of time. On the contrary, he gave all the assistance that was possible for him to do to bring all the malefactors to justice that existed during that period of time. And I also wish to give full credit to the leaders of the party in power during the Civil War, who were big enough and brave enough at that time to denounce, whenever it came to their notice, any attempt to reach illegally into the Public Treasury. But notwithstanding this ability and honesty on the part of the heads of the Government the fact existed that in the subordinates of that administration at that time there existed during the war-time period a perfect carnival of fraud. And this notwithstanding, as I say, all their vigilance, which escaped their power of detection or ability to stop.

The difficulty in obtaining honest administration does not lie with the high executive officers, but with the system under which a small peace establishment is suddenly called upon to enter into enormous transactions to sustain a great world war, for which the establishment is wholly inadequate. Under these circumstances new and inexperienced subordinates are hastily called, and much is necessarily left to their discretion, with

the result that the man who secures a Government contract is generally regarded as being on the high road to wealth.

And therefore, so far as the head officers of the administration are concerned, it is absolutely impossible in such a period of time, it seems to me, to absolutely ferret out the misdoings of subordinates or, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] said yesterday, the underlings of the Government. And this lack of honest administration which occurred during the Civil War occurred quite early during the history of that war. It was known to the public a few months after Fort Sumter was fired upon.

Two States soon thereafter, in their legislatures, passed resolutions upon the subject. The Michigan Legislature, by a resolution of January 11, 1862, mentioning the charge that "traitors in the disguise of patriots have plundered our Treasury, destroyed our substance, paralyzed our efforts, by a system of fraud and peculation," asked for legislation making such commission of fraud a felony punishable by imprisonment for years or for life or even by death upon the gallows.

The Ohio Legislature one month later regarded with surprise, anxious alarm, pain, and regret "the evidences that have reached us and the disclosures that have been made in Congress of wastefulness, fraud, and peculations, based upon deep corruption among the subordinate agents of our National Government in connection with the supplies for the Army," and asked Congress to provide suitable and effective laws against all manner of fraud.

And in the citations which I shall make now they shall all be from those who were supporters of the administration at that time, and not a single one will be given from those who were opponents of that administration.

Secretary Stanton appointed a commission to adjust claims against the War Department. Before making their report, July 1, 1862, they had secured deductions of nearly $17,000,000 from claims amounting to $60,000,000.

A special Senate committee (Rept. No. 84, 37th Cong.) reported that they had discovered "gigantic and shameless frauds on the Government"; that they "are overwhelmed with astonishment and sorrow by the revelations which have been made." This report gave the following as an example of what was undoubtedly occurring in other departments of the Government. "A Prussian by birth, an Israelite by descent, a peddler and horse jockey by profession," who is selling horses to the Government, has made illicit profits by bribing an inspector and three Government clerks, turns up as an extensive shipowner (though comparatively poor a few months earlier), chartering 13 transports to the War Department. These transports cost him $65,000, but at the rate per diem of charter the committee estimated that if the engagement lasted a year his net profit would be $293,000. There were frauds also in the Navy Department, a common mode of which is illustrated by the following statement made by Senator Grimes April 12, 1864 (Cong. Globe, 1521), in the Senate. Phelps, Dodge & Co., a large house in New York City dealing in metals, proposed to furnish tin at 29 cents per pound, which they considered a low price. Their bid was rejected, but a naval contractor afterwards bought from them the same lot at their price of 29 cents and turned it in to the Navy Department at 27 cents, the bid which had secured the contract. The contractor made his profit by cheating the Government in false weight, which he was enabled to do by corrupting the agent and master mechanic who were to receive the tin. Senator Grimes, in the Senate, May 23, 1864 (Globe, 2406), showed how oils were adulterated and how fictitious bidding had been reduced to a science. He maintained that frequently the civil engineer or master workman at the navy yard who made the estimate was in collusion with the contractor; that "Navy agents, clerks, master workmen, inspectors, and other servants of the Government have been debauched by bribes, promises, and threats in order to secure prompt payment of bills and to induce them to receive and pay for short measure, weight, and count." In April, 1862 (Globe, 1841), Henry L. Dawes, of Massachusetts, said there was indubitable evidence that somebody had plundered the Public Treasury well nigh, in a single year, as much as the entire current yearly expense of the Government which the people hurled from power because of its corruption.

The yearly expense of the Government to which he referred was something like $80,000,000, and this amount Mr. Dawes stated had been plundered during the first year of the war.

In the Senate, on January 14, 1862, Senator Trumbull, quoting from the testimony of the House committee, said that Hall's carbines, originally owned by the Government, but condemned and sold as useless at about $2 each, were purchased back for the Government in April or May, at $15 each. In June the Government sold them again at $3.50 each. Afterwards, in August, they were purchased by an agent for the Government at $12.50 each, and turned over to the Government at $22 each, and the committee of the House finally succeeded in preventing the last payment from being made. On the 13th of January, 1862 (Globe, 298), Dawes referred to certain purchases of cavalry horses, as follows:

"A regiment of cavalry has just reached Louisville, 1,000 strong, and a board of Army officers has condemned 485 of the 1,000 horses as utterly worthless. The man who examined those horses declared upon his oath that there is not one of them worth $20. They are blind, spavined, ringboned, with the heaves, with the glanders, and with every disease that horseflesh is heir to. Those 485 horses cost the Government, before they were mustered into the service, $58,200, and it cost the Government to transport them from Pennsylvania to Louisville $10,000 more before they were condemned and cast off.

"There are, sir, 83 regiments of cavalry, 1,000 strong, now in or roundabout the Army. It costs $250,000 to put one of those regiments upon its feet before it marches a step. Twenty millions of dollars have thus far been expended upon these cavalry regiments before they left the encampments in which they were gathered and mustered into the service. They have come here and then some of them have been sent back to Elmira; they have been sent back to Annapolis; they have been sent here and they have been sent there to spend the winter, and many of the horses that were sent back have been tied to posts and to trees within the District of Columbia, and there left to starve to death. A guide can take you around the District of Columbia to-day to hundreds of carcasses of horses chained to trees, where they have pined away, living on bark and limbs till they starve and die, and the Committee for the District of Columbia have been compelled to call for legislation here to prevent the city wherein we are assembled from becoming an equine Golgotha."

Referring to this extract, Horace White, in his Life of Lyman Trumbull, says:

"Horse contracts of this sort had been so plentiful that Government officials had gone about the streets of Washington with their pockets full of them. Some of these contracts had been used to pay Cameron's political debts and to cure old political feuds, and banquets had been given with the proceeds, 'when the hatchet of political animosity,' said Dawes, 'was buried in the grave of public confidence and the national credit was crucified between malefactors.'"

Not only were these frauds in Government contracts but also in connection with the filling of military quotas by substitute brokers and bounty jumpers. Roscoe Conkling, in the House on April 24, 1866 (Globe, 2151), declared that the Provost Marshal General and his subordinates had "turned this business of recruiting and drafting into one carnival of corrupt disorder, into a paradise of coxcombs and thieves. * * * There never has been in human history a greater mockery and a greater burlesque upon honest administration than the conduct of this bureau, taking the whole country together." Gov. Brough, of Ohio, wrote on February 6, 1865, as follows: "I am satisfied that there is more or less corruption in at least one-half of the subordinate provost marshalships of the State. * * * I know the fact that some men of heretofore moderate means have retired from these positions with handsome competencies, while some remaining in them are manifestly outward tokens of worldly means not derived from salaries." Brough and Senator Wilson, of Massachusetts, charged that corruption extended to the surgeons, who examined drafted men in order to ascertain whether they were fit physically for the service. Men would feign deafness, blindness, cardiac disease, and other disabilities, and some surgeons would write out certificates of exemption on receipt of a substantial fee.

In line with this mass of evidence is a startling article written by Col. Henry S. Olcott in Annals of the War, page 723.

Col. Olcott drew his data to a large extent from contemporary reports which he made to the Secretary of War. He was a native of New York, and at the outbreak of the Civil War was one of the editors of the New York Tribune. He went to the front during the first year of the war, joined the Burnside expedition at Annapolis, participated at the capture of Roanoke Island, the Battle of Newbern, the siege and capture of Fort Macon, the battles on the Rappahannock during Pope's retreat, and other military affairs. Exposure to malaria finally disabled him with fever, and two months later, when convalescent, he was appointed by Secretary Stanton to investigate the condition of military arsenals, disbursing offices, and so forth, and brought to light much corruption. Later he performed similar service in exposing the abuses in navy yards, being officially

commissioned by the Navy Department for this purpose. He was one of a committee of three appointed to arrest the assassins of President Lincoln and to take evidence against the conspirators. He served as special commissioner of the War and Navy Departments until his retirement in 1866.

He prefaced his article, first published in 1879, by a statement of the absolute unpreparedness of the Government for war, and that all considerations of business caution had to be subordinated to the imperious necessity for haste. "If," he says, "it was the golden hour of patriotism, so was it equally that of greed." And in the course of his article he said:

"The rush of men to the front left the war office no time to be nice over details, so that as the volume of administrative business overflowed the bureau machinery for its supervision things were, in a measure, suffered to take their course. An unhealthy tone pervaded everything; speculation was the rule, conservatism the exception. We floated, on a sea of paper, into a fool's paradise. Contractors, bloated with the profits on shoddy, rode in emblazoned carriages which a little while before they would have been glad to drive as hirelings, and vulgar faces and grimy fingers were made more vulgar and coarse with the glare of great diamonds. Intrigue held the key to the kitchen stairs of the White House, shaped legislation, sat cheek by jowl with Congressmen, and seduced commissioned officers from the strict path of duty. Our sailors were sent to sea in ships built of green timber, which were fitted with engines good only for the junk shop and greased with "sperm" oil derived from mossbunkers and the fat of dead horses. For 1 pound of necessary metals, 1 yard of fabric, 1 gallon of liquid the price of 2 was paid. Our soldiers were given guns that would not shoot, powder that would only half explode, shoes of which the soles were filled with shavings, hats that dissolved often in a month's showers, and clothing made of old cloth ground up and fabricated over again.

"In the navy yards there was a system of corrupt bargaining between the public servants and contractors under which goods of inferior quality and short of quantity were accepted as of the lawful standard and count; public property was purloined and carried off in open daylight; scores of superfluous men were quartered on the pay roll by politicians; Navy agents colluded with ring contractors to buy of them all supplies at highest market rates on an agreement for a 15 per cent commission, and clerks in the yards, for a consideration, would slip the pay requisitions of these ring thieves from the bottom to the top of the pile that awaited the official certificate of approval, so that they might draw their money at once, to the prejudice of honest dealers. There was no such thing as the taking of a general account of stock—not even a keeping of the accounts by double entry. The old regular officers in charge of bureaus, high-toned and unsuspicious, were flattered into a fatal sense of security by subordinates bound body and soul to thieves.

"In the military arsenals the same rottenness prevailed. Here and there were to be found public servants without a moral ulcer in their breasts, but such were annoyed and hampered in the execution of duty, overridden, too, often by positive orders from superiors to receive supplies not up to Army standards, and when too obstinate were removed to posts less desirable. The Army standards were themselves debased under the plea of an exigency. In the lettings of contracts a fair competition was frustrated by the transparent conspiracy of bidders, who would put in absurdly low proposals under fictitious names and then bid themselves at the highest price that from surreptitious information obtained they knew would throw out honest competitors and secure them the contract. Their profits were calculated to come out of the delivery of inferior articles of skimped measure to Government inspectors with whom they had an understanding. Presents of horses, carriages, jewelry, wines, cigars, and friendly help toward promotion, though passing under a politer name than bribery, effected the same results as though they had not. Every artifice that rascally ingenuity could devise and clever men and women carry out was resorted to to procure the brigadier's stars or the colonel's eagles for ambitious incompetents. The sacredest secrets of our Government were sold to the enemy, loud-mouthed hypocrites trafficked across the lines, the very medicines for the sick were adulterated, and dishonest gains were made out of the transportation of the wounded. Nay, so vile was the scramble for money, so debasing its influence, that our dead heroes were followed into the very grave by the plundering contractor, who cheated in the coffin that was to hold the sacred dust, and amassed fortunes by supplying rotten headstones in defiance of accepted stipulations. What shall we call this wretched episode of national history but a carnival of fraud? This was the Augean stable to cleanse which the broom of authority was placed in my hands."

He concludes his article with the following astonishing statement:

"It is my deliberate conviction, based upon the inspection of many bureaus and the examination of some thousands of witnesses in every walk of life, that at least 20, if not 25 per cent of the entire expenditures of the Government during the Rebellion were tainted with fraud. That is to say, that over $700,000,000 were paid to public robbers or worse than wasted through improvident methods. If the loss of the money were the only thing to be deplored it would be comparatively a trifling affair, for this country has boundless resources and unprecedented recuperative capacities. But every dollar of this ill-spent treasure contributed toward a demoralization of the people and the sapping of ancient virtues."

James Russell Lowell, who held a brief for the war, writing in 1865, philosophized over this amazing record as follows:

"It is true that by the side of self-devotion and public spirit the vices and meannesses of troubled times appear as they will and must. We have had shoddy, we have had contracts, we have had substitute brokerage, we have had speculators in patriotism and, still worse, in military notoriety. Men have striven to make the blood of our martyrs the seed of wealth or office; but in times of public and universal extremity, when habitual standards of action no longer serve and ordinary currents of thought are swamped in the flood of enthusiasm or excitement, it always happens that the evil passions of some men are stimulated by what serves only to exalt the nobler qualities of others. In such epochs evil as well as good is exaggerated. A great social convulsion shakes up the lees which underlie society, forgotten because quiescent, and the stimulus of calamity brings out the extremes of human nature, whether for good or evil."

While it is undoubtedly true that war time brings out the extremes of good and evil, it is also true that every age has its own moral ideals and conception of right and wrong. Unfortunately, evil was rampant from the very beginning to the close of the Civil War. The careful Washington correspondent of the Springfield Republican, long a resident of the Capital, wrote in May, 1864: "Washington was never quite so villainously corrupt as at the present time. In the palmy days of southern rule of slavery there was not half the corruption there is now." And Robert C. Winthrop, a former Speaker of this House, in a public address delivered about the same time, referred to "the flood of vice and crime, of immorality and irreligion, which is sweeping so wildly over the land." But the evils of this period were righted in subsequent years, for the Nation was sound at heart, and when it came to the present war a higher standard prevailed.

None but supporters of the Lincoln administration have been cited to show the fraud and corruption that prevailed at that time. It is to the great credit of the leaders of that administration that they were big enough and brave enough to denounce corrupt practices when they discovered them. The contrast, however, between the two periods is most marked. It is the difference between a "villainously corrupt" Washington and a Washington charged with extravagance.

Within a few months after the firing on Fort Sumter, in April, 1861, the public became aware that gross frauds were being perpetrated upon the Public Treasury. Nine months thereafter a Cabinet minister was dismissed and the legislatures of two States adopted resolutions referring to disclosures in Congress "of wastefulness, fraud, and peculation based upon deep corruption."

It is now more than two years since war was declared against Germany and seven months since an armistice was signed. During this war period expenditures were authorized by the practically unanimous vote of both Democrats and Republicans, amounting to more than five times the entire cost of the four-year Civil War period. The difference between the two periods has already been mentioned. It is not due to the mere fact that different political parties were in power during the two war periods, but to the noteworthy historical change in the standards of business and public morality, which is to the everlasting credit of the American people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House

on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Army bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5227, the Army appropriation bill, with Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchase of subsistence supplies: For issue as rations to troops, including enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, civil employees when entitled thereto, hospital matrons, nurses, applicants for enlistment while held under observation, general prisoners of war (including Indians held by the Army as prisoners, but for whose subsistence appropriation is not otherwise made), Indians employed with the Army as guides and scouts, and general prisoners at posts; for the subsistence of the masters, officers, crews, and employees of the vessels of the Army transport service; hot coffee for troops traveling when supplied with cooked or travel rations; meals for recruiting parties and applicants for enlistment while under observation; for sales to officers, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps while on active duty, and enlisted men of the Army: *Provided*, That the sum of $12,000 is authorized to be expended for supplying meals or furnishing commutation of rations to enlisted men of the Regular Army and the National Guard who may be competitors in the national rifle match: *Provided further*, That no competitor shall be entitled to commutation of rations in excess of $1.50 per day, and when meals are furnished no greater expense than that sum per man per day for the period the contest is in progress shall be incurred. For payments: Of commutation of rations to the cadets of the United States Military Academy in lieu of the regular established ration, at the rate of 68 cents per ration; of the regulation allowances of commutation in lieu of rations to enlisted men on furlough, enlisted men and male and female nurses when stationed at places where rations in kind can not be economically issued, including enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, and when traveling on detached duty where it is impracticable to carry rations of any kind, enlisted men selected to contest for places or prizes in departments and Army rifle competitions while traveling to and from places of contest, male and female nurses on leave of absence, applicants for enlistment, and general prisoners while traveling under orders. For payment of the regulation allowances of commutation in lieu of rations for members of the Nurse Corps (female) while on duty in hospital, and for enlisted men, applicants for enlistment while held under observation, civilian employees who are entitled to subsistence at public expense, and general prisoners sick therein, to be paid to the surgeon in charge; advertising; for providing prizes to be established by the Secretary of War for enlisted men of the Army who graduate from the Army schools for bakers and cooks, the total amount of such prizes at the various schools not to exceed $900 per annum; for other necessary expenses incident to the purchase, testing, care, preservation, issue, sale, and accounting for subsistence supplies for the Army, $90,000,000.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the word "advertising" on line 10 of page 21. I do so just for the purpose of asking a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment may not be offered while the point of order is pending.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question or two about "advertising," on page 21, line 10. The question arises from the statement made recently in the newspapers that $185,000 would be expended for advertising purposes to secure enlistments. I wanted to ask whether this had reference to that?

Mr. KAHN. No. This has reference to the advertising of bids for food for the soldiers. This item is altogether about subsistence, and it would not refer in any way to advertising for enlistments.

Mr. FESS. I will state to the chairman that I shall not make the point of order on the word if that is the purpose.

Mr. KAHN. That is the purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] withdraws his reservation of the point of order, and the Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KAHN: Amend, page 21, line 17, by striking out "$90,000,000" and inserting "$67,500,000."

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is this: The committee yesterday reduced the Army to an average strength of 300,000 men, instead of the 400,000 men recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs. Therefore the matter of subsistence for the Army can be reduced correspondingly. That is the purpose of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Delaware moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. LAYTON. I have risen, Mr. Chairman, to make an inquiry which I think is very appropriate under this heading of "Subsistence." I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, who I understand was also a member of the same committee in the Sixty-fifth Congress, whether there was any lack of appropriations at any time for the buying of supplies for the Army and Navy in the military equipment of the country?

Mr. KAHN. I am quite positive that there was no lack of appropriations, for if the Army and Navy appropriation bills did not carry the necessary amounts, the Committee on Appropriations promptly furnished deficiency appropriations, and all the money that was required for furnishing supplies of every kind to the Army as well as the Navy was forthcoming under the various appropriation bills.

Mr. LAYTON. That was my impression, Mr. Chairman; and the point I want to make is that my constituents, engaged in packing tomatoes, are very anxious to understand why they can not be paid for last year's tomato pack. Those men had the price fixed on them by the War Department authorities, as to the price of the tomatoes in the field, and the Government then commandeered a certain portion of the entire pack for its use.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Delaware yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. LAYTON. Yes.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I desire to ask the gentleman from Delaware whether or not there is any question about the goods he mentions coming up to the specifications laid down by the War Department?

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, there has never been any question about a Delaware product coming up to the specifications at any time, so far as that is concerned. [Applause.] We grow the finest tomatoes and the finest fruit on earth, and we have in our State the finest packing establishments, that know how to put up Triple-X products. There is no objection raised by the department, as I understand from the inquiries I have made, as to any failure to come up to the standard, but there has simply been a delay in paying these people for their pack. Now this is a great hardship. Our packers as a general rule, in order to get liquid capital, go to the banks and borrow money at 6 per cent, in order to take advantage of spot cash for the tins out of which the cans are made, and in order to pay their labor and pay the farmer for his fruit.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAYTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KAHN. Do the people in the War Department give any reason why the gentleman's constituents are not being paid?

Mr. LAYTON. I have never been able to ascertain any reason. Several days ago I wrote a letter to the Secretary of War asking for an explanation, but I have received none up to this time. I want to say that these people go to the banks to get their liquid capital in order to take advantage of the market for spot-cash tins, and in order to pay their labor and in order to pay the farmer for his products. They borrowed that money last year. The Government is not paying them any interest at all upon what it commandeered, and it is a great hardship. They stand to-day on the threshold of another packing season. They have got to go and borrow money again, and it is a matter which in my judgment justifies my calling attention to it at this time for the purpose of a public inquiry.

Mr. CANNON. I should like to be heard a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment?

Mr. CANNON. Yes. I want to ask the gentleman a question. This is for the subsistence of the Army. How much is the appropriation for the current year?

Mr. KAHN. It is considerably above the amount that they are asking in this bill.

Mr. CANNON. I want to ask this: Not being present all the time yesterday, I see in glancing at the RECORD that the time of the House for an hour or two yesterday was taken up in a debate about the supplies for the Army. Having hastily glanced at the RECORD, I judge from that debate that there must be enough supplies of one kind and another to take care of the Army for the coming fiscal year. I do not know as to that. Has the committee taken into consideration what is on hand?

Mr. KAHN. Yes. Of course, the supplies that are being sold or are to be sold by the commissioner of sales are for the most part not food supplies. They are other materials, including acids, locomotive cranes, and things of that kind. The Quartermaster General stated to the committee, not in this

session but in the previous session of Congress, when we were considering the appropriation bill last winter, that there would not be any considerable quantity of food material left for the subsistence of the Army, practically, after the 1st of July; that the articles of subsistence were being used right along and that their surplus was being depleted rapidly. I think that is practically true of everything except the meat products.

Mr. CANNON. Everything except the meat products?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Then I take it that much of the conversation that was had yesterday about the packers, and about people being protected in order to hold up prices, and so on, was just talk.

Mr. KAHN. A good deal of it. I want to say to the gentleman that I have last year's appropriation bill, and I find the amount that was allowed then was $552,868,390, and that sum was supplemented by deficiency appropriations reported from the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CANNON. I notice there was much talk yesterday about meat. Whether it was wise or unwise, or whether it elicited information I do not know; but if we have got plenty of meat products they ought not to be sold, but ought to be kept for the subsistence of the Army, and that would mean a decrease in the amount of this appropriation.

Mr. KAHN. That, of course, is not appropriated for in this item. In other words, the War Department, instead of apportioning money for meat products under the appropriation, does not apportion any sum for meat products. The gentleman knows the Army appropriation bill has been in this form for many years and the estimates are sent to the committee so as to show the specific amount for every single item in the paragraph. I understand that for meat products they are not asking any money, and no money is included in the total for that.

Mr. CANNON. I have an impression, however, that while this is for subsistence, and while various items are referred to, if this bill follows former bills—I have not examined as to whether it does or not——

Mr. KAHN. It does.

Mr. CANNON. There is a clause that puts the whole thing into a hodgepodge.

Mr. KAHN. There is a clause a little later on in the bill which covers such items as subsistence, transportation, regular supplies, and so on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

By unanimous consent the time of Mr. CANNON was extended five minutes.

Mr. KAHN. During the war practically every item of the bill was included in that catch-all phrase or paragraph, the purpose being that if there should be a deficiency in some particular item in the bill they would not have to come to Congress for a deficiency, but could use any excess moneys that might have been appropriated for the other items to make up the amount.

Mr. CANNON. Is the same thing true in this bill?

Mr. KAHN. No; we have restricted that part of the bill to the paragraphs that were formerly in the bill before we got into the war.

Mr. CANNON. So they can not throw it all into a pot and transfer from one to the other?

Mr. KAHN. No; only for some half dozen items, but not all. The gentleman will find it on page 39, at line 18, of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. It throws half a dozen into a bulk item.

Mr. KAHN. Exactly. That language was included in the bill for many years before we got into the war.

Mr. CANNON. I will express the hope that there will be nothing sold that is on hand, that we heard so much about yesterday, judging from the RECORD; that nothing will be sold at a smaller price than it can be bought for now, that will be necessary for the support of the Army for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. KAHN. I want to say to the gentleman that they have a very large surplus of canned products, and after six months there is a possibility that some of those canned products may become blown and spoiled. Therefore they are trying to sell the surplus as speedily as possible, but they will keep enough to supply the Army for the fiscal year 1920.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, this bill as it was reported to the House carried something above $809,000,000. The appropriation thus made did not, however, nearly cover the anticipated cost of the Army for the fiscal year. In the matter of subsistence, the item now under consideration, the cost of the maintenance of an army of 300,000 is very much greater than the sum carried in the bill. The committee did not appropriate, I assume, the full sum necessary for subsistence, in view of the fact that a large portion of the subsistence will be drawn out of the stores now on hand. So the cost of the maintenance of the Army which is proposed, either an army of 400,000 as originally proposed, or 300,000 or 350,000 which may be determined on, will be very much greater in many items than the sums carried in this bill.

In other words, whatever the bill may carry when agreed upon, whether $700,000,000 or $800,000,000, it will not measure the cost of the Army for the year. How much will it cost? I rise to propound that inquiry to the chairman of the committee. I do not know whether the committee has had the time to carefully examine the various items of subsistence, of regular supplies, horses, munitions, material, clothing, and equipment, equipage of various kinds, to determine the difference between the amount carried in the bill and the cost of these articles that will be consumed by the Army which we are providing for.

If the committee has not had time to do that I hope before the consideration of the bill is concluded that a statement may be made giving us, at least approximately, what will be the actual cost of the Army provided for—not only the cost in money appropriated in this bill, but the cost in the stores drawn upon and not provided for in the bill.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think the committee has figured down about as close mathematically as it can be done the cost of subsistence, figuring for an army of 300,000 men for one year, and the present cost of a ration is 56 cents a day. Figuring it 60 cents a day will give $65,700,000.

Mr. MONDELL. Do I understand that the committee is appropriating in this bill as though we were going to restore to the accumulated stores all of the subsistence that may be required?

Mr. ANTHONY. No.

Mr. MONDELL. If it is not, and I assume that it is not, then, of course, the appropriation carried in this bill does not cover the total cost of subsistence for the Army of the size you are proposing.

The question is, How much more will the Army which you propose, or the Army that we may ultimately agree upon, cost—how much more will it cost than the appropriations carried in the bill? No one can make an absolutely correct statement relative to that fact, but an approximation can be made.

The time of Mr. MONDELL having expired, by unanimous consent he was given two minutes more.

Mr. MONDELL. The committee ought to be able to make an approximation of the actual cost of the Army that shall be determined upon by adding to the various items in this bill the difference between the appropriations made and the actual value of the articles that will be used for the Army of the size we propose. If it is going to cost $1,200,000,000 for the Army we propose, rather than seven or eight hundred million carried in the bill, we ought to know approximately what the amount is to be. In other words, when word goes out to the American people how much the proposed Army will cost it should be stated, not in terms of the appropriation, but in terms of the cost, by adding to the appropriation the value of the material and supplies that will be used, but not paid for out of these appropriations.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, the statement of the gentleman from Wyoming is correct. The amount carried in the bill does not show the total cost of the Army. The gentleman suggests that we put into the RECORD what the total cost will be before we conclude the bill. I submit that it is practically impossible to do that.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. In a moment. The Democratic members of the Committee on Military Affairs were named on the 26th day of May. On the 27th the committee met and concluded to take this bill as the basis for its legislation. On Wednesday the Public Printer was printing it, and on Thursday the committee met to take up the hearings. It had hearings all day Thursday, all day Friday, all day Saturday, all day Monday, all day Tuesday, all day Wednesday; and on Thursday it commenced the executive consideration of the bill for the amount to be allowed for each item. It met all day Thursday, all day Friday, and finished the bill. The bill was reported to the House on Saturday, and was taken up for consideration on this floor on Monday.

I think that is very expeditious work, and I want to thank my colleagues on the committee for the splendid manner in which they have cooperated in bringing this bill speedily on the floor of the House.

Now, the question asked by the gentleman from Wyoming will be given every attention, and I ask the unanimous consent of the House that I may be allowed to extend my remarks in the RECORD, so that I may, as soon as possible, get the data the gentleman asks for and give it to the House.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GREEN of Iowa). The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I had no thought of criticism, as the gentleman from California knows. I did feel that I should like to know, and I am sure all the Members of the House would like to know, as soon as may be, approximately the estimated cost of the Army we are providing for by adding to the appropriations made the estimate of the value of supplies of various sorts that will be consumed, supplies now on hand.

Mr. KAHN. I shall put it in the RECORD as soon as I can get the figures.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to make an inquiry of the chairman of the committee. Owing to the fact I have been continuously in attendance at the hearings of the Naval Committee, which bill has just been completed and is now before the House for consideration, it may be possible that the inquiry I am about to make of the chairman has already been made and answered, and if so, I apologize for making it again. It comes to me from very high sources in the Navy Department, sources I do not question, that there seems to be an inclination on the part of the Army to prevent naval recruiting officers from going to the demobilization camps and supplying men being demobilized from the Army with literature pertaining to the Navy. They say that the recruiting officers are finding it difficult to get recruits for the Navy owing to the fact that the Army men, evidently having in mind the fact that they want all these men to go back into the Army if they are going back into any military service, prevent the naval men from interviewing these military men and giving them this literature. It has worked out in this way, that the field for recruiting recruits we urgently need now on our ships, in order that the old men may be discharged, has been curtailed and Army men deprived of a chance of going into the Navy, and I would like to ask the chairman of this committee if he has any information whether or not orders have been issued to prevent naval men from going upon the Army grounds?

Mr. KAHN. I have no information upon the subject. I do know that an effort is being made to recruit for the Army some of these men who are being discharged. I want to say my information is that the department is meeting with very poor success among the men who are just being demobilized. Of course, that would be a matter that rests entirely with the War Department. They have not informed the committee of their attitude in the matter of Navy enlistments, so I can not give the gentleman the information.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion? I understand he has the idea possibly the War Department has not that sympathy that it might have toward the making of naval enlistments.

Mr. HICKS. I have not so stated, but that is my private opinion; and I feel that, instead of two rival services of one country, there should be one service of one country.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Having that opinion and expressing it publicly, let me offer this one of the same character of my own. I noticed throughout the post offices literature gotten out by the Navy Department which said, in effect, to the young American citizen, by way of throwing a little cold water on the Army, "If you join the Navy you do not have to spend much time in training camps." How does that work out as a counter proposition to the one the gentleman advanced?

Mr. HICKS. The post offices are probably free ground for the Army and Navy or any other department of this Government. I am making the point that the Army has no right, in my opinion, to say to men in the Navy, "You shall not come upon this ground and recruit for the Navy." I believe that a man who is going out of the Army should have an equal chance to go into the Army or the Navy, whichever he sees fit.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. I will.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. We want to get this straight. Will the gentleman state that the Navy is willing to reciprocate and permit the Army recruiting officers to board ships to get recruits?

Mr. HICKS. I will say to my friend from New York that the Navy does not demobilize on board ship.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Well, the receiving ships.

Mr. HICKS. I believe that the Navy will be perfectly willing to have men from the Army go to their demobilization camps and allow the men there to receive literature from the Army men. We will take our chances, for we should all be interested primarily in advancing Government service, irrespective of the branch.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. I will.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In reply to the statement just made by the chairman of the committee that they have been having very poor success in enlisting men in the Army——

Mr. KAHN. Pardon me, I did not make that statement. If the gentleman will allow me, I said they had poor success with men who are being demobilized. They are probably getting a good many men who had not been in the Army.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to call attention to the fact that in the statement appended to the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama on yesterday the Chief of Staff states that "enlistments reported to date, which do not include enlistments reported at camps during the present week, 48,023, so we have gotten the first block of 50,000 men called for when we started in a month or two ago."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

REGULAR SUPPLIES.

Regular supplies of the Quartermaster Corps, including their care and protection; construction and repair of military reservation fences; stoves and heating apparatus required for the use of the Army for heating offices, hospitals, barracks and quarters, and recruiting stations, and United States disciplinary barracks; also ranges, stoves, coffee roasters, and appliances for cooking and serving food at posts, in the field, and when traveling, and repair and maintenance of such heating and cooking appliances; and the necessary power for the operation of moving-picture machines; authorized issues of candles and matches; for furnishing heat and light for the authorized allowance of quarters for officers, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps when ordered to active duty, and enlisted men, warrant officers, and field clerks, including enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty; contract surgeons when stationed at and occupying public quarters at military posts; for officers of the National Guard attending service and garrison schools, and for recruits, guards, hospitals, storehouses, offices, the buildings erected at private cost, in the operation of the act approved May 31, 1902, and buildings for similar purposes on military reservations authorized by War Department regulations; for sale to officers and including also fuel and engine supplies required in the operation of modern batteries at established posts; for post bakeries, including bake ovens and apparatus pertaining thereto and the repair thereof; for ice machines and their maintenance where required for the health and comfort of the troops and for cold storage; ice for issue to organizations of enlisted men and offices at such places as the Secretary of War may determine, and maintenance of laundries at military posts in the United States and its island possessions; for the authorized issues of laundry materials for use of general prisoners confined at military posts without pay or allowances, and for applicants for enlistment while held under observation; authorized issues of soap; toilet paper and towels; for the necessary furniture, textbooks, paper, and equipment for the post schools and libraries, and schools for noncommissioned officers; for the purchase and issue of instruments, office furniture, stationery, and other authorized articles for the use of officers' schools at the several military posts; for purchase of relief maps for issue to organizations, commercial newspapers, market reports, etc.; for the tableware and mess furniture for kitchens and mess halls, each and all for the enlisted men, including recruits; for forage, salt, and vinegar for the horses, mules, oxen, and other draft and riding animals of the Quartermaster Corps at the several posts and stations and with the armies in the field, and for the horses of the several regiments of Cavalry and batteries of Artillery, and such companies of Infantry and Scouts as may be mounted; for remounts and for the authorized number of officers' horses, including bedding for the animals; for seeds and implements required for the raising of forage at remount depots and on military reservations in the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands, and for labor and expenses incident thereto, including, when specifically authorized by the Secretary of War, the cost of irrigation; for straw for soldiers' bedding, stationery, typewriters and exchange of same, including blank books and blank forms for the Army, certificates for discharged soldiers, and for printing department orders and reports, $95,000,000.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, line 5, strike out "$95,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$87,033,335."

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, that amendment is in keeping with the other amendments which I offered to meet the views of the House regarding the size of the Army. The item for regular supplies can be cut to the figures I have sent to the desk.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there was, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] stated, considerable talk about the bureau of sales of surplus supplies yesterday, and a good many of my colleagues on this side of the House seemed to be quite interested in the subject and asked me to get further particulars concerning the gentleman in charge of that bureau. I want to

call the committee's attention to page 398 of the hearings, in which the director of sales of surplus supplies testified that he has had 20 years' experience with the United Gas & Improvement Co., of Philadelphia. He is a gentleman still in the prime of life, so that we can reasonably assume he has had experience as a sales manager with no other concern. And he also stated this—and I call the attention of the committee to it—on page 397 of the hearings:

During the war they gave me a leave of absence which enabled me to do a variety of things, and recently they have made the necessary arrangements to allow me to continue here if I am needed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will show you what those arrangements are. This same gentleman appeared before the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and in a hearing held pursuant to Senate resolution 386 we find this Mr. Hare, who has testified before our committee as Mr. "C. W." Hare, is Mr. "C. Willing" Hare, of Philadelphia. Mr. C. Willing Hare testified, Mr. Chairman, before that committee, and you will find part of his testimony on page 611 of the printed testimony, that he was then assistant director of munitions in the War Department, drawing a salary of $4,000 a year, and that at the same time he was receiving $15,000 a year from the United Gas & Improvement Co., of Philadelphia. When he was questioned whether this concern had any business with the Government or not, Mr. Hare said:

None whatever; and I think this can be verified by the Assistant Secretary of War or some one in his office. The only time since I have been down here, since the 1st of August, that anything came up between the Government and the United Gas & Improvement Co. was the question of supplying a certain amount of toluol, which is one of the residuums from the process of making gas, and which is used in explosives; and somebody in the Secretary's office said: "Do you know anything about this?" I said, "No; I want you to handle that thing yourself;" and how they decided that particular point has passed from my memory.

So at the same time this gentleman was drawing $15,000 a year from the United Gas & Improvement Co. he was drawing $4,000 a year from the Government, and on his testimony the Government was buying this residuum of gas from his company, but which fact he let slip from his memory.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a great deal was said yesterday whether this man was an expert or not. The gentleman from Ohio said, "Yes; he admitted himself that he was an expert." The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], the distinguished chairman of this committee, informed the committee of the enormous work of this bureau; that they had machine tools to sell, locomotives to sell——

Mr. KAHN. No; locomotive cranes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Locomotive cranes and oil, metal, and lumber. So we have this expert, whom we are paying $25,000 a year. He has been, according to his own testimony, in the employment of the United Gas & Improvement Co., of Philadelphia, for years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask for additional time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent for five minutes additional. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I have heard the gentleman say a good many disagreeable things about Mr. Hare. What is his remedy? Does he want to fire him or reduce his salary?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Fire him. I trust I have made myself sufficiently clear. He was asked, on page 614 of the Senate hearings:

Your present position with it is what?

To which he replied:

Manager of the new business department which has charge of sales. Now, it has not charge of the sales of the residuals. It has charge of sales of gas and electric light to our consumers.

So this expert is an expert in selling gas and electric light. Then Senator Hardwick asked him:

In other words, you sell the main products?

Mr. HARE. We sell the main products; and in order to develop their use, of course, we have to build up the development of gas ranges, hot plates, gas irons, and anything that can use gas efficiently and will help in the domestic use of gas.

So we have this gentleman, expert in gas ranges, curling irons, and hot plates, coming here and posing as a $25,000 expert, drawing $15,000 from the United Gas & Improvement Co. for some reason which I have not yet been able to discover, and advising the various branches of the Army how to dispose of their surplus sales. I think it is an outrageous and flagrant abuse of power and a waste of public money.

The gentleman from Ohio asked what remedy I would propose. I tried to make that clear the other day. In the first place, fire this fellow. Get rid of him. One of his chief assistants upon whom he relies is a colonel in the Army and drawing a colonel's pay. There are many competent, able, trustworthy business men who entered the military service and are willing to stay and finish the job. They are in all departments, and are right in this office. My remedy would be to take the chief of the various sales departments of the Army, Ordnance, Aviation, Artillery, Quartermaster, and so on, and form an executive board of each of these chiefs of sales. They will get together. They know what they have on hand, and they will so arrange their sales as not to compete with each other or dump too much of one commodity on the market, and they will be able to carry these sales without this expensive bureau and its ornamental chiefs.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I do not know yet what the fault is that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] is finding with the head of the sales department. He has served notice upon the committee that he intends to offer a motion to recommit this bill, with instructions to report back with a lesser amount for the running expenses of this department. I know nothing about the character or ability of Mr. Hare, and it seems that the gentleman from New York has not much more information than I have. [Applause.] I am only here to argue a principle.

As was stated yesterday——

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. KEARNS. Not now; no.

As was stated, when this sales department was organized there was practically $2,000,000,000 worth of surplus products of various kinds on hand.

It seems to me as a business principle that where there is that much money involved in various kinds of products there ought to be a central department through which these sales would be made. If Mr. Hare is not the proper man for the place, the remedy lies with the Secretary of War. If the Secretary has made a bad selection he ought to remedy the mistake that he has made by removing this man and putting a competent man in charge. The only thought I have in mind is that we ought to have an expert at the head of this sales department. If Mr. Hare is not the proper man the Secretary of War can soon furnish us with a remedy. We have many different kinds of products to put upon the market. Mr. Hare told the committee that he intended to get an expert salesman, expert in the sale of each of these commodities, and put him at the head of the department selling that particular article. If he has meat for sale, he said, he would have an expert meat salesman to place that commodity on the market and obtain for the Government the very highest prices obtainable. If he had automobiles for sale he was going, he said, to get the best automobile salesman he could find in the United States and put him in charge of the sale of automobiles. If he had clothing for sale—which he has—he was going to get an expert salesman of clothing, the best obtainable in the United States, and put him in charge of that.

His theory is good, and it is the only plan that ought to be adopted by the Government. I have no defense to make of Mr. Hare. I only rose to defend the principle involved, the manner in which these goods are to be sold; and whether Mr. Hare is in charge or some other man of greater ability than he, this $1,000,000 appropriation is not too much.

As was suggested in argument yesterday, Mr. Hare, incompetent although he may be, has already recalled contracts which had been made by the Government and has sold the products at an increased price of many million dollars. For a nonexpert he has already saved the Government more money than he is now asking to carry him over the year.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. I want to ask the gentleman if it has come to his attention that this sales department has disposed of linters of cotton at 3 cents a pound, which the general market can not dispose of at more than 1 cent, and thereby has saved the Government more than $10,000,000 in the last two or three weeks?

Mr. KEARNS. That is only another reason why this department should be kept intact; it is only another reason why this $1,000,000 appropriation should be made; because if the gentleman's statement is correct, and I accept it as true because the gentleman stands sponsor for its truth, it has already in a single transaction ten times over paid for itself. You want an expert at the head of this department, and, as I say, if Mr. Hare is not the expert that we ought to have, certainly such a man can be found somewhere in the United States, and whatever

this House may do when the motion is made to recommit the bill with that proposition to strike out this item, it ought to be voted down, and the Secretary of War, if he discovers that he has made a bad choice, undoubtedly if he has the public interest at heart—and he surely has—can right the wrong with one stroke of the pen. [Applause.]

This is not a proposition to spend $1,000,000 but is an effort to save many millions. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, following along the line of the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEARNS], who just preceded me, I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] possibly contributed a good suggestion when he read from the Senate investigation that Mr. Hare is evidently a very important gentleman and surely demands a good salary. It is suggested in that testimony that the Philadelphia Gas Improvement Co. was paying Mr. Hare $15,000 a year and at the same time loaning him to the Government. If that be true, in all likelihood the Philadelphia Gas Improvement Co., appreciating his work and ability, and desirous of helping the Government in the great crisis we were passing through, was willing to give to the Government the services of a valuable man like Mr. Hare, and they continued to give him $15,000 a year because they were fearful that when he came to Washington to engage in Government work other industries might learn of his ability and try to take him away from them, so that they had a string tied to him by which they could retain his services.

Now, a word in regard to a great industry in the district which I have the honor to represent. When some gentlemen here desire to get some publicity or do something sensational they proceed to attack the meat-packing industry. I want to say to the Members of the House that all of the large and most of the small packing houses of Chicago are in my district. I am as anxious as any other Member of this House, if the packers do wrong, to see that they are punished, but I am also as anxious as any other Member of this House who wants to be fair to see that these industries, which have many millions of dollars of invested capital and which employ thousands of people in my district, get fair play. I do not want to see them unduly criticized, and I do not want to see them held up to the people of this country as burglars or robbers or thieves, and I think it is time that some gentlemen here stop criticism, unless it is good healthy criticism and unless they can prove what they say.

Now, I went to see Mr. Hare yesterday with reference to the sale of meat. I heard the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FITZGERALD] wax eloquent here about the high cost of living, and others also followed him, and I am going to ask, without burdening the Members, that this statement, which was given to me by Mr. Hare, a very concise statement concerning his attempt and the attempt of his department to distribute and to market this 141,000,000 pounds of meat which the Government has in its storehouses, be placed in the RECORD to correct the misinformation that has been given on the floor of this House by some of the Members.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by the insertion of the statement indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. I ask that the Clerk read it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more, and, as suggested by one of my colleagues, I will read it myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. I read:

STATEMENT OF THE DIRECTOR OF SALES AS TO SURPLUS OF CANNED MEATS IN THE ARMY.

JUNE 3, 1919.

The approximate surplus of canned meats held by the War Department was furnished the director of sales by the Quartermaster General of the Army about May 5, as per attached inventory. This consisted of:

	Pounds.
Bacon	47,000,000
Roast beef	38,000,000
Corned beef	36,000,000
Corned-beef hash	20,000,000
Total	141,000,000

These meats cost the Government average prices as follows:

Bacon issue, ser. 8, crates	per pound	$0.40
Bacon issue, ser. 19, 12-pound cans	do	.46
Beef, roast, 6-pound cans	per can	2.70
Beef, roast, 2-pound cans	do	.82
Beef, roast, 1-pound cans	do	.51
Beef, roast, 12-ounce cans	do	.35
Beef, corned, 6-pound cans	do	2.09
Beef, corned, 24-ounce cans	per can	$0.70
Beef, corned, 1-pound cans	do	.45
Beef, corned, 12-ounce cans	do	.38
Hash, corned beef, 2-pound cans	do	.48
Hash, corned beef, 1-pound cans	do	.28

This represents in round figures a total cost to the Government of $60,000,000.

The question of the disposal of this large quantity of canned meat was discussed, and it was decided to call in conference representatives of the packing industry who sold the meat in question to the Government; following the general policy adopted by the War Department in the disposal of all its surplus to consult with the industry affected before decision was reached as to the best method to adopt for its disposal and to endeavor to avoid dumping vast stores on the market in such a way as to entail an undue sacrifice of the Government's interests.

The following Government representatives were present at the meeting:

Gen. Kniskern, zone supply officer of Chicago district, who acted as chairman.
Col. Fred Glover, Assistant Director of Sales.
Col. Quackenbush, Assistant Director of Storage.
Capt. Foster, Chief Surplus Property Division.
Lieut. Clement, Chief of Subsistence Section, Surplus Property.
Mr. Birkenstein, Storage Division, Purchase and Storage.
Maj. Squier, Chief of Quartermaster Stores, Director of Sales Office.
Mr. Elcock, Chief of Sales Promotion, Director of Sales Office.

Representing the packers there were present the following:

Mr. J. A. Hawkinson, Wilson & Co.
Mr. M. C. Plainer, Wilson & Co.
Mr. D. B. Russell, Morris & Co.
Mr. J. J. Deady, Armour & Co.
Mr. A. F. Feiffer, Armour & Co.
Mr. W. F. Wardell, Armour & Co.
Mr. G. C. Shepherd, Cudahy & Co.
Mr. F. E. Wilbur, Cudahy & Co.
Mr. E. D. Baldwin, Libby, McNeil & Libby.
Mr. Burroughs, Swift & Co.

The general question was discussed as to how this canned meat could be marketed in this country to the best advantage. The department had no organization to retail this large supply to individual consumers, and the packers' opinion was therefore asked as to what was the best method to dispose of it.

In substance they stated that the canned meats were not in commercial packages and that the canned roast beef had never been sold to the consuming public in this country, its use having been heretofore incident to the supply of various mining expeditions and logging camps, etc. Furthermore, the shape in which it was packed made it necessary to repack it before it could even be offered for sale and any reasonable price realized. It was further brought out that this canned roast beef was not even used for the Army in peace times, fresh beef being the ration.

It was stated that there is a market for corned beef in 12 and 24 ounce cans, but it was believed that the Government could secure no more for the 2-pound cans, containing almost 33 per cent more corned beef, if sold generally to the consuming public than they could for the commercial size 12 and 24 ounce cans, and that therefore, before making any attempt to sell this to the consuming public in this country, it should be repacked in commercial sizes.

The market for corned-beef hash, it was stated, is limited, most of it being sold in 6-ounce cans on individual order, and in order to market this to the public to the best advantage to the Government it would be necessary to repack it in commercial-size cans.

The bacon was specially cured for the Army. It contains an unusual amount of salt and has gone through a process of eight days' smoking instead of the usual 48 hours for the bacon prepared for the trade. The majority of this bacon is put up in sealed cans for export to the troops overseas.

In regard to the 8,000,000 pounds of bacon crated and located in Chicago, Baltimore, and Columbus, it was brought out that sealed proposals were about to be asked for in connection with a supply of approximately 2,400,000 pounds at Baltimore. This quantity had been offered the meat packers and meat dealers and the meat trade in general located east of the Mississippi.

In view of these various statements, and further in view of the fact that it had come to the attention of the director of sales office that Mr. Hoover had very recently purchased in this country for shipment overseas bacon held by the Italian and French Governments in this country, it was decided advisable to get in touch with Mr. Hoover and ascertain whether or not he would not purchase a certain amount of the canned surplus meats held by the Army.

If it was found that the canned meats could not be sold to advantage overseas, the packers were willing to cooperate in any way possible to help in the disposal of it in this country, and it was suggested that if it was decided to use the packers' distribution facilities, that they would be willing to act as the Government's selling agents and sell the canned meats at prices dictated by the Government and charge the actual expenses involved.

It was explained at this meeting that this amount of canned meat was produced by the packers in about five months, running at full capacity, three shifts per day, and represented as much canned meat as would ordinarily be packed in two and one-half years. Therefore, if an effort were made to dump this entire supply on the American market, irrespective of the prices secured for it, it would probably lead to a disruption of the entire canning industry for a period of a year.

Immediately after this meeting a cable was sent to Mr. Hoover through the United States Liquidation Commission asking him whether or not he was in the market to purchase a portion of the canned meats held by the Government. Mr. Hoover's representative in this country, Mr. J. S. Barnes, was also consulted; but Mr. Barnes did not believe that he was in the market to purchase them.

The question of the disposal of these canned meats in this country was discussed with the Salvation Army; Red Cross; the Farmers' Union, who distribute food products through cooperative stores; the Central Purchasing Committee of New York City, which does the purchasing for all charitable, penal, and hospital institutions in the city of New York; Austin Nichols & Co., of Brooklyn; and R. C. Williams & Co., of New York City, two of the largest wholesale grocery houses in the country.

Col. Parker, representing the Salvation Army, stated that they might be able to buy a limited amount of the canned meats, provided a sat-

isfactory price were named as they are obliged to sell at very low prices.

The Red Cross have no distributing means.

The Farmers' Union stated that they did not care to purchase any of it, and advised strongly that it be sold for export.

The central purchasing committee of New York City stated that they purchased only fresh meat, and unless a considerable change were made in their dietary regulations they would not be able to purchase it.

Austin Nichols and R. C. Williams & Co. stated that they would be interested in a small quantity at a price for export.

The matter was also taken up with A. R. Rodway Co., exporters of canned-food products in New York City, and Nogan Garrison & Co., merchants' representatives of groceries and canned meats of New York City, who stated that they would be interested in small amounts for export solely, and that no market, in their opinion, existed for this type of canned meat in this country.

Since the meeting with the packers bids have been received for the 2,400,000 pounds of bacon held at Baltimore. This bacon cost the Government approximately 40 cents a pound. Several thousand circular letters were sent out requesting bids and only 12 bids were received. The highest bid for all this bacon was 21 cents per pound. None of the bids were accepted, and negotiations are now under way, and it is believed that a sale of all of this bacon can be made for approximately 28 cents per pound to a commission house in Baltimore, who represent Texas interests and will resell this bacon to be used for the colored trade in the South.

We are now circularizing approximately 20,000 State, municipal, and charitable institutions, asking them to bid on this surplus meat, and we may be able to dispose of a certain amount of it in this way. We are also circularizing all of the dealers, wholesale and retail grocers, and other dealers in food products who may be interested, and this sale is being advertised in all daily papers in cities where the meat is stored and in trade papers appealing to produce men, wholesale grocers, hotel men, and large dealers in foodstuffs.

We are also seeing if arrangements can not be made through which some of this canned meat may be offered direct to the public at the warehouses where it is stored in Chicago, Columbus, Schenectady, New Cumberland, Pa., Newport News, Baltimore, Omaha, New Orleans, Boston, San Antonio, New York, St. Louis, El Paso, Atlanta, and San Francisco. On account of the inaccessibility of the warehouses where this food is stored, however, it is doubtful whether any considerable portion of the public will come to a sale if carried out.

Before any of these sales, however, can take place the important question must be decided as to what price we are to market this vast store of foodstuff for. It is obvious that if the price is made low enough and the articles sacrificed that all of it can be disposed of in this country. It must not be forgotten, however, that a very much better price can be secured through export.

We already have offers from various firms averaging approximately 70 per cent of the cost price to the Government, and an inquiry arrived on the 28th from the American Oceanic Corporation stating that they were authorized to purchase foodstuffs in amounts up to $10,000,000 for shipment to Roumania, payment to be made by two-year Roumanian treasury notes at par, bearing 6 per cent interest, payable in gold dollars.

It must be remembered that all of this canned meat is considered perishable; i. e., that under the storage conditions maintained by the Army it is doubtful if it will remain marketable for a longer period than nine months. I also want to draw your attention to the fact that once a can is opened it spoils very rapidly, which would make it rather difficult for the average small household to make use of the larger-sized cans which the Army has for disposal.

It seems advisable therefore that we continue our present effort to market as much of this surplus as possible in this country at the best prices obtainable and sell the remainder for export. It must be borne in mind, however, that if a low price is established here for domestic sales it will make it more difficult to secure a higher price for the same class of canned meats from exporters.

Some of this information has already been placed in the RECORD, having been inserted at the instance of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FITZGERALD] the other day.

Some gentlemen criticize the propriety of calling in representatives of the packing industry. If you have 141,000,000 pounds of meat to be disposed of, who should know more about meat products than the packers, and who could give more expert advice? When the war broke out the packing industries of Chicago came to Washington and offered to turn over their plants to the Government. They were willing and anxious to do everything they possibly could do to help this country win the war. There is no industry in the world that has been more responsive to the wants of Uncle Sam than the great packing industries of Chicago. On 24 hours they delivered millions upon millions of pounds of meat to the seacoasts to be sent over to our boys. They never fell down in one of their orders. They delivered the best meats. There was no quibbling about prices, no question of prices. They wanted to do everything they could consistently do—everything within their power. They came down here at the invitation of Mr. Hare, as I understand, and said to him, "These meats that you people have purchased from us were specially prepared for overseas, have been put up in large cans, for which there is little demand. We have no call for them from the grocers or the butchers, and therefore we can not conveniently take them back, but we will do everything we can to help you market them. We will give you the use of our sales department, we will assist and help in every way, but we think it would be more advantageous to the Government to export this meat, in order that the Government may get its price, because it was particularly prepared for export."

Now, I hold no brief for the packers. I am just casually acquainted with some of them; but I serve notice that from now on I am going to fight for my district here whenever it is attacked. I am going to manifest just as much interest in my district as some of you other gentlemen have shown. I think it was the former Speaker of the House who said, "You've got to quit akickin' my dog around," and I am serving notice on some champions of various districts that they had better let my district alone, or, at least, when they criticize it they be fair and honest. All I ask for my district is that you treat the people there as fairly as you treat the poor farmer. If you do that, we will have no complaint, and we will be sure to get everything we want, and maybe a little bit more. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. FESS. Has the gentleman the figures as to the amount of meat in cold storage, not held by the War Department, but in the country.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. I regret to say that I have not. I visited Mr. Hare because of the attack upon this particular industry, and he kindly gave me this synopsis that he had prepared.

Mr. FESS. I am sure that the gentleman is just as much interested as the rest of us are in knowing the reasons why prices are so high when there is so much being held on hand. I have from the Bureau of Markets the figures as to the amount of meat held in cold storage, and those figures are startling, in view of the price of meat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. May I have time enough to read the rest of this into the RECORD?

Mr. KAHN. The figures are already in the RECORD, and I suggest to the gentleman that he had better put the entire correspondence in.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. I will be very glad to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. I ask unanimous consent that I may read a few figures which I have as to the amount of meat in cold storage as reported by the Bureau of Markets in its last report. It will not take over two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. The amount of frozen beef in cold storage is 167,000,000 pounds plus; cured beef, 27,000,000 pounds; frozen lamb and mutton, 7,000,000 pounds; frozen pork, 138,000,000 pounds; dry salt pork, 413,000,000 pounds; pickled pork, 427,000,000 pounds; lard, 107,000,000 pounds; miscellaneous, 113,000,000 pounds; total, 1,399,000,000 pounds of meat in cold storage to-day.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question.

Mr. FESS. Just a moment and then I will yield. At the time of the last report of the Bureau of Markets there was on hand in the way of poultry, broilers, 10,000,000 pounds plus, as against 3,000,000 pounds a year ago, being 346 per cent more now in peace times than a year ago in war times; roasting chickens, 18,000,000 pounds, as against 7,000,000 pounds a year ago, an increase of 165 per cent; ordinary fowls, 18,000,000 pounds, as against 4,000,000 pounds a year ago, an increase of 450 per cent, making a total of 46,000,000 pounds of cold-storage fowls, speaking only of chickens, as against 14,000,000 pounds a year ago. And my observation is that the price of meat and fowls is higher now than ever before. It seems to me there ought to be some way to get at this problem of high price with such supply on hand, and if there is no way that the War Department or the other departments in charge can get at it, I think a persuasive resolution from this House would help a little. I am convinced that this body should at least take steps to get at the situation. [Applause.]

Mr. DOWELL. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to make an inquiry of the committee and to read a few lines from the testimony of Mr. Hare in the hearings on this bill. On page 399 of the hearings I read as follows:

> The general way in which sales are made is either by negotiation or by sealed bids. In certain cases where it has been found possible, or in the case of every class of material where it has been found possible, we have called into the meeting representatives of the industry which created this particular material. The Government's policy has been to get the material back through the ordinary channels of trade, to get the very best price we could, and at the same time not create an unnecessary disturbance in the labor and business conditions of the country.

May I inquire if it is the purpose of this department to sell these materials on the market or to turn them back to the

persons from whom they were purchased? Does the interpretation of the language I have just read mean that these materials are not to be placed in the hands of the public and are not to go into the hands of the consumers, but they are to go back from whence they came? In other words, is it the purpose of this department to turn back the meats and foodstuffs now in the hands of the War Department to the packers and thus prevent these meats from going upon the market and getting into the hands of the consumers, except through that source?

I would be pleased to know what interpretation the committee places upon this language. The House ought to have this information now.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up the time of the committee at any great length. On page 469 of the hearings there is some testimony about it, which I will not attempt to read. As I recall, the gentleman, Mr. Hare, when testifying before the committee, stated specifically that he was endeavoring to sell these meat products to the various penal institutions of the country, to the various eleemosynary institutions of the country, to the large lumber camps and construction camps of the country, so it does not seem that they intend to turn them back altogether to the packers.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. KAHN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLACK. I thought the gentleman had yielded the floor. I only want three minutes.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph be concluded in three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph be concluded in three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, there has been so much said in criticism of the policy of the War Department in the sale of the canned meats and other surplus meats which it has on hand that I think it is but fair at this particular time to read from the statement of Mr. Hare upon that particular point as found on page 467 of the hearings. I think any of us will at once say that the suspicions of the gentleman from Iowa, or his misunderstanding of the situation, as the case might be, are not well founded. It will be remembered that Mr. Hare is the director of sales of the War Department, and it has been stated by those who ought to know that he is a very capable business man of irreproachable standing.

On page 467, in the statement of Mr. Hare, this explanation of the efforts he is using to dispose of these meats appears:

> The question of the disposal of these canned meats in this country was discussed with the Salvation Army; Red Cross; the Farmers' Union, who distribute food products through cooperative stores; the central purchasing committee of New York City, which does the purchasing for all charitable, penal, and hospital institutions in the city of New York; Austin Nichols & Co., of Brooklyn, and R. C. Williams & Co., of New York City, two of the largest wholesale grocery houses in the country.
>
> Col. Parker, representing the Salvation Army, stated that they might be able to buy a limited amount of the canned meats, provided a satisfactory price were named, as they are obliged to sell at very low prices.
>
> The Red Cross have no distributing means.
>
> The Farmers' Union stated that they did not care to purchase any of it and advised strongly that it be sold for export.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Since the meeting with the packers bids have been received for the 2,400,000 pounds of bacon held at Baltimore. This bacon cost the Government approximately 40 cents a pound. Several thousand circular letters were sent out requesting bids and only 12 bids were received. The highest bid for all of this bacon was 21 cents per pound. None of the bids were accepted and negotiations are now under way, and it is believed that a sale of all of this bacon can be made for approximately 28 cents per pound to a commission house in Baltimore, who represent Texas interests, and will resell this bacon to be used for the colored trade in the South.

I could go on and read further from the hearings showing the diligent efforts that are being made to make proper sale of these products, but I will not undertake to do so at this time; but I will say that if gentlemen will read the hearings instead of taking up the time in criticizing the War Department they will find that the War Department is using every possible effort to wisely and economically market these products with good, sane business judgment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INCIDENTAL EXPENSES.

Postage; cost of telegrams on official business received and sent by officers of the Army, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps, when ordered to active duty; extra pay to soldiers employed on extra duty, under the direction of the Quartermaster Corps, in the erection of barracks, quarters, and storehouses, in the construction of roads, and other constant labor for periods of not less than 10 days; as additional school-teachers during the school term at post schools, and as clerks for post quartermasters at military posts, and for overseers of general prisoners at posts designated by the War Department for the confinement of general prisoners, and for the United States disciplinary barracks guard; of extra-duty pay at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of War for mess stewards and cooks at recruit depots who are graduates of the schools for bakers and cooks, and instructor cooks at the schools for bakers and cooks; for expenses of expresses to and from frontier posts and armies in the field; of escorts to officers or agents of the Quartermaster Corps to trains where military escorts can not be furnished; hire of laborers in the Quartermaster Corps, including the care of officers' mounts when the same are furnished by the Government, and the hire of interpreters, spies, or guides for the Army; compensation of clerks and other employees of the Quartermaster Corps, and clerks, foremen, watchmen, and organist for the United States disciplinary barracks, and incidental expenses of recruiting; for the apprehension, securing, and delivering of deserters, including escaped military prisoners, and the expenses incident to their pursuit, and no greater sum than $50 for each deserter or escaped military prisoner shall, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be paid to any civil officer or citizen for such services and expenses; for a donation of $5 to each dishonorably discharged prisoner upon his release from confinement under court-martial sentence, involving dishonorable discharge; and such additional expenditures as are necessary and authorized by law in the movements and operation of the Army, and at military posts, and not expressly assigned to any other department, $20,000,000.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EMERSON: Page 25, insert: "There shall be paid to each honorably discharged soldier who served over 30 days in the World War the sum of $300 in addition to any bonus now paid."

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. EMERSON. Will not the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. KAHN. No; I want to finish this bill by 6 o'clock tonight.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman give me one minute?

Mr. KAHN. If the gentleman asks unanimous consent for one minute, I do not object.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting what other countries are paying discharged soldiers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EMERSON. I think we all realize that we have not paid enough to our discharged soldiers, sailors, or marines.

I have offered this amendment to this bill for the soldiers, and will offer a like amendment to the naval bill for the marines and sailors.

Considering the purchasing power of money we are paying less than any other country in the world. Sixty dollars does not even clothe the discharged soldier, and if he happens not to have other means and has no job to which he can go he immediately becomes an object of charity. A majority of the discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines prefer the money bonus. If they were asked which they preferred, land or money, 98 per cent would say money.

I submit the following facts on this subject:

DENVER, COLO., *June 6, 1919.*

To the Members of Congress:

Playfair takes the stand that the soldier and the sailor are entitled to full pay for the time they have given their country on a basis somewhere approximating the commercial value of that time. The soldiers and sailors have given approximately forty million months. They are coming home flat in pocketbook. They can not afford to make that huge sacrifice. Nor can we, the 100,000,000 who remained at home and enjoyed war profits, ask them to donate to us something like three and one-half million years of their time. Playfair has proposed that an equitable settlement could be reached by paying each soldier and sailor $50 for each month that he has served. And a further proposal was made that this payment could take the form of a soldiers and sailors victory bond issue, the bonds not being offered to the public for sale, but being given to the soldiers and sailors at the rate of a $50 bond for each month served.

It would be required that each soldier and sailor accepting such payment give the Government a signed release disavowing any future service pension claim.

This plan has many advantages over any flat bonus such as a year's pay for each man regardless of the length of time served. The man who has served 20 months under any bonus plan would be treated the same as the man who has served 5 or 10 months. The amount of time that a man has given his country is the vital element. No compensation scheme that is not strictly based upon the length of service with full pay for the time served can be satisfactory. Besides, no other plan would entitle the Government to demand a signed release disclaiming future service pension.

Unless the soldiers and sailors receive equitable compensation for the time they have rendered now service pensions will surely come up in the future. It will cost $2,000,000,000 at the present time to liquidate our debt on this score. If we give a bonus, large or small, and disregard the question of future pensions very little good will have been done. If we pay in full for the boys' time now, not as a bonus but as compensation due based strictly on the number of months served, we will save many billions in pensions later, besides putting a smile on the faces of millions of the boys who need and can use the money due them right now.

Yours, truly,

PLAYFAIR,
URBAN A. WALTER, *Editor.*

GREAT BRITAIN—SCALE OF GRATUITIES ON DEMOBILIZATION (FROM ARMY ORDER 17, 1919).

5. The minimum gratuity payable to a soldier, other than a boy, in respect of war service will, subject to paragraph 9, be as follows:

Private, lance corporal, lance bombardier, or equivalent rank	25	$24.00
Second corporal, bombardier, corporal, or lance sergeant	6	28.80
Corporal of horse (household cavalry) or sergeant	8	38.40
Squadron quartermaster corporal (household cavalry) or squadron, battery, troop, or company quartermaster sergeant, staff corporal (household cavalry), staff sergeant or color sergeant	10	48.00
Warrant officer, class 2	12	57.60
Warrant officer, class 1	15	72.00

The ranks mentioned above include in each case all appointments in the rank.

Rank, for the purposes of this paragraph, will be subject to such definition as may be prescribed by the army council.

6. Soldiers who have completed more than 12 calendar months' war service will receive, in addition, the following sums in respect of each complete calendar month or portion of a calendar month of war service beyond 12 months, subject to a maximum addition of 48 such monthly increments, corresponding to a total gratuity covering five years' war service:

(a) If with any war service overseas, 10s. ($2.40).

(b) If with no such service, 5s. ($1.20).

The rates under both (a) and (b) being subject to reduction in the cases shown in the next paragraph, and the rate under (b) not applying to any war service rendered by the soldier as a boy.

7. If a soldier has been entitled to draw service pension during any portion of his war service, or if he has been entitled under article 6 of the Royal warrant published in army order 1 of 1918, to elect to draw it, in respect of any portion of that service, irrespective of whether he has actually drawn it or not, the monthly addition for any month during the whole of which pension has been or would have been issuable, will be 5s. ($1.20) or 2s. 6d. (60 cents) instead of 10s. ($2.40) and 5s. ($1.20), respectively.

8. The minimum gratuity payable to a soldier who is a boy will be £2 ($9.60). The additional sum for each month's war service after the first 12 months will be as in paragraph 6, except that if no service has been rendered overseas the sum shall be 2s. 6d. (60 cents) instead of 5s. ($1.20). For the purpose of this warrant the term "boy" will include trumpeters, drummers, buglers, pipers, fifers, and bandsmen enlisted as boys, and under the age 18.

9. The soldier who has served both as boy and man will be eligible for the minimum as a man if he has given any war service overseas, or has over six months' war service as a man. Otherwise the boy's minimum will apply.

The monthly additions will be 10s. ($2.40) if any overseas war service has been rendered; if not, they will be 2s. 6d. (60 cents) for each month (beyond the first 12) served wholly as a boy, and 5s. ($1.20 for each subsequent month.

DEMOBILIZATION IN GREAT BRITAIN.

OFFICIAL STATEMENTS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS FROM THE SIGNING OF THE ARMISTICE TO THE PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT NOVEMBER 21, 1918.

[Compiled from the parliamentary debates in the Legislative Reference Division, Library of Congress.]

INFORMATION FOR THE ARMY. NOVEMBER 12.

Mr. MACPHERSON (undersecretary of state for war). I am fully aware of the importance of the diffusion amongst the troops serving abroad of information as to the Government plans for the demobilization of the forces. Arrangements have been made by which full information concerning the method of demobilization will be given to the troops when the situation is suitable. Lectures are already being given at the front dealing with the outlines of the procedure to be adopted.

MARRIED MEN (RELEASE). NOVEMBER 12.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The claims of married men to early release have been recognized, and it has been provided in the scheme of demobilization that, other conditions being equal, married men shall be selected in preference to single men for the drafts for disposal.

COAL SUPPLY (RELEASE OF MINERS). NOVEMBER 12.

Mr. MACPHERSON. In view of the present situation, as many additional miners as possible who are serving at home will be released, and I understand some are being released from France.

LEAVE WITH PAY AND UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS. NOVEMBER 12.

Dr. MACNAMARA (secretary to the admiralty). It may be as well that I should state at once that on demobilization each man will receive at least 28 days' leave with pay and allowances, and that he will be fully insured against unemployment for a period of not less than 20 weeks during the first year.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS. NOVEMBER 12.

Dr. ADDISON (minister of reconstruction). The rates for benefits for both exservice and civil workers are as follows: Adults, 24s. per week for men and 20s. per week for women, with 6s. per week for the first dependent child under 15 and 3c. per week for each succeeding dependent child, so that a man with a wife and one child will get 30s. per week and 3s. for each additional dependent child. The donation will not be payable for the first three days of any continuous period of unemployment. The out-of-work donation payable to partially disabled men in receipt of pensions will be additional to their pensions, and no deductions will be made on account of such pensions.

PLAN OF DEMOBILIZATION. NOVEMBER 12.

Dr. ADDISON. I propose to issue a pamphlet, which is in popular form, but I hope honorable members will not like it any the less for that. It is intended to be read by the general public. It will be posted to every member this evening. The pamphlet sets out the whole scheme of army demobilization, and it is reduced at the end to the form of question and answer. It deals with the navy, the air force, and the army. This matter was gone into at great length by a committee presided over by my honorable friend, the secretary of state for India [Mr. Montagu], appointed by the previous Government, and we have adopted the principle that demobilization must be governed by industrial requirements. It has been a most elaborate piece of work. We have had to have the army classified into trade groups, of which there are 42, and the department at the war office that deals with this side of the question fills me with admiration. Arrangements have been made to mark down, first, what we call the demobilizers. They are the people required to start the demobilizing machinery. That has been done. The next group are what we call pivotal men; and here, again, I have issued a precise statement. You get in practically every work some men around whom the work revolves, and until they are there you can not get the work started. Therefore, the ministry of labor have invited the different trades to specify their pivotal groups, and these are separately catalogued in the army.

The demobilization, whilst the man is with the colors, will be managed with the war office, but the order or priority of demobilization—the arrangement for picking out the pivotal men—is undertaken by the organization at the ministry of labor under Sir Stephenson Kent. The civil side is under that organization, and the army deals with the military side of it. Those are the two organizations which work in common and which deal with the whole arrangements.

In discussing occupation we naturally have to have regard to those occupations the reestablishment of which causes the biggest amount of employment. We naturally put them very high in the scale. Therefore the priority grading of employment is based upon considerations of that kind. It must depend partly upon the time of the year, because grading is different now from what it would be in harvst time. At any rate, these pivotal men represent a group, and they, of course will come back early. But within each group we have regard to the length of service the men have done during the war, whether a man is married, and other considerations of that kind. Another large group of the army which has been separately marked down, and which makes our problem very much easier, is that large group of men for whom there are jobs waiting for them when they come back. I am sure we all recognize that it is a national duty to secure these men the priority of reemployment when they return. I am glad to say, according to information I have received from the minister of labor, that more than 60 per cent of the men in the army are what are called "slip" men; that is to say, men who have jobs awaiting them. So that when a commanding officer receives an order to send back a certain number of men he knows at once which men are the pivotal men and which men have a job awaiting them, and this eases our problem enormously with regard to employment at home. Those have been the governing considerations right through this very elaborate scheme.

The scheme deals with the whole of the Army, whether at home or abroad. The committee considered very carefully the rate of demobilization. That necessarily must depend upon all kinds of military considerations, some of which are obvious, and the maximum rate of demobilization can clearly only be attained after some time, but the general scheme contemplates that the rate of demobilization from the forces at home will be the same compared with the rate of demobilization of the forces overseas. That at first might look as if it gave some advantage to the men at home, but, as a matter of fact, the men at home in the vast majority of cases have seen foreign service; they have been abroad; therefore you can not distinguish in that way, and the scheme contemplates an equal demobilization of the two groups. The machinery by which they are to be demobilized is set out in detail in the pamphlet which I am circulating to honorable Members, therefore I need not trouble the committee with it now. I may say that a man is sent primarily to a place that is called his dispersal station, which is near his home. There he receives a protection certificate, a railway warrant home, a cash payment of his war gratuity, and an out-of-work donation policy, which lasts, in the case of the soldiers, 12 months and covers 26 weeks of unemployment, with benefit at the rate I have mentioned. He will receive the war gratuity. The precise method of the payment of that will be announced shortly. I believe it is likely that it will be paid in four weekly installments. The man will receive 28 days' furlough when he reaches his dispersal station and will then receive pay and ration allowance during that time, and the separation allowance will also continue during that period.

There is another class of demobilized men, before I come to the officers, for whom we have to make special provision. A large number of men joined the Army who had not completed their apprenticeship. It will be, I am sure, a waste of brains and energy if these men, after three or four years' service, have to go back to civil life and find that they have lost their skill. They were practically unskilled workmen, and we must provide some incentive to their completing a short term of apprenticeship which will bring them up to a sufficient standard of skill. Therefore we have worked out this scheme for a system of completion of apprenticeship for men who have been serving in the forces. Again I will circulate the full details, as it is a rather elaborate scheme. It is a rather elaborate scheme, but what it comes to is this—we discussed it with the employers and the workmen's representatives in great detail—the employer is to pay wages to the apprentice during the first 12 months representing not less than seven-twelfths of the current rate of wages, and the State makes them up to the man, so that he gets in the aggregate three-fourths of the wages to which he would have been entitled at that stage of his apprenticeship, and the next year it makes up to a bigger fraction still, namely, five-sixths. That is to say, what we really do, on the basis of the employer affording facilities for an intensive form of apprenticeship, is to make a contribution, in view of the man's age being greater than it otherwise would have been, in order to bring up his wages practically to the standard of what they would have been at that stage of his career. The details are elaborate; therefore I do not give the committee anything but a bare statement.

Now I come to the question of officers. We have dealt with great care with the question of officers, and the committee, under Sir Reginald Brade, spent a great many months working on this business. I am sure the committee will recognize that in respect to a large number of young men of all branches of training who gave up their prospects, who have been in the Army and have become dislocated from their normal employment, we are under a very special heavy responsibility. The Government has accepted the general principle that from the beginning of demobilization and for a year afterwards permanent appointments in the civil service shall be reserved for ex-officers and ex-soldiers. As the rigid application of this rule, however, would exclude certain candidates with special qualification, it is intended that the rule should not apply (a) to the relatively small number of posts requiring special technical qualifications or involving special responsibility, and (b) that it should not apply to a limited number of cases in which men pronounced unfit on grounds of health for general service have been temporarily employed and are specially recom-

mended by the heads of their departments. With those exceptions, by that means we open the civil service to ex-officers and ex-soldiers for 12 months after the war.

The next thing is that a great number of officers and men in various callings have had their professional training interrupted during the war, and it would be equally, as in the case of the skilled mechanic and the apprentice, very unfortunate if we were not to recognize that we have special responsibility with regard to enabling these men to complete their professional or other training. Therefore it is recognized that the further training or education of young ex-officers in various callings, or men not officers, who have interrupted their training in those callings, is a matter in which we have special responsibility, and the war cabinet has agreed to the principles of a scheme whereby, where circumstances require, assistance with respect to fees and maintenance shall be given on the recommendation of the training committee to enable men in those classes to complete their training. The details of the scheme proposed will be announced very shortly.

With regard particularly to a special class of cases in which the one-man business figures very largely, we propose to make provision against that by continuing the civil liabilities department after the termination of the war, so that assistance subsequent to demobilization may be given in accordance with a scheme based upon the existing regulations of the department. That covers assistance with regard to officers and men who are unable, by reason of their undertaking military service, to meet their financial obligations after demobilization and are thereby exposed to serious hardship, and the obligations in respect of which assistance may be granted are those arising in respect of rent, interest, and installments payable in respect of loans, including mortgages, installments payable under agreements for the purchase of business premises, a dwelling house, furniture, and the like, rates and taxes, insurance premiums, and school fees. We will continue the existing scheme for assisting those cases. There it will be within the discretion of the department which deals with the civil liabilities to make a grant, either in the form of a lump sum or by quarterly or other installments; and if in any particular case the department is of opinion that in lieu of assistance in respect of any of the specific obligations mentioned above it is desirable that assistance should be given for the purpose of enabling applicants to purchase stock, trade, or shop fittings, a grant may be given for this purpose.

In connection with reorganization we have to consider another question which has been present to the mind of everyone, and that is the considerable and very right demand that in appropriate cases, where they are capable of making good use of these facilities, the men shall have some right of access to the land. A scheme has been worked out and examined in great detail by a cabinet committee, the details of which will be announced shortly, which will provide facilities for ex-service men of all branches of service for settlement, either on small holdings, allotments, or gardens.

CIVIL POSITIONS (PRIORITY OF RELEASE). NOVEMBER 13.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Provision has been made in the demobilization scheme that those men whose civil positions have been kept open for them shall receive priority of release within their several industrial groups. Instructions will be issued in due course, but no application should be made by employers until public notification is given. While it is not proposed to differentiate between volunteers and conscripts as such, the object aimed at will be achieved by including in early drafts a certain proportion of those men who have served longest in a theater of active operations.

INFORMATION FROM EMPLOYERS. NOVEMBER 13.

Mr. ROBERTS (minister of labor). In order to assist the working of the schemes by which men with definite employment awaiting them can be released early, action in the direction indicated by the honorable and gallant member is being taken. Letters are being issued to employers suggesting that they should prepare particulars of men now with the forces whom they wish to engage immediately upon dispersal. The particulars required will be the men's names, the nature of the employment, and the rate of wages offered, and also, if possible, the unit, regimental number, and home address. It is not desired that these particulars should be supplied to the ministry of labor at present, but employers will be asked in due course to send the particulars to the employment exchanges on special cards which will be supplied.

APPLICATIONS FOR RELEASE. NOVEMBER 14.

Mr. ROBERTS. The civil demobilization and resettlement department of the ministry of labor will be responsible for dealing with applications for the release of men from the forces and for laying down the principles which, subject to the exigencies of the naval and military situation, will regulate the order of release. I promise to deal with both these points in a public announcement.

POLICE. NOVEMBER 14.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Provision has been made in the demobilization scheme for the early release of policemen serving with His Majesty's forces.

PROCEDURE. NOVEMBER 18.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Men will be released from military service in accordance with a general scheme of industrial priority which is being prepared by the ministry of labor. When demobilization begins, dispersal drafts will be formed by officers commanding units strictly in accordance with instructions which have been laid down, wherein the principle of a priority on industrial grounds is combined with that of a limited priority on other grounds, such as marital condition, length of war service, etc.

MEMENTO OF SERVICE. NOVEMBER 19.

Mr. MACPHERSON. It is intended that on demobilization a soldier will retain his uniform (except greatcoat) and kit, and he will therefore keep his cap and badge.

AGRICULTURAL LABOR. NOVEMBER 19.

Mr. MACPHERSON. There are at present over 79,000 men in agricultural companies, and 5,000 plowmen, who are in medical category A, have just been sent out on two months' furlough. All men at home of any medical category who are thrashers are now being obtained from the army. During the harvest 20,000 soldiers were supplied, of whom about 3,000 are still engaged on potato lifting. Any men of low medical category who are experienced farm workers, and are serving at home, are being attached to agricultural companies and made available for agricultural work.

PROFESSIONAL MEN. NOVEMBER 19.

Dr. ADDISON. Arrangements have been made to earmark for early release when general demobilization begins soldiers who have definite offers of employment. The honorable member will appreciate the need for demobilizing first of all those men whose services are essential for the reestablishment of industries which will be able to absorb labor. In regulating the priority of release due weight will be given to the industrial importance of surveyors and valuers.

YOUNG SOLDIERS (EDUCATION). NOVEMBER 20.

Mr. MACPHERSON. It has been arranged that officers and men whose education has been interrupted by military service, and who wish to resume their studies, will be treated on the same basis as those men who have definite employment awaiting them, and they will be granted early release within the period of general dispersal. I am unable to make any statement as to when this release will take effect. * * * What I have tried to arrange is this: There are a great many brilliant young boys in officers' cadet battalions, and I am now most anxious that they should be allowed to attend their examinations at Oxford or Cambridge.

BUILDING TRADES. NOVEMBER 20.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The urgent necessities of the building trades will not be lost sight of in the administration of the scheme of demobilization.

BUSINESS PROPRIETORS. NOVEMBER 20.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The general scheme of demobilization provides that proprietors of one-man businesses who will be able to recommence their business may be released from the Army on the same basis as other men with employment awaiting them.

PIVOTAL MEN. NOVEMBER 21.

Mr. BRIDGEMAN (parliamentary secretary to the ministry of labor). Employers who wish to insure that men serving with the forces who desire to return to their employment are earmarked for early release should obtain from the nearest employment exchange a post card (E. D. 406), enter on it each man's full name, unit, regimental number, and the theater of war or command where he is now serving, and return it to the exchange. These forms (E. D. 406) are also obtainable from employment exchanges throughout Scotland.

FRANCE—BONUS ON DEMOBILIZATION TO SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

Sections 1–7 of the act of March 22, 1919, providing for a demobilization bonus. (Journal officiel, Mar. 29, 1919, p. 3218.)

SEC. 1. Any soldier or sailor now serving or having served, up to and including the grade of captain, being a French citizen, whether called to or retained in active service as a result of the present war or voluntarily enlisted, shall receive a fixed bonus of 250 francs ($48.25), payable on the day of his discharge from active service or immediately upon promulgation of this act if he has already been discharged: *Provided, however,* That he has completed three months of effective service between August 2, 1914, and the date of the signature of the peace treaty.

Men pensioned or discharged for disabilities incurred while with the colors shall be entitled to this bonus irrespective of the length of their effective service.

SEC. 2. There shall be paid, in addition to this bonus, a premium of 15 francs ($2.90) for each month of effective service between August 2, 1914, and the day of the discharge, over and above the period of service required by law in the case of the class to which the interested party belongs.

This premium shall be increased to 20 francs ($3.86) for each month in active duty between August 2, 1914, and November 11, 1918, with a large unit (army corps, division) or a fighting unit under command of generals commanding in chief. For the period subsequent to November 11, 1918, the rate of 20 francs shall be paid only for the months during which the fighting indemnity may have been due.

The following shall be reckoned as effective service: The time spent in hospitals, sick leaves on account of wounds or illness, the time elapsed while awaiting discharge for disability (instance de réforme), the time spent in captivity, and, in general, all the months during which a mobilized soldier or sailor was drawing his pay or would have been entitled to do so under the regulations now in force: *Provided, however,* That in the case of mobilized soldiers or sailors called to the colors ahead of the date for the regular call of their class, the monthly premium for the time served ahead of such date shall be 20 francs ($3.86).

SEC. 3. No mobilized soldiers or sailors of any class shall be entitled to the monthly premiums for such time as they have been receiving both their military pay and the total or partial amount of a pension or salary, when the aggregate amount of the salary or pension and of the military pay shall have exceeded 5,000 francs ($965) per annum, with an allowance of 1,000 francs ($193) per child under 16 years of age.

SEC. 4. Mobilized soldiers and sailors working in factories, those to whom a delay for joining the colors has been granted, and those detached without pay, entitled to the fixed bonus provided for by section 1, who may receive or have already received a discharge indemnity (indemnité de congédiement), shall not be allowed to draw both such indemnity and the fixed bonus of 250 francs ($48.25): *Provided, however,* That they may do so up to the amount of said bonus. They shall not be entitled to the monthly premiums unless they have completed at least 18 months of effective service, as defined in section 2. The amount of the monthly premiums shall always be deducted up to the amount of the discharge indemnity in excess of 250 francs ($48.25).

SEC. 5. The said premium shall be paid by monthly installments of 100 francs ($19.30), the first payment to be made one month after that of the fixed bonus of 250 francs: *Provided, however,* That if the payee accepts payment in one-year national defense bonds the full amount may be paid him immediately.

SEC. 6. Any mobilized soldier or sailor may renounce the fixed bonus and the monthly premiums by giving notice thereof to the mayor of the commune, who shall publicly record the same and shall notify the depot of the interested party of such renunciation.

The party shall be permitted in this case to assign one-third of the amount to which he was entitled to works of charity approved by the Government or by the department.

SEC. 7. The amount of and the rules applicable to the payment of a fixed bonus and of a premium proportional to the length of service with the colors of soldiers or sailors other than French citizens shall be settled by decree.

GERMANY—ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE MINISTER OF WAR CONCERNING DISCHARGE FROM THE ARMY, NOVEMBER 16, 1918.

[From Sämtliche Kriegs-Gesetze, etc., 1919 (IV Ergänzungsheft zu Bd. 5, p. 211.]

Clothing, bonus, and traveling expenses: Every noncommissioned officer and private leaving the army on November 11, 1918, and thereafter shall receive—

(1) Without payment on his part: A suit of clothes, civilian, if possible, otherwise a uniform (which he already possesses).

(2) A war bonus of 50 marks.

(3) A lump sum of 15 marks for traveling expenses (i. e. in so far as he has a right to demand them).

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to speak a few moments in relation to this matter of sales. We stand to gain or lose by the methods adopted. I have nothing to say in relation to the individual who shall conduct the sales. I do not understand that any person is named in the bill to be employed to direct this business. The more money we can get in the hands of the Government the lower the taxation may become. Every dollar that we can save in getting a better price will be so much saved for the National Treasury, and the levy of taxes and loans can be reduced to that extent. Hence the best method should be adopted.

If you leave this matter to be handled by three or four or a dozen different branches of the departments you are likely to have men in charge of these sales who are not familiar with business, perchance an Army officer who was taken when a boy, educated at the expense of the Government, clothed, fed, and housed, and his profession made for him. He has not had an opportunity to learn what it means to earn a dollar. He expects the country to raise the dollar and pay it on his command. He is a commanding officer. That has been drilled into him, and he does not follow the ordinary lines that business men develop. If you have 10 or 12 men in the various branches of the departments you will be liable to dispose of the property for much less than you would if you centralize it and hold some man responsible for it in making the sales. On that proposition I believe the plan of the committee is sound. I have nothing to say in regard to the individuals employed in the matter. We must trust somebody. The Secretary of War is the administrative officer. In these matters he must be held responsible regardless of his politics, regardless of our view of what he has done in other contracts; we must give him the authority which will enable him to realize the largest benefit from the sale of this property. [Applause.]

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman of the committee with reference to this item beginning in line 7, page 25:

And no greater sum than $50 for each deserter or escaped military prisoner—

And so forth.

Mr. KAHN. That has been the law for many years.

Mr. BEE. That is the Federal law—$50?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. BEE. That satisfies that question. I want to state that I am opposed to it. Now I direct the Chair's attention to line 12:

For a donation of $5 to each dishonorably discharged prisoner upon his release from confinement under court-martial sentence involving dishonorable discharge.

Is that the law?

Mr. KAHN. That is the law. These items, I want to say to my friend from Texas, have been carried in the appropriation bill in conformity with the existing law for many years.

Mr. BEE. I just want to say—thanking the chairman—with reference to this $50 in time of peace, that there are syndicates of ex-soldiers whose only business is to go out and apprehend deserters in order to collect that miserable $50. In reference to the $5, it amounts to absolutely nothing for a man dishonorably discharged from the service, confined in prison, who walks out a marked man with his stripes off, to give him $5 to enable him to get home; and the sooner we change that the better off this country will be.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

TRANSPORTATION OF THE ARMY AND ITS SUPPLIES.

For transportation of the Army and its supplies, including transportation of the troops when moving either by land or water, and of their baggage, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps, enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, including the cost of packing and crating; for transportation overseas to the United States of the bodies of officers and enlisted men who died upon foreign soil in the present war; for transportation of recruits and recruiting parties; of applicants for enlistment between recruiting stations and recruiting depots; for travel allowance to officers and enlisted men on discharge; for payment of travel allowance as provided in section 126 of the act approved June 3, 1916, to enlisted men of the National Guard on their discharge from the service of the United States, and to members of the National Guard who have been mustered into the service of the United States, and discharged on account of physical disability; for payment of travel pay to officers of the National Guard on their discharge from the service of the United States, as prescribed in the act approved March 2, 1901; for travel allowance to persons on their discharge from the United States disciplinary barracks or from any place in which they have been held under a sentence of dishonorable discharge and confinement for more than six months, or from the Government Hospital for the Insane after transfer thereto from such barracks or place, to their homes (or elsewhere as they may elect), provided the cost in each case shall not be greater than to the place of last enlistment; of the necessary agents and other employees, including per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence not exceeding $4 for those authorized to receive the per diem allowance; of clothing and equipage and other quartermaster stores from Army depots or places of purchase or delivery to the several posts and Army depots and from those depots to the troops in the field; of horse equipment; of ordnance and ordnance stores, and small arms from the foundries and armories to the arsenals, fortifications, frontier posts, and Army depots; for payment of wharfage, tolls, and ferriages; for transportation of funds of the Army; for the payment of Army transportation lawfully due such land-grant railroads as have not received aid in Government bonds (to be adjusted in accordance with the decisions of the Supreme Court in cases decided under such land-grant acts), but in no case shall more than 50 per cent of full amount of service be paid: *Provided*, That such compensation shall be computed upon the basis of the tariff or lower special rates for like transportation performed for the public at large and shall be accepted as in full for all demands for such service: *Provided further*, That in expending the money appropriated by this act a railroad company which has not received aid in bonds of the United States and which obtained a grant of public land to aid in the construction of its railroad on conditions that such railroad should be a post route and military road, subject to the use of the United States for postal, military, naval, and other Government services, and also subject to such regulations as Congress may impose restricting the charge for such Government transportation, having claims against the United States for transportation of troops and munitions of war and military supplies and property over such aided railroads, shall be paid out of the moneys appropriated by the foregoing provisions only on the basis of such rate for the transportation of such troops and munitions of war and military supplies and property as the Secretary of War shall deem just and reasonable under the foregoing provision, such rate not to exceed 50 per cent of the compensation of such Government transportation as shall at that time be charged to and paid by private parties to any such company for like and similar transportation; and the amount so fixed to be paid shall be accepted as in full for all demands for such service: *And provided further*, That nothing in the preceding provisos shall be construed to prevent the accounting officers of the Government from making full payment to land-grant railroads for transportation of property or persons where the courts of the United States have held that such property or persons do not come within the scope of the deductions provided for in the land-grant acts; for the purchase and hire of draft and pack animals in such numbers as are actually required for the service, including reasonable provision for replacing unserviceable animals; for the purchase, hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of such harness, wagons, carts, drays, other vehicles, and motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles as are required for the transportation of troops and supplies and for official, military, and garrison purposes; for drayage and cartage at the several depots; for the purchase and repair of ships, boats, and other vessels required for the transportation of troops and supplies and for official, military, and garrison purposes; for expenses of sailing public transports and other vessels on the various rivers, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans: *Provided further*, That $225,000 of the appropriation hereby made shall be available for additional pay of employees on harbor boats, quartermaster service, in lieu of subsistence, $242,000,000.

Mr. KAHN. I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 14, strike out "$242,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$235,672,000."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose, while the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] is present, of correcting an error concerning myself in his speech on page 710. In his speech on June 5, on page 710, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], among other things, said:

The gentleman knows that his letter reached the commission on the same day that these printed questionnaires were actually placed in the hands of more than 100,000 clerks.

I desire to read two letters. The first is as follows——

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will permit me to correct a statement affecting myself alone in the RECORD. It will only take a few minutes to read the letters.

Mr. DOWELL. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa withdraws the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. On May 17, 1919, I mailed the following letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 17, 1919.*

Hon. HENRY A. COOPER,
Hon. C. W. HAMLIN,
Hon. EDWARD KEATING,
Commission on Reclassification of Salaries, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: As soon as I noticed the published copy of the questionnaire which you are propounding to employees I discussed with your Mr. Hamlin the other day the question of submitting in a supplemental

questionnaire certain interrogatories that would elicit information concerning which each Member of Congress would doubtless be interested when this subject comes up for consideration.

Mr. Hamlin stated that he would be glad to take up with me for discussion the form of supplemental questionnaire prepared by me, but I presume that pressure of business has prevented him from doing so.

I am inclosing each one of you gentlemen separately a copy of my proposed supplemental questionnaire, and I hope that you will see fit to submit it and require it to be answered by employees.

Very sincerely, yours,

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

In reply to my letter of May 17, I received the following:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMISSION ON RECLASSIFICATION OF SALARIES,
Washington, May 20, 1919.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BLANTON: Thank you very much for yours of the 18th instant. I have just finished reading it, and shall take the earliest opportunity to discuss your valuable suggestions with the other members of the committee. Both your letter and the accompanying blank form for a supplemental questionnaire are very interesting and suggestive.

I shall be pleased at any time to hear from you touching the difficult and important work of the commission.

With personal regards,

Very truly, yours,

HENRY ALLEN COOPER.

Thus the gentleman from Missouri was mistaken when he intimated that my request reached the commission too late for them to use it. I might therefore with propriety in the language of his own quotation, suggest to the distinguished gentleman: "There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamt of in your philosophy."

The Clerk read as follows:

CLOTHING AND CAMP AND GARRISON EQUIPAGE.

For cloth, woolens, materials, and for the purchase and manufacture of clothing for the Army, including enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, for members of the Reserve Training Corps; for issue and for sale at cost price according to the Army regulations; for payment for clothing not drawn due to enlisted men on discharge; for altering and fitting clothing and washing and cleaning when necessary; for equipment and repair of equipment of laundries, dry-cleaning plants, salvage, and sorting storehouses, hat repairing shops, shoe repair shops, clothing repair shops, and garbage reduction works; for equipage, including authorized issues of toilet articles, barbers' and tailors' materials, for use of general prisoners confined at military posts without pay or allowances and applicants for enlistment while held under observation; issue of toilet kits to recruits upon their first enlistment, and issue of housewives to the Army; for expenses of packing and handling, and similar necessaries; for a suit of citizens outer clothing, to cost not exceeding $10, to be issued upon release from confinement to each prisoner who has been confined under a court-martial sentence involving dishonorable discharge; to each enlisted man convicted by civil court for an offense resulting in confinement in a penitentiary or other civil prison; and to each enlisted man ordered interned by reason of the fact that he is an alien enemy, or, for the same reason, discharged without internment; for indemnity to officers and men of the Army for clothing and bedding, and so forth, destroyed since April 22, 1898, by order of medical officers of the Army for sanitary reasons, $25,000,000.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 5, insert after the word "reserve" the word "officers."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 5, strike out "$25,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$18,750,000."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HOCH having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 5312) to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for carrying out the act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

BARRACKS AND QUARTERS, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Continuing the work of providing for the proper shelter and protection of officers and enlisted men of the Army of the United States lawfully on duty in the Philippine Islands, including repairs and payment of rents, the acquisition of title to building sites, and such additions to existing military reservations as may be necessary, and including also shelter for the animals and supplies, and all other buildings necessary for post administration purposes, and for shelter and repair thereof, and rentals for the United States troops in China, $150,000.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. JUUL. There is in line 12 a provision for United States troops in China. I suppose most Members are not familiar with the Chinese situation, and I would like to ask the chairman to state the situation concerning our troops in China?

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, under an international agreement entered into shortly after the close of the Boxer insurrection in China, the various countries whose ministers were surrounded in Peking decided to hold a certain number of their soldiers in China to protect that portion of the city where the legations are situated. I believe, so far as I remember, that we have had about a battalion of troops over there doing that work; a battalion of the old form, about 250 men. We are still keeping the troops there under that international agreement with the other countries of the world. They are all keeping their troops there.

Mr. JUUL. Now, may I ask the chairman what proportion of the $150,000 appropriated in this item does the gentleman think is being expended in maintaining troops in China?

Mr. KAHN. We have to pay rentals for quarters there. The amount is not very great. The War Department several years ago came to the committee and suggested that we construct permanent barracks there for our troops, but the Committee on Military Affairs did not deem it wise to follow that suggestion, and we are still paying rentals.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JUUL. I want to know, Mr. Chairman, why it should be necessary for a Member of this Congress to make a motion or offer an amendment that is absolutely no amendment at all. For instance, the Chair suggested when I asked the question of the chairman of the committee that I moved to strike out the last word. If the Chair will permit, I had no desire whatever to strike out the last word.

It has seemed to me, Mr. Chairman, that every gentleman upon this floor has had an undying grudge against the last word here now for several years. I do not know of any time when they have gotten square with the last word and succeeded in striking it out. But every day the battery of big guns and little guns is directed against this unfortunate last word. I want to ask in good faith of the chairman of this committee why gentleman should move to strike out the last word in order to ask a direct question for information from the chairman of a committee? Why can not we just state what we want to know and not camouflage? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. In order that we may proceed in order there must be something pending that would entitle a man to the floor. Otherwise he would have to ask for unanimous consent in order to ask a gentleman a question.

Mr. JUUL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. He could ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute or five or ten.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to suggest, unanimous consent might be refused.

The CHAIRMAN. It might be refused; but he would have a right to the floor by making the pro forma amendment to strike out the last word.

Mr. JUUL. If the Chair will pardon me, in order to hang up your hat or coat you have to have either a nail or a peg on which to hang it, but to strike out the last word——

The CHAIRMAN. The last word is the peg. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Illinois withdraws his pro forma amendment, and the Clerk will read.

The clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF HOSPITALS.

For construction and repair of hospitals at military posts already established and occupied, including the extra-duty pay of enlisted men employed on the same, and including also all expenditures for construction and repairs required at the Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark., and for the construction and repair of general hospitals and expenses incident thereto, and for additions needed to meet the requirements of increased garrisons, and for temporary hospitals in standing camps and cantonments; for the alteration of permanent buildings at posts for use as hospitals, construction and repairs of temporary hospital buildings at permanent posts, construction and repair of temporary general hospitals, rental or purchase of grounds, and rental and alteration of buildings for use for hospital purposes in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, for use during the existing emergency, including necessary temporary quarters for hospital personnel, outbuildings, heating and laundry apparatus, plumbing, waters and sewers, and electric work, cooking apparatus, and roads and walks for the same, $5,000,000.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. KAHN: Page 35, line 13, strike out the word "waters" and insert the word "water."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

VOCATIONAL TRAINING.

For the employment of the necessary civilian instructors in the most important trades, for the purchase of carpenter's, machinist's, mason's, electrician's, and such other tools and equipment as may be required, including machines used in connection with the trades, for the purchase of material and other supplies necessary for instruction and training purposes and the construction of such buildings needed for vocational training in agriculture for shops, storage, and shelter of machinery as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of section 27 of the act approved June 3, 1916, authorizing, in addition to the military training of soldiers while in the active service, means for securing an opportunity to study and receive instruction upon educational lines of such character as to increase their military efficiency and enable them to return to civil life better equipped for industrial, commercial, and general business occupations, part of this instruction to consist of vocational education either in agriculture or the mechanic arts, $10,500.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I call the attention of the members of the committee to a situation that has arisen in the payment of money, or rather the application of funds, under the provision of the soldiers' rehabilitation bill. I know that every member of the committee will be interested in learning the situation as it is. The rehabilitation bill provides that the eligibility of an applicant to be trained must be passed upon by the War Risk Insurance Bureau. That is the requirement of the law. The War Risk Insurance Bureau has had its work so piled up that all of us recognize it is pretty nearly at a point where it is not functioning. There are 4,000 applicants who have been injured and who desire to use the facilities provided for under the law but that are held up because the War Risk Insurance Bureau has not been able to pass on the cases. I have the figures, that I will ask to place in the RECORD, which give not only those who have made application, but those who are now being examined, which number will probably reach 7,000.

The War Risk Insurance ruling is one interpretation and the Vocational Board ruling is a different one. The War Risk Insurance says that for a disabled soldier to be eligible for reeducation he must be actually receiving the compensation, and in order to determine whether the compensation should be paid it passes upon two items; one is whether the injury was received in the pursuance of the line of duty, so as not to have been willful negligence on the part of the soldier, and the other is the degree of the injuries, so as to ascertain what would be the amount of compensation under the War Risk Insurance Bureau. And, as I said, there are 4,000 soldiers crippled that have made application to the board, whom the board wanted to enter upon the training of, but where it could not do so because they have not been passed upon by the bureau.

This confusion being so apparent, the bureau and the board have joined in a request that the matter be remedied by legislation in an amendment to the rehabilitation bill. That amendment was offefed in the Senate, reported from the Committee on Education and Labor, and was passed by the Senate unanimously. It came over here, was introduced, exactly as it passed the Senate, by myself, and the Committee on Education went over it and unanimously reported it, and it is now on the calendar. And if it is possible to get it before the House soon, so that this emergency can be met, and as has been recommended by Secretary Glass in a letter, which, if it is the pleasure of the committee, I will put in the RECORD, it will be a good thing to do.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will yield.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman be kind enough to tell us just what provision the amendment makes for the examination of these men for entry into the training schools?

Mr. FESS. I will. The amendment makes two modifications of the bill. The first modification is the change of the amount to be received by the soldier while in training. The war-risk insurance law says that it will be either what he is receiving as an enlisted man on the pay roll or his compensation—whichever is the larger. So it put an officer's allowance quite beyond that received by the private soldier.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FESS. The officer, for example, might get $200 a month, while the private would get but $30, but in addition to the $30 he would have his keep and a certain amount of clothing and his board while in the service. But the bureau has ruled that when he passes over into the vocational training the board, the lodging, and so on, stop. So an officer would be supported in training at $200, while the private would get only $30. That was not the intention of the law at all, and therefore the amendment fixes the price generally at $75 per month, in the belief that it costs that much. That is the minimum.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. In both cases?

Mr. FESS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOWELL. Alike to officers and men?

Mr. FESS. Yes. So far as the training goes, there is no desire to discriminate in favor of officer against private.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MADDEN. Before the gentleman yields, I wish he would finish the answer to my question.

Mr. FESS. If the gentleman will wait, I would like to finish the answer to the question of the gentleman from Illionis [Mr. MADDEN]. The other change of the law is that the Federal board, instead of the War Risk Insurance Bureau, will be the judge as to the eligibility of the applicant for the training in the belief that if it was the purpose of Congress when it passed the rehabilitation bill to put it in the power of the Vocational Educational Board to direct the education, that it would also mean that the board could settle whether the person is sufficiently in need of training as to warrant it, and therefore could be safely intrusted with the decision on the eligibility for training.

Mr. MADDEN. And also so situated that they could pass promptly upon the cases?

Mr. FESS. Yes. They could pass at once upon the cases, which under the present situation can not be reached within reasonable time.

Another thing that I think the Members would all be glad to know is that this bill will transfer, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury, the amount that would come out of the Bureau of War Risk in the way of payment of compensation to the Federal board to be applied in support of training. So that if the $6,000,000 that is asked for in the amendment is fully understood, it will be readily observed that it is no addition to the Government's obligation but is simply paying out by one board that which was paid out before by another.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman explain what success is being had in the vocational work at the hospitals?

Mr. FESS. I will be glad if the membership will give me the right to place that statement in the RECORD. It is quite complete as to what work has already been done under the administration of this law. I would rather not take the time now to read it, but if it will be satisfactory I would be glad to be allowed to put it in the RECORD.

Mr. DOWELL. I hope the gentleman will do that.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a statement of the operations of the board under this law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the statement referred to:

I. THE POLICY OF THE BOARD IN ITS INTERPRETATION OF THE INTENT AND SPIRIT OF THE ACT.

1. That the Congress wanted all disabled men to know of their rights and opportunities under the war-risk insurance act and the vocational rehabilitation act.

This means reaching every disabled man with the information.

2. That the Congress wanted every disabled man entitled to training or placement and needing it to have its benefits.

This means the careful consideration of the case of every man applying for the help of the board under the act, in order to determine whether he should have training and what training, or placement and what placement.

3. That the Congress wanted every disabled man needing training or placement, or both, to be reached and helped as rapidly as possible, so that he might be saved from privation and dependency.

This means that the board must maintain a force large enough to establish contacts, as rapidly as possible, both with disabled men before their discharge from the service and with those additional thousands of disabled men discharged from the service previous to the passage of the vocational rehabilitation act.

4. That the Congress wanted the work of vocational rehabilitation for men disabled by the war to be done as well as is humanly possible, so that the hopes of these men that by training they may overcome their handicaps may be realized.

This means that the board must employ competent persons, in temporary positions, to advise, to train, and to assist in placing disabled men in successful employment, and to pay temporary salaries sufficient to attract and hold competent experts in the service of the board.

5. That the Congress desired that the work should be conducted by the board in such a way as to avoid all foolish and unnecessary expenditures, while at the same time providing the very best training possible.

The board has saved the Government millions of dollars in the cost of plant and equipment by using the existing educational facilities of the country instead of attempting to erect or operate Government schools. Moreover, by employing a large force since the signing of the armistice it has, up to May 1, 1919, been able to reach 52,144 disabled men in hospitals, at an approximate cost for this item of $5 per man, while the failure to reach these men at the hospital would have entailed a cost of at least $50 per man, a saving in cost of approximately $2,346,460 through the policy adopted.

6. That the Congress wanted a flexible and generous interpretation of the act instead of a narrow and technical one, so that the need for vocational rehabilitation of every worthy disabled soldier, sailor, or marine should be met.

This means giving the benefit of any doubt to the disabled soldier, sailor, or marine.

7. That at the close of the work the board should be in a position to report to the Congress that it had established contact with every man discharged from the service with a disability of 10 per cent or more, had informed him of his rights and opportunities, and had met the just need for vocational training or placement of all worthy cases.

II. Funds Available for the Work During the Current Fiscal Year (1918–19).

By the vocational rehabilitation act approved June 27, 1918, and supplementary legislation approved February 26, 1919, Congress made a continuing fund of $2,000,000 available for the training and placement of men disabled in the war. In addition $77,025 was received from private sources and deposited in the special fund for vocational rehabilitation authorized by the act, making a total of $2,077,025 received for the uses of the board.

III. Work Accomplished with the Money.

1. Organization set up:

IN FRANCE.

A bureau of information for disabled soldiers was established at Paris, and a field service carried on in cooperation with the American Red Cross established contact with practically every disabled American soldier before his return to this country.

IN THIS COUNTRY.

A vocational rehabilitation division of the board was created with a chief and staff of superintendents and assistants for special phases of the work. In order properly to reach the disabled men in hospitals and in the field 14 district offices were established—at Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Washington, Atlanta, New Orleans, Cincinnati, Chicago, St. Louis, Minneapolis, Denver, San Francisco, Seattle, and Dallas—and representatives of the board stationed at practically all cities of over 100,000 population. The work of registering the cases of disabled men and of advising, training, and placing them is in each district in charge of a district officer with a force of supervisors, clerical assistants, and field agents. The total number of employees of the board on May 1 was 1,142, of which 351 were employed at the central office and 791 by the district offices.

2. Information for the men (publications and publicity):

It was necessary to publish pamphlets and magazine and newspaper articles informing disabled men and their friends, employers, and wage workers, and the public generally concerning the generous provision Congress has made for the vocational rehabilitation of those injured or diseased by the war, and to supply information to disabled men and others as to the requirements and opportunities for desirable employment in many hundreds of professional, agricultural, commercial, and industrial occupations. Since July 1 the board has published and distributed in France, on transports, and to soldiers, sailors, marines, and civilians in this country the following material:

Forms, issues, and quantities printed and distributed.

Forms.	Issues.	Copies printed.
Posters, pictorial and printed	4 designs	45,300
Leaflets, blouse pocket size	8 titles	2,000,009
Monographs and bulletins	41 titles	4,000,000
Monthly periodical, Vocational Summary	12 issues	580,000

GROUPS TO WHICH PUBLICATIONS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED.

Disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines.
Dependents of disabled men.
Teachers of disabled men.
Employers and fellow workmen.
General public.

3. Getting in touch with the men:

IN FRANCE.

Work overseas reported by Federal board agents in France, as of February 15, 1919:

Number of talks in huts and hospital wards	3,456
Number of disabled men reached by these talks	120,646
Number of personal conferences with disabled men	52,968
Number of blanks filled out by men interested in training upon return to United States	18,878

IN THIS COUNTRY.

Work accomplished by district offices in reaching men with information, contact, and help, as of April 26, 1919:

Total number of disabled men of all kinds registered with board	81,741
Average number of new cases registered per day, Mar. 16–Apr. 26	776

4. Advising with disabled men:

IN FRANCE AND ON TRANSPORTS.

The figures for men reached in hospitals in France have already been given above. Substantially all these men were reached again on transports through the publications of the board distributed by morale officers and the American Red Cross.

IN THIS COUNTRY.

In considering the needs of disabled men the board has, through hospital, district office, and field service, surveyed, through conference, advice, recommendation as to disposal of case, and the preparation of papers for compensation training and placement the following cases:

Total number of cases surveyed to Apr. 26	52,367
Average number of new cases surveyed per day, Mar. 16–Apr. 26	611
Estimated number of cases yet to be surveyed	60,000
Total problem of survey (estimated)	112,367

5. Deciding each man's case:

Volume of daily business.

Average daily number of cases recommended for training by districts to central office during April	117
Average daily number of notices of men placed in training	33
Average daily notices from Bureau of War Risk Insurance as to new claims filed for compensation	1,172
Average daily number of daily letters from men and friends	200
Average daily number of applications for compensation filed by board with bureau	254
Average daily notices of discharge of disabled men from the War Department to the Federal board	400
Total daily number of communications about disabled men received at central office	2,175

THE WORK OF THE CASE BOARDS.

In each district office a case board, consisting of the district officer, a medical officer, an employer, and a representative of labor, pass upon the request of the disabled man and the recommendation of the vocational adviser of the board who surveyed his case, as to whether he should have training and what training. The recommendation of the district case board is sent to Washington, where it is approved or disapproved by the central office case board. Up to April 26 the following work had been done:

Number of cases recommended by district case board for training	7,504
Number of cases disapproved by district case board	213
Number of new cases per day recommended by district case boards (March and April)	86
Number of cases approved by central office case board	4,106
Number of cases pending approval in central office and awaiting action on compensation by the War Risk Insurance Bureau	3,398

6. Training the disabled man:

THE SIZE OF THE PROBLEM.

As it is impossible to state this in exact figures, estimates are made on the basis of known facts and the experience of the board up to this time.

Known facts.

1. Number of cases recommended for training by district case boards	7,504
2. Number of cases disabled men approved for training by central office, including Apr. 26	4,106
3. Number disapproved or pending at central office waiting decision War Risk Insurance Bureau	3,498
4. Average daily number of new cases recommended for training by district case boards (April)	117
5. Average monthly number of new cases recommended for training by district case boards	3,351
6. Number put in training, including Apr. 26	2,079
7. Number Mar. 16 to Apr. 26	884
8. Average daily number of new cases put in training (April)	32
9. Number put in training in May at present rate	960
10. Number in training June 1	3,039
11. Number in training July 1 (at present rate, which is rising daily)	4,000
12. Canada, with 40 per cent loss total casualties, had approved for training	13,541
13. At this same rate, under our more liberal law the number to be trained in the United States	18,957
(Or, in round numbers, 19,000 men.)	

United States casualties.

1. Number of wounded soldiers and marines (from General Staff reports)	204,743
2. Estimated number of disabilities from disease	100,000
3. Total disabilities	304,743
4. Estimating 6 per cent of these to need training gives approximately 19,000 men	18,264

7. Institutions used for training and teachers:

The main work of training is being done with the facilities of regular institutions in regular or special classes. On March 15 the class of institutions providing training for disabled men was as follows:

Commercial schools	72
Agricultural schools	83
Industrial schools	89
State universities	28
Universities other than State	46
Normal schools	4
Grammar schools	1
Secondary schools	13
Special schools	6
Hospitals	3
Shops and companies	16
Tutors	2
Total	363

On May 15 the number of workshops and other industrial establishments where 126 men were being trained had been increased to 79.

Since March 15 the board has established a total of 30 receiving stations or schools, where nearly 300 men are in training as cases under investigation to test their possibilities, overcome illiteracy, and give preliminary training.

In addition the board is operating for the Navy a scheme of curative workshops and trade training at the navy yards and hospitals at Norfolk and Charleston, and is establishing other centers at Portsmouth,

Chelsea, League Island (Philadelphia), and Mare Island (San Francisco). It has also installed a scheme of preliminary training for discharged tuberculous men in sanatoria at Sanatorium, N. C.; Rutland, Mass.; El Paso, Tex.; and Albuquerque, N. Mex., where such men have been placed for treatment by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

8. Placing the disabled man:

The law requires the board to assist disabled men to find employment who do not need or want training, and also to place those who have taken training. Each case is a separate problem. Often placement is made to test whether the man needs training. Difficulties arise because of the prejudice against the employment of handicapped persons. In some States the provisions of the compensation laws make the employment of disabled men a serious step for employers. In placing the handicapped soldier as a temporary ward of the Government the agents of the board must protect him from exploitation hazards and unhygienic surroundings. This requires a great deal of attention to each case. In discharging this task the board is cooperating with all national, State, and local agencies, public and private, concerned with employment and social problems. Much advice has been given to men with slight disabilities not placed by us. Others have been assisted in applications for compensation and pay troubles. In all, the amount of correspondence and personal contact for each case is very large and can not be represented by mere figures.

1. Number placed by board to Apr. 26	1,455
2. Number of cases followed up and reported upon by agents, but self-placed	3,985
3. Total cases of disabled men reached with Employment Service	5,440
4. Average daily rate of placement of disabled men by board (April)	48
5. Number of placements for May at this rate (these rates are increasing daily)	1,440
6. Total placement to June 1	2,895
7. Per cent of total disabilities which are practically placement rather than training cases	90
8. Total number of disabilities—estimated	304,000
9. Number of potential placement cases which the board is charged by law with handling, if requested	273,600
10. Estimated number self-placed without help of board	246,240
11. Estimated number to be assisted to employment by board	27,360

IV. WHAT HAS BEEN DONE WITH THE MONEY (FISCAL YEAR 1918–19).

1. Total amount available since June 27, 1918	$2,077,025.00
2. Amount expended to May 1, 1919	1,030,351.91
Salaries of employees, including instructors and supervisors of training and placement	620,464.00
Travel and subsistence—employees	64,452.02
Printing and stationery	48,996.78
Rent, repair, and equipment	31,505.12
Supplies and equipment	67,863.24
Communication	3,168.03
Miscellaneous and emergency	23,078.08
Tuition	4,153.47
Travel and subsistence (disabled men)	99,734.38
Special fund for vocational rehabilitation	66,936.79
Total	1,030,351.91
3. Unexpended balance May 1, 1919	1,046,673.09
4. Expenditures for April	291,586.90
5. Expenditures for May and June at this rate, but rate is increasing now because of greater number of cases handled and increase each month of about 1,000 new men in training	583,173.80

V. FUNDS NEEDED FOR VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION—AN ESTIMATE FOR 1919–20.

It is difficult to make anything but the most approximate estimate of the cost in money per man for training or placement, as no two cases are alike, and even in countries which have been carrying on this work for a much longer period than the United States definite costs statistics are not yet available.

A prominent official of the department of soldiers' civil reestablishment, of Canada, estimates that the total cost of training and subsistence per man averages there about $1,000, but it must be remembered that in Canada the civilian department assumes the whole cost of subsisting the man and his dependents, his pension being suspended during the period of his training.

The figures will be lower, so far as the budget of the Federal board is concerned, since the Bureau of War Risk Insurance pays each man in training at least $30 per month to the single man, with considerable additions if he has dependents, leaving the board to pay the difference between that amount and what is deemed necessary to support him while he is training. On the other hand the length of course of instruction in Canada is somewhat shorter than with us, thus tending to increase American cost over those of Canada. The greatest difficulty is to figure either the total numbers to be trained or the number in training at any given time.

1. Comparative amounts received by discharged disabled soldiers in training, United States and Canada, single man, private:

	United States.	Canada.
a. Post discharged bonus	60	600
b. Monthly compensation allowance, temporary total disability, or pay as of last month of active service	30	.....
c. Monthly supplementary support while in training	45	60
Paid $100 per month for six months.		
d. Total received during training (Canada, 8½ months; United States, 10 months)	810	1,110
e. Clothing allowance	.....	35
f. Total allowance	810	1,145
g. Average per month per man in training	81	135

2. Cost of training per man to the Federal board budget:

a. Supplementary allowance for subsistence per month for each man (on the average)	$40.00
b. Average monthly tuition cost	10.00
c. Average cost of travel per man ($50 in all), $5 per month (estimated)	5.00
d. Average cost of medical care, appliances, and other aid ($30 per man, $3 per month, estimated)	$3.00
e. Average monthly cost of administration and supervision, including travel	7.50
f. Total monthly cost	65.50
g. Total cost for course of training per man (10 months)	655.00

3. Cost of placement per man to the Federal board budget:

a. Cost of field service and administration and supervision per man placed, exclusive of preliminary contact, surveys, and advisement (estimated)	$25.00

4. Cost of surveys per man to the Federal board budget:

a. Cost of actual service in the hospitals, per man (estimated)	5.00
b. Cost of administration and supervision, including case board, medical advice, clerical service, and travel (estimated)	5.00
c. Total cost of surveys per man (estimated)	10.00

5. Total cost of work to be done (estimated):

a. 19,000 men trained for 10 months each, at average cost of $655	12,445,000
b. 27,360 men to be placed in employment, at $20 each	547,200
c. 60,000 additional men yet to be surveyed, at cost of $10 per man	600,000
d. Total cost of work from June 27, 1918	13,592,200
e. Amount expended during current year on present continuing appropriation (see sec. 4 above)	1,677,025
f. Estimated amount necessary to complete the work assigned by the act	11,915,175
g. Balance of continuing appropriation available for 1919–20 (see sec. 4 above)	[1] 400,000
h. Total additional appropriations necessary to complete the work	11,515,175
i. Total length of time to practically complete job from July 1, 1919—3 years.	
j. Average cost per year	3,838,391

k. Estimated appropriation necessary by years:

	Balance available.	Total amount needed.	Appropriation necessary.
1919–20	$400,000	$6,400,000	$8,000,000
1920–21	.....	3,600,000	3,600,000
1921–22	.....	1,515,175	1,515,175

6. Estimated expenditures for 1919–20:

a. Surveying practically all additional cases—60,000 men at $10 each	$600,000
b. Placing 15,000 men in employment, at $20 each	300,000
c. Cost of training average of 7,000 men continuously, at $65.50 per month, or 12 months, $780	5,502,000
d. Total cost of work for 1919–20	6,402,000
e. Balance on hand of current continuing appropriation on July 1, 1919	400,000
f. Appropriation needed	6,002,000

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman promised to yield to me.

Mr. FESS. Yes; I yield to my friend.

Mr. JUUL. I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio if it is a fact, for instance, that an officer in the United States Army, not the Regular Army, who has lost a leg, is granted a compensation amounting to between $7 and $8 a month when he is retired, whereas an officer of the Regular Army, meaning a West Point graduate, will be granted from half to two-thirds pay? Will the gentleman tell what is the situation?

Mr. FESS. I am not informed on that.

Mr. JUUL. The information that the gentleman proposes to give will not cover that point?

Mr. FESS. I think not. That has not been called to my attention at all.

May I ask the committee to have a sympathetic respect for this emergency bill and assist me in getting it before the House as soon as possible? There are 4,000 already on the list waiting, and they claim there are 3,000 additional to be examined, and I think we ought, in the spirit of the law originally passed, to make this effective just as soon as possilbe. I have not urged it heretofore on account of these other appropriation bills.

In order that a better understanding of the situation may be had by the members, I herein append a statement of the vocational director handed me a few days ago:

STATEMENT BY C. A. PROSSER, DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

The Treasury Department and the Federal Board for Vocational Education join earnestly in the request that this bill be reported favorably by the committee and passed at the earliest possible moment. The board asks for the relief given by the bill for these reasons:

[1] The rapid increase in the number of soldiers to be trained and the volume of the work for the months of April, May, and June make it certain that all of this money will be necessary to meet the increasing expenditures of the board for the travel and subsistence of disabled men and administrative costs by July 1, 1919.

I.

In its present form section 2 of the vocational rehabilitation law has been interpreted by the board and the bureau so differently that the law can not be properly and promptly administered for the benefit of disabled men needing immediate training.

1. As set forth in section 2 of the law, a disabled man must meet three conditions in order to be eligible to its benefits: (1) He must have been disabled under circumstances entitling him to compensation under the war-risk insurance act. (2) Vocational training must be necessary to overcome the handicap of his disability. (3) Finally, vocational training must be feasible.

In entire good faith the bureau has, in the discharge of its duty and responsibility, so interpreted the first of these conditions as to practically take out of the hands of the board the administration of the law and make it impossible for the board properly to discharge the duties imposed upon it by the Congress.

The bureau has interpreted the condition that the disabled man must have been disabled under circumstances entitling him to compensation under the war-risk insurance to mean not only that the circumstances under which he was injured or diseased must be such as to make him eligible for compensation, but also that he must, at the time he is placed in training by the board, actually be in receipt of compensation from the bureau.

On the other hand, the Federal board has taken the position that disabled under circumstances entitling him to compensation means only that the circumstances under which the disability was incurred must be such as to make the disabled man entitled to consideration for compensation whether he ever applies for such compensation, ever receives it, or, once receiving it, has it later withdrawn for any reason by the bureau.

In determining the compensability of a disabled man, the bureau passes upon two questions: The first is, Were the circumstances under which the disability was incurred such as to make the man eligible for compensation? This involves all such matters as whether the disability was incurred while in line of duty in active service, and whether the injury or disease was due to his own willful misconduct. The second question, entirely separate and apart from the question of the circumstances under which the disability was incurred, is that of whether the disabled man is entitled to compensation, and what compensation, because of his disability. This involves all such matters as whether the disability is temporary or permanent; whether it is large or small; and possibly the extent to which the disability constitutes a handicap to the man in the light of all the factors in his individual case.

By its interpretation of section 2 of the vocational rehabilitation law the bureau has, in effect, added to the condition that the circumstances under which the disability was incurred must be such as to entitle the man to consideration for compensation by the bureau the further condition that the man is not eligible for training by the board until the disability itself has been passed upon as compensable by the bureau, under the rules, regulations, policies, and procedure established for the purpose.

This same section 2 provides that when a disabled man has been placed in training by the Federal board, the bureau shall suspend all payments to him under the war-risk insurance act and pay to him under the vocational rehabilitation act a monthly amount equal to his monthly pay for the last month of his active service, or an amount equal to the compensation to which he would otherwise be entitled as compensation under the war-risk insurance act, whichever amount is the greater. A subsequent section (sec. 8) of the vocational rehabilitation act authorizes the Federal board to make such a supplementary allowance to the man as is necessary properly to provide for his support while in training.

Inasmuch as the bureau, acting in good faith in the light of its interpretation of section 2, will not pay any money to a disabled soldier placed in training by the board, unless he was actually in receipt of compensation by the bureau, it has been necessary for the board to submit to the policy of the bureau until such time as relief from an impossible situation could be secured from the Congress.

The board believed, and still believes, that when the board has, as the administrative agency designated by Congress for providing vocational reeducatien for a disabled man, satisfied itself that the circumstances under which the disability was incurred are such as to make him eligible for consideration for compensation by the bureau, and has, in the exercise of the discretion authorized by the law, determined that the disabled man needs training to overcome his handicap and that the training prescribed can be given successfully, the board has the legal right and duty to place the man in training, and it becomes the duty of the bureau to pay him while in training the monthly pay provided in section 2 of the act. No other plan can do prompt justice by the men handicapped by injury or disease incurred in the war.

In order, however, to reach and help as many disabled men as possible under these difficult circumstances, the Federal board conformed to the requirements of the bureau, and up to May 10 submitted for the determination of the bureau as to compensability the applications for compensation of 26,814 disabled men, who were assisted in preparing their cases by the district offices of the board, this number being over and above a much larger number of applications filed by disabled men themselves directly with the bureau. Of these applications filed by disabled men through the Federal board 8,622 were the cases of men already surveyed by our district officers and recommended by our district case boards to the central office for training. More than 4,000 of these cases have not as yet been adjudicated by the bureau, and therefore can not safely be put into training by the board until it knows whether they would receive any pay from the bureau under its interpretation of the act.

With the passage of this proposed bill, amending section 2, the board could immediately proceed with the training of these men, most of whom are so handicapped that they can not work successfully without reeducation and can not undertake employment now without grave danger of further serious physical or mental injury. This, of course, takes no account of the further fact that the new cases of disabled men recommended for training by our district officers are pouring into the central office at the rate of more than 100 per day, so that every day the situation grows worse.

II.

The change in section 2 of the vocational rehabilitation act proposed by this bill is as necessary for the relief of the War Risk Insurance Bureau as for the Federal Board for Vocational Education. Hence the joint request for its enactment.

1. The Federal board recognizes fully that the bureau is dealing with a very difficult problem in the administration of the provisions of the war-risk insurance act regulating the award of compensation to disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines. Personally I believe that nothing short of a practical revision of that act at the earliest possible moment will either give to those disabled by the war the prompt and just compensation to which they are entitled and which the Congress intended they should receive or make the act a law capable of consistent and successful administration.

In determining a man's compensation for disability the bureau must investigate many questions that sometimes require months to settle. The Federal board is charged with the duty of rendering for a temporary period a service which a disabled man should have at once if he is to be properly rehabilitated. The bureau is charged, on the other hand, with determining for what in many cases will be the permanent period of a man's expectancy of life, the question as to whether he should have compensation, and what that compensation should be in his individual case. These questions involve such factors as the nature, character, and extent of his disability, his marital relations, the number, age, and relationship of his dependents, his income before the war, his present earnings, and many other such questions. These often require many papers, many affidavits, many investigations, and extensive correspondence with many persons over widely scattered territory.

In the meantime, those disabled men whom the board wishes to put into training at once must wait often for many weary months, while their compensation status is being determined, before the board can proceed with their schooling. Handicapped so they either can not work at all or can work only for small wage, at grave risk to their health or mentality, their condition is a sad one, and their spirit of disappointment and justifiable discontent one which none of us can view without sympathy and alarm.

2. By the adoption of the proposed amendment to section 2 both bureau and board would secure immediate relief from the present complex and confused situation. The board would at once provide vocational rehabilitation for more than 4,000 handicapped men, who have been waiting months for his help, and handle promptly all new cases of men needing training, of whom there will be, in my opinion, about 10,000. The bureau would at once be relieved of any further responsibility under the vocational rehabilitation act and could proceed, without pressure, confusion, or controversy with the Federal board, to determine the compensability of this large group of disabled men pursuing courses under the Federal board, and therefore provided with proper support for themselves and their dependents while going to school.

When compensation has been awarded to such men in training, the bureau would, under the proposed amendment to section 2, be relieved of the making of payments for compensation to more than 95 out of 100 of them during their period of training, as the support provided by the board would be larger than their compensation, and therefore in lieu of all compensation while they are going to school. This would leave the bureau, under the amendment, to make payments to only those men in training (less than 5 of every 100) whose compensation was in excess of the amount received for support from the board.

III.

The appropriation of money provided in the proposed bill amending section 2 of the vocational rehabilitation law involves no additional expenditure of money, but only the payment by the board, to the disabled man in training, of the total amount which he received under the present law by separate checks from board and bureau.

1. Under the present law, for example, the disabled man without dependents receives, while in training, a total of $75 per month for his support. The bureau pays him an amount which in no case can be less than either his last monthly pay while in the service or his compensation, whichever is the greater. The board pays the remaining sum necessary to give him the $75 guaranteed for his support. By the proposed amendment payments from the bureau would be suspended during the period of training and the man paid the total of $75 by the board. This would make no difference in the total amount now received by the man, and therefore no difference in the expenditures by the Government on him.

2. At the present time the board has placed in training about 3,200 men, whose average period of instruction is 10 months. More than 4,000 additional cases are now awaiting the award of compensation before being given courses of instruction, and the new cases recommended by the districts for training are coming in at the rate of about 500 per week. It is estimated that the average number of men in training during the fiscal year 1919–20 will be 7,000. At the rate of $75 per months the support of these men will require $525,000 per month, or $6,300,000 for the year. Hence the request for the appropriation to carry out section 2 as amended.

The amendment proposed is as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5225) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, be hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. That every person enlisted, enrolled, drafted, inducted, or appointed in the military or naval forces of the United States, including members of training camps authorized by law, who, since April 7, 1917, has resigned or has been discharged or furloughed therefrom under honorable conditions, having a disability incurred, increased, or aggravated while a member of such forces, or later developing a disability traceable in the opinion of the board to service with such forces, and who, in the opinion of the Federal Board for Vocational Education is in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of such disability, shall be furnished by the said board, where vocational rehabilitation is feasible, such course of vocational rehabilitation as the board shall prescribe and provide.

"The board shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to furnish the persons included in this section suitable courses of vocational rehabilitation, to be prescribed and provided by the board; and every person electing to follow such a course of vocational rehabilitation shall, while following the same, be paid monthly by the said board from the appropriation hereinafter provided such sum as in the judgment of the said board is necessary for his maintenance and support and for the maintenance and support of persons depending upon him, if any: *Provided, however*, That in no event shall the sum so paid such person while pursuing such course be more than $75 per month for a

single man without dependents, or for a man with dependents $75 per month plus the several sums prescribed as family allowances under section 204 of article 2 of the war-risk insurance act.

"No compensation under article 3 of the act entitled 'An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department,"' approved October 6, 1917, shall be paid for the period during which any such person is being furnished by said board a course of vocational rehabilitation and support as herein authorized: *Provided, however*, That in the event any person pursuing a course of vocational rehabilitation is entitled under said article 3 to compensation in an amount in excess of the payments made to him by the said board for his support and the support of his dependents, if any, the Bureau of War Risk Insurance shall pay monthly to such person such additional amount as may be necessary to equal the total compensation due under said article 3 of said act.

"There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, available immediately and until expended, the sum of $6,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be used by the Federal Board for Vocational Education for the purpose of making the payments prescribed by this section and for defraying the administrative expenses incident thereto."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask that the gentleman's time be extended half a minute in order to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Ohio be extended half a minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOCHT. I do not want to delay the committee, but I wanted to ask the gentleman what information he could give with respect to American soldiers who are now attending colleges in England? For instance, I had a letter recently from a young man, a soldier, who is on his way back from France, and in that letter he recited the story of how he is attending school there, presumably at the expense of the Government. Is that at our expense, and if so, now that the war is over, why do they not return to the United States and attend some school or university here?

Mr. FESS. We have what may be accounted one of the greatest universities in the world in Europe under American management, in which our soldiers are pupils.

Mr. FOCHT. Is that in England?

Mr. FESS. It is at Beaune.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the procurement and supply as provided in section 56 of the act of Congress approved June 3, 1916, of such tentage and equipment, including the transporting of same, as the Secretary of War shall deem necessary for proper military training to schools and colleges other than those provided for in section 47 of the act above referred to, $100.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask what military schools and colleges we have in the United States equal to that at Champaign, Ill., and whether the United States Government contributes to military education?

Mr. KAHN. This item does not cover the West Point Military Academy, which after all is the only military academy which we have. But there are several laws which provide for military training in various schools and colleges throughout the country. The Morrill Act, which was passed in the early sixties, gave certain colleges and universities in the various States certain areas of land provided they gave military instruction and also established a college of agriculture. I think there is such a university at present in every State in the Union. In addition to that the national defense act, which was approved, as the gentleman knows, on June 3, 1916, contained a proviso that various schools and colleges throughout the country can apply to the Secretary of War for equipment and, during certain periods of the year, give their students military training at encampments during vacations. Those schools and colleges also receive for their students ammunition and small arms—rifles. This year there is no intention to have this outdoor training, and therefore the item in the bill is carried just to keep the item alive. The appropriation is only nominal. It is $100. It is provided for under the national defense act, and possibly on some other occasion, if we do not provide this nominal appropriation in this bill, some Member of the House may make a point of order and have it stricken from the bill.

Mr. JUUL. If the gentleman will pardon me, from line 6 to line 12, on page 39, you propose to expend a total of $100 upon these colleges outside of West Point. Where do these colleges get the money?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. KAHN. If the camps were to be held this year the amount would be largely in excess of the amount carried in the bill, and naturally that money would be expended for these maneuvers and this training. But as the camps are not to be held, it was deemed advisable just to make a nominal appropriation.

Mr. JUUL. Just to keep the paragraph in the bill?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. FESS. The colleges and universities are glad to have this instruction given and regard it as very important to the students because it is such an advantage to the esprit de corps of the students.

Mr. KAHN. And the Government details some officer of the Regular Army to give the necessary instruction and training.

Mr. McKENZIE and Mr. McKEOWN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE], a member of the committee, will be recognized first.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I want to take two or three minutes to say that if my colleague [Mr. JUUL] will consult the hearings he will find, on pages 228 and 229, a list of these colleges and schools where they have a training corps. And I want to say further, for the information of the members of the committee, that the wisdom of some of the provisions of the national defense act is fully exemplified by a statement which I want to read. An officer, Maj. Lewis, testified before our committee that there were practically 100,000 young men taking training in this country as officers in our Military Establishment. I asked him the following questions:

Mr. McKENZIE. Do I understand you to say we have practically 100,000 young men taking training as officers?
Maj. LEWIS. Yes, sir.
Mr. McKENZIE. In this country?
Maj. LEWIS. Yes, sir.
Mr. McKENZIE. One hundred thousand?
Maj. LEWIS. The exact figures are 99,695 at present.
Mr. ANTHONY. You include in this training students from the high schools where they have military organizations?
Maj. LEWIS. Yes, sir.

Then further down on the page I asked him—

Are you sufficiently familiar with the work in these schools and colleges to be able to say whether they get such training as to be of real value to a military man?

Maj. LEWIS. He does in the advanced course. When he has completed four years he has received as much training as a lieutenant in the Reserve Corps; in other words, he is fitted for a second lieutenant in the Reserve Corps.

Mr. McKENZIE. Has he such qualifications that you would consider he was a man fitted to take charge of a company of men, such as a battalion or squad?

Maj. LEWIS. His qualifications are such he could take care of a platoon of men, a platoon of Infantry; he has the training and education in general to do that.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I think it is a matter of congratulation, and it ought to be a matter of some satisfaction to the people of this country, that while we have no great military system, we have 100,000 of our young men in the schools and colleges of our country who are taking such useful military training as will enable them to take part in any future war we may have. [Applause.]

Mr. McKEOWN. I move to strike out the last two words. I should like to ask a question for information. I want to inquire as to the training of veterinary surgeons, whether there is to be a school established to train veterinarians for the Army? I have heard considerable complaint about that matter, and I wanted to inquire if there was anything in the bill about that.

Mr. KAHN. There is no item in the bill that I can recall which provides for such a school, but, of course, that would be a matter for the War Department. They would probably ask for an appropriation if they contemplated organizing such a school. So far as I recall, there was no such request made of the committee.

Mr. McKEOWN. I notice an item of $350,000 under the head of pay of officers on page 16, line 19, for the pay of reserve veterinarians.

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. I was not here yesterday afternoon at the time that item was considered. That is my reason for asking a question about it now.

Mr. KAHN. There are a great many reserve veterinarians in the department at this time who are doing a very useful work.

Of course, the Veterinary Corps in the Regular Army is comparatively small. During the war, when we had several hundred thousand animals, it became necessary to have a large number of veterinarians, in addition to the force in our Regular Army, and they were all put into what they call the veterinarian's reserve. They were doing a very useful work in Europe, as well as in this country.

In Europe many of our horses were stricken with mange and lice. I found in the occupied territory especially that large numbers of our animals were suffering from these diseases. Every horse and mule had to be given careful treatment, and was being given careful treatment. I assume that it will be necessary for the Army to continue the services of a fairly large number of reserve veterinarians during the coming fiscal year to take care of our animals.

Mr. McKEOWN. The complaint that came to me was that graduates of such schools as McKellops of Chicago and other well-established schools were not given any recognition in that arm of the service.

Mr. KAHN. I had the matter up with the department some years ago about graduates from veterinary colleges, and at that time it was the policy of the department to give the graduates of recognized schools of that kind every facility to go into the Army.

Mr. McKEOWN. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. BEE. I move to strike out the last word. I listened to the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] with reference to 100,000 young men taking military training in colleges. I want to ask him if those colleges he speaks of are the public schools in this country or are land-grant institutions?

Mr. McKENZIE. The land-grant colleges are included, though, as a matter of fact, before we passed the national defense act they were compelled in those colleges to give a certain amount of military training.

Mr. BEE. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. McKENZIE. But in the national defense act we made provision so that the War Department could recognize other schools, providing they would comply with the regulations laid down by the War Department, and whenever they did comply with the regulations of the War Department, then under the national defense act the War Department was authorized to detail officers to those schools as instructors.

Mr. BEE. Then, as I understand it, it is not only the land-grant colleges but the private schools which have complied with the War Department regulations.

Mr. McKENZIE. Under the national defense act it is provided that any school having 100 male students over the age of 16 years may have an Army officer detailed as an instructor.

Mr. BEE. And there is where the 100,000 young men are found?

Mr. McKENZIE. That is it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Is the 100,000 in addition to those in the land-grant colleges?

Mr. McKENZIE. No; in all.

Mr. DOWELL. I wish to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question.

Mr. McKENZIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman from Illinois advise the committee what is the military status of these boys who take this course in these colleges? What relation do they have to the Army?

Mr. McKENZIE. They have no connection with the Army, but in case of a war like the one we have just passed through, when the War Department calls for men and officers, these young men would have the qualifications that would enable them to be commissioned in the Reserve Corps of the United States.

Mr. DOWELL. But they have no relation whatever to the Army, except that they receive the training by an Army officer?

Mr. McKENZIE. That is it. They have the qualifications.

Mr. DOWELL. The War Department furnishes the instruction to these institutions?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. And they are under regular military drill and training?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL DEPARTMENT.

For the manufacture and purchase of medical and hospital supplies, including disinfectants for military posts, camps, hospitals, hospital ships, and transports, for laundry work for enlisted men and Army nurses while patients in a hospital, and supplies required for mosquito destruction in and about military posts in the Canal Zone, $5,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, select types and makes of motor ambulances for the Army and authorize their purchase without regard to the laws prescribing advertisement for proposals for supplies and materials for the Army; for the purchase of veterinary supplies and hire of veterinary surgeons; for expenses of medical supply depots; for medical care and treatment not otherwise provided for, including care and subsistence in private hospitals, of officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Army, of applicants for enlistment, and of prisoners of war and other persons in the military custody or confinement, when entitled thereto by law, regulation, or contract: *Provided further*, That this shall not apply to officers and enlisted men who are treated in private hospitals or by civilian physicians while on furlough; for the proper care and treatment of epidemic and contagious diseases in the Army or at military posts or stations, including measures to prevent the spread thereof, and the payment of reasonable damages not otherwise provided for, for bedding and clothing injured or destroyed in such prevention; for the pay of male and female nurses, not including the Nurse Corps (female), and of cooks and other civilians employed for the proper care of sick officers and soldiers, under such regulations fixing their number, qualifications, assignments, pay, and allowances as shall have been or shall be prescribed by the Secretary of War; for the pay of civilian physicians employed to examine physically applicants for enlistment and enlisted men; and to render other professional services from time to time under proper authority; for the pay of other employees of the Medical Department; for the payment of express companies and local transfers employed directly by the Medical Department for the transportation of medical and hospital supplies, including bidders' samples and water for analysis; for supplies for use in teaching the art of cooking to the enlisted force of the Medical Department; for the supply of the Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark.; for advertising, printing, binding, laundry, and all other necessary miscellaneous expenses of the Medical Department.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 40, line 8, after the words "Canal Zone," strike out "$5,000,000," and on page 41, line 19, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the sum of "$4,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, on page 40, line 11, by striking out the word "without" and adding the word "having."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HULINGS: Page 40, line 11, strike out the word "without" and insert in lieu thereof the word "having."

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, unless there is some special reason why the Secretary of War in this particular should have the right to purchase without regard to the law prescribing advertisements for proposals to furnish supplies, I think this amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, this language has been in the bill for a great many years. There are times when supplies—for instance, medical supplies—should be obtained immediately.

Mr. HULINGS. This is not for medical supplies; it is for motor ambulances.

Mr. KAHN. I remember that we had that up in the committee recently, probably within the last year or two. There were to be various makes of ambulances, and the gentleman's colleague [Mr. CRAGO] is fully familiar with the matter. I will ask him to explain it.

Mr. CRAGO. The explanation is that they are experimenting with different types of ambulances, and in order to get them built and furnished they could not be advertised for and bought in the usual way of purchasing anything of that kind. It is for the purpose of developing a satisfactory type that they had this language put in the bill.

Mr. HULINGS. It occurs to me that we have gone a long way in the direction of giving various officials unlimited authority to do what they like. It has seemed to be necessary in times gone by that that right should be limited by requiring a regard for the laws prescribing advertisements for proposals, and I see no reason why, if we are going to buy motor ambulances, there should not be the same advertisement for bids.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For care, maintenance, and treatment at asylums in Porto Rico of insane soldiers of the Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry, $100.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee if this is another case of trying to keep the paragraph in the bill?

Mr. KAHN. No.

Mr. JUUL. I notice that in lines 19, 20, and 21 you appropriate $100 for insane soldiers of the Porto Rico regiment. I want to know how many soldiers you can maintain for $100.

Mr. KAHN. There are very few soldiers of the Porto Rico regiment who go insane. That regiment is specifically provided

for by law. I think they have only one insane soldier at Porto Rico belonging to that regiment.

Mr. JUUL. How can you maintain one insane soldier for $100?

Mr. KAHN. Because in that part of the world it does not cost as much to maintain them as it does in Washington. We maintain our insane soldiers in this country at the asylum of St. Elizabeths in the District of Columbia. It is very much cheaper for the Government to pay this asylum in Porto Rico $100 for taking care of an insane soldier than to transport him to Washington and put him over at St. Elizabeths.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the bill by striking out the final letter "s" in the word "soldiers," line 20, page 42.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will withdraw his amendment, because by the time the amendment is adopted there may be a second insane soldier.

Mr. JUUL. But the gentleman would not have more than $100 anyway. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Equipment and maintenance of the Engineer School, including purchase and repair of instruments, machinery, implements, models, and materials for the use of the school and for instruction of engineer troops in their special duties as sappers and miners; for land mining, pontoniering, and signaling; for purchase and binding of professional works and periodicals of recent date treating on military and civil engineering and kindred scientific subjects for the library of the United States Engineers' School; for incidental expenses of the school, including chemicals, stationery, hardware, machinery, and boats; for pay of civilian clerks, draftsmen, electricians, mechanics, and laborers; compensation of civilian lecturers and payment of tuition fees of student officers at civil technical institutions; for unforeseen expenses; for travel expenses of officers on journeys approved by the Secretary of War and made for the purpose of instruction: *Provided*, That the traveling expenses herein provided for shall be in lieu of mileage and other allowances; and to provide means for the theoretical and practical instruction at the Engineer School by the purchase of textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, and for other absolutely necessary expenses, $50,000.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 43, line 19, strike out the word "engineers" and insert the word "engineer."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the execution of topographic or other surveys, the securing of such extra topographic data as may be required, and the preparation and printing of maps required for military purposes, to be immediately available and remain available until December 31, 1920: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War is authorized to secure the assistance, wherever practicable, of the United States Geological Survey, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, or other mapping agencies of the Government in this work and to allot funds therefor to them from this appropriation, $200,000.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This matter of military surveys and maps is one of great importance to this country. My impression is that we are further behind in that regard than any other of the great progressive countries of the world. While in Europe recently the members of the Committee on Military Affairs were given copies of the military maps used in European countries. I dare say that every one of the members was able to orient himself by means of the map and find his way in any direction by following the directions on the map.

There are a few portions of our own country that have been fairly well plotted in that regard. But the great area of the southern part of the country especially has had little mapping of that kind. Several years ago the Engineer Department began this work. It has been very beneficial, and I thought I would take this opportunity to explain the need of it to the members of the committee.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. I wish to ask the gentleman in regard to this $2,000,000 appropriation. I desire to ask whether any part of that is to be used for maps. It is the last item in the paragraph, "maps, War Department."

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, the Chief of Engineers came to the committee and asked for something like $30,000,000 for that item. It seems that in the operations in the field in Europe there was a great deal of work to be done by the Engineer Department during the present fiscal year. It developed that $28,000,000 of the $30,000,000 has already been expended in this work. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Sherley, in the last session of the last Congress, came to the House and told the House that many departments had a great deal more money than they could possibly spend, consequently a bill was brought in to cover back into the Treasury large sums of money. It developed that the committee covered back into the Treasury the $28,000,000 that was needed for the work that was performed in France by the Engineers. The Committee on Military Affairs felt that it was a deficiency and not an item to go into this bill for the fiscal year 1920. So the committee reduced the amount to $2,000,000, which is about the sum that will be required during the next fiscal year for the work done under this item of engineer operations in the field. I understand that it does not have anything to do with maps.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion to strike out the last word of this paragraph. This is one of the items in this bill in which I have always felt a very deep and sincere interest—the making of better military maps of this country. As suggested by the gentleman from California, we have over a part of this country a good topographical survey map made by the Geological Survey. A large portion of the eastern part of the country has been covered, although not all, even of New England, has been mapped, and there is a considerable part of the south Atlantic seaboard that has not been mapped. There is a large portion of the whole country not yet mapped; and it seems to me that a great country like this that has no war map of the country should attempt to have one. If we had a war, in some parts of the United States we would not have a single decent map upon which we could base our military map. After completing the foundation map, which is made by the Geological Survey, there is, of course, considerable military information that should be added, much of which is very interesting to people generally, in addition to its value for strictly military uses. I see here an appropriation of $200,000, and it is proposed that a portion of that shall be allotted to the Geological Survey to assist them in going on with that survey. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the Geological Survey ought to go on with mapping the country, without regard to the Military Establishment; that as soon as that foundation map is made it should be taken advantage of by the military authorities and made into a proper military map of the United States.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I would like to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to this. The language of the bill, page 45, line 13, is:

That the Secretary of War is authorized to secure the assistance, wherever practicable, of the United States Geological Survey, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and other mapping agencies of the Government in this work—

And so forth.

Mr. Chairman, for what particular department are these organizations working if it becomes necessary to state in a bill that the Secretary of War is authorized to secure the assistance? Are not these departments working for all branches of the United States Government? And why should it be necessary to legislate and authorize some officer of the Government to ask these gentlemen to furnish what they ought to furnish without legislation of this sort?

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, the reason of that language is this: The Geological Survey and the Coast and Geodetic Survey are both bureaus of the Interior Department. Each of those bureaus performs a certain work in connection with the land areas and the water areas of this country. Each of those bureaus issues maps covering their particular work. It is very valuable information, and these maps are sought by the citizens of this country. Now, instead of making a third map covering all this detail information which the Geological Survey and the Coast and Geodetic Survey show upon their maps, the War Department takes those maps and superimposes upon them the additional information gathered by the War Department officers and they have a complete map showing geological information, coast and geodetic information, and military information in the one map.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman stated that the Coast Survey was part of the Interior Department. I think it is under the Department of Commerce. The Geological Survey is under the Interior Department.

Mr. KAHN. It has been transferred to the Department of Commerce since that was made a separate department. The gentleman is quite correct, and I thank him.

Mr. JUUL. Does not the chairman think that a great saving would be effected and a lot of confusion avoided if all the mapping departments were consolidated and placed under one head?

Mr. KAHN. My experience in this matter has taught me to believe that there will be such an amount of overhead charge if we were to establish a new bureau that it would cost the Government more for the overhead charge than what the three bureaus cost the Government now.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the current expenses of the Ordnance Department in connection with purchasing, receiving, storing, and issuing ordnance and ordnance stores, comprising police and office duties, rents, tolls, fuel, light, water, and advertising, stationery, typewriters, and adding machines, including their exchange, and office furniture, tools, and instruments of service; for incidental expenses of the Ordnance Service, and those attending practical trials and tests of ordnance, small arms, and other ordnance stores; for publications for libraries of the Ordnance Department, including the Ordnance Office; subscriptions to periodicals, which may be paid for in advance; and payment for mechanical labor in the office of the Chief of Ordnance; and for purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, $5,000,000.

Mr. KAHN. I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 13, after the figures "$5,000,000," add:

"*Provided*, That all material purchased under the appropriations for the Ordnance Department in this act shall be of American manufacture, except in cases when, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, it is to the manifest interest of the United States to make such purchases abroad, which material shall be admitted free of duty:

"*Provided*, That the Chief of Ordnance of the United States Army is authorized to employ in the District of Columbia, out of the appropriations made in this act for designing, procuring, caring for, and supplying ordnance and ordnance stores to the Army, such services, other than clerical, as are necessary for carrying out these purposes:

"*Provided*, That the appropriations hereinbefore made under the heading 'Ordnance Department' shall be available for the payment of an allowance not to exceed $4 per day in lieu of subsistence to civilian employees of the Ordnance Department traveling on official business outside of the District of Columbia and away from their designated posts of duty."

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, this item has heretofore been carried in the appropriation bill. It was in the bill last year, and inadvertently was left out of the committee print this year.

Mr. DENT. Is it in identically the same language?

Mr. KAHN. I believe it is.

Mr. DENT. Then I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama withdraws the point of order. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I wish to ask the chairman of the committee whether under this item there is any part of the appropriation to be expended for the storage of ordnance; for instance, the heavy guns?

Mr. KAHN. I understand that is the purpose of the item. I understand that the officers of the Ordnance Department are now greasing the guns and also the rifles in order to put them into storage. And this money is intended in part for that purpose.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most important items of the bill, if that is the purpose of it. As is well known, at the beginning of this war we had so few guns—by which I mean cannon—that we abandoned practically all of our types and started in making new ones.

In other words, we abandoned our old 3-inch gun and our 6-inch gun and adopted the 75 millimeter and the 155 millimeter, used by the French, to take their places. After some considerable difficulties in attempting to make those two pieces, we finally got under way and succeeded in getting quite a number of guns ready for action about the time the war closed. Since that time—I mean since the armistice was signed—we have finished more of them, and are still finishing, as we ought to do, a considerable number of these guns.

It is well known that the 75-millimeter gun, which is really the backbone of the artillery program, is a gun with a very fine recoil system. We wasted considerable time in trying to make it by American processes after the gun was brought over to us, but we finally had to go to the French method and make it in the same way they make it, which was a very expensive proposition for us. However, we had to have the guns, so went ahead and made them.

In the recoil of that gun there is one part of such a highly polished character that the very faintest trace of dust or anything else on it will entirely spoil it. It must be kept air-tight, as we say, in order to make it of any use. There are a series of fine washers, one of them a silver washer, in order to protect the recoil mechanism. A gun of that kind, with such an arrangement in it, is a very important matter. It is going to give us some labor, some care, and considerable expense to properly keep these guns. I believe that they can be covered with cosmoline, or some other form of oil, and put into such a condition that they will last indefinitely without deterioration. My point is that, having made those guns at great expense, and fine guns they are, which ought to last us for years, longer than any of us here are living, we ought to take care and precaution to see that they are properly stored and taken care of. They are not only of the right kind, but there are a sufficient number of them, which is a good deal for me to say, because I have been speaking for many years for more artillery. We have a sufficient number of those guns, either made or in process of completion, now to serve us for many years to come. The only problem, so far as these particular forms of ordnance are concerned, is to properly store and take care of them. If that is what this item is for, it is a meritorious one, and I hope too much of it will not be used for some other purpose.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I notice in lines 11, 12, and 13 an appropriation of $5,000,000 can be used in buying automobiles for the Army. Of course, other things are mentioned in the item, but there is no limitation on the authority of the Secretary, and he could continue, as he has done in years past, to provide an automobile for every officer in the Army, down to every little lieutenant. I understood that the committee, following the action of the House at the last session, would correct the trouble that was so flagrant previous to this time, and so frame the bill that no money would be available for the purchase of these passenger automobiles for the officers of the Army. Here we see that there is $5,000,000, any part of which can be used for that purpose. I would like to have something from the chairman of the committee on that.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, it developed in the hearing that the War Department has all the motor-propelled vehicles that may be required for passenger carriage, and also for the ordinary uses for which motor trucks are required. But in this particular item, the Ordnance Service, it becomes necessary to provide traction cars which are motor propelled for drawing the very heavy pieces of ordnance. It is a part of the equipment of the ordnance at this time. Many of the large guns of the Army were drawn by so-called caterpillar tractors in the areas which our Army occupied in France. I take it that it is only intended to keep on experimenting with various types of these vehicles, so as to get the most effective ones for our Army that it is possible to procure.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield to permit me to ask a question of the chairman?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman is well informed, of course; but he must know that it is under this item that the Secretary of War has purchased, or has permitted the purchase of, passenger-carrying vehicles—automobiles—for the officers of the Army for use around the city of Washington. What he says about these motors for drawing ordnance and guns, and all that, has no relation whatever to my inquiry.

Mr. KAHN. Oh, I think the gentleman is mistaken. Most of the motor cars used here in the city of Washington, and probably all of them, are Quartermaster Department cars, and are not Ordnance Department cars.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan yield for a question?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I want to direct the attention of the gentleman from Michigan and that of the chairman of the committee to the fact that the words "passenger-carrying vehicles" are expressly used here.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That is the matter I called to the gentleman's attention.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is not the character of vehicle to which the gentleman from California is referring.

Mr. KAHN. I want to say to the gentleman that this is the situation with reference to the Ordnance Department: The gentleman knows that the department operates the seacoast defenses, the large guns which protect our coast. Many of the forts are away from the cities in rather isolated places. There are in some places no good roads where you can get to the fortifications. Perhaps you have to go there with a horse and carriage. I take it that the vehicles which they have sometimes wear out, and sometimes they have to buy a new vehicle. I take it that that language in the bill is for the purpose of permitting the department to secure occasionally one of these vehicles. Besides, the Ordnance Department operates the pontoon boats of the Army. These have to be carted on horse-drawn vehicles.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I would respectfully say, in answer to what the chairman has said, that he is again evading the issue. Under this appropriation, as I understand and as we were told distinctly at the last session, the Secretary of War buys, or has permitted others to buy, all these numerous passenger automobiles—a very large number—for the use of the officers of the Army, so many of them, and used in such a way that it was a scandal. Everybody recognized it as such, and the House at the last session, when considering the last Army bill, adopted an amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] forbidding the use of the money for that purpose. Here is the money now that can be used for the same purpose. An amendment similar to the provision in the amendment offered at the last session, making impossible the continuance of that scandal, ought to be offered now.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I still insist that the money for automobiles was expended by the Quartermaster Department and not by the Ordnance Department.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman point out where in the bill money is carried for any such purpose as this in the Quartermaster Department?

Mr. KAHN. Oh, it is not in the bill at the present time, but those automobiles which are used by the War Department here in Washington bear the inscription "Quartermaster Department." Any man who will take the trouble to look at them will see the initials "Q. M. C." or the words "Quartermaster Department."

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay of National Guard (armory drill), $5,000,000.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a few words, nearing the close of the consideration of this bill, in commendation, first, of the action of the Committee on Military Affairs in bringing in here a unanimous report and cutting down the appropriations $400,000,000 and doing so without friction and with good reasons for every reduction and with the entire approval of the committee.

I know it has been said that when the war ended, when the period of the universal support for the prosecution of the war should cease, when the time should come when it was not a patriotic duty to put beneath us partisan interests, when that time should come immediately we would enter upon a factional era of passionate discussion on political issues. I am very glad to notice that in these bills that have already been considered in the House, and in the Senate as well, there is the same anxiety, the same feeling of responsibility that existed during the war to bring the country back to a peace basis that existed during the continuance of the war. In other words, the patriotism of peace seems to be greater than factional interests in the House and in the Senate, and I desire to call the attention of Congress and of the people to this fact and to hope that it may continue during our further deliberations.

I think we are probably not really aware of the remarkable progress that we are making in the demobilization of the Army and the advances toward a peace basis. I have no hesitancy to say that the record of the War Department in the demobilization of soldiers and in the return from France to America of the soldiers that we sent over there during the past few months has been a remarkable record, commendable in every degree. [Applause.]

I do not hesitate, and I am glad to give my commendation to the administration in its work. When this month we shall bring back from France 375,000 of our soldiers across the sea 3,000 and more miles away, and shall demobilize them almost instantly when they arrive on our shores, I believe it is an achievement of its kind that has never been equaled before in all the history of the world. [Applause.] I think it is only just that we should say that. I sincerely hope that it may go on.

I want to say also this: I presume there has been no history written of the Civil War that has not mentioned, as a remarkable incident in connection with it, the rapidity with which the soldiers of the Civil War drifted back and were absorbed into the citizen life of the Nation, quickly and with little difficulty and trouble. There is nothing perhaps that has so excited the admiration of Europeans, who have commented upon that war and its results as the fact that 2,000,000 men in arms, many of them having been four years under arms, with all the ambitions and passions of a long fratricidal war, suddenly were disarmed and sent back to their homes, and in a very few months were absorbed into the citizen life of the country with hardly a ripple on the surface to disturb the body politic. I think, notwithstanding the sensational statements of the newspapers, who try to imagine that we are going to have serious conditions in this country regarding our demobilization, and that the passions of war will be carried out into uneasiness and disorder in the community, that when the record of this war——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

By unanimous consent the time of Mr. TOWNER was extended five minutes.

Mr. TOWNER. I believe that a like record will be made with regard to this war. I have been astonished as I have learned of the absorption of the troops into civil life in my own State. I have asked as to whether or not there was any disorder. No disorder was reported. I have asked, "Are there men seeking employment?" "There is employment enough for every man who asks for it." And I find in this country to-day, when you come to examine the situation carefully, there is a place in civil life, there is employment in civil life for every soldier who desires to find such employment. [Applause.]

I am very glad indeed that such conditions exist. Thankful should we be certainly as American citizens and as Representatives of the American Congress when under these conditions, going through the awful disorders that have come to this world because of this war, that we shall find in a few years that the burdens that we have to carry are after all only economic and financial burdens, that the memories that now cause pain will gradually die out, that the wonderful prosperity that will come to this country following this war will be such as to carry our Nation forward at such an accelerated rate that we will hardly realize that a war existed, even in economical and financial matters. I believe we have nothing to fear from the future. I think Members of Congress should look into it not only with hope, but with an earnest desire to see that we shall do everything within our power to make the years that are to come so glorious in prosperity and in the advancement that this country will give to the civilization and to the happiness of the world that we will soon blot out the memories and the heartburnings and the pain of those sacrifices that we have made during these years of warfare. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I do not wish to offer any criticism of the magnificent service of the soldiers of the United States, and there is nothing but commendation that should be said of the individual and collective efforts of the Army of the United States in this World War. But I do think, now that this war is over, that there is one thing we should bear in mind when we come to the reorganization of the Army and to the reorganization of the plans for the conduct of our military affairs. I hope there will never be a repetition of this World War, but I have my doubt upon that proposition and believe that as long as the human race exists there will continue to be wars. I have special reference to the monstrous action of the courts-martial during this present war, which have been indefensible, barbaric, and without excuse in many instances. I had called to my attention to-day a case—and there are many just like it, I dare say—that would almost melt a heart of stone.

There was a young man in the northern part of Indiana, in my district, who went away and joined the colors a few days before he was 18 years of age, fabricating a little in order to get in. He went through the training camps here, went over on the other side, and was engaged on six of the great battle fronts, including Chateau-Thierry, Verdun, Belleau Wood, and three others. After all these serious engagements his division was taking a much needed rest.

He and another boy thought that possibly they could improve their opportunity, without any great detriment to the Army, so slipped away one day to go and see Paris, without any thought of desertion in their minds. After they had gotten away they stopped at a wine shop and drank a little wine. There they changed their clothes for citizens' clothes in order that they might not be detected. Their purpose was to go and see Paris. On their way, perhaps under the influence of this wine, they concluded that after having seen Paris they would go down to Brest and, if possible, would get onto a ship, stow away, come

home and see their fathers and mothers, and go back and join their regiment again. That is the evidence as disclosed in this case, and it is undisputed. Notwithstanding that fact, notwithstanding the fact that they had rendered this valiant service on these six battle fronts, each one of these boys was charged with being a deserter, when it never was in their minds to desert, and they were each sentenced to a military prison for 20 years.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Not now.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Not now. It is fair to say that this sentence was commuted to three years. These boys were sent to Leavenworth. There the one whom I have in mind, and in whom I was interested, was taken with appendicitis, from which he died. He sent for his mother, the one to whom a boy always turns when faced with death. His mother felt the disgrace. She wanted the boy to tell her the exact truth about the whole matter, and with his dying lips he told her the same story I have told you now.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman, of course, presents a clear case of desertion. Does he defend it?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I would not defend it, but it is not a clear case of desertion. It is only technical, and very technical desertion at most.

Mr. LEVER. Suppose the whole Army had done that?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Well, if the whole Army had done it there would have been some conspiracy which prompted that action, but I do say that in order to be a criminal there must be criminal intent. These boys were only gone for 24 hours. They were picked up by some French gendarmes before they had gotten 10 miles away from their command. There was no criminal intent in this case. There was no design on the part of these young men to be deserters. The worst that could be said is they were absent without leave.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is a fine lawyer, and the gentleman knows that the intent is fixed by circumstances.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That depends on the character of the act. I say there is not a civil court in the land but what would have taken into consideration the circumstances of the case, together with the previous conduct and habits and services of these boys. There is not a civil court in the land under the evidence presented by the prosecution in this case that would have convicted them of this major offense. There is not a military court in the land that can successfully contend that these boys had an intent to desert or that they ever formed the design to desert.

Mr. PELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. PELL. Does the gentleman mean to say that this boy, being in the Army for six months, having fought for some period, having had this military training, did not know that to leave his post, get drunk, change his clothes, and conceal himself was a serious military offense? Should he have been in an insane asylum or in a jail? [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I am surprised that any man in this House has not enough of the milk of human kindness in his heart and enough of gray matter in his head to discern the difference between the acts of these boys, immature as they were, and the acts of a willful deserter. Of course they knew that they were committing a violation of military regulations, but they did not suppose that they were committing a crime, and under the law and the facts they were not committing the crime of desertion. My sole purpose in speaking of this incident is to call attention to the archaic and barbaric court-martial system of ours, that is not only a disgrace to our Army but a disgrace to our boasted civilization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LEVER. I ask that the gentleman have two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana desire more time?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; I have said all that I care to.

The Clerk read as follows:

AUTOMATIC MACHINE RIFLES.

For the purchase, manufacture, test, repair, and maintenance of automatic machine rifles, or other automatic or semiautomatic guns, including their mounts, sights, and equipments, and the machinery necessary for their manufacture, $1,500,000.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The Ordnance Department must have an enormous number of these guns on hand already.

Mr. KAHN. Not as large a number as the gentleman imagines. Of course, the care and maintenance of those we have is a very important matter. And then, too, the Ordnance Department will continue to manufacture those guns that are required for the strength of the Army that we will need when we get down on a peace-time basis.

It developed in this war, I will say to the gentleman, that there is no piece of ordnance that is so very important as the machine gun. Every army in the future, in my humble opinion, will have to have a greater number of light and heavy machine guns than have been utilized heretofore. As I now recall, the Ordnance Department asked for a much larger sum than we are giving them. I think they ask for $3,000,000, but the committee felt that they would have to worry along for the fiscal year 1920 with one million and a half.

I think every dollar of that amount will be used, and used to good advantage, for the purposes needed.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I was one of the strong supporters of the gentleman from California in trying to get an appropriation for machine guns early enough to be of some use during the war. We were resisted at every stage. Finally the appropriation was made, but at a time when it was impossible to get the guns until the war was nearly over. Now we have an enormous number, and I should not suppose it was necessary to go on and manufacture them for our little Army for some time to come.

Mr. KAHN. They delivered 318,372 machine guns. But, as the gentleman is aware, in actual warfare many of them are destroyed and others injured. I do not suppose the department has many more than a hundred thousand at this time.

Mr. PLATT. If we are going to have an Army as low as the appropriations adopted yesterday would indicate, that would be one to every three men.

Mr. KAHN. The appropriation, of course, indicates an Army of 225,000 men eventually, but in the use of these guns, as I say, many of them are injured and many are destroyed.

Mr. PLATT. Not in time of peace.

Mr. KAHN. Even in time of peace. They are in use constantly. The National Guard will have to be equipped also. There is not a country in the world that uses as much ammunition as we do in practice, and during the practice these guns are frequently destroyed. The life of any gun is not as great as the gentleman probably imagines. This war developed that every soldier in the field used approximately three rifles a year during the war.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Certainly.

Mr. TILSON. As a matter of fact, is not a large part of the appropriation for the development and manufacture of 50-caliber guns, which we lacked. We had a number of light and heavy type, and I think will have a good supply, but we were weak in the larger caliber gun, which was used successfully by Germany and which was thought to be a very valuable gun against tanks and machine-gun nests.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PLATT. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLATT. Now I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. TILSON. The idea is to finish developing the gun, which was practically complete at the time of the armistice. As I understand the purpose of this appropriation, it is to complete the development, to prepare for manufacturing, and to manufacture a number of these 50-caliber guns. They are of a type that proved quite useful in the war, and especially useful against tanks and against machine-gun nests.

Mr. KAHN. We were using the 37-millimeter small gun for that purpose. As the gentleman from Connecticut has stated, we had no guns of the 50-caliber type, and it is desirable to make some experiments in that direction.

Mr. TILSON. Of course, the 37-millimeter gun is entirely too large for many of the purposes for which this gun is to be used. Among other things, it is intended to use these guns on aeroplanes. They will probably be found very useful for aeroplane fighting.

Mr. KAHN. The 37-millimeter cannon we had, though, did very effective work in the Argonne in cleaning up German machine-gun nests.

Mr. PLATT. If I may ask the gentleman one more question, and that is whether the league of nations has not forbidden the use of tanks and things of that sort?

Mr. KAHN. That is in the next item.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchase of horses for mounted units, $1,000,000.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. With regard to the paragraph just read I want to offer a pro forma amendment, and I do not know whether I should do it now or wait until we conclude the reading under the head of the National Guard.

The CHAIRMAN. It was stated by the chairman of the committee that he desired that subheads be considered rather than paragraphs in the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Then I move to strike out the last word of that paragraph. I beg the Chair's pardon, I did not understand the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment would be in order at the conclusion of the reading of the subhead of which each paragraph is being read.

Mr. KAHN. Of course, that rule that was made in the House on a former occasion applies to those paragraphs that do not contain sums of appropriation. It would be in order after a sum is read on any of these appropriations to move to amend the change of sum.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion of the gentleman from Texas is in order.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make that motion for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee for some information, if I may have the attention of the chairman. I observe here in line 18 the item carries a provision for the purchase of horses for the National Guard, $1,000,000. On page 31 there is a provision for the purchase of horses for the Regular Army, and there you safeguard, or undertake to safeguard, the purchase of those horses, providing how and under what conditions they may be purchased. I want to ascertain from the chairman why the committee has not thrown the same safeguards around this item of purchase?

Mr. KAHN. The National Guard, of course, has never bought polo ponies, and I assume that it does not buy——

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The provision with regard to polo ponies, if I may interrupt the chairman, is a very small part of the safeguard you undertake to throw around the provision authorizing the purchases of horses for the Regular Army, if the chairman will refer to the item.

Mr. KAHN. I thought the safeguard referred to polo ponies and undersized horses.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. If the chairman of the committee will permit, I will read the language. It provides that—

no part of this appropriation shall be paid out for horses not purchased by contract after competition duly invited by the Quartermaster Corps and an inspection under the direction and authority of the Secretary of War. When practicable, horses shall be purchased in open market—

And so forth.

Nothing of that kind is provided with reference to this item, and I wanted to know why.

Mr. KAHN. All the horses for the National Guard, as well as for the Regular Establishment, are purchased by the War Department. I have no objection to this proviso going into the bill. It has not been in it heretofore. So far as the present chairman of the committee is concerned, he does not object to such a proviso.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DENT. I do not think that we should observe the same strict rules and regulations in the purchase of horses for the National Guard that we would for the Artillery and Cavalry in the Regular Army, and that is the reason that is not contained in the National Guard provision. The horses we purchase for the National Guard are merely for a certain amount of temporary training, and the same regulations are not necessary as to the character of the horses and size of the horses. There are things connected with horses that you would need for the Artillery and Cavalry service in the Regular Army that are not with horses for the National Guard. I think that is the reason.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I ask this question? Now, if it is necessary to provide that horses for the Regular Army are to be bought upon a competitive basis, why is it not advisable to have the same provision with regard to the purchase of those horses? It seems clear to me the restrictions and directions ought either to be in both places or in neither.

Mr. DENT. I thought the gentleman was referring to that part of the proviso, which I understood him to read, that no part of this appropriation shall be expended for horses below the standard set by Army regulations.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Oh, no. I read the language a moment ago, and I will read it again:

No part of this appropriation shall be paid out for horses not purchased by contract after competition duly invited by the Quartermaster Corps and an inspection under the direction and authority of the Secretary of War. When practicable, horses shall be purchased in open market—

And so forth.

With regard to this last item there is no provision in regard to purchase in the open market and no provision with reference to purchase upon competitive bidding.

Mr. DENT. I thought the gentleman was referring to this proviso to which I called attention; I have no objection.

Mr. KAHN. Of course the gentleman understands that when horses are bought for the Army they are bought all over the country, and then they are sent to some remount station for maintenance and keep.

The horses for the National Guard, I understand, are purchased in the State where the guard has its existence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] stated, as I recall, that the same requirements are not necessary for the National Guard horses. Of course most of the horses required for the National Guard are for those officers who, under the law, are required to be mounted, whereas the horses for the Regular Army are principally Cavalry and Artillery horses that must be carefully selected.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. If the chairman will permit me, I want to direct the Committee on Military Affairs to what seems to me to be an unwise method of purchasing horses, especially for the Army service, and I would like to have the attention of the chairman of the committee, as I have made some investigation of this matter.

Under the present system of purchases there intervenes between the men who raise the horses and the Government which uses the horses, one, two, and sometimes three contracts, each of whom gets his rake-off for a service that ought not to be interposed. It is important that the Government have the right sort of horses bred for its use, but the price which those get who do the work is not sufficient to induce them to raise the proper horses. And instead of provisions, which have been referred to, it would be common sense to give notice, for instance, in horse-breeding centers that on certain days a man for the Government would be there to inspect these horses and to purchase them from the men who raise them. We have been doing this, I think we do now, namely, we advertise for bids. Some one who never raised a horse in his life bids on the contract, and then he finds a lot of subcontractors, Tom, Dick, and Harry, throughout the country, who gather the horses for him. I know it to be a fact that the Government has paid as much as $150 for a horse when the man who raised the horse got but $75 for it. That is absurd. It is not practical for individual growers to bid on these contracts, and everybody knows it. Here is one service that the Government ought to perform and not depend upon these intermediaries, and I beg the gentlemen who constitute the Committee on Military Affairs to bring pressure to bear on the Government to change its policy in order that it may offer the highest inducement to the men upon whom the Government is depending to raise horses that are to carry its soldiers into battle. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Travel of Federal officers and noncommissioned officer on visits of instruction, $40,000.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KAHN: Page 49, line 9, strike out the last word, "officer," and insert in lieu thereof the word "officers."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Travel of Federal officers and noncommissioned officers connected with camps of instruction, $10,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee what is the difference between this item and the one just read. It says:

Travel of Federal officers and noncommissioned officers connected with camps of instruction, $10,000.

The other item reads:

Travel of Federal officers and noncommissioned officers on visits of instruction, $40,000.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, as I recall, the national-defense act provides that there shall be officers and noncommissioned officers stationed at the camps of instruction who shall give instruction at those camps. The other item provides for the inspection of the camp by officers and noncommissioned officers who go there especially to inspect the camps. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAGO], who takes a particular interest in the National Guard items, can probably enlighten the gentleman from Kentucky more fully.

Mr. CRAGO. The larger item is for the pay of officers and noncommissioned officers in making their annual trips of inspection around the home companies of the different organizations of the National Guard, scattered all over the United States, and the smaller item is for the expense of officers and men at the instruction camp in the different States.

Mr. BARKLEY. One is to pay their way in going from place to place and the other is to pay expenses while they are there?

Mr. CRAGO. There is the annual spring inspection, to which an officer is detailed to go and make the inspection, but in the summer instruction camps these men are sent to the camps of instruction for the purpose of giving instruction.

Mr. BARKLEY. I withdraw the pro forma amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Inspection of material, Field Artillery, Coast Artillery, and Signal Corps, $2,500.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask the attention of the chairman of the committee. I desire to direct the attention of the chairman to what I believe to be a mistake which I discovered in the investigation of the provisions of the bill to which I addressed myself a moment ago. On page 31, at the bottom of the page, the language is:

When practicable, horses shall be purchased in open market at all military posts or stations, when needed, at a maximum price to be fixed by the Secretary of War.

It seems to me that the language should be "within or not to exceed the maximum price." As I understand it, the purpose is that the purchase price shall not exceed the maximum price, but may be as much lower than the maximum price as it can be made. I direct the attention of the chairman, so that he may examine the language of that portion of the bill.

Mr. KAHN. Probably it is as the gentleman says. The trouble with these various items is this: They are used in one appropriation bill after another for many years, and in that way a matter such as the gentleman has called attention to is overlooked.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I merely direct the gentleman's attention to it.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think it is overlooked. I think the language is all right as it is. This provides that a maximum price to be fixed by the Secretary of War. Now, the Secretary of War says to the man who buys the horses, "You can not buy them at a higher price than the price I fix." That is a given sum.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No; the language is that purchases shall be made at the maximum price, while the purpose is that they shall be made within the maximum price. The language is not correct, and the chairman will so determine when he examines it, and I am sure will make the proper correction. Therefore I shall not take the time of the committee to present the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to issue from surplus stores now on hand and purchased for the United States Army such articles of clothing and equipment matériel as may be needed by the National Guard organized under the provisions of the act of June 3, 1916, which law is still in force and applicable to State forces. This issue will be made without charge against militia appropriations and will be reimbursed in kind for all Federal property brought into service by State troops. Issue will be made as soon as the provisions of act of June 3, 1916, shall have been fulfilled: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 62, act of June 3, 1916, will be considered fulfilled if the first strength mentioned therein be attained by June 30, 1919, and the other increments provided therein be attained by successive years thereafter: *Provided further*, That this will not prevent any State from compliance with the provisions of section 62 as now worded: *Provided further*, That the appropriations and provisions of this act referring to the National Guard become applicable and available upon the date this becomes a law.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KAHN: Page 50, line 6, strike out the words "June 30" and insert in lieu thereof the words "December 31."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is this: June 30 is almost at hand, and it will not be possible to organize the National Guard of the United States within the two or three weeks remaining. Therefore, it has been suggested that the date be changed to December 31.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SANFORD: Page 50, line 12, after the word "law," insert the following:

"That section 69 of the act of June 3, 1916, be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 69. Enlistments in the National Guard: Hereafter the period of enlistment in the National Guard shall be the same as is, or may be, prescribed by the Regular Army: *Provided*, That all persons who have served as enlisted men in the Army of the United States, or the Organized Militia of the several States, subsequent to April 6, 1917, and who have been honorably discharged from such service, may within six months of such discharge or within six months after the passage of this act, enlist in the National Guard for a period of one year and may reenlist for like periods, and that such enlistments shall not be counted in computing the proportion authorized to be enlisted for one year to conform to the period of enlistment prescribed for the Regular Army: *Provided further*, That enlisted men in the National Guard of the several States now serving under contracts providing for a six-year period of enlistment—three years in an active organization and the remaining three years in the National Guard Reserve—shall be afforded an opportunity to enlist for the periods specified above, and upon entering into a new contract of enlistment for a period of three years under this authority shall be given credit for the period served under the old enlistment contract.'"

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that. I would like to hear some explanation of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am confident that the House and the committee will be unanimously in favor of this amendment. I am confident that the chairman of the committee will be persuaded to withdraw the point of order, or not make it, if the House shows some disposition to encourage it.

The committee unanimously agreed not to add legislative features to the bill, and we should not add this one unless the situation was critical. The National Guard finds itself, or will find itself at the close of the emergency, substantially without personnel. The only term of enlistment in the National Guard now is for six years. The men who have been in the Army and who have seen oversea service will not take an oath to serve for six years, and no one could expect them to take such an oath. The men who have served in the different home-guard organizations are not willing to take a six-year oath, and no one would expect them to do so. At the close of the last session of Congress we amended the law with reference to the term of enlistments in the Regular Army, providing that enlistments in the Regular Army may be for one year for one-third of the force and for the remainder of the force for three years.

This amendment which I have offered, although somewhat complicated, and necessarily complicated, does exactly this: It makes the period of enlistment in the National Guard the same as in the Regular Army. The men who have seen oversea service, the men who have served in the home guard, may within six months after the passage of this act, or after their

discharge, enlist for one year; otherwise enlistments in the National Guard must be for three years.

This amendment also would strike out all provision for reserves in the National Guard, just as we have already stricken out all provision for reserves in the Regular Army. I can say to you with confidence that the members of the committee who have given this subject their attention all favor the amendment. The National Guard authorities of my State—and I am informed, in fact, of all the other States—favor the enactment of a law similar to that contained in this amendment.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. SANFORD. Gladly.

Mr. KAHN. I would like the gentleman to explain the last proviso in his amendment, which reads:

Provided further, That enlisted men in the National Guard of the several States now serving under contracts providing for a six-year period of enlistment—three years in an active organization and the remaining three years in the National Guard Reserve—shall be afforded an opportunity to enlist for the periods specified above, and upon entering into a new contract of enlistment for a period of three years under this authority shall be given credit for the period served under the old enlistment contract.

Mr. SANFORD. I personally feel that that provision will not have much, if any, application, because I believe that there will be no personnel whatever in the National Guard to whom it will apply. But the amendment I have offered has the approval of the Militia Bureau and other people who have studied it. If there is any one in the National Guard to whom it applies, he will be relieved and be allowed to make a new enlistment on the new terms and be credited with the term he has already served. If there are none such, it can do no harm.

Mr. KAHN. I am rather doubtful myself about the last proviso. Would the gentleman object to striking that out of the amendment?

Mr. SANFORD. I would be very glad to have the amendment considered and revised and reamended as much as the committee likes. I think the latter portion of the amendment probably will have no effect, because I think that when the emergency is over there will be no personnel in the National Guard except those who have enlisted recently.

Mr. KAHN. If the gentleman will offer his amendment with the last proviso stricken out, I shall not make the point of order.

Mr. SANFORD. I ask unanimous consent to reform my amendment by striking out the last proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to reoffer his amendment without the last proviso. Is there objection?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANFORD] that the last proviso ought to remain in the amendment. It is probable that no case will exist, but it is also possible that there will be a case which will exist. This will put everybody on an equality. I think the law should be in accordance with the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, and that we should put enlistments in the National Guard on exactly the same basis as enlistments in the Regular Army. I think that ought to be adopted.

Mr. SANFORD. I will say to the gentleman from Alabama that I am agreeable to the suggestion of the gentleman from California only because I am glad to get rid of the point of order. Will the gentleman from California allow my amendment to come before the committee and give the committee a chance to consider it and amend it if it wishes to do so?

Mr. KAHN. I want to say frankly to the gentleman from New York that I should like to study the effect of that last proviso a little more carefully. If it is essential to the bill, I think it can be inserted on the Senate side, and we can come to an agreement on it without any difficulty. But it is a matter I have not been able to study carefully enough, and I hope, therefore, that the gentleman will agree to leave out the proviso.

Mr. DENT. I reserved the right to object. I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know that we ought to take the time now; but it does seem to me that the last proviso can do no harm in any case, and that it might do a lot of good, because it is just possible that a number of men have already enlisted under the six-year enlistment plan in the National Guard at some places.

Mr. SANFORD. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. If they have, this provides for them; and if they have not, it does not matter.

Mr. SANFORD. I am very confident that if the committee now passes on this amendment the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], who will be one of the conferees, will have an opportunity to pass on this particular question; and if he wants this proviso in there, then the House can pass on it later.

Mr. MADDEN. I agree exactly.

Mr. KAHN. I can assure the gentleman——

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman does not have to assure me——

Mr. KAHN. That if it does seem important I shall not oppose it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to offer his amendment without the last proviso. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York as modified.

Mr. KAHN. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee what is meant by the item in line 19, on page 49—

Pay of National Guard (armory drill), $5,000,000.

Mr. KAHN. Under the national-defense act, as I recall, National Guardsmen are compelled to take 48 drills a year, and possibly 52.

Mr. BEE. Is that in addition to their compensation while in service?

Mr. KAHN. Yes. When they are in the service of course they get the pay of the enlisted men and the officers of the Regular Army, but this is for attending drills while they are acting simply as National Guardsmen.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RIFLE RANGES FOR CIVILIAN INSTRUCTION.

For arms, ammunition, targets, and other accessories for target practice for issue in connection with the encouragement of rifle practice in pursuance of the provisions of section 113 of the act approved June 3, 1916, $100,000.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KAHN: Page 60, lines 16 and 17, strike out the words "section 113 of the act approved June 3, 1916," and insert in lieu thereof the word "law."

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, there are several laws which refer to rifle ranges for civilian instruction. Under the wording of the paragraph in this bill this money could only be used under the provisions of the national-defense act ,and it is desirable to utilize all the laws which apply for this purpose to the National Guard.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVILIAN MILITARY TRAINING CAMPS.

For arms and ordnance equipment, including overhauling and repairing of personal equipments, machine-gun outfits, horse equipment; ammunition, targets, and other accessories for target practice; and for overhauling and repairing arms for issue and use in connection with training camps for civilians in pursuance of the provisions of section 54 of the act approved June 3, 1916, is hereby extended and made available for the fiscal year 1920, $100.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KAHN: Page 50, lines 25 and 26, strike out the words "is hereby extended and made available for the fiscal year 1920."

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, of course this appropriation is for the fiscal year 1920, and therefore these words are superfluous.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESERVE CORPS.

ORDNANCE STORES, EQUIPMENT, ETC., RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS.

For arms and ordnance equipment, including overhauling and repairing of personal equipments, machine-gun outfits, and horse equipments for use in connection with the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, established by the act approved June 3, 1916, is hereby extended and made available for the fiscal year 1920, $100.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KAHN: Page 51, lines 8 and 9, strike out the words "is hereby extended and made available for the fiscal year 1920."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For arms and ordnance equipment, including overhauling and repairing of personal equipments, machine-gun outfits, and horse equipments for issue to schools and colleges in pursuance of the provisions of section 56 of the act approved June 3, 1916, $100: *Provided*, That the appropriations herein made for the support of the Army and the National Guard are available for such printing, binding, and blank books as may be necessary in putting in effect the objects of the appropriations: *And provided further*, That hereafter printing, binding, and blank books required for use outside of the District of Columbia in connection with the support of the Army and the National Guard may be done or procured elsewhere than at the Government Printing Office when in the opinion of the Secretary of War such work can be more advantageously done or procured locally, the cost thereof to be paid from the proper appropriations: *And provided further*, That no part of any of the appropriations made herein nor any of the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the support and maintenance of the Army or the Military Establishment shall be expended for the purchase of real estate.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the proviso beginning on line 20, page 51, the second proviso in the paragraph. That provides apparently for permanent law.

Mr. KAHN. I hope the gentleman will reserve his point of order.

Mr. WALSH. I will reserve it.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment can not be offered when a point of order is pending.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order against the last proviso.

Mr. MONDELL. The point of order comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will protect the rights of Members who wish to make points of order to the several provisos.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve a point of order against the entire paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina reserves a point of order against the entire paragraph.

Mr. KAHN. I want to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he would have any objection to the second proviso if I offer an amendment to strike out the word "hereafter"?

Mr. WALSH. No; I would have no objection to it. I will withdraw the point of order reserved to the proviso.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman from California yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts withdraws his reservation of a point of order, and the gentleman from South Carolina reserves a point of order to the whole paragraph.

Mr. KAHN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. LEVER. The last proviso in this paragraph reads:

That no part of any of the appropriations made herein nor any of the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the support and maintenance of the Army or the Military Establishment shall be expended for the purchase of real estate.

It has come to my attention that at certain cantonments obligations have been entered into by the Government for the purchase of land, and these people with whom contracts have been made "do not know where they are at." They have moved away from the property, bought other land, or are engaged in other pursuits, and it seems to me that a sufficient authorization or appropriation should be made to take care of those existing contracts. I would like to ask the gentleman from California what the situation is?

Mr. KAHN. The committee felt constrained to offer this proviso because the War Department has been purchasing land for Army posts in various sections of the country, and the committee felt that the Military Establishment owns enough land for all purposes of the Army of the United States. The committee felt that under the circumstances this practice should be discontinued. The appropriations for these purchases, I may say to the gentleman, have not generally been made by the Committee on Military Affairs. They have been made under lump-sum appropriations reported to the House and were passed by the House. The appropriations came from other committees and were necessary probably for the proper conduct of the war. But the Committee on Military Affairs feel that the custom that has prevailed in the last year or two should be stopped and that the further purchase of land should be discontinued by affirmative action on the part of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inquire of the gentleman from California are there unexpended balances out of appropriations that will be available after July 1 until expended?

Mr. KAHN. My information is that there will be such balances out of appropriations that were made for certain large sums that would be available until the money therein appropriated is expended.

The CHAIRMAN. And that money would be available for the purchase of land affected by this proviso?

Mr. KAHN. That is my understanding of the situation.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman from California will permit, I thoroughly agree with him that until the size of the standing Army of the United States has been agreed upon it is folly, senseless, and asinine to extend the size of the cantonments. I think the committee is thoroughly right in that respect. But where obligations have been incurred, where farmers, for instance, have had their lands taken, their houses razed, forced to move away and buy other property, go into other occupations, it does seem to me that provision might be made here for caring for that kind of a situation. I had in mind to suggest to the gentleman from California the addition of this language: "Except in fulfillment of contracts or obligation." It seems to me that that would take care of the situation and be just to these people.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. LEVER. I will be very glad to do so.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Were these contracts for the purchase of land by the Government, to which the gentleman from South Carolina refers, begun before the armistice or since?

Mr. LEVER. I think some were begun before and some since. I am not sure. I understand the gentleman from California has possibly some communication from the Chief of Staff on this proposition. I have not received that myself.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will not those which were taken before the armistice come under the terms and provisions of this act, by which we sought in reference to those incomplete war claims and incomplete war contracts to validate them? I refer to the act passed at the last session of Congress.

Mr. LEVER. That is likely true, but if there should be other obligations entered into since the armistice there would be no protection of the people——

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. If those negotiations were conducted in pursuance of law, then on their face they must be good as damages against the Government up to the point to which this proviso attaches.

Mr. LEVER. I do not see what the objection would be——

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Because it is too comprehensive; it has no limitation at all upon any project which the Government has even just begun, and that is exactly what we want to get at.

Mr. CRAGO. I desire to ask the gentleman if the striking out of the word "unexpended" and substituting the word "unobligated" would not accomplish the purpose?

Mr. LEVER. It would accomplish everything I am looking to and which I think we ought to do as a matter of justice to these people.

Mr. CRAGO. It is only fair and right——

Mr. LEVER. Would the gentleman from California accept the proposition?

Mr. KAHN. Personally I have no objection to making the change.

Mr. DOWELL. In cases where options have been secured on part of the land and not secured upon other parts of the land, what would the gentleman do in such a case as that?

Mr. LEVER. I would say that the option did not apply.

Mr. DOWELL. It would be one part of a camp that would be subject to purchase and the other part would not. It seems to me that that would put you in a very peculiar situation of purchasing a part of a camp and not be able to get another part, perhaps the center of the camp.

Mr. LEVER. I will say this to the gentleman from Iowa: I agree with the chairman of the committee that we ought as quickly as possible determine our policy in reference to the purchase of land for additional Army posts, cantonments, and so forth. I should think myself, without knowing anything of the subject except general knowledge, that you have got enough of these cantonments and camps to take care of a standing Army of a million men. Am I right?

A MEMBER. Five.

Mr. LEVER. It seems to me it is foolhardy and absurd to continue to buy property at exorbitant prices, sometimes, to enlarge these cantonments. The only thing I stand for at all is that where the Government has incurred its obligations and disarranged the status of citizens it ought to make good to those citizens, and if we can do that in this paragraph by virtue of a simple amendment like striking out the word "unexpended" and making it "unobligated," I am perfectly willing to do it.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, it is not the purpose of the Committee on Military Affairs and it is certainly not my purpose in standing for this proposed amendment that we desire to do an injustice to any citizen of this country, and the purpose of this amendment is not that any citizen of the country shall be injured in his rights, but the purpose of this amendment is to protect all the citizens of this country against the policy that has been carried on by the War Department since the armistice was signed. During the war the Congress of the United States very properly turned over to the War Department the administration of everything connected with the War Department necessary in the prosecution of the war—the acquiring of land, the purchase or leasing of lands, and all other activities—found necessary for the carrying on of the war, but it never was the purpose of the Congress of the United States to turn over to a real estate bureau in the War Department the right to go out all over this country and enter upon a debauch of purchasing real estate in every section of the country and making contracts that would bind the people of this country after the war is over. As a matter of fact, since the signing of the armistice, since the War Department knew that the great armies of this country were going to be demobilized and reduced and that we would not have any further need for land or for buildings, the agents of the War Department have gone on buying thousands and thousands of acres of land and contracting with the citizens of the different States to pay for the same. And it was testified to before our committee that they desired to buy large plants for the manufacture of machine guns and other munitions of war and for the storage of property, and unless the Congress of the United States take some steps to prevent it, gentlemen, they will continue to do so. I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that I am not in favor of inserting the word "unobligated" in the proposed amendment. If these men without authority of law, without the consent of Congress, have implicated the Government in contracts, thereby undertaking to tie the hands of the taxpayers in order to pay men in Georgia or Connecticut or Illinois for land, and they have said to them, "You can move off this land, we will tear down the buildings and then we will pay you for it," I would stop that payment as far as the purchase of land is concerned and the turning over of the title of the land to this Government, because it does not mean only the price of the land. It means that the War Department will then insist on an organization being set up there to take care of it and make an artillery firing field of it, a small-arms firing field, a flying field, or some other military activity which will require perhaps a regiment of soldiers to care for the same, and to maintain the regiment, battalion, or company, or whatever force may be stationed thereon for all the years to come, and I say, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of this House, let us put our foot down on this thing now and stop it. [Applause.]

And if any citizen has a claim—and there are certainly some who have—if any person has been induced to enter into such contract, let him present his claim to the Congress of the United States, and I for one will be in favor of paying it, but I am also in favor of branding the officer or agent of the United States that would undertake to place that burden upon the taxpayers of this country and let the world know that we have men in this land in the employ of the Government who, without authority of law, without any instruction from Congress, would undertake to tie our hands by making a contract for the purchase of land and then assume Congress would make the appropriations to pay for it and thereby ratify the contract.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that no man—I care not from which section of the country he comes—will stand up in this body at this time and undertake to stop us from putting the brake on such conduct which has been going on since the armistice was signed.

I am for the amendment without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t." Let us insert it in this appropriation bill and stop this needless and useless waste of the public money. [Applause.]

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the proposition, and if the Chair will recognize me for that purpose, I wish to say that it should be inserted before the discussion of the merits or demerits of the proposition.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will withhold it for five minutes, I would like to say something on this, or will the gentleman agree to withhold it for three minutes?

Mr. CRISP. I will withhold it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] will not make the point of order for the reason that the War Department not long since transferred the school of rifle practice from Fort Sill, Okla., without any reason on earth, as far as I can see, to a county in the State of Georgia, a county containing only about 180,000 acres of land, 140,000 acres of which the War Department has purchased for this school. And I understand that they are paying the people owning this 140,000 acres of land in this county in Georgia fabulous prices for it. They had all the land they needed in Oklahoma. There was no need to move this school of rifle practice into the State of Georgia. They had more land in Oklahoma than they needed for the purpose. Oklahoma met all the needs of the War Department for this kind of work.

Now, why did the War Department go to Georgia to buy this 140,000 acres of land out of a county containing only 180,000 acres? They have spent more than $7,000,000 on this range, and without any authority of law. It had the money in lump sum. They have taken advantage of the fact that they had it, and they have purchased the land in Georgia and abandoned the land that they owned in Oklahoma. Now, why? That is the question.

I hope the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] will not make the point of order. Some of the land in the county that I have referred to in Georgia is in the process of being purchased. Of course, the purchase is not all complete. And this amendment which is proposed to the bill would probably prevent the completion of the purchase. The point of order will permit the War Department to proceed to the conclusion of the purchase without any limit of expenditure, and thereby, in my judgment, complete a transaction of iniquity by the transfer of the school of rifle practice from a State where they already own the land to another State where it has to be purchased.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. FOSTER. When was this land purchased?

Mr. MADDEN. They are purchasing it now.

Mr. FOSTER. Since the armistice?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, as illuminating the matter under discussion, I submit a letter for reading by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

CUSSETA, GA., *June 5, 1919.*

Congressman MONDELL, *Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. MONDELL: I wish to call your attention to the large expenditure of money by the War Department on a military camp down here in Chattahoochee County, Ga., known as Fort Benning.

The War Department on November 2, 1918, filed a petition for condemnation of 130,000 acres of land in Chattahoochee and Muscogee Counties, Ga., for a military reservation.

There lives within this area about 8,000 civilian population. They are taking from Chattahoochee County 72,000 acres of land out of a total of 165,000 acres in the entire county. Chattahoochee County is a small county, with 5,640 population. This camp is taking in about 3,300 of the population, most of whom are opposed to giving up their homes.

In January of this year we succeeded in getting a hearing before the Senate Military Affairs Committee in opposition to this camp. The Senate Military Affairs Committee, after hearing both sides, for and against the camp, passed a resolution disapproving the project. The War Department suspended work, and announced no further work would be done on Fort Benning and that proper steps would be taken to salvage same. Immediately after the adjournment of Congress on March 4 the War Department again began the construction of this camp, and are now very busily engaged in building same, working some 4,000 or 5,000 laborers and spending money in a most lavish and extravagant manner. It strikes me that the War Department is undertaking to build a permanent camp in an illegal and fraudulent way, spending money that was appropriated for camp sites, camps, and cantonments during the war emergency.

The department has succeeded in buying about 30,000 acres of this land at an average cost of $42 per acre. Much of the most expensive land within the area is yet to be purchased or condemned and paid for. For this project to go forward and be completed on the large scale proposed means an expenditure in due time of $75,000,000 or $100,000,000; it also means the complete destruction of Chattahoochee County, Ga.

The total taxable value of the county is $1,400,000. The camp zone takes in $900,000 of this taxable property, leaving only $500,000 with which to maintain the remainder of the county. The camp line comes within one-half mile of Cusseta, Ga., the county site.

Our people are very anxious to have Congress make a thorough investigation of this project, with a view to getting the matter stopped.

The buildings at the camp are of the cheapest and crudest kind, having the appearance of a saw-mill settlement.

We are appealing to you, as the majority floor leader of the Sixty-sixth Congress, for help in this matter, and ask that you bring the project to the attention of the proper committees of Congress and give us relief.

I am coming to Washington soon to see what can be done about the matter. I beg to remain.

Yours, very truly,

C. C. MINTER.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONDELL. What is the point of order now pending?

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will give me an opportunity, I will state it. I have tried to do it repeatedly, but have been swept off my feet each time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] reserved a point of order and the gentleman from Georgia served notice that he would make the point of order. The point of order has not yet been made.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I will now proceed to give the gentleman from Wyoming the benefit of the point of order that I desire to present to the Chair.

Clause 2 of Rule XXI——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia make the point of order?

Mr. CRISP. Yes, sir. I make the point of order to the last proviso on page 52, providing:

That no part of any of the appropriations made herein nor any of the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the support and maintenance of the Army or the Military Establishment shall be expended for the purchase of real estate.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] withdraw his reservation of the point of order against the paragraph?

Mr. LEVER. It is not necessary. The gentleman from Georgia makes the point of order.

Mr. CRISP. I make it against the last proviso.

Mr. LEVER. I withdraw it against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina withdraws the reservation of the point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is that under clause 2, Rule XXI, legislation is not in order on a general appropriation bill unless that legislation comes within one of the excepted classes by reducing the amount of money appropriated by the bill, by reducing the salaries of anybody paid for in the bill, or by reducing the number of employees carried in the bill. Clearly the proviso is legislation and does not come within any of these three excepted classes.

Now, I apprehend, Mr. Chairman, it will be contended that the proviso is in order, not as legislation but as a limitation. I am not going into the merits or demerits of the establishment of Fort Benning, Ga., or argue it, because I do not think it appropriate or has anything whatever to do with this point of order. Sufficient to say that I believe the officials of the War Department who have been intrusted with the affairs of the Government in spending colossal sums of money to win this war—and we have won it—are honest men and will perform their functions honestly, and are not common grafters. They are capable and honest men. And let me say, besides, that this project—Fort Bennings—was started before the armistice——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. CRISP. I was coming to that; but I did not think I was digressing, in view of the remarks that others have made in interjecting matters that are not pertinent to the point of order. But if the Chair holds me to a strict accountability, I will confine my remarks to the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is only interested in the point of order.

Mr. CRISP. I will keep the Chair from it only for a moment, but I did want to answer briefly some of the aspersions that have been cast on this project in Georgia, which, let me add, is not in my district, but I will restrain myself.

Now, under the rules, I grant you, Mr. Chairman, this House is clothed with plenary power, and this House can pass legislation expressing its views on any matter; and there is no doubt but that this House, if it desires to do so, can pass a resolution carrying into effect this very proviso. But this House has adopted rules for its procedure, and I apprehend that this body—an orderly body—adopted the rules to be governed by them.

Rules unanimously adopted should be observed in the conduct of the business of this House, and those rules say that on an appropriation bill you can not legislate unless it comes within one of those exceptions mentioned, which this proviso does not.

Now, let us see, Mr. Chairman, if this provision can be held to be in order under the guise of a limitation. I call the attention of the Chairman especially to this part of the proviso: "Nor any of the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made." Now, there are appropriations heretofore made, with unexpended balances, with no limitations whatever upon them, with which, under the discretion of the executive department, they can buy land.

Now, what does this provision do? This provision seeks to tie up the money appropriated in this bill. I concede that you can do that. I concede that would be a limitation, and I concede that that would be in order. But when the bill goes further and seeks to put a limitation interfering with the executive discretion, putting legislation upon appropriations heretofore made, it is not a limitation, but is legislation, and is not in order on a general appropriation bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is not a new proposition. I call the Chair's attention to the House Manual, section 825, where you will find this citation:

The limitation must apply solely to the money of the appropriation under consideration and may not be made applicable to money appropriated in other acts—

Citing Hinds' Precedents, volume 4, sections 3927 and 3928. Now I read section 3929 of Hinds' Precedents, volume 4, but I will read before that section 3927. This was prepared by Mr. Asher C. Hinds, who was the best parliamentarian in the United States, and for 20 years served this House as parliamentarian. Section 3927 of Hinds' Precedents says:

A limitation may be attached only to the money of an appropriation under consideration, and may not be made applicable to moneys to be appropriated in other acts.

That is exactly this proposition. Now, I read, Mr. Chairman, section 3928, where this very proposition arose, as to whether a provision in the bill placing a limitation on appropriations made in prior appropriation bills is in order as a limitation. I am very glad to be able to call the attention of this distinguished Chairman to the ruling of that great Chairman who was presiding at that time, the late Vice President James S. Sherman. There was no better Chairman of the Committee of the Whole than Mr. Sherman.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman cite the page of Hinds' Precedents?

Mr. CRISP. It is section 3928, page 623, Volume IV, of Hinds' Precedents. This is a ruling of James S. Sherman, of New York:

The Chair, rather than to rule, desires to make a suggestion. It seems to the Chair perfectly clear that it is in order to put a limitation upon the appropriation contained in this bill only; but this appropriation provides: "Toward the armament and armor," etc., indicating that it is expected that a future appropriation must be necessary in order to complete this armament. And in reference to this future appropriation it is not proper to put a limitation in this bill.

The Chair suggests that if the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Hopkins, would withdraw his point of order the wording might be changed, so that, in line 12, the words "all future" be stricken out, and after the word "armor," in line 13, the words "herein appropriated for" be inserted, and that would bring the provision where it would not be obnoxious to the rule. It would be a limitation upon the appropriation and would be admissible under the rule.

Mr. Hopkins having declined to withdraw the point of order, the Chairman said:

If the gentleman from Illinois declines to withdraw the point of order, the Chair, for the reasons that he has stated, will sustain the point of order.

The reasons stated being that it sought to put a limitation on an appropriation previously made.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair inquire of the gentleman from Georgia——

Mr. CRISP. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has read the decision to which the gentleman from Georgia refers. Did not that ruling refer to future legislation rather than to prior acts?

Mr. CRISP. I do not think so, but the principle is the same. It does not make any difference. I will read the provision to which this applied:

Armor and armament: Toward the armament and armor of domestic manufacture for the vessels authorized by the act of July 26, 1894, of the vessels authorized under the act of March 2, 1895, of those authorized by the act of June 10, 1896, of those authorized by the act of March 3, 1897, of those authorized by the act of May 4, 1898, and of those authorized by this act, $4,000,000. In all future contracts for armor for any of the vessels above mentioned the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to procure armor of the best obtainable quality at an average cost not exceeding $545 a ton of 2,240 pounds, including royalties.

All of those vessels were previously authorized by different acts, but the proposed amendment sought to attach a limitation to those acts, and Chairman Sherman held that it was legislation, because it applied to other authorizations and was not confined strictly to the appropriation in the bill under consideration, and therefore it could not be held in order as a limitation, when in fact it was legislation interfering with the executive discretion, attaching new conditions to laws heretofore made.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair call the attention of the gentleman from Georgia to the language of the point of order made in that case?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. On page 623:

Against the last sentence of this paragraph, beginning with the words "in all future contracts," Mr. Albert J. Hopkins, of Illinois, made a point of order.

Mr. CRISP. And may I call the attention of the Chair to the suggestion of Mr. Chairman Sherman, to strike out that and insert a limitation to apply to the money "herein appropriated."

Mr. LEVER. That is absolutely on all fours with the gentleman's argument.

Mr. CRISP. That was the suggestion of Vice President Sherman, to make it apply only to that appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. What the Chair is trying to get settled is whether or not in this case the prior authorizations, with hold-over appropriations with unexpended balances, were involved, or whether the question came up on the future appropriations that were to be made?

Mr. CRISP. I can not possibly present my views any more clearly or cite any authority that is more explicit, or that in my opinion covers the proposition better than the one I have used.

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that in the last session of Congress when the military appropriation bill was under consideration an amendment was offered to limit the War Department in the expenditure of money theretofore appropriated for automobiles that would apply up to the 1st day of July, and the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole held it out of order because it limited an appropriation heretofore made.

Mr. CRISP. The Chairman presiding over the House is the honored chairman of the Committee on Rules of this House, and I am sure he will not require me to cite authority on the proposition that you can not under the guise of a limitation legislate so as to interfere with executive discretion on some other appropriation. I am sure the able Chairman recognizes that proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is very clear on that phase of this question. What the Chair is anxious to ascertain is whether in the proviso there is an unexpended balance that would be affected by it.

Mr. CRISP. About that I do not think we ought to be concerned. I do not think we can know as to all of these things. I think all that interests the Chair and myself is what the language of the proviso says. The proviso says that this limitation shall attach to any money heretofore appropriated. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs has stated to the Chair that there are unexpended balances.

Mr. KAHN. There are.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been ruled that the Chair does not take judicial notice of things. It is a question of fact whether there are unexpended balances that would be affected by the proviso.

Mr. CRISP. May I call the attention of the Chair to the statement of the chairman of the committee just now, that there are unexpected balances which would be affected by this proviso. The distinguished Chairman has conceded my point that it is not in order under the guise of a limitation to attach legislation to other acts or to interfere with executive discretion.

Now, there are other appropriations made heretofore that are available for the purchase of land. If you adopt this provision these appropriations cease to be available for the purchase of land. They have a legislative condition tied to them and executive discretion is interfered with. I do not see, Mr. Chairman, how if you follow the ruling of the distinguished late Vice President of the United States you can do otherwise than to sustain my point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I think the provision in the bill is in order as a limitation. I do not think there is any question about that. But I do not intend to take the time of the Chair in the discussion of that view of the matter. The gentleman from Georgia in discussing the Holman rule made no reference to the last proviso of the rule, which is as follows:

That it shall be in order further to amend such bill upon the report of the committee or any joint committee authorized by law or the House members of any such commission having jurisdiction of the subject matter of such amendment, which amendment, being germane to the subject matter of the bill, shall retrench expenditures.

This provision under discussion clearly retrenches expenditures. Beyond question this provision retrenches expenditures not only under this bill but expenditures generally. There are, it is true, unexpended balances which can be utilized for the purchase of land, and it is because there are unexpended balances which can not be expended for such purposes if this provision is adopted that makes the provision in order under the last paragraph of the Holman rule.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say on the point of order, in addition to what the gentleman from Wyoming has said, that I understand the rule to be that if it appears on its face, and it is patent to the Chair, that the legislation will have the effect of retrenching expenditures, then it is in order. I desire to call the attention of the Chair to the ruling in the Manual, found on page 371, section 825:

To an item of appropriation for transportation of foreign mails, an amendment providing that no money hereby appropriated, etc., shall be expended in carrying out contracts hereafter made under the act known as the "subsidy act," was held to be in order under the rule.

In this case it is provided that no portion of the money shall be used for the purpose of purchasing real estate. That is on all fours with the citation I have called the attention of the Chair to.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. This has reference to the moneys appropriated in this bill, and also has reference to moneys appropriated in other appropriation bills, and therefore it could not apply.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That does not make any difference. In answer to that we make appropriations in the pension bill for the payment of pensions that have already been provided for.

It has been held by the House, and properly, that a certain class of pensioners now on the pension roll, while we have contracted to pay them, should not hereafter receive the pensions. That amendment has been held in order.

Mr. SABATH. That was on a pension bill.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. This is in an appropriation bill for the purpose of providing revenue for the maintenance of the Army and that was in a pension appropriation bill, and it had as much application to a pension appropriation bill as this has application to the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. SABATH. But this states—

Nor shall any of the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made——

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It does not make any difference if upon its face it shows that it results in a retrenchment of expenditures; if so, it is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair has been interested to ascertain whether or not any appropriation is to be affected by this proviso except the appropriation made in this bill, and has endeavored to ascertain the amount. The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from California, states that there are unexpended balances affected by one of the clauses in this proviso. The sympathies of the Chair are with the proviso, but the Chair must decide what his judgment is of the rules of the House as they apply to this proviso.

Mr. MONDELL. If the Chair will allow me, the Chair is now discussing the matter from the standpoint of the limitation and not from the standpoint of the Holman rule, I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the opinion of the Chair that the Holman rule does not apply in this case.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not understand the Chair to mean that under the Holman rule an amendment could not be offered which affected other appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wyoming contend that the bill now under consideration could affect an appropriation heretofore made or hereafter to be made under the Holman rule?

Mr. MONDELL. The last paragraph of the Holman rule very distinctly provides that a provision is in order if it retrenches expenditures. No reference is made to appropriations, but if it retrenches expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. But the constructions heretofore of that clause of the Holman rule have been held to apply to expenditures provided for in the pending appropriation bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true as to a limitation, Mr. Chairman, but it is not true as to legislation which is claimed to be in order under the Holman rule. We do not claim this is in order as a limitation, but we do claim this is in order under the Holman rule. We could put a whole chapter of law on this appropriation bill if the effect of the legislation was to retrench expenditures. May I call the attention of the chairman to the decision by Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, in which he held——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman commences let me make this suggestion. I did not argue to the Chair that provision of the Holman rule, because I did not think it applicable, but I would like to have the gentleman from Minnesota,

if he will in presenting his views to the Chair, show wherein this provision retrenches expenditures, because under that provision of the Holman rule it must be apparent to the Chair that it retrenches expenditures, and this limitation does not per se bring about any retrenchment, because it simply says you can not spend this money to buy land but you can spend it to buy powder, shot, or anything on earth you want except land. I would like the gentleman to show to the Chair wherein that retrenches expenditures.

Mr. ANDERSON. The chairman of the committee has stated there are unexpended balances of appropriation which are available for the purchase of land. The gentleman predicated his argument that this was not a limitation upon the theory that there were unexpended balances which were available for the purchase of land. Now, then, when you remove from this appropriation one of the items for which it can be expended you do thereby raise the presumption that the expenditure will be reduced.

Now, I want to call the attention of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to a decision by Chairman SAUNDERS of Virginia in a recent Congress. I have reference to the decision which appears in section 945 of the House Manual and Digest. In that case an amendment was submitted which proposed to reduce the number of Cavalry regiments from 15 to 10. It did not, as I recall it, in itself propose any actual reduction in the amount carried in the appropriation bill, but the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole held, inasmuch as that amendment did reduce the number of regiments from 15 to 10, that it necessarily followed that it would cost less to support and maintain 10 regiments than 15 regiments, and therefore that the proposed legislation on its face indicated that it would retrench expenditures. It seems to me that decision is entirely in point and practically on all fours with the situation which we have here.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds that the proviso referred to does not come within the limitations permitted on an appropriation bill. Congress has the power to withhold appropriations or parts of appropriations. It has that power to withhold money for the purchase of land heretofore authorized to be purchased, for the pay of aeroplanes heretofore authorized to be constructed, or the purchase of aero fields heretofore authorized, but the appropriations affected by such limitations must be the appropriations contained in the pending bill. It is stated that this limitation would affect unexpended balances of appropriation that are still available after the 1st of July that are available until expended. If that is true it would be a change of existing law, and the Chair, for the purpose of accomplishing a temporary end, would not hold that in an appropriation bill we can change existing law.

Now, it is stated that the Saunders decision, on the reduction of Cavalry, is in point. The Chair does not have to review the Saunders decision. It is only necessary to say that the Chair does not take the view that the Holman rule applies in this case. The Chair is not aware of the amount or the extent to which expenditures could be retrenched or made. The Chair has endeavored without result to ascertain the amount, if any, that would be saved. In the Cavalry case it could have been figured to a mathematical certainty just the amount that could be saved by the reduction of the troops of Cavalry. The units were counted there. Here the Chair is simply advised that there are unexpended balances available until expended after the 1st of July, which would be affected by this proviso. That would change the law, and we can not change existing law in that way.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Chair, if I may, if I understand his ruling. If I understand it, the Chair is in harmony with the precedents. You can not on an appropriation bill, as I understand the Chair, do anything more than to limit the amount, touching the amount carried in this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the holding of the Chair.

Mr. CANNON. Now, then, of course, Congress has the power to make another rule, and Congress has the power to do on any other appropriation bill exactly what is sought to be done here.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do rise.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I desire to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California moves that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that commitee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Friday, June 13, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the War Department for "small-arms target practice, fiscal year 1920" (H. Doc. No. 98); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of appropriation required for additional laborers in the office of the Auditor for the Navy Department, fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 99); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Attorney General submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Department of Justice for "detection and prosecution of crimes" (H. Doc. No. 100); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of Commerce submitting a supplemental estimate required by the Department of Commerce to enable the department to comply with the provisions of House resolution 76, requesting certain information as to Government employees (H. Doc. No. 101); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Acting Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Panama Canal for completing the construction of two seagoing coal barges, authorized by the act of June 12, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 102); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, calling attention to the necessity of an appropriation to comply with the request contained in House resolution 65 (H. Doc. No. 103); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, calling attention to the necessity of an appropriation to comply with the request contained in House resolution 76 (H. Doc. No. 104); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Attorney General, submitting an estimate of appropriation to enable the Department of Justice to comply with House resolution 69 (H. Doc. No. 105); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 241) to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the east branch of the Susquehanna River from the city of Pittston to the borough of West Pittston, Pa., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 36), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

By Mr. PLATT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 87) authorizing national banks to subscribe to the united war work campaign, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 37), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 5603) to provide for the retirement of any enlisted man of the Regular Army who has heretofore been discharged to accept a commission in the Army of the United States for service during the present emergency with the retired pay and allowance of a master signal electrician, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5604) relating to the pay of retired enlisted men serving as field clerks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ECHOLS: A bill (H. R. 5605) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building at Beckley, in the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. REAVIS: A bill (H. R. 5606) to prohibit intoxicating liquors and prostitution within the Canal Zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 5607) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to each of the following-named towns and villages of Virginia: Appalachia, Bland Court House, Abingdon, Bristol, Big Stone Gap, Chilhowie, Emory, Dublin, Gate City, Jonesville, Lebanon, Max Meadows, Marion, Norton, Pearisburg, Pennington Gap, Pulaski City, Richlands, Saltville, Tazewell, Wise, Clintwood, Grundy, Honaker, and Wytheville, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 5609) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Brookline, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: A bill (H. R. 5610) making an appropriation for erecting and equipping and otherwise providing a quarantine station at or near New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 5611) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Odanah, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: A bill (H. R. 5612) donating a captured German cannon or fieldpiece to the borough of North Plainfield, State of New Jersey, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARBOUR: A bill (H. R. 5613) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Visalia, county of Tulare, State of California, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5614) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hanford, Kings County, State of California, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5615) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fresno, Fresno County, State of California, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5616) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the police department of the city of Fresno, Fresno County, State of California, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 5617) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 5618) to define the status of and to remove the restrictions from certain members of the Five Civilized Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS: A bill (H. R. 5619) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of West Plains, in Howell County, in the State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5620) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Gainesville, in Ozark County, State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5621) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ava, in Douglas County, in the State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5622) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Forsyth, in Taney County, State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5623) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ozark, in Christian County, in the State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5624) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Galena, in Stone County, State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5625) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Alton, in Oregon County, in the State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5626) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Doniphan, in Ripley County, State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5627) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Poplar Bluff, in Butler County, in the State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5628) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bloomfield, in Stoddard County, in the State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5629) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Jackson, in Cape Girardeau County, in the State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5630) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of New Madrid, in New Madrid County, in the State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5631) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Charleston, in Mississippi County, in the State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5632) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Benton, in Scott County, in the State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5633) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cape Girardeau, in Cape Girardeau County, in the State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5634) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Caruthersville, in Pemiscot County, in the State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5635) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Kennett, in Dunklin County, in the State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 5636) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of McKenzie, Tenn., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5637) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and the Mexican War, to certain widows and certain helpless and dependent children of such soldiers and sailors, and to certain Army nurses; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5638) for the erection of a public building at Linton, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5639) to make additions, extensions, and improvements to the post-office building at Vincennes, Ind., to be used for post-office and mine rescue purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 5640) to deport certain undesirable aliens and to deny readmission to those deported; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 5641) providing for wage increases in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 5642) to punish aliens in the United States of America for placing or throwing bombs or explosives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5643) to punish aliens in the United States of America for conspiracy against the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5644) to expel and exclude from the United States aliens who, to escape military service, have withdrawn

their declaration of intention to become citizens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5645) to prohibit immigration for a period of three years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 5646) authorizing the Secretary of War to make donation of condemned German cannon to the city of Ennis, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOIGT: A bill (H. R. 5647) granting additional pay to officers, enlisted men, and others who served in the armed forces of the United States in the war with Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 5648) for the construction of a bridge across the Rainy River between Spooner, Minn., and Rainy River, Province of Ontario, Canada; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 5649) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to each county seat in the ninth congressional district of Minnesota one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. UPSHAW: A bill (H. R. 5650) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fairburn, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5651) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Decatur, Dekalb County, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5652) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Douglasville, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5653) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Conyers, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5654) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Georgia Military Academy, College Park, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5655) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Confederate Soldiers' Home, State of Georgia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5656) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Atlanta, Ga., four German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS: Resolution (H. Res. 106) requesting the Secretary of State to furnish to the House of Representatives a list of all American citizens who, since the recognition by the United States of the Carranza government, have been killed in Mexico or near the boundary between the United States and Mexico by Mexicans; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolution (H. Res. 107) directing the amendment of the rules of the House of Representatives so as better to provide for the handling of the budget when received from the President; to the Committee on Rules.

By CLARK of Missouri: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, asking legislation according to the National Army and National Guard treatment similar to that given the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOCHT: Memorial from the Legislature of Pennsylvania, favoring the pensioning of all veterans of the Spanish-American War when said veterans reach a certain age; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, favoring pensions for veterans of Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LUFKIN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, urging the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to insure life and liberty to the Jewish inhabitants of the newly created Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, protesting against the discontinuance of the Parker Hill Hospital, at Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, protesting against the cruelties being inflicted upon the Jews in Poland and urging the United States to pass appropriate legislation to help in this direction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 5657) granting an increase of pension to Daniel E. Keister; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5658) granting a pension to Sophia A. Lint; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5659) granting a pension to Martha Gibson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5660) granting a pension to Maria I. Rink; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5661) granting an increase of pension to Harrison H. Riddle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5662) to reimburse John Anderson, former postmaster at Sandborn, Knox County, Ind., for stamps and funds stolen from the post office; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5663) for the relief of Frank Hardesty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BOIES: A bill (H. R. 5664) granting an increase of pension to Oluf Volkerts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 5665) for the relief of Carlow Avellina; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5666) granting a pension to Marie Merz; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 5667) granting a pension to Edward T. Costello; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 5668) to correct the military record of Peter Netz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 5669) granting an increase of pension to Lionelle Gottschalk; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5670) for the relief of Ynchausti & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HASKELL: A bill (H. R. 5671) granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. O'Shea; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 5672) referring to the Court of Claims the claims of the heirs and legal representatives of John P. Maxwell and Hugh H. Maxwell, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 5673) for the relief of Ephriam M. Beach; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5674) for the relief of Peter J. Hill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5675) for the relief of John A. Odell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5676) for the relief of William S. Rote; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5677) for the relief of Ashley H. Short; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5678) for the relief of Bernhard Steuber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5679) for the relief of Frederick Salzman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5680) for the relief of Hiram Wilson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5681) for the relief of Cyrus J. Wilsey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5682) to correct the military records of the United States Army as to muster-in service of John A. Brimmer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5683) to correct the military record of Alfred Coffin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5684) to correct the military record of Edward Hilsher alias Edward Holmes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5685) to correct the military record of John S. Miller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5686) to correct the military record of George O. Pratt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5687) granting an increase of pension to Isaac B. Stead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5688) granting an increase of pension to Ralph M. Musser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 5689) granting an increase of pension to August J. Griesbach; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Central Christian Church, of Cincinnati, Ohio, to grant to all American Indians full rights of American citizenship; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Petition of citizens of Kearney, Clay County, Mo., favoring legislation to enforce national prohibition amendment to the Constitution and protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BABKA: Petition of C. H. Flandermeyer, of Ohio, for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: Petition of Hampstead Grange, No. 163, Patrons of Husbandry, Hampstead, N. H., by Mary E. Lake, Howard Putnam, and H. E. Spencer, committee, advocating the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Keeneborough Grange, No. 172, of Brentwood, N. H., by Charles Flanders, John F. Suasey, and John Lake, committee on resolutions, and Nellie J. Smith, secretary, advocating the immediate repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of J. S. M. Ford, S. J. Parshley, Leo Frey, and Noah P. Ford, of Dover, N. H., protesting against an appropriation for reclaiming lands which are swamps, desert, and cut-over; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CARSS: Petition of Women's Alliance of First Unitarian Church, for establishing a Federal motion-picture commission for censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition relating to Jugo-Slav affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Petition of Julius A. Coleman, of Seattle, Wash., to amend the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of numerous citizens of Missouri, asking the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLE: Petition of Mount Victory (Ohio) Methodist Episcopal Church, Mount Cory (Ohio) Christian Endeavor Society of Methodist Episcopal Church, protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COPLEY: Petition of Transportation Lodge, No. 1082, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, Chicago, Ill., urging retention of the railroads under Government control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of residents of Elburn, Ill., and vicinity, protesting against any modification of war-time prohibition act; to the Committeee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of numerous residents of Schenectady, Gloversville, and Amsterdam, N. Y., praying for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY of California: Petition of Slovenic Catholic Benevolent Society of St. Joseph, of Crockett, Calif., with respect to certain features of peace deliberation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Sacramento (Calif.) Federated Trades Council in favor of the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of Frederick H. Eschmann, the Mercantile Adjuster, Eisenstadt Manufacturing Co., all of St. Louis, Mo., against repeal of zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Henry A. Frederick, W. F. Schappner, sundry citizens of St. Louis, J. F. Conrad Grocer Co., Byram Cade, B. H. Schroeder, John N. Schappner, all of St. Louis, Mo., to repeal war-prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of American Specialty Manufacturers' Association, St. Louis, Mo., against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOCHT: Papers in support of bill (H. R. 3780) for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. Roland, bill (H. R. 3779) for the relief of Sarah E. Hood, bill (H. R. 3774) for the relief of James H. Nale, bill (H. R. 3777) for the relief of Daniel Gossert, and bill (H. R. 3776) for the relief of William Francis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in support of bill (H. R. 3782) for the relief of Clarence Durr; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers in support of bill (H. R. 3769) for the relief of George D. Jones; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREEMAN: Petition of Society of Christian Endeavor, of Mansfield; members of Congregational Church, South Coventry; Methodist Episcopal Church, of Sprague; Leffengwell Baptist Church, all of Connecticut, against repeal of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. P. Bradway and others, of West Stafford, Conn., against repeal of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of Brooklyn Post, No. 368, Department of Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring House bill 280, granting an increase of pension in certain cases; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of 74 citizens of Cherry Valley, Ill., opposing any repeal or modification of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of De Kalb, Ill., concerning the Italo-Jugo-Slav question; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS: Petition of S. H. Stein and others, of Ozark; D. I. L. Seabough, of Millersville; Rev. J. S. Grabill, of Campbell, Dunkin County; Mr. Goddard and others, of Mixa; Christian Endeavor convention of Fredericktown; Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Oran; and Methodist Church membership, of Fruitland, all in the State of Missouri, against repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution adopted by the Dunkin County (Mo.) Association of Rural Letter Carriers, for equipment and maintenance allowance, and for other improvements in the Rural Delivery Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOWARD: Petition of Commercial Club, of Pecher, Okla., relating to removal of restriction from Ouapaw and other Indian tribes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 5583) for relief of Capt. Leonard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of National Croatian Society, Lodge No. 323, of Aberdeen and Wilkerson, Wash., relating to Jugo-Slav question; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of fruit growers and farmers of California, board of supervisors, city and county of San Francisco, Calif., and San Francisco Labor Council, for repeal of war-time prohibition law and praising record of President Wilson in peace conference; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Petition signed by 24 voters of Aurelius and Vevay Townships, Ingham County, Mich., protesting against the brewers and liquor men making capital out of our boys, and also that all alcoholic beverages be termed alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIESS: Papers in support of bill (H. R. 2810) granting an increase of pension to John H. Chatham; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KLECZKA: Petition of O. A. Hensel and sundry citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., for the repeal of the luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Builders' Exchange of Baltimore, by I. H. Scates, secretary, against the appropriation of $14,000,000 for the continuance of the Department of Labor Employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Gressitt-Laws Co., of Baltimore, against the repeal of the zone advances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Builders' Exchange of Baltimore, by its secretary, I. A. Scates, against the repeal of the daylight saving; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Gomprecht & Benssch, for the repeal of section 904 of the revenue law of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hochschild, Kohn & Co. for the repeal of the so-called luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of L. A. Goldheim for the repeal of the luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Robert H. Anderson, protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Isaac Roffeld, against the atrocities committed against Jews in Poland and other Slavic countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Ellicott Machine Corporation, Baltimore, Md., against United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of Peterson-Weter Co. (Inc.), Buffalo, N. Y., against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Manufacturers and Dealers' Association of Western New York, for repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Cleo B. Nield, chairman executive committee of Erie County Home Bureau, New York, protesting against the reduction of the Agricultural appropriation bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of F. W. Tyler Drug Co., Charles F. Wohrle, Henry V. Roese, and H. J. Dimmet, all of Buffalo, N. Y., for repeal of tax on medicines and toilet articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Edward Adams and sundry other citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of James A. Donovan, A. J. Leis, Eugene J. Tars, A. B. Hoolihan, William C. Hammond, Martin V. Van Every, W. J. Heegaard, E. F. Fraine, and Caledonio I. Duca, all of Buffalo, N. Y., asking for repeal of tax on medicine and toilet articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of the congregation of the Cicero Methodist Episcopal Church, of Cicero, N. Y., favoring national war-time prohibition, the necessary legislation for its enforcement, and the enforcement of the same; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of congregation of the Kirkville Methodist Episcopal Church, protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of many residents of the city of Syracuse, favoring and asking for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of thousands of citizens of New York City and Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against luxury taxes and asking immediate repeal of same; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of Christian Endeavor Society of Congregational Church of Greens Farms, Conn., opposing the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition adopted by Jewish residents of Danbury, Conn., protesting against the persecution and massacre of Jewish people in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOONEY: Petition of Jacob Rolman, of Jugo-Slav organization, asking for justice in Jugo-Slav affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of residents of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring the repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY: Petition of Jewish citizens of Steubenville, Ohio, against the manner which people of Jewish faith are being treated in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Jewish citizens of Bellaire, Ohio, against the manner in which people of Jewish faith are being treated in Roumania, Poland, and Galicia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Petition in form of telegram of United Brotherhood of Leather Workers' Union, No. 18; Flour City Local, No. 73, Blacksmiths and Helpers; No. 267, Beer Drivers; Cigar Makers, No. 77; Pressmen's, No. 20; Picture Machine Operators, No. 219; City Fire Fighters, No. 82; Theatrical Mechanical Association, No. 50; Ice Wagon Drivers, No. 221; Bricklayers and Masons' Union, No. 2; Brewery Workers Local, No. 103; Shoe Workers' Local, No. 231; Linseed Oil Workers' Union, No. 191; Bakers' Local, No. 222; Grain Elevators' Local, No. 160; Flour and Cereal Mill Workers, No. 92; Beer Bottlers' Union; Northwestern Cooks' Association, No. 458; Waiters' Union, No. 536; Bartenders' Union, No. 152; Barbers' Union, No. 61; Twin City Chauffeurs and Teamsters and Keepers; Electrical Workers, No. 292; Milk Drivers, No. 471; Minneapolis Trades and Labor Assembly; Builders' Trade Council; Press Assistants' Union, No. 6; Twin City Local, No. 12; Leather Union Lodge, No. 30; B. R. C. of A. Advance Lodge, No. 112; Coopers' Machine Operators; Iron Molders, No. 176; Local Division, No. 775, Street and Electric Railway Employees of America, all of Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against bone-dry prohibition and favoring a bill providing for beer and light wines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of W. F. Schilling, president Twin City Milk Producers' Association; George W. Kelley, editor Northwest Farmstead; J. R. Crystal; and H. I. Harter, all of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Boyd Transfer & Storage Co., Minneapolis Steel & Machinery Co., Minneapolis Tax Bureau, Strong-Scott Manufacturing Co., G. J. Carlson, Minneapolis Drug Co., W. B. & W. G. Jordan, Clark R. Fletcher, A. H. Stem and office force, all of Minneapolis, Minn., and Gordon & Ferguson, Fire & Marine Insurance Co., and American Hoist & Derrick Co., of St. Paul, Minn., protesting against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Northwestern Automobile Association, Warner Hardware Co., S. Jacobs & Co., J. B. Hudson & Co., R. G. Winters Jewelry Co., and Munns & Pomerleau, all of Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against luxury tax on automobiles, jewelry, sporting goods, and merchandise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Albert L. Demers, of Woodhaven, N. Y., for some method of checking after the so-called luxury-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. J. Nevius, of New York, against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Memorial by George A. Stedman and approximately 5,000 other citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging the repeal of section 904, revenue law of 1918, and by A. M. Hopkins and approximately 900 others, urging the repeal of said section and also of sections 902, 905, and 907, revenue law of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAIGE: Petition of E. T. Slattery Co. and Smith Patterson Co., of Boston, Mass.; also Charles F. Dingman, of Palmer, Mass., protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of Evangelical Congregational Church and Christian Endeavor Society, of Athol, Mass., protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Samuel Cohen, Boston, Mass., and National Association of Worsted and Woolen Spinners, New York City, against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of First Baptist Church, Clinton, Mass., representing 350 persons, opposing any repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of F. F. Smith and other citizens of Bucksport, and Thomas H. Darr and other citizens of Orland, Me., protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: Petition of 537 citizens of Whittier, Calif., against repeal of war prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES: Petition of Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Flat River, Mo., protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Festus, Mo., requesting the repeal of the tax on sodas, ice cream, and soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICKETTS: Petition of Baltimore-Basil Ministerial Association, representing 2,000 people, protesting against any change in prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSE: Petition of citizens of Cambria and other counties of Pennsylvania, asking for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Hartwell A. Wilkins, of Clark & Wilkins Co., New York City, relative to House bill 5; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Branford Electric Co., New York City, asking for adequate appropriations for necessities of Patent Office; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of Merchants' Association of New York, relating to the housing problems in New York City; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Service Motor Truck Co., Wabash, Ind., against tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petition of residents of Troy, Green Island, Watervliet, N. Y., opposing enforcement of eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of residents of Albany, Cohoes, Green Island, Rennselaer, Troy, and Watervliet, N. Y., representing in all 2,400 people, favoring removal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Protest against modification of war-time prohibition act from citizens of the seventeenth congressional district of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of members of Methodist Episcopal Church, Saranac Lake, N. Y., urging enforcement of war-time and constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of members of Methodist Episcopal Church, Ticonderoga, N. Y., urging enforcement of war-time and constitutional prohibition legislation, extension of prohibition to Americans in China, Federal motion-picture censorship to furnish wholesome saloon substitute; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of sundry citizens of Cave City, Ky., against the repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWNER: Petitions of Croatian League, Rathbun, Iowa, by its officers, Carl Mihalovick, president, Anton Golik, secretary, and William Katick, treasurer; Croatian League, Numa, Iowa, by its officers, Tony Tornetick, president, Frank Graehm, secretary, and August Tornetick, treasurer; and San Anton Baduo, No. 27, John Burban, president, Tohon Golik, secretary, and George Chebular, treasurer, for recognition of claims of Jugoslavia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Gravity, Taylor County, Iowa, against repeal of the so-called war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VESTAL: Papers to accompany House resolution 105, application for extension of time to take testimony and for other relief in the Alaska contested-election cases; to the Committee on Elections No. 3.

By Mr. WASON: Memorial of Pinnacle Grange, No. 18, Lyndeboro, N. H., advocating the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of Arlington Grange, No. 139, of Winchester, N. H., favoring the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Resolution adopted by the civic committee of the Organized Men's Bible Class of the Schwenkfelder Church, of Lansdale, Pa., against the repealing of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, against the luxury tax on sodas, ice cream, and soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Methodist Episcopal Church of Monessen, Pa., against the repeal of prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.